

---

## **3.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

---



## 3.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

---

The following is an introduction to the environmental analysis for the proposed project, including cumulative analysis and a discussion of general assumptions used in the environmental analysis. The reader is referred to the individual technical sections of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) (Sections 3.1 through 3.8) for further information on the specific assumptions and methodologies used in the analysis for each particular technical subject.

### 3.0.1 APPROACH TO EVALUATING PROJECT IMPACTS

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15125(a) requires that an EIR include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the project vicinity as they exist at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published and the environmental analysis is begun. The CEQA Guidelines also specify that this description of the physical environmental conditions is to normally serve as the baseline physical conditions by which a lead agency determines whether impacts of a project are considered significant.

The project site is the surface parking area of the South Pasadena Unified School District's (SPUSD or District) administrative offices site. The project site is located on the south side of Mission Street between Diamond and Fairview avenues, in the Mission West Historic Business District and in the City of South Pasadena's Mission Street Specific Plan (MSSP) area. The environmental setting conditions of the project area are described in detail in the individual technical sections of the Draft EIR (see Sections 3.1 through 3.8). In general, these sections describe the project area setting as it existed when the project's NOP was released on July 1, 2015.

#### STRUCTURE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

Sections 3.1 through 3.8 of this Draft EIR contain a detailed description of current setting conditions (including the applicable regulatory framework) and an evaluation of direct and indirect environmental effects resulting from project implementation. Sections 3.1 through 3.8 identify feasible mitigation measures and whether significant environmental effects of the project would remain after application of feasible mitigation measures, as needed.

The individual technical sections of the Draft EIR include the following information:

#### **Existing Setting**

This subsection includes a description of the physical setting associated with the technical area of discussion, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15125. As previously identified, the existing setting is normally based on conditions as they existed when the NOP for the proposed project was released on July 1, 2015.

#### **Regulatory Framework**

This subsection identifies applicable federal, state, regional, and local plans, policies, laws, and regulations that apply to the technical area of discussion.

#### **Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

This subsection identifies direct and indirect environmental effects associated with project implementation. Standards of significance are identified and used to determine whether the environmental effects are considered significant and require the application of mitigation measures. Each environmental impact analysis is identified numerically (e.g., Impact 3.1.1, Air Quality) and is supported by substantial evidence. Mitigation measures for the proposed project

### 3.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

---

were developed through a review of the project's environmental effects by consultants with technical expertise and by environmental professionals. The mitigation measures consist of performance standards that identify clear requirements which would avoid or minimize significant environmental effects.

#### Consideration of Cumulative Impacts

Each technical section in the Draft EIR considers whether the project's effect on anticipated cumulative setting conditions is cumulatively considerable (i.e., a significant effect). "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects (CEQA Guidelines Section 15065[a][3]). Cumulative impacts are based on the proposed project's contribution to development compared with the cumulative baseline condition. The determination of whether the proposed project's impact on cumulative conditions is considerable is based on a number of factors, including consideration of applicable public agency standards, consultation with public agencies, and expert opinion.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b), one of the following elements is necessary for an adequate discussion of significant cumulative impacts:

- A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency; or
- A summary of projections contained in an adopted local, regional, or statewide plan, or related planning document, that describes or evaluates conditions contributing to the cumulative effect.

In this Draft EIR, a combination of these two methods is used, depending on the environmental topic analyzed. **Table 3.0-1** provides a list of projects that could produce related impacts. The planning document used to provide a summary of projections is the City of South Pasadena General Plan, which is available for public review at the South Pasadena Unified School District's administrative offices (located at 1020 El Centro Street in South Pasadena) during normal business hours.

**TABLE 3.0-1  
RELATED PROJECTS**

Related Project	Type/Size	Location
820 Mission Street	Multi-Family Housing (38 units) Office (3,585 square feet)	820 Mission Street, South Pasadena
South Pasadena Downtown Revitalization Project	Condominiums (45 units) Senior Housing (12 units) Bowling Alley (6 lanes) Office (8,943 square feet) Retail (14,279 square feet) Restaurant (11,390 square feet)	Three-city blocks in South Pasadena generally bounded by Hope Street to the north, Fair Oaks Avenue to the east, Oxley Street to the south and Mound Avenue to the west

### 3.0.2 COMMON TERMINOLOGY USED IN THE DRAFT EIR

This Draft EIR uses the following terminology to describe the environmental effects of the proposed project:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** A less than significant impact would cause no substantial change in the physical condition of the environment (mitigation measures would not be required for project effects to be less than significant).

**Significant Impact:** A significant impact would cause a substantial adverse change in the physical conditions of the environment. Significant impacts are identified by the evaluation of project effects using specified standards of significance provided in each technical section of the Draft EIR. Identified significant impacts are those where the project would result in an impact that can be measured or quantified. Mitigation measures and/or project alternatives are identified to avoid or reduce project effects to the environment to a less than significant level.

**Significant and Unavoidable Impact:** A significant and unavoidable impact would result in a substantial negative change in the environment that cannot be avoided or mitigated to a less than significant level if the project is implemented.

**Not Cumulatively Considerable Impact:** A not cumulatively considerable impact would cause no substantial change in the physical condition of the environment under cumulative conditions.

**Cumulatively Considerable Impact:** A cumulatively considerable impact would result when the incremental effects of the project result in a significant adverse physical impact on the environment under cumulative conditions.

**Standards of Significance:** A set of significance criteria to determine at what level or “threshold” an impact would be considered significant. Significance criteria used in this Draft EIR include the CEQA Guidelines; factual or scientific information; regulatory performance standards of local, state, and federal agencies; and South Pasadena Unified School District and City of South Pasadena goals, objectives, and policies. Specified significance criteria used by the South Pasadena Unified School District are identified at the beginning of the impact analyses in each technical section of the Draft EIR.

### 3.0.3 IMPACTS FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

The proposed project consists of developing a 1.27-acre surface parking lot owned by the SPUSD with a three-story, 85,775-square-foot mixed-use project comprising two new buildings. In total, the project proposes 91 multi-family residential units (8 two-bedroom units and 83 one-bedroom units), 7,000 square feet of ground-floor commercial space fronting Mission Street, and 228 parking spaces in three levels of underground parking. As allowed under CEQA Guidelines Section 15128, this section discusses why impacts to certain environmental topics were determined to be less than significant and are therefore not discussed in detail in the Draft EIR. For an in-depth analysis, see the Initial Study in **Appendix A**.

#### AESTHETICS

As discussed in the Initial Study (**Appendix A**), the project is on an infill site in a transit priority area; consequently, the aesthetic and parking impacts of the project cannot be considered significant impacts pursuant to CEQA.

### 3.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

---

Since the proposed project would not obstruct views of the primary façades of the SPUSD Administration Building or Boardroom Building and because the project would establish a view corridor to the primary architectural feature and focal point of the rear façades, the project's impact on views of these contributing structures in the Mission West Historic Business District is **less than significant**.

According to the City of South Pasadena General Plan, no officially designated state scenic routes or highways occur near the project site. Therefore, project implementation would have **no impact** on scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

Given that the project's architectural style is consistent with the surrounding area, the scale of the proposed buildings is similar to other existing buildings in the area, and the proposed mixed-use nature of the project is consistent with the surrounding Mission West Historic Business District, the proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. Impacts are **less than significant**.

The project is required to comply with the outdoor lighting standards in the South Pasadena Municipal Code. The proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Therefore, lighting impacts are **less than significant**.

With the required compliance with this performance standard in the City's Municipal Code, the proposed project would not create a new source of substantial glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Therefore, glare impacts are **less than significant**.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

The project would have a **not cumulatively considerable impact** on aesthetic resources.

#### AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

The project site is located in a parking lot. The project site does not contain any agricultural or forestland, and the project would not result in the loss of agricultural or forestland. Therefore, the project would have **no impact** on agriculture and forestry resources.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

The project impact would be **not cumulatively considerable** on agricultural and forestry resources.

#### AIR QUALITY (ODORS)

Construction activity associated with the project may generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust. However, this impact would be short term in nature and cease upon project completion. Proposed land uses are standard multi-family residential and commercial uses and would not be expected to create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

#### BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The project site is urbanized with buildings and surface parking. Landscaping in the area consists of ornamental vegetation, including trees and shrubs. No species that are candidate, sensitive,

### 3.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

---

or special-status species are known to exist on the project site. The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts to federal or state listed or other designated species. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

The project site is urbanized with buildings and surface parking. No riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities exist on-site. **No impact** would occur to any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

No federally protected wetlands occur on-site. There would be **no impact**.

No migratory wildlife corridors or native wildlife nurseries exist in the project area. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts in this regard. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

The proposed project would be subject to the requirements of Chapter 34 of the City of South Pasadena Municipal Code, which requires a tree removal permit prior to the removal of any trees. Compliance with Chapter 34 of the City's Municipal Code would ensure that impacts related to tree preservation would be **less than significant**.

The project site is not included in an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other habitat conservation plan. There would be **no impact**.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

The project site is currently a parking lot and devoid of riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities. Further, the project would comply with the City of South Pasadena Municipal Code related to tree removal. The project would have a **not cumulatively considerable impact** with respect to biological resources.

#### **GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

No active faults are known to traverse the project site, and the project site is not located within or immediately adjacent to an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Therefore, the proposed project would not be subject to the rupture hazards of a known earthquake fault. Impacts from the rupture of a known earthquake fault would be **less than significant**.

According to the National Seismic Zone maps, South Pasadena is in Seismic Zone 4, which has the highest earthquake danger (California Seismic Safety Commission 2005, pp. 7 and 38). However, earthquake-resistant design and materials used in new construction or seismic retrofitting must meet or exceed the current seismic engineering standards of the Uniform Building Code, California Building Code Seismic Zone 4 requirements, and other applicable codes. Buildings constructed or retrofitted according to these standards would have the highest level of resistance to building collapse and major injury during a seismic event. As a result, impacts would be **less than significant** with conformance to these required standards.

The project site is not within a liquefaction hazard zone as shown on the seismic hazard zone maps for the city (California Geological Survey 2015). Therefore, project implementation is not anticipated to result in the exposure of people or structures to potential impacts related to seismic ground failure or liquefaction. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

According to the seismic hazard zone maps for the city (California Geological Survey 2015), the project site is not located within a landslide hazard area. The project site and surrounding area

### 3.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

---

are characterized by relatively flat topography. Project implementation would not expose people or structures to landslides; therefore, **no impact** would occur in this regard.

The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting process requires that the applicant submit a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) to be administered throughout project construction. Compliance with the SWPPP would ensure that impacts associated with soil erosion and loss of topsoil are **less than significant**.

Excavation and grading activities for development of the proposed project would be required to comply with the grading requirements set forth in the California Building Code. Modern engineering practices and compliance with established building standards, including the California Building Code, which require special design and construction methods, would reduce impacts to a **less than significant** level.

The City's Safety and Noise Element does not identify expansive soils as a risk to the project area, and the project site is underlain by alluvial material from the San Gabriel Mountains. This soil consists primarily of sand and gravel and is in the low to moderate range for expansion potential. Modern engineering practices and compliance with established building standards, including the California Building Code, would reduce impacts to a **less than significant** level.

The proposed project would connect to the City's existing sewer system. No septic systems and/or other alternative forms of wastewater disposal would be utilized, and **no impacts** would occur.

#### Cumulative Impacts

The project would comply with the California Building Code Seismic Zone 4 requirements for construction and grading in the project area. The project would further have a **not cumulatively considerable impact** on expansive soils and stormwater pollution. As such, the project would have a **not cumulatively considerable impact** with respect to geology and soils.

#### HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

While construction and operation of the proposed project would not generate large amounts of hazardous materials, the use, transport, and disposal of any hazardous materials during project construction and operation would be subject to federal, state, and local health and safety requirements. Adherence to federal, state, and local regulations would ensure that potential risks resulting from the routine use of hazardous materials and disposal of hazardous wastes would be a **less than significant**.

Project operation would involve a variety of common hazardous materials routinely used in households, commercial businesses, and industrial operations and processes. The proposed project would include the following hazardous materials: cleaning and pool-related chlorine products; chemical fertilizers, herbicides, and/or pesticides; paints and solvents; oils, lubricants, and refrigerants associated with building mechanical and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems; motor/hydraulic oil associated with generators and elevator equipment; and grounds and landscape maintenance products formulated with hazardous substances, including fuels, cleaners and degreasers, adhesives, and sealers. Adherence to federal, state, and local regulations would ensure that potential risks resulting from the routine use of hazardous materials and disposal of hazardous wastes would be **less than significant**.

### 3.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

---

The proposed project would be constructed at the site of the South Pasadena Unified School District's administrative offices; the project site is not located within one-quarter mile of any existing or proposed schools. There would be **no impact**.

The project site is not located on a site listed on the Cortese List. According to the State Resources Water Control Board's (2015) GeoTracker database, two sites within 1,000 feet were reported to have leaking underground storage tanks. Both of these sites are classified as completed, case closed (SWRCB 2015). Therefore, there would be **no impact**.

The project site is not located in an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of an airport or private airstrip. The proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. There would be **no impact**.

The City's Fire Department and Public Works Department would review all plans to ensure emergency access would not be impacted. The Fire Department and Public Works Department would impose conditions of approval which require that Mission Street, Diamond Avenue, and Fairview Avenue remain open to vehicular access during construction activity. The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

The project site and the surrounding area are currently developed and are not located in a portion of the city identified in the City's General Plan Safety and Noise Element as having the potential for wildland fires. **No impacts** would occur.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

Adherence to federal, state, and local regulations would ensure that potential risks resulting from the routine use of hazardous materials and disposal of hazardous wastes would be minimized and the project would have a **not cumulatively considerable impact**. Further, the project would have a **not cumulatively considerable impact** on hazardous sites and schools.

#### HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Compliance with the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit and the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Control ordinance (South Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 23.12), as well as with Section 303 of the federal Clean Water Act, would ensure that the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

The project site is located in an urbanized area, and the adjacent areas are predominantly built out. Project implementation would incrementally decrease impervious surfaces by removing the existing asphalt parking lot and introducing landscaped areas. The project does not include groundwater wells and would not be expected to affect local aquifers. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

The project site contains no streams or rivers, and the site does not directly discharge to any surface waters. However, erosion or siltation could occur during construction-related earthmoving activities associated with the proposed mixed-use buildings. Compliance with the City's regulations, including Municipal Code Chapter 23.12, and the requirements of the NPDES would ensure that this impact remains **less than significant**.

### 3.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

---

The proposed project site is currently utilized as surface parking. According to the Existing Hydrology Exhibit Plan (see Appendix A of the Initial Study), the project area is approximately 98 percent impervious surface, and the majority of the existing surface flow drains to the southeast into an existing grate drain. It is estimated that surface runoff from a 25-year storm event drains from the site at a rate of 4.52 cfs, and runoff from a 50-year storm event drains from the site at a rate of 5.13 cfs. Based on the Proposed Hydrology Exhibit Plan (see Appendix A of the Initial Study), the proposed project would result in runoff of 4.18 cubic feet per second (cfs) during a 25-year storm event and runoff of 4.75 cfs during a 50-year storm event. Thus, the amount of surface runoff would be decreased from pre-development conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not create runoff that would exceed the capacity of the storm drain system and would not provide a substantial additional source of polluted runoff. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

Short-term surface water quality impacts may occur from water erosion of soils during construction. Compliance with the City's regulations, including Municipal Code Chapter 23.12, and the requirements of the NPDES would ensure that this impact remains **less than significant**.

According to the City of South Pasadena General Plan, no portions of the city are located within the 100-year floodplain boundaries, as identified by the Flood Insurance Rate Maps. In addition, no levees or dams present flooding risks to the site or surrounding area. Thus, there would be **no impact**.

Given the inland location of the proposed project, the possibility of a seiche (seismic wave on the surface of a lake or landlocked bay) or tsunami (seismic sea wave) affecting the project site is very low. In addition, the relatively flat-lying topography of the project area precludes the possibility of mudslides inundating the project site. There would be **no impact**.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

By complying with federal, state, and local regulations, the project would have a **not cumulatively considerable impact** on water quality standards, groundwater resources, water quality, flood hazard zones, or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Since project construction impacts are short in duration and temporary on drainage patterns or stormwater drainage systems, the cumulative impact would also be negligible and therefore **not cumulatively considerable**.

#### ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES

The proposed project would incorporate "green" building measures in both the building design and the landscape design, as outlined in the Initial Study **Appendix A**. The installation of energy-efficient appliances is consistent with the energy conservation goals and policies outlined in the Open Space and Resource Conservation Element of the City's General Plan. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

The project is not located in an area known to contain mineral resources. Therefore, **no impact** on the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or a locally important resource recovery site would occur.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

The project would have a **not cumulatively considerable impact** on energy and mineral resources.

#### LAND USE AND PLANNING

Development of the proposed project would not extend past the established existing property boundaries and would therefore not divide the existing surrounding community. The proposed project would not conflict with existing commercial uses along Mission Street and would be developed consistent with the surrounding community through architectural features and landscaping. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community, and there would be **no impact**.

#### Cumulative Impacts

The project would have a **not cumulatively considerable impact** related to dividing an existing community.

#### NOISE

The project site is not located in an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, project implementation would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. There would be **no impact**.

The project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Exposure of people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels is not anticipated as a result of project implementation. There would be **no impact**.

#### Cumulative Impacts

The project would have a **not cumulatively considerable impact** related to airport land use or private airstrip operations.

#### POPULATION AND HOUSING

The project proposes the development of 91 multi-family residential units (8 two-bedroom units and 83 one-bedroom units) and 7,000 square feet of ground-floor commercial space. Therefore, project implementation would be expected to draw a new residential population to the neighborhood. The proposed project would generate a projected population increase of approximately 200 residents based on 2.2 persons per unit. The addition of the project's population would be within the Southern California Association of Governments' (2012) forecast for the city's population in 2035. Given the small percentage increase in population caused by the proposed project and because such an increase is consistent with the city's growth forecasts, impacts would be **less than significant**.

The project proposes the development of 91 multi-family residential units. The project would be constructed on a 1.27-acre site that is currently utilized as a surface parking lot for the SPUSD. Therefore, the project would not displace any existing housing and would in fact provide more housing stock. **No impact** would occur.

The project would be constructed on a 1.27-acre site that that is currently utilized as a surface parking lot for the SPUSD. Therefore, the project would not displace any people and **no impact** would occur.

#### Cumulative Impacts

The project would have a **not cumulatively considerable impact** on population and housing.

### 3.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

---

#### PUBLIC SERVICES

The project would generate a population increase of 200 persons and add approximately 7,000 square feet of commercial space. The South Pasadena Fire Department provides fire protection and emergency medical services in the city. The South Pasadena Fire Station, located at 817 Mound Avenue, would serve the project site. Although the proposed project would incrementally increase the demand for fire protection services, the project would be developed in accordance with the most current California Building Code. In addition, the type and scale of the proposed project is similar to other existing buildings in the project area that are currently adequately served by the Fire Department's existing facilities. The Fire Department would be able to maintain adequate service ratios and the proposed development would not result in the need to construct new or altered fire protection facilities or increase in firefighting services needs (Riddle 2014). Impacts would be **less than significant**.

The City of South Pasadena Police Department provides police protection in the area. Development of the proposed project would add 7,000 square feet of commercial space and approximately 200 residents to the city. This level of development is not expected to substantially affect police protection needs or service ratios. The proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered police facilities. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

The city has a current parkland deficiency of approximately 11.8 acres. The proposed project could generate an estimated 200 new residents. Based on the City's requirement of 4 acres per 1,000 residents, the project would generate demand for 0.8 acres of parks. This demand would further exacerbate existing deficiencies. When school recreation facilities are incorporated into the assessment adequate parkland facilities are available to serve both the current and forecast population in South Pasadena (City of South Pasadena 1998). In fact, according to the City's General Plan Open Space and Resource Conservation Element, when adding public recreational play areas, a surplus of approximately 30 acres of parkland currently exists. However, school recreation facilities have limited access. Importantly, residential development projects in South Pasadena are required to pay a park facilities impact fee, in accordance with Section 16A.5 of the City's Municipal Code. With payment of these fees, impacts would be **less than significant**.

#### Cumulative Impacts

Because the project would not generate a need for new or expanded facilities for fire, police or recreation services the project would have a **not cumulatively considerable impact** on fire, police, and recreation services.

#### RECREATION

Park demand can be accommodated by South Pasadena's existing supply of recreation and park facilities. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

The proposed project would 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. **No impacts** would occur.

#### Cumulative Impacts

The project would have a **not cumulatively considerable impact** on recreational resources.

#### UTILITIES

The proposed project is estimated to generate approximately 29,850 gallons per day of wastewater (see Appendix C of the Initial Study). This would represent approximately 0.000074 percent of the capacity at the County's Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) in Carson. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed the wastewater treatment capacity of the JWPCP, and this impact would be **less than significant**.

The project site is located in an urbanized area in South Pasadena. Water demand generated by development of the site would not be expected to require the construction of new or expanded water treatment or conveyance facilities (see Appendix C of the Initial Study). Impacts to water treatment facilities would therefore be **less than significant**.

According to the Existing Hydrology Exhibit Plan (see Appendix A of the Initial Study), the project area is approximately 98 percent impervious surface, and the majority of the existing surface flow drains to the southeast into an existing grate drain. It is estimated that surface runoff from a 25-year storm event drains from the site at a rate of 4.52 cfs, and runoff from a 50-year storm event drains from the site at a rate of 5.13 cfs. Based on the Proposed Hydrology Exhibit Plan (see Appendix A of the Initial Study), the proposed project would result in runoff of 4.18 cfs during a 25-year storm event and runoff of 4.75 cfs during a 50-year storm event by decreasing impervious surface and developing a new site drainage system. Thus, the amount of surface runoff would be decreased from pre-development conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not create runoff that would exceed the capacity of the storm drain system, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

The project would be expected to generate 12,753.49 pounds of solid waste per day, which can be accommodated by the Scholl Canyon Landfill and other regional landfills. Therefore, the project would be served by landfills with sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. Impacts related to solid waste disposal facilities would be **less than significant**.

The project would be required to comply with adopted programs and regulations pertaining to solid waste. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

#### Cumulative impacts

The project would have a **not cumulatively considerable impact** on wastewater treatment, water facilities, storm drain systems, and solid waste due to existing capacity and existing standards with which the project would comply.

#### TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

There are no airports or private airstrips within 10 miles of the project site. The closest airports to the project site are the Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, which is located more than 20 miles away, and the El Monte Airport, which is 11 miles away. The project would not directly impact any airport facilities and thus would not cause a change in the directional patterns of aircraft. There would be **no impact**.

The project site plan is required to adhere to the City's Municipal Code and standards for vehicle and pedestrian circulation; therefore, no significant impacts to on-site circulation are anticipated. All project-related vehicular circulation (noted above) would occur on-site and

### **3.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

---

would not impact any public streets and/or pedestrian/bicycle facilities. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

Compliance with all Building, Fire, and Safety Codes would be required to ensure that adequate emergency access to the proposed buildings and their upper floors is made available. Additionally, the City's Building Division, Public Works Department, and Fire Department would review all plans prior to building permit issuance. As a result, impacts would be **less than significant**.

Based on the Municipal Code, the proposed project would be required to provide a total of 127 spaces, of which 99 spaces would be required for the residential component and 28 spaces would be required for the retail/commercial component. In order to receive the density bonus as permitted by the MSSP, an additional 41 public spaces would be required. Therefore, in total, the proposed garage would provide 228 parking spaces and is intended to provide parking for the proposed uses, existing District uses, and general public use. Therefore, the proposed project would satisfy the City's parking standards and impacts would be **less than significant**.

### 3.0.4 REFERENCES

- California Geological Survey. 2015. Seismic Hazard Zonation Program (SHZP) Data Access. Accessed March 28.  
<http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/MapProcessor.asp?Action=SHMP&Location=All&Version=5&Browser=Netscape&Platform=Win>.
- California Seismic Safety Commission. 2005. *The Homeowner's Guide to Earthquake Safety*.
- City of South Pasadena. 1998. *City of South Pasadena General Plan*.
- . 2015. *South Pasadena Municipal Code*.
- Riddle, Paul. 2014. Deputy Fire Chief, City of South Pasadena Fire Department. Personal communication, November 17.
- SCAG (Southern California Association of Governments). 2012. *2012–2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy*.
- SWRCB (State Water Resources Control Board). 2015. GeoTracker. Accessed April 16.  
<http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=1020+El+Centro+Street%2C+South+Pasadena%2C+CA>.

### **3.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

---

This page is intentionally left blank.