

**CITY OF PASADENA
175 NORTH GARFIELD AVENUE
PASADENA, CA 91101**

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: Conditional Use Permit #5837
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: Planning & Community Development Department
City of Pasadena
175 N. Garfield Avenue, Pasadena, CA 91101
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: David Sinclair, Planner, (626) 744-6766
4. Project Location: 159 Glen Summer Road, Pasadena, CA 91105
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Dan Rix, City Engineer
City of Pasadena, Department of Public Works
100 N. Garfield Avenue, Room N-306
Pasadena, CA 91101
6. General Plan Designation: Low Density Residential
7. Zoning: RS-6
8. Description of the Project: The proposal is to allow for the continued operation of a Public Safety Facility in a single-family residence while structural repairs/improvements are made to the nearby Fire Station #39 (50 Avenue 64). This temporary facility accommodates two Fire Personnel, in three shifts, and one Rescue Ambulance. No "fire trucks", or similar large vehicles, are proposed to be located at this site. The temporary facility was established on the site in February 2012 under the provisions of the Zoning Code that permit temporary uses to be established on a site for a period of up to 12 months. As the rehabilitation of Fire Station #39 will require more than one year to be completed, a Conditional Use Permit is therefore required to permit the facility's continued operation until the repairs are complete.
9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The property is located on the west side of Glen Summer Road, approximately mid-block between Nithsdale Road to the south and Melrose Avenue to the north and is on the western side of this single-family neighborhood. San Rafael Branch Library and San Rafael Elementary School are to the south on Nithsdale Road. To the rear (west) are houses located along Avenue 64, a popular north/south route.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): Review and approval for any related building permits is required by Department of Public Works, Fire Department, and the Building Division and Design and Historic Preservation section of the Planning Department. Approval from public agencies outside the City of Pasadena is not requested or required for the proposed project.

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

DETERMINATION: (to be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Prepared By	Date	Reviewed By	Date
David Sinclair		Jennifer Paige	
Printed Name		Printed Name	

Negative Declaration/Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted on: _____
Date

Adoption attested to by: _____
Signature Date

Printed name

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 21, “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 21 at the end of the checklist.
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier documents and the extent to which address site-specific conditions for the project.
 - 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

SECTION II - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. BACKGROUND.

Date checklist submitted: September 12, 2012

Department requiring checklist: Planning & Community Development Department

Case Manager: David Sinclair, Planner, LEED AP

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? While the area does offer views of the San Gabriel Mountains and the San Rafael Hills, no construction is proposed and as a result there would not be any impact to these views or any other 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 only designated state scenic highway in the City of Pasadena is the Angeles Crest Highway (State Highway 2), which located north of Arroyo Seco Canyon in the extreme northwest portion of the City. The project site is not within the viewshed of the Angeles Crest Highway, and not along any scenic roadway corridors identified in the City's General Plan documents. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts to state scenic highways or scenic roadway corridors.

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

WHY? The proposed project consists of the continued operation of a Public Safety Facility in a single-family residence in a residential neighborhood in the City. The proposed project does not involve any construction and therefore would not lead to any demonstrable negative aesthetic impact.

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY? No construction is proposed that would add a new source of light or glare to the site. However, the use of emergency lights on the rescue ambulance could potentially be an impact. To mitigate this potential impact Mitigation Measure A-1 will be required. With the incorporation of this mitigation measure the project's impact as a source of light and glare will be reduced to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure A-1: When an emergency vehicle is dispatched from the subject site, emergency lights shall not be used until the vehicle reaches Melrose Avenue or Nithsdale Road.

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

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

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

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

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

c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104 (g))?

WHY? There is no timberland or Timberland Production zone in the City of Pasadena; therefore the proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land, timberland or Timberland Production areas.

d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use?

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY? There is no forest land in the City of Pasadena; therefore the proposed project would not result in the conversion or loss of forest land.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The most recently adopted plan is the 2007 AQMP, adopted on June 1, 2007. This plan is the South Coast Air Basin's portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). This plan is designed to achieve the five percent annual reduction goal of the California Clean Air Act.

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

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

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

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

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

<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 is well below the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) land use, construction, and mobile emission thresholds for significant air quality impacts, according to the 1993 updated SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook. Therefore, the proposed project would not violate and air quality standard or substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

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

WHY? The City of Pasadena is within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is an airshed that regularly exceeds ambient air quality standards (AAQS) – i.e., a non-attainment area. The SCAB is designated a non-attainment area for respirable particulate matter (PM₁₀), fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), and ozone (O₃). The SCAB is currently designated an attainment area for the remaining criteria pollutants, which include carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NOx), and sulfur dioxide (SO₂).

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

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

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

WHY? While the project is located near sensitive receptors (single-family residences), it is not likely to generate any toxic air emissions other than would normally be expected to occur in the neighborhood (e.g. vehicle exhaust). Therefore, the level of toxic air emissions that would be generated would be less than significant.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY? The proposed land use is not shown on the 1993 SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook Figure 5-5 "Land Uses Associated with Odor Complaints." This use will operate similar to a single-family residence and will not produce odor causing emissions. Therefore, the proposed project would not create objectionable odors, and would have no associated impacts.

6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

WHY? The project is in a developed urban area. There are no known unique, rare or endangered plant or animal species or habitats on or near the site.

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

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

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

- c. Have a substantial adverse effect of federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? ()

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

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

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

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

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

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

WHY? The only local ordinance protecting biological resources in the City of Pasadena is Ordinance No. 6896 “City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance”. The site contains two “Brush Cherry” trees neither of which are on the City’s list of protected trees and neither tree is proposed to be removed. There are no changes proposed to the site. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and would have no related impacts.

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

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

7. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

WHY? 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. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, and the project would have no related impacts.

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

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

WHY? There are no known prehistoric or historic archeological sites on the project site. In addition, the project site does not contain undisturbed surficial soils. If archaeological resources once existed on-site, it is likely that previous grading, construction, and modern use of the site have either removed or destroyed them. Consequently, surficial soils on the project site are devoid of archaeological resources. There is no construction or changes to the site. Therefore, the proposed project would not destroy a unique archeological resource and would have no related impacts.

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

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

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

WHY? There are no known human remains on the site. The project site is not part of a formal cemetery and is not known to have been used for disposal of historic or prehistoric human remains.

8. ENERGY. Would the proposal:

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

WHY? The proposed project consists of the continued operation of a Public Safety Facility in a single-family residence in a residential neighborhood in the City. The proposed project does not involve any construction. The site is manned with two-people at a time and does not consume more energy than a typical single-family residence. The project would not lead to any demonstrable negative impact to energy usage.

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

Why? (Oil-based products.) The proposed project will not create a high enough demand for energy to require development of new energy sources.

(Energy) The long-term impact from increased energy use by this project is not expected to be significant in relationship to the number of customers currently served by the electrical and gas utility companies. Supplies are available from existing mains, lines, and substations in the area. Therefore, impacts related to consumption of energy would be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

(Water) This project will result in a net-zero change in water consumption on the site. The use of the single-family residence by six fire personnel in three shifts of two at a time is not significantly different than a typical a household unit and no significant increase in the amount of water used on the site would occur.

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. ()

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.

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

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

The project site is not within any of these potential fault rupture zones. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects caused by the rupture of a known fault. No related significant impacts would result from the proposed project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? ()

WHY? See 9.a.i.

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Since the City of Pasadena is within a larger area traversed by active fault systems, such as the San Andreas and Newport-Inglewood Faults, any major earthquake along these systems will cause seismic ground shaking in Pasadena. Much of the City is on sandy, stony or gravelly loam formed on the alluvial fan adjacent to the San Gabriel Mountains. This soil is more porous and loosely compacted than bedrock, and thus subject to greater impacts from seismic ground shaking than bedrock. However, as the project does not involve any construction and the use of the site is not significantly changing, no related impacts are expected.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction as delineated on the most recent Seismic Hazards Zones Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of known areas of liquefaction? ()

WHY? The project is located within a Liquefaction Hazard Zone as shown on Plate P-1 of the 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects caused by seismic induced ground failure. However, as the project does not involve any construction and the use of the site is not significantly changing, no project related impacts would occur.

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

WHY? The project site is not within a Landslide Hazard Zone as shown on Plate P-1 of the 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan. This Plate was developed considering the Earthquake-Induced Landslide areas as shown on the State of California Seismic Hazard Zone maps for the City. Therefore, the project will have no impacts from seismic induced landslides.

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

WHY? No construction is proposed as part of this project, therefore there will be no impact from grading or alteration of the site's topography.

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? ()

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Background Report to the 2002 Safety Element, the majority of the City lies on the flat portion of the alluvial fan, which is expected to be stable.

The project site is located in the southwest portion of the City near the base of the San Rafael Hills. Plate 2-4 of Technical Background Report to the 2002 Safety Element shows this area to have a Slope Instability Rating of "Low". Therefore, the project would not likely expose the rescue personnel to risk from on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

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

WHY? According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City's General Plan the project site is underlain by alluvial material from the San Gabriel Mountains. This soil consists primarily of sand and gravel and is in the low to moderate range for expansion potential. Further, the project site is located near the base of the San Rafael Hills. Alluvial materials in this area may contain clay-based soils that are subject to expansion. However, as no construction is proposed part of the project and no related impacts are expected.

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

WHY? The existing single-family residence is already connected to the existing sewer system. Therefore, soil suitability for septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems is not applicable in this case, and the proposed project would have no associated impacts.

10. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

WHY? The project will generate Carbon Dioxide similar to that of the surrounding single-family residences. Carbon Dioxide is the primary component of Greenhouse gases (GHG). Thus, the project will contribute to global warming as described by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. However, the amount of Greenhouse gases generated by the continued operation of a temporary Public Safety Facility in a single-family residence will not be significant.

b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

WHY? The project will not conflict any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Code and is not a use that is a significant source of GHG emissions. The project will not conflict with AB 32 and the ARB Scoping Conditional Use Permit #5837 Initial Study September 12, 2012 Page 13
Temporary Public Safety Facility
159 Glen Summer Road

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Plan: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scopingplan.htm; therefore, there will be no impacts related to conflict with applicable plans.

11. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

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

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

b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? ()

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

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

WHY? While the project is within one-quarter of San Rafael Elementary School, it does not involve hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials, substance, or. Therefore, the proposed project would have no hazardous material related impacts to schools.

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

WHY? The project site is not located on the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List of sites published by California Environmental Protection Agency (CAL/EPA). The site is not known or anticipated to have been contaminated with hazardous materials and no hazardous material storage facilities are known to exist onsite.

f. 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? ()

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. The nearest public use airport is the Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, which is operated by a Joint Powers Authority with representatives from the Cities of Burbank, Glendale and Pasadena. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport and would have no associated impacts.

g. 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. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would have no associated impacts.

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

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

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

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

i. 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? ()

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

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

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

As shown on Plate P-2 of the 2002 Safety Element, the project site is in an area of very high fire hazard. The Fire Department has reviewed the project and is requiring the installation of fire alarms in the residence.

12. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

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

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

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

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

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

The proposed use is not a point source generators of water pollutants, and thus, no quantifiable water quality standards apply to the project. As an urban development, the proposed project would add typical, urban, nonpoint-source pollutants to storm water runoff. As discussed, these pollutants are permitted by the County-wide MS4 permit, and would not exceed any receiving water limitations. Furthermore, the proposed project proposes no new construction and does not meet the City's SUSMP requirement thresholds, and thus, water pollutants generated from the development are considered negligible. Therefore, the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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

The project will use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power. The source of some of this water supply is ground water, stored in the Raymond Basin. Thus, the project could indirectly withdraw groundwater. However, the proposed water usage would be negligible in comparison to the overall water service provided by the Department of Water and Power. The site contains a single-family residence that has been operating as a Temporary Public Safety Facility. There are no changes to personnel or operations that would increase water demand at the site.

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

WHY? The project site is currently virtually flat, and runoff onsite drains as sheet flow from west to east. The project site does not contain any discernible streams, rivers, or other drainage features. No constriction is proposed, therefore there would not be any impact to the existing drainage pattern.

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

WHY? As discussed, the project would involves no changes in the site's drainage patterns and does not involve altering a discernible drainage course, therefore, the proposed project does not have the potential to alter drainage patterns or increase runoff that would result in flooding.

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

WHY? The proposed project would not change the amount of water runoff as no construction is proposed. Therefore, the City's existing storm drain system can adequately serve the proposed development.

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? ()

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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

WHY? No portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As shown on FEMA map Community Number 065050, most of the entire City is in Zone X. A few scattered areas are located in Zone D. Both Zone X and Zone D are located outside of the "Special Flood Hazard Areas Subject to Inundation by the 1% Annual Chance of Flood" (100 year floodplain) and no floodplain management regulations are required.

In addition, according to the City's Dam Failure Inundation Map (Plate 3-1, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan) the project is not located in a dam inundation area.

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

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

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

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

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

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

13. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

a. Physically divide an existing community? ()

WHY? The project will not physically divide an existing community, as the site is surrounded by similar development on all sides, and the project consists of an infill development within a highly urbanized area. No adverse impact will result.

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

WHY? The project is consistent with both the RS-6 zoning designation and the Low Density Residential General Plan Land Use Designation in the adopted 2004 Land Use Element. The project proposes the continued operation of Temporary Public Safety facility in an existing single-family residence. The review and approval of a Conditional Use Permit allows this proposed use. There are no changes to the site proposed and the project will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulations.

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

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

14. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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

15. NOISE. Will the project result in:

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

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

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

WHY? The project is not located near any sources of groundborne noise or vibration and will not expose any persons to excessive vibrations or groundborne noise levels.

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

WHY? See response to 15.a. The project will not lead to a significant permanent increase in ambient noise. The project does not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by the project would be typical urban environment noise. Furthermore, in Pasadena many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code. There are no changes proposed to the site and there will be no permanent increase to the ambient noise level.

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

WHY? No construction is proposed as part of the continued operation of the Public Safety Facility, so no constructed-related noise impacts are expected. However, the use of emergency vehicle sirens could potentially be a significant impact, even on a short-term basis. There are no proposed changes to the current

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

operation of the site; however a mitigation measure is included to address any potential noise from the ambulance that is dispatched from the site. Mitigation Measure N-1 is required. With the incorporation of this mitigation measure the project's impact as a source of noise will be reduced to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure N-1: When an emergency vehicle is dispatched from the subject site, emergency sirens shall not be used until the vehicle reaches Melrose Avenue or Nithsdale Road.

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

WHY? There are no airports or airport land-use plans in the City of Pasadena. The closest airport is the Bob Hope Airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people to excessive airport related noise and would have no associated impacts.

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

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

16. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

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

WHY? The proposed project involves continued operation of a Public Safety Facility in a single-family residence which is consistent with the land use designations for the site (See Section 13 of this document). Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the growth anticipated and accommodated by the City's General Plan. Furthermore, the project is located in a developed urban area with an established roadway network and in-place infrastructure. Thus, development of the proposed project would not require extending or improving infrastructure in a manner that would facilitate off-site growth. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

WHY? The existing residence would temporarily be used as Public Safety Facility, thereby eliminating the possibility of it being used as a residence during that time. However, the temporary loss of one dwelling unit is a less than significant impact.

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

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

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

WHY? No persons currently reside on the project site and the temporary loss of one dwelling unit is a less than significant impact.

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

a. Fire Protection? ()

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

WHY? The proposed project will not result in the need for additional new or altered fire protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. The project is providing a temporary Public Safety Facility while Station #39 is remodeled and will therefore assist in meeting fire safety needs for the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact fire protection services. See also Section 11.h) of this document for wildfire-related impacts.

b. Libraries? ()

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

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

c. Parks? ()

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

WHY? The proposed project is a non-residential project that would not increase the City's population.

d. Police Protection? ()

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

WHY? The proposed project will not result in the need for additional new or altered police protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact police protection services.

e. Schools? ()

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY? The temporary use of a single-family residence for use as a Public Safety Facility will not impact schools.

f. Other public facilities? ()

WHY? The temporary use of a single-family residence for use as a Public Safety Facility will not impact other public facilities.

18. RECREATION.

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

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

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

WHY? The project does not include recreational facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project does not involve the development of recreational facilities that would have an adverse effect on the environment, and would have no associated impacts.

19. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

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

WHY? The project is located along Glen Summer Road and is supported by a roadway network consisting of Melrose Avenue, West Colorado Boulevard, Avenue 64, and Nithsdale Road. None of these roadways are Principal Mobility/Multimodal Corridors or are de-emphasized streets, as identified in the 2004 Adopted Mobility Element of the General Plan.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

The City of Pasadena Department of Transportation reviewed the proposed project and determined that no additional traffic analysis is required. This decision is in part based on the fact that the Public Safety Facility is existing and its continued operation does not trigger further analysis. In addition, the total number of vehicle trips that the use would generate per day is approximately 12-20, of which 6-10 are staff trips, and the existing street system has sufficient capacity to handle these trips.

The City of Pasadena Department of Transportation also reviews a project to determine if it is in compliance with plans and policies related to alternative modes of circulation (i.e. the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans). The project has been reviewed and will not conflict with such plans and will not interfere with effectiveness of the overall circulation system.

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

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

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

Intersection Capacity Analysis (ICU)	
Current ICU	Change due to project
A	0.060
B	0.050
C	0.040
D	0.030
E	0.020
F	0.010

The proposed project would not add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to any CMP facility, and would not add 150 or more trips, in either direction, during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to a mainline freeway. The total number of trips per day is approximately 12-20, of which 6-10 are staff trips. Thus, due to the size of the project, an impact analysis for CMP facilities is not required for the proposed project. In addition, according to PasDOT, the project would not significantly impact the level of service (LOS) at any roadway intersections. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, an establish level of service standard, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

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. Consequently, the proposed project would not affect any airport facilities and would not cause a change in the directional patterns of aircraft. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to air traffic patterns.

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

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

WHY? The temporary use of a single-family residence for use as a Public Safety Facility does not involve any changes to the vehicular circulation on the site and therefore no significant impacts are expected.

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

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

WHY? The ingress and egress for the site have been evaluated by the PasDOT and found to be adequate for emergency access or access to nearby uses. The project does not involve the elimination of a through-route, and does not involve the narrowing of a roadway.

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

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

WHY? The parking demand is expected to be one personal vehicle per fire personnel and one rescue ambulance. As the staffing is two personnel at a time (and three shifts per day) the needed parking can be accommodated in the existing two-car garage and the driveway, where the rescue ambulance is staged. Similar to other residences in the vicinity, additional parking can be accommodate in the driveway and on the street as needed, although the likelihood and that street parking would be needed is minimal.

g. *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? ()*

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

WHY? The project has been evaluated by the PasDOT and has been found to be consistent with the City's policies, plans, and programs supporting alternative transportation. Therefore, the project would have no impact to alternative transportation.

20. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

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

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

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

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

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

WHY? The proposed project would not increase or decrease the demand for water and wastewater service and all connections to water and wastewater facilities currently exist. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities off-site, and the project would have no associated impacts.

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

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

WHY? The project will not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. The project is located in a developed urban area where storm drainage is provided by existing streets, storm drains, flood control channels, and catch basins. As discussed in Section 12, the project does not involve any changes in the site's drainage patterns and does not involve altering any drainage courses or flood control channels.

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

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

WHY? The adequacy of water supply is a potential problem for all new development since the Southern California region has been known to experience periods of drought and needs a long-term reliable water supply. However, this project will not result in an increase in water consumption as the temporary Public Safety Facility currently exists and is operating at this site. Therefore, the project would not result in insufficient water supplies, and would cause no related impacts.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY? The proposed project consists of the continued operation of a temporary Public Safety Facility and would not increase the demand for wastewater service. Therefore, the project would not result in insufficient wastewater service, and would cause no related impacts.

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

WHY? The project can be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. The City of Pasadena is served primarily by Scholl Canyon landfill, which is permitted through 2025, and secondarily by Puente Hills, which was 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 substantial alteration to the existing system of solid waste collection and disposal. Therefore, the project would cause no impacts under this topic

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

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

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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

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

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

prehistory. As discussed in Sections 12 and 14 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to water quality or Mineral Resources.

However, as discussed in Sections 3 (Aesthetics) and 15 (Noise), there are potentially significant impacts to the surround neighborhood that could result from the use of emergency light and/or sirens. To mitigate these impacts, Mitigation Measures A-1 and N-1 will be incorporated into the operation of the Public Safety Facility to reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure A-1: When an emergency vehicle is dispatched from the subject site, emergency lights shall not be used until the vehicle reaches Melrose Avenue or Nithsdale Road.

Mitigation Measure N-1: When an emergency vehicle is dispatched from the subject site, emergency sirens shall not be used until the vehicle reaches Melrose Avenue or Nithsdale Road.

b. *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?* ()

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

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

WHY? As discussed in Sections 5, 11, 12, and 19 of this document, the proposed project would not expose persons to the hazards of toxic air emissions, chemical or explosive materials, flooding, or transportation hazards. In addition, as discussed in Sections 13 Land Use and Planning, 16 Population and Housing, 17 Public Services, 18 Recreation, 19 Transportation/Traffic and 20 Utilities and Service Systems the project would not indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

However, as discussed in Sections 3 (Aesthetics) and 15 (Noise), there are potentially significant impacts to the surrounding neighborhood that could result from the use of emergency light and/or sirens. To mitigate these potential impacts, Mitigation Measures A-1 and N-1 will be incorporated into the operation of the Public Safety Facility to reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure A-1: When an emergency vehicle is dispatched from the subject site, emergency lights shall not be used until the vehicle reaches Melrose Avenue or Nithsdale Road.

Mitigation Measure N-1: When an emergency vehicle is dispatched from the subject site, emergency sirens shall not be used until the vehicle reaches Melrose Avenue or Nithsdale Road.

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

INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

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