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

INITIAL STUDY

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

SECTION I – PROJECT INFORMATION

- 1. Project Title: Temporary Increase in Rose Bowl Displacement Events
- 2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Pasadena, 175 North Garfield Ave, Pasadena, CA 91101
- 3. Contact Person and Phone Number: David Sinclair (626) 744-6766
- 4. Project Location: 1001 Rose Bowl Drive, Pasadena, CA 91103
- Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Rose Bowl, 1001 Rose Bowl Drive, Pasadena, CA 91103
- 6. General Plan Designation: Open Space
- 7. Zoning: Open Space
- 8. Description of the Project: The Rose Bowl currently holds approximately 12 displacement events (greater than 20,000 attendees) per year, primarily on weekends. The number of displacement events is restricted by the Pasadena Municipal Code, which currently allows for 12 displacement events annually. The proposed project would amend the Municipal Code, Chapter 3.32, to temporarily increase the number of displacement events to 25 per year. Currently, seven events are contractually reserved for the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) football games, as well as up to two post-season collegiate games including the Rose Bowl. Up to 13 proposed events would be reserved for the National Football League (NFL). Given the scheduling of the NFL, it is anticipated that no more than three games per year would be held on a weeknight. No NFL games would be held on the same day as a college football game. The NFL is currently in negotiations with the owners of two potential stadium sites in or near the City of Los Angeles to house the NFL in a permanent location. The use of the Rose Bowl would be temporary until a new NFL stadium is selected and built in the Los Angeles area, or until the completion of the football season (including playoffs) in 2018,

whichever comes first. The Rose Bowl would also continue to host other displacement events such as concerts and additional sporting events, with the total number of events not to exceed 25 annually.

In addition to displacement events, the monthly swap meet and flea market would continue to be held, as would soccer and other games held in Lot H outside the stadium. There would be no change to the number of minor events that could be held. Approximately 25 events with attendance between 2,000 and 20,000 are held on an annual basis.

The proposed project does not include any physical changes to the Rose Bowl Stadium or any of the surrounding features. It would not increase or decrease the seating available at the stadium, or associated parking. It does not include any ground disturbing or excavation activities, any interior or exterior renovation to the Rose Bowl, or any new structures on the project site.

- 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Surrounding land uses include Brookside Golf Course immediately to the north of the Rose Bowl stadium and the Brookside Park to the south. Single-family residential units are located near the stadium on the slopes of the Arroyo Seco. The residential neighborhoods surrounding the Central Arroyo are primarily zoned single-family residential and within a hillside development district. The southeast edge of the Central Arroyo along Arroyo Terrace contains some small areas zoned for multi-family residential uses.
- 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): The project will require amendments to the Arroyo Seco Public Land Ordinance, which is codified in the Pasadena Municipal Code at Chapter 3.32. Amendments would be required to temporarily increase the number of displacement events from 12 to 25.

Commissions involved in the entitlement process include, but are not limited to the following:

- Rose Bowl Operating Company
- City Council for review/approval of the amendment to the Arroyo Seco Land Ordinance

Additional approvals from the following local, regional, or state agencies may be required for implementation of the proposed project:

• South Coast Air Quality Management District – air quality permits, if needed

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

	Aesthetics		Geology and Soils		Population and Housing
	Agricultural Resources		Hazards and Hazardous Materials	X	Public Services (parks)
Х	Air Quality(including Greenhouse Gas Emissions)		Hydrology and Water Quality	Х	Recreation
	Biological Resources	X	Land Use and Planning	X	Transportation/Traffic
	Cultural Resources		Mineral Resources		Utilities and Service Systems
	Energy	X	Noise	Х	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.	
I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	X
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.	4
Impact Sciences Prepared By/Date Multiplication Seviewed By/Date	3/13/12
Susan Tebo	
Printed Name	
Negative Declaration/Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted on:	
Adoption attested to by:Printed name/Signature Date	
Temporary Increase in Rose Bowl Displacement Events March 13, 2012	Page 3

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.
 - 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

SECTION II - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1.	BACKGROUND. Date checklist sub	mitted: March 13	3, 2012		
2.	ENVIRONMENTAL IMP	PACTS. (explana	tions of all answer	s are required):	
		Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.	AESTHETICS. Would the	ne project:			
	a. Have a substantial a	adverse effect on	a scenic vista? ()	
					\boxtimes
prop Rose Free resu Ther any	e Central Arroyo Seco, osed project would not re Bowl or surrounding so way (located approximalt in a temporary change e is no construction propway obstruct the views on pact to scenic vistas.	esult in the mod enic resources s tely 0.25 mile from e in the number cosed or physical	lification of any of such as nearby Liron the project site of events to be held to the site of the sit	the physical com nda Vista Avenue e). The proposed reld at the Rose tadium. The proje	nponents of the e or the Foothill d project would Bowl annually. ect would not in
	b. Substantially damage outcroppings, and h		, , ,	-	es, rock ()
					\boxtimes
High north High docu	The only designated sway (State Highway 2) west portion of the City way, and not along any ments. Therefore, the pric roadway corridors. The only designated states are supplied to the price of th	, which located. The project sitey scenic roadwa	north of Arroyo e is not within the ay corridors identi	Seco Canyon in viewshed of the fied in the City's	n the extreme Angeles Crest General Plan

However, the project site is within 0.25 mile of the Foothill Freeway (I-210), and approximately 1,500 feet (at its closest point) to Linda Vista Avenue, both the Foothill Freeway and Linda Vista Avenue were identified in the 1987 Environmental Quality Element of the City's General Plan as a Los Angeles County Recommended Scenic Highway. Although the project site is within a locally recognized scenic roadway corridor, the proposed project would not damage any scenic resources, and would not otherwise affect the visual quality of the roadway corridor. The project would not negatively affect any historic structures, landscape features, or vegetation that

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

 \boxtimes

No Impact

contributes to the views along the corridor. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact any locally recognized scenic roadway corridors.

C.	Substantially degra surroundings? (al character or q	er or quality of the site and its		
					\boxtimes

WHY? The proposed project does not include any physical changes to the Rose Bowl Stadium. It would not change the scale or massing of the stadium or any dominant features of the stadium that contribute to the visual character of the site such as the neon Rose Bowl sign, the horizontal structure and tower of the Press Box, the elliptical shape of the stadium bowl, the low-rise even height of the stadium rim, the flat paved open concourse surrounding the stadium, and the Arroyo stone berm retaining walls and landscaping. The approval of the proposed project will increase the amount of displacement events held annually from 12 events to 25 for a period of up to five years. There are no changes to the stadium, parking, or outer surrounding areas proposed. The project will therefore not lead to any demonstrable negative aesthetic impact.

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

WHY? The proposed project would increase the number of displacement events that could be held at the Rose Bowl from 12 to 25 per year (for a period of up to five years). The majority of the 13 new events would likely be NFL games. Given the NFL schedule, it is anticipated that approximately three games per year would be weeknight games, additional games could be held on Sunday evenings, but it is anticipated that the majority of the games would be Sunday day games.

The existing field lighting system consists of five poles spread around the field (each with 27 fixtures), two poles at the north end (each with nine fixtures), and 14 banks of light fixtures (each bank consisting of 12 light fixtures) on top of the Press Box. The light poles currently reach a height of 30 feet above the rim of the stadium. The bank of lights atop the Press Box reaches a height of 10 feet above the roofline. When illuminated at night, the stadium is visible from the surrounding area. The proposed project does not include any changes to the field lighting system and therefore would not create a new source of light or glare. Although the frequency of events would increase, less than half of the proposed 13 events would be night events, and it is estimated that approximately three to four night events would occur per year. Further, the use of the Rose Bowl by the NFL would be temporary only. The project approval would allow the additional events for a period of up to five years only to accommodate a new permanent stadium that will be constructed. The increase in the number of nighttime events of three to four games per year for up to five years would not be a material change to existing conditions. No changes to the lighting will be made. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Potentially
Significant
Impact
Unless
Mitigation is Incorporated

Significant
Unless
Significant
Significant
Significant
Significant
Impact
Impact

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources

are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land

4.

Conserva	on and Site Assessment ation as an optional mode e project:				
a.	Convert Prime Farmlar (Farmland), as shown of Monitoring Program of t ()	on the maps p	repared pursua	nt to the Farmlan	d Mapping and
					\boxtimes
northwes south thr contains maps pro	he City of Pasadena is a cet. The western portion of rough the City. It has conno prime farmland, unique epared pursuant to the Fes Agency.	the City containmercial recre efarmland, or	ains the Arroyo eation, park, na farmland of sta	Seco, which runatural and open stewide importance	s from north to pace. The City e, as shown on
b.	Conflict with existing zoni	ng for agricult	ural use, or a W	'illiamson Act con	tract? ()
					\boxtimes
growing Commerce the RS (I specific p Open Sp	The City of Pasadena has areas. Commercial Gricial), CL (Limited Comme Residential Single-Family) plan areas. The project site ace. Consequently, there amson Act contract.	owing Area/0 rcial), and IG ,and RM (Res te is zoned an	Grounds is pe (General Indus idential Multi-Fa id has a Gener	ermitted in the strial) zones and amily) districts an al Plan Land use	CG (General conditionally in d within certain designation of
C.	Conflict with existing zone Resources Code Section Code Section 4526), or Government Code Section	n 12220 (g)), timberland 2	timberland (as zoned Timberla	s defined by Pul	blic Resources
					\boxtimes
WHY? T	here is no timberland or T	imberland Pro	duction zone in	the City of Pasa	dena; therefore

the proposed project would not result in the loss of forestland, timberland, or Timberland

Production areas.

		Impact	Incorporated	Impact	
d.	Result in the loss of fore	est land or c	onversion of forest	land to a non-fo	rest use?
					\boxtimes
	ere is no forestland in th sult in the conversion or	•		the proposed p	roject would not
	Involve other changes ature, could result in con-		•		
					\boxtimes
	ere is no known farmland ot result in the conversion	•		• •	ed project would
quality m	QUALITY. Where avail anagement or air pollutinations. Would the project	ion control o			
a. C	Conflict with or obstruct in	mplementatio	on of the applicable	air quality plan	?()

Potentially

Significant

Significant

Unless

Mitigation is

Less Than

Significant

No Impact

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 5 percent annual reduction goal of the California Clean Air Act.

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

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

The project is consistent with the growth expectations for the region, as it does not include any additional housing or commercial uses that would result in an increase in population or stationary sources of pollution. The proposed project is therefore consistent with the AQMP and the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan.

b.	Violate any air quality s violation? ()	tandard or con	tribute to an	existing or projed	cted air quality
		\boxtimes			
receives prevailing cities, to the against the Pasadent air quality and induces	ue to its geographical losmog from downtown Log winds, from the southwenthe San Fernando Valley the foothills. For these read is located in a nonattain standards. Due to pote ced air pollutants, the proprojected air quality viound this topic will be discurred.	os Angeles and est, carry smog and to Pasaden sons, the potent nment area, an intial for increase roject may viola plation. Therefore	d other areas from wide are in the San Cial for adverse area that frequed traffic asso te an air quale, the project I	in the Los Angele cas of Los Angele Gabriel Valley who are air quality in Passuciated with the prolity standard or c	eles basin. The es and adjacent ere it is trapped sadena is high. ational ambient roposed project contribute to an
	Result in a cumulatively the project region is nor quality standard (including for ozone precursors)?	n-attainment und ng releasing em	der an applica	able federal or sta	ate ambient air
WHYS T	ha City of Basadana is w	vithin the South	Coast Air Box	oin (SCAB) which	h io an airchad

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 (PM2.5), and ozone (O_3). 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 described in **Section 5.b**, the proposed project could exceed the SCAQMD's Thresholds for Significance. The SCQAMD established its thresholds in consideration of cumulative air pollution in the SCAB. Thus, projects that exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds may significantly contribute to cumulative air quality impacts. Since the proposed project could exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds, the project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant. Therefore, the project has the potential for a significant impact, and this topic will be discussed in the EIR.

	Impact	Incorporated	Impact	-
d. Expose sensitive recep	otors to substant	ial pollutant conce	entrations?	()
	\boxtimes			
WHY? Land uses surrounding the north of the Rose Bowl residential units are located not neighborhoods surrounding the within a hillside development Terrace contains some small a independent kindergarten throusite. However, the Rose Bowl Chandler School since the school	stadium, and the stadium of the stadium has open of the stadium of th	he Brookside Pa on the slopes of the are primarily zone theast edge of the nulti-family reside eschool, is locate erated on the pro	ark to the sout ne Arroyo Seco ned single-famil ne Central Arro ential uses. Cha d within 0.25 m	th. Single-family b. The residential y residential and yo along Arroyo andler School, an aile of the project
The proposed project is anticipal associated with events. Due to will be discussed in the EIR.				
e. Create objectionable o	dors affecting a	substantial numbe	er of people? ()
WHY? The proposed project is of the proposed project, the sit use is not shown on the 1993 Associated with Odor Completentainers and removed at recobjectionable odors, and would	e would remain i SCAQMD's CE0 aints." Any proje gular intervals. T	n use as a recrea QA Air Quality Ha ect related refus herefore, the pro	ational event spandbook Figure e would be stapposed project was	ace. This type of 5-5 "Land Uses ored in covered
6. BIOLOGICAL RESOUR	CES. Would the I	oroject:		
 a. Have a substantial a any species identifiee regional plans, polici Game or U.S. Fish ar 	d as a candidate es, or regulatior	e, sensitive, or sp ns, or by the Cal	pecial status sp	ecies in local or
			\boxtimes	
WHY? The majority of the prouses that are not likely to sup Arroyo Seco is recognized as a Gabriel Mountains to the Los A has undergone extensive mod plant communities and species slopes of the project area, as	port special state an important region angeles River and difications to both are almost exclusion	us species or hal onal wildlife corrid d Pacific Ocean. In the landscape a usively restricted	bitat. However, dor because it on the central port and the channe to the east and	the surrounding connects the San tion of the arroyo I. Native, natural west-facing side

terrestrial natural communities to the sidewalls of the arroyo has limited the natural habitat available for animals to use for food, shelter, cover, and movement. Furthermore, the central portion of the site experiences substantial daytime and nighttime recreation and illumination that would tend to inhibit wildlife movement across developed areas. The proposed project would

Significant

Unless

Less Than

Significant

No Impact

Potentially

Significant

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

modify the number of displacement events allowed at the stadium and does not propose any new construction or physical changes to the site or surrounding area. The project would not affect habitat or special status species through physical modifications of the site. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant effect on wildlife and habitat.

b.	Have a substantial adve community identified in California Department of	local or region	al plans, poli	icies, and regulat	ions or by the
similar uspecies Department within the recently status plays to the significal regional	As discussed above, the uses. As recently as 200 (or associated habitats) tent of Fish and Game, or ne project site. Surveys as 2007 did not identify the lant species within the site ite or surrounding area. Ont effect any riparian habit plans, policies, and regult hand Wildlife Service.	7, no endange designed by the California Natival and literature to occurrence of the Consequently, that or other ser	red, rate, throme U.S. Fish we Plant Societ reviews for standangew construction he proposed insitive natural	eatened, or speci- and Wildlife Servety were known to sensitive species ered, rare, threate on proposed or phase project would had community ident	al status plant vice, California occur or found conducted as ened, or special sysical changes ve a less than ified in local or
C.	Have a substantial adv Section 404 of the Clear coastal, etc.) through dire ()	Water Act (ind	cluding, but n	ot limited to, mars	sh, vernal pool,

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 Arroyo Seco flood control channel is located just west of the stadium. The proposed project does not propose any physical changes to the project site, nor would it directly modify the channel, which is considered a jurisdictional water (e.g., "other waters") of the United States and therefore subject to regulation under Section 404 and 401 of the Clean Water Act. Consequently, the project would not create any significant impacts to federally protected wetlands.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d.	Interfere substantially wildlife species or wit impede the use of nati	h established r	native resident or		•
				\boxtimes	
WHY? As discussed above, the Arroyo Seco is recognized as an important regional wildlife corridor because it connects the San Gabriel Mountains to the Los Angeles River and Pacific Ocean. However, the central portion of the arroyo has undergone extensive modifications to both the landscape and the channel. Native, natural plant communities and species are almost exclusively restricted to the east and west-facing side slopes of the project area. Therefore, the confinement of terrestrial natural communities to the sidewalls of the arroyo has limited the natural habitat available for animals to use for food, shelter, cover, and movement. Furthermore, the central portion of the site experiences substantial daytime and nighttime recreation and illumination that would tend to inhibit wildlife movement across developed areas. Thus wildlife movement is generally restricted to the sidewalls or the channelized portion of the stream. The proposed project would not result in any physical or permanent changes to the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant effect on wildlife and habitat. e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (
					\boxtimes
WHY? The only local ordinance protecting biological resources in the City of Pasadena is Ordinance No. 6896 "City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance," codified at Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.52 All trees within the project boundary would be subject to the Tree Protection Ordinance, as they are considered public trees (located on property under ownership or control of the City). Some of the trees on site may also be protected as landmark, specimen, or native trees as defined in the Ordinance. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the removal or damage of any public trees, as no physical changes would occur as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, there would be no related significant impacts. f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural					
	Community Conserva habitat conservation p	•	,,), o, ouis, app	novou novum, nog	ional, or olato
					\boxtimes
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. Therefore, no impact would occur.					

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

Impact

7.	CULTURAL	RESOURCES.	Would the	project:

a.	Cause a substantial adve defined in CEQA Guideline			of a historical res	source as
					\boxtimes
the Arroy Rose Bo Millard H are designed previousl City of Pa historic s for devel effects go that the features of the rock vegetation tiered se tunnels of scoreboom modified surround displacer Therefore significar	here are five historical results of Seco area, all of which wil, Prospect Historic Districtions, and La Miniatura. According as a support of the Rose Bowl include the wall, the open underside on pattern, particularly rose ating, including gently slop with aisles that radiate strates. None of these featur as a result of the propose ing area proposed as pattern, can be proposed as pattern, can be proposed as pattern, particularly rose ating, including gently slop with aisles that radiate strates. None of these featur as a result of the propose ing area proposed as pattern, proposed project and of a historical resource,	are also listed or ict, Louise C. Be diditionally, the Louise of the condmarks. Severally altered that resource are boundary of the cor materially altered that resource are boundary of the of the bowl and is and large palmoded the compact. There are of this project. There are of this project would not caus and the project would not caus an	n the National Rentz House, Holly wer Arroyo Seconal other resource of historic designesources are evaportance and there convey its historicing a resource in e no longer context exposed unpain a trees, the operage punctuated by to the field and ocated, altered, are no physical of the context of the only clamporarily for a period of the exposed unpain to the field and ocated, altered, are no physical of the only clamporarily for a period of the exposed unpain to the field and ocated, altered, are no physical of the only clamporarily for a period of the exposed unpain the context of the only clamporarily for a period of the field and ocated. The only clamporarily for a period of the field and ocated and ocated and the field and ocated and	egister. These in a Street Livery S and La Casita D es are currently ation or recognitical luated by determined the significance. So an adverse many veyed. Characte luding the perimented concrete sure bowl of the start of upward above, demolished, or changes to the shange is the new period of up to fix adverse change ated impacts.	iclude the table and oel Arroyo or have on by the nining the potential Significant ner such r defining ter fence, face, the dium with ed access, and the otherwise tadium or umber of ye years). Je in the
b.	Cause a substantial adver-	-	significance of a	ın archaeological	resource

WHY? The arroyo environment surrounding the Rose Bowl has been extensively modified by construction of the Bowl, the surrounding golf course, parking lots and roads. Few areas of exposed ground surface are located within the project area, due to extensive paving and landscaping. Boulders present in the open area indicate that high energy water flow occurred in the arroyo at times, suggesting it would have been a poor place for long-term human habitation, and that any cultural materials left behind in the arroyo were probably washed away by flooding. During construction of the Rose Bowl in 1923, earth was taken from within the Bowl and was used to create the berm supporting the Bowl. Subsequent construction of parking lots and the golf course required further grading and filling in the active arroyo channel, and this probably disturbed any prehistoric cultural resources that might have been present in the vicinity of the Rose Bowl. The Central Arroyo Master Plan indicates the floor of the Arroyo Seco has a low potential for archeological resources. This is particularly true in areas extensively disturbed by

construction of the stadium. As the proposed project would not involve any construction or

 \boxtimes

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

physical changes to the site (including ground-disturbing activities that could potentially uncover buried archeological resources) no impact would occur.

	c. Directly or indirectly geologic feature? (destroy a unique p)	aleontological r	esource or site or	unique
					\boxtimes
that has pleis feet pote the bedr pale is th prop surro	/? The Arroyo Seco is a generally represents too a low potential to cont tocene-age older alluviur and is also exposed in ntial to contain vertebrat Rose Bowl likely disturbock is quartz diorite, wontological resources gene potential for intact passed project does not bunding area (including govery of paleontological resources)	dynamic a geologi ain fossil resource n, which may be propertied the hills adjacent to the fossils; however, which has no sensite the has no sensi	cal environments. The vicinity resent in the Arco the arroyo. Construction on sentiments. Stirivity for pale as below those conces to be prestruction or phrearth moving re, no impact were structed to the control of t	at for the formation of the Rose Boroyo Seco at dept Some older alluving the concrete floor Beneath the allumination on the site of archeological resent on the site of activities that could occur.	n of fossils and owl is inset in the of five more um has a high ow channel and uvial soils, the irces. Because esources, there. However, the to the site or uld result in the
	d. Disturb any human re	mains, including th	ose interred ou	tside of formal ce	remonies?()
ceme Seco unlik pres	(? There are no known hetery however; inhumation. Although the presence ely due to the disturbed ent. However, the proposexcavation that could disturbed	ns have been asso of additional arch nature of the site sed project would n	ociated with arc eological resou , the potential ot include any	heological contex irces within the B exists for such re ground disturbing	ts in the Arroyo sowl footprint is esources to be activities, such
8.	ENERGY. Would the pro	oposal:			
	a. Conflict with adopted	d energy conservat	ion plans? ()	
					\boxtimes
com	7? The proposed project pliance with adopted ene her of displacement ever the project of the	rgy conservation pl	lans. It is ackno	wledged that the	increase in the

WHY? The proposed project is the continuation of an existing use that currently operates in compliance with adopted energy conservation plans. It is acknowledged that the increase in the number of displacement events will also increase the demands for energy on the City's utility infrastructure. The City of Pasadena (through its Water and Power Department) is the utility provider for the site and is currently able to serve all football game-related power demands from the site. 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 and energy use by the City of Pasadena or the Rose Bowl Stadium. The site is served by existing gas and electric utilities. Currently, the Rose Bowl hosts 12 displacement events and several smaller events during the course of the year. The Rose Bowl also requires energy for routine maintenance that would not change as a result of the proposed project. It is anticipated that there will be increased demand for energy on the additional event days.

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Although the frequency of these events would increase, the intensity of the energy demand on the site during a game would not change from that which is currently demanded and provided during current games. As a result, the current infrastructure can adequately serve energy on additional game days, and the additional demand on new game days can be provided by the City within the supply available to or produced by the City on a daily basis.

The Rose Bowl Stadium is currently undergoing a renovation that will greatly improve its energy and water efficiency for future operations. These improvements will be in place by the time these additional displacement events would occur.

Furthermore, the City's newly adopted Open Space and Conservation Element (January 2012), outlines a number of provisions addressing energy use reduction, wherein the "Preferred Resource Plan" component of the City's Integrated Resource Plan is summarized and includes key elements which will require PWP to take specific actions to begin reconfiguring its existing energy portfolio over the next several years to have fewer adverse environmental effects without reducing the amount of power available across the City.

Therefore, no potentially significant energy impacts would occur from the additional displacement events, and additional displacement events would not conflict with the City's Open Space and Conservation Element or its Integrated Resource Plan.

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

Why? The proposed project is essentially the continuation of an existing use and would not create a high enough demand for energy to require development of new energy sources. The only change on site is the number of displacement events that would be permitted to occur annually for a period of up to five years. Further, the proposed project does not include any construction activities that would require consumption of oil-based energy products. Therefore, the proposed project will not cause a significant reduction in short-term available supplies.

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 and energy use by the City of Pasadena or the Rose Bowl Stadium. The site is served by existing gas and electric utilities. Currently, the Rose Bowl hosts 12 displacement events and several smaller events during the course of the year. The Rose Bowl also requires energy for routine maintenance that would not change as a result of the proposed project. It is anticipated that there will be demand for energy on the additional event days. Although the frequency of these events would increase, the intensity of the uses on the site would not change. Further, the Rose Bowl Stadium is currently undergoing a renovation that will greatly improve its energy and water efficiency for future operations. These improvements will be in place at the time these additional displacement events would occur. As the same types of events would occur as under present conditions, and only the frequency would increase, the increased demand for energy use would not be substantial in comparison to the current demand and no significant impact would occur.

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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:

 Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most re Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist fo based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Divis and Geology Special Publication 42. () 							
				\boxtimes			

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 in a known Earthquake Fault Zone, as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act of 1972, nor is it in an Earthquake Fault Management Zone, according to the City of Pasadena's General Plan Safety Element. Further, the proposed project does not include the construction of any new structures such as housing or commercial use that could be subject to ground rupture. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects caused by the rupture of a known fault. Consequently, no related significant impacts would result from the proposed project.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
ii.	Strong seismic gr	ound shaking? ()				
				\boxtimes			
WHY? See 9.a.i. Since the City of Pasadena is within a larger area traversed by active fault systems, such as the San Andreas and Newport-Inglewood 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. Further, the proposed project does not include the construction of any structures such as housing or commercial uses that could be subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Consequently, no related significant impacts would result from the proposed project and seismic ground shaking.							
iii.	Seismic-related grecent Seismic Habed on other su	azards Zones M	ap issued by the	State Geologist	for the area or		
				\boxtimes			
the surface younger allowand the Staproject site seismic-relation any new as a result	efaction typically of and where soils auvial sands. Accordate of California Sis within an areauted ground failure, housing or comme of seismic related mpacts would resulted	are composed of ding to the City of displaying to the City of displaying the control of the cont	of poorly consolice of Pasadena Safe Zone Map for the ct to liquefaction oposed project dould potentially exincluding liquefaction	dated, fine- to mety Element of the hasadena Concaused by grooses not include the ction. Conseque	nedium-grained, ne General Plan Quadrangle, the bund shaking or the construction the risk of injury ently, no related		
iv.	Landslides as de by the State Ge known areas of la ()	ologist for the a			•		
				\boxtimes			
blocks or as a relatively	dslides are movements jumbled mixes of level canyon floor is in the Arroyo S	bedrock blocks, terrain and, as	fragments, debris such, is not sub	s, and soil. The p ject to landslide	project site is on s. Because the		

C:---:f:----t

WHY? Landslides are movements of relatively large landmasses, either as nearly intact bedrock blocks or as jumbled mixes of bedrock blocks, fragments, debris, and soil. The project site is on a relatively level canyon floor terrain and, as such, is not subject to landslides. Because the project site is in the Arroyo Seco, surrounding canyon slopes could be subject to landslides. According to the City of Pasadena Safety element of the General Plan and the State of California Seismic Hazards Zone Map for the Pasadena Quadrangle the canyon slopes surrounding the project site are in areas subject to potential slope instability caused by ground shaking or seismic related ground failures. Landslide hazards associated with these canyons are classified by the City of Pasadena General Plan Safety Element as "Moderate" because of the steepness of the slopes and proximity to drainage swales. Although the potential exists for landslides to occur in the arroyo canyons, the proposed project does not include the construction of any new structures, such as housing or commercial uses that could expose

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

people to potential landslides. Consequently, no related significant impacts would result from the proposed project and landslides.

b. Res	ult in substantial soil	erosion or the	loss of topsoil?	()	
					\boxtimes
excavation) ti	oroposed project doe nat could utilize poor . There are no physi	base soils, re	sulting in unsta	ble foundations of	or other erosion
as	e located on a geolog a a result of the proj reading, subsidence,	iect, and pote	ntially result in	on- or off-site la	
				\boxtimes	
California Se area potentia failures. In a potential slop Landslide has Pasadena Ge to drainage s small debris f however, the site is consi (grading or cliquefaction, cl. Be de	rding to the City of Paismic Hazards Zone ismic Hazards Zone ally subject to liquefaddition, the canyon one instability caused zards associated with eneral Plan Safety Elevales. Thus, soil slips allows and small slides potential for large degreed low. The project of collapse. Therefore the located on expansion of the collapse of the located on expansion of the loc	map for the laction caused slopes surroud by ground these canyor lement because and slumps or rock falls eep-seated laposed project this impact is live soil, as desired.	basadena Quade by ground sha anding the project shaking or see a slopes are classes of the steep slope could occur in the steep slopes are the slopes are th	Irangle, the project site are in a eismic related gasified as Moderates of the slope pes and in the dinese surrounding e areas surrounding any construction. 18-1-B of the L	ect site is in an related ground reas subject to ground failures. It in the City of and proximity rainage swales, ground areas; ding the project uction activities and, subsidence,
				\boxtimes	
slightly corro	project site is locate sive to uncoated ste w compressibility, and	el or concret	e. They are mo	derate to low in	n strength, with

is currently developed, and the underlying soil is not likely to become unstable as a result of the project, as the proposed project does not include any physical changes to the site, nor would it require any grading or excavation. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.

	Significant Impact	Mitigation is Incorporated	Significant Impact	No Impact
e. Have soils incapable wastewater disposa wastewater? ()				
WHY? The proposed project is connected to the existing sew wastewater disposal systems have no associated impacts.	er system. There	efore, soil suitabili	ty for septic tank	s or alternative
10. GREENHOUSE GAS	EMISSIONS. Wo	uld the project:		
a. Generate greenhous significant impact on			indirectly, that ma	ay have a
WHY? The project will generate therefore, will generate Carbo (GHG). Therefore, this impact b. Conflict with any appropriate purpose of reducing	n Dioxide, which will be discussed licable plan, polic	is the primary cod in the EIR. Expression of the second control o	mponent of Gree	enhouse gases
purpose of reducing	_	greennouse gase	s: □	
WHY? The project will not co purpose of reducing GHG em and the ARB Scoping Plan: this impact will be analyzed in	issions. The proj http://www.arb.c	ect would not be	expected to con	flict with AB 32
11. HAZARDS AND HAZAF	RDOUS MATERIA	ALS . Would the p	roject:	
a. Create a signific transport, use or di			ironment through)	the routine
WHY? The project does not in small amounts of pesticides, f the structure and landscaping Titles 8, 22, and 26 of the CO Health and Safety Code, were	ertilizers, and cle . These material CR and their ena	aning agents requested agents requested agents are currently stopping legislation s	uired for normal i ored on site in a et forth in Chapt	maintenance of ccordance with ers 6.95 of the

regulations to reduce the risk to the human health and the environment from the routine use of hazardous substances. These regulations must be implemented by employers/businesses, as appropriate and are monitored by the state. As the proposed project is a request to increase the frequency of displacement events to allow for the temporary placement of an NFL team and not

Significant

Unless

Less Than

Significant

No Impact

Potentially

Significant

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

introducing a new use, these policies are currently in place and would remain in place for the additional events. The Rose Bowl must adhere to all applicable regulations regarding the use and storage of any hazardous substances and there would be no changes from current conditions. Therefore, there are no related impacts.

b.	Create a significant hazard to upset and accident condition environment? ()							
allo haz cou cha thro	WHY? The proposed project is the request to increase the frequency of displacement events to allow for the temporary placement of an NFL team. There are no changes that involve hazardous materials. The proposed project does not include demolition of any structures that could contain asbestos or lead based paint or other hazardous materials, and no physical changes are proposed. Therefore, there is no significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions, which could release hazardous material and there are no related impacts.							
	c. Emit hazardous emissi substances, or waste wi							
				\boxtimes				
the 11a loca the prowood	WHY? The project site is in use as a recreational stadium for large events, which do not entail the use of hazardous materials, aside from those general maintenance products as described in 11a, above. Chandler School, an independent kindergarten through eighth grade school, is located within 0.25 mile of the project site. However, the Rose Bowl stadium has operated on the project site, within 0.25 mile of the Chandler School since the school's founding in 1950. The proposed project would generally represent a continuation of existing conditions and therefore would not emit hazardous emissions within 0.25 mile of a school. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.							
	d. Be located on a site wh pursuant to Governmer significant hazard to the	nt Code Secti	ion 65962.5 and,		-			
Sul (CA use cor	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 has been in use as a recreational stadium since 1923, which is not a land use associated with hazardous materials. The site is not known or anticipated to have been contaminated with hazardous materials and no hazardous material storage facilities are known to exist on site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.							

	Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Significant Impact	No Impact
e. For a project located been adopted, within project result in a safe	two miles of a	a public airport c	or public use airp	oort, would the
				\boxtimes
WHY? The project site is not vor public use airport. The neare approximately 10 miles from the a safety hazard for people reseassociated impacts.	est public use ai e project site. T	rport is the Bob Herefore, the prop	Hope Airport in Bu posed project wou	urbank, located uld not result in
f. For a project within the hazard for people res	•	•	• •	sult in a safety
			\boxtimes	
WHY? The project site is not we north of the Rose Bowl near the Los Angeles County Fire Departure an accident occurring at the satthe helicopter operations curresproposed project, it is anticipated addition, the Los Angeles Cocontinue to comply with all respectively. Which helicopter operations by using people, whenever feasible. We frequency of event attendees, helipad operation, the infreque of helicopter accidents nationally and pilot safety, such as pilot the would ensure that this impact is result in a safety hazard for primpacts would be less than significant to the control of t	the Hahamongna artment and the artment and the artme time as a Rently exist and the ted that the helipounty Fire Department of the flight path will further regulations promote thus exposing thus exposing and complication, aircraft is less than significant.	Watershed Park Pasadena Police ose Bowl event is would not increa bad would not po- artment and Pasa bulgated by the leduce potential sed project coule more persons to r arrivals and dep ance with all FA nspection and ce ficant. Therefore, or working in the	The helipad is of a Department. The considered remase with implements as safety hazards adena Police Defended Police Defended Police Defended Police Defended Police Defended Police Defended Police Description of the proposed provicinity of a privation of the proposed privation	pperated by the ne likelihood of tote. Given that entation of the is to visitors. In Department will Administration om emergency incentrations of increase in the risks posed by ith the low rate ated to aircraft r traffic control, oject would not ate airstrip and
g. Impair implementation plan or emergency ev			n adopted emerg	ency response
			\boxtimes	
WHY? The City of Pasadena	maintains a City	wide emergency	response plan, v	which goes into

Significant

Unless

Less Than

Potentially

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 preplanned evacuation routes for dam inundation areas associated with Devil's Gate Dam, Eaton Wash, and the Jones Reservoir.

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

As required by law, the proposed project would continue to provide adequate access for emergency vehicles and appropriate evacuation routes, as well as regulate the storage of flammable and explosive materials and their transport within the project area. Additionally, the proposed project would comply with applicable Uniform Fire Code regulations for issues including fire protection systems and equipment, general safety precautions, water supplies and distances from structures to fire hydrants.

If a large accident or natural disaster were to occur during an event, up to 75,000 event attendees could be present. Similar to existing conditions, the substantial concentration of people would result in a risk of accidents or conditions requiring police, fire, and/or medical emergency response services, as compared to times when there are no events. Such a situation could result in the need to methodically and expeditiously evacuate people from the premises and/or provide emergency medical care. Any evacuation process would need to occur in an orderly departure onto the nearby pedestrian and roadway network. If on-site emergency personnel require additional support from off-site emergency personnel, congestion on the surrounding roadway network could cause delays in emergency response or other logistical problems. This would be of particular concern immediately prior to and after event(s) when vehicles are queued on local streets. The pedestrian circulation system could be overwhelmed. Event-related congestion on local roadways could also impede emergency response to other locations not associated with the proposed project.

However, the City has prepared an Emergency Plan for the Rose Bowl that is designed to provide specific guidelines in the event of a major emergency at the stadium during which it is occupied. It is designed to be general in content to allow operational flexibility by command personnel in the various scenarios, which could present themselves. The plan identifies the key responsibilities of various departments and agencies and the location of key operational areas. The Emergency Plan identifies a range of issues including operational procedures such as staging areas, medical operations, and access routes; pre-evacuation procedures and associated responsibilities; mass casualty incident procedures; bomb threats; dam failures; and emergency traffic management. Implementation of the proposed project would not interfere with the Emergency Plan for the Rose Bowl, or other emergency response plans and would not create significant impacts.

h.	Expose people of wildland fires, incresidences are in	cluding where	wildlands are	adjacent		_
]	\boxtimes	

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, no wildlands are located in the immediate project vicinity, and the entire Central Arroyo is located within a low wildland fire hazard area. Although the surrounding San Rafael Hills contain large areas of native chaparral and other vegetation and are considered a high-fire risk zone, the project site is currently developed and does not contain any overgrown or untended vegetation that would be likely to be ignited by a spark or heat related incident. There are no physical changes to the site or surrounding area proposed. The project is the request to allow a temporary increase in the number of displacement events that can occur annually at the Rose Bowl. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Potentially
Significant
Impact
Unless
Mitigation is Incorporated

Significant
Unless
Significant
Significant
Significant
Impact
No Impact

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 Countywide 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 project consists of temporarily increasing the number of displacement events allowed at the Rose Bowl from 12 to 25. The proposed project does not include any new construction and would therefore not generate significant water pollutants. Thus, no quantifiable water quality standards apply to the project. Events at the Rose Bowl would be expected to add typical, urban, nonpoint-source pollutants to storm water runoff. As discussed, these pollutants are permitted by the Countywide MS4 permit, and would not exceed any receiving water limitations. Furthermore, the proposed project does not require any construction or physical changes and therefore does not meet the City's SUSMP requirement thresholds. As such, water pollutants generated from the project 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.

Potentially
Significant
Unless
Mitigation is Incorporated

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is Impact
Impact

Significant
Unless
Significant
Impact
Impact

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 we would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses f which permits have been granted)? ()					
	which permits have be		,	\boxtimes		

WHY? The project site is located within a larger unconfined groundwater aquifer called the Raymond Basin. The Raymond Basin aquifer is approximately 40 square miles in area and underlies much of the City of Pasadena. It is bounded to the north by the San Gabriel Mountains, to the south and east by the San Gabriel Valley, and to the west by the San Rafael Hills. The Monk Hill and greater Raymond Basin aquifers are composed largely of unconsolidated alluvial sediments (conveyed by runoff processes), ranging to a maximum thickness of approximately 1,100 feet. Groundwater basin is recharged by the Arroyo Seco, a tributary of the Los Angeles River, and by Eaton Canyon, Santa Anita Canyon and other streams in the watershed of the San Gabriel River. The Arroyo Seco stream contributes approximately one third of the natural replenishment of the aquifer.

The Rose Bowl currently uses 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. This minor amount of water use would not result in significant impacts from depletion of groundwater supplies.

Over the past several years, Pasadena Water and Power (PWP) has been impacted by several factors that have restricted local and regional water supply. PWP's groundwater rights in the Raymond Basin have been curtailed in order to mitigate groundwater depletion experienced over the last half century. With respect to imported supplies, a decade-long drought has reduced the ability to replenish regional groundwater supplies; drought conditions in the American southwest have reduced deliveries of water from the Colorado River, and legal and environmental issues have resulted in reduced water deliveries through the State Water Project. The City accounted for these conditions in its current Water Integrated Resources Plan (adopted January, 2011) and Urban Water Management Plan (adopted June, 2011). As of April of 2011, the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) has lifted allocation restrictions as a result of improvements in Southern California's water reserves.

The Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 13.10 establishes 13 permanent mandatory restrictions on wasteful water use activities. In addition, there are also statewide water demand reduction requirements such as the 20x2020 Water Conservation Plan (20x2020), and the current work being done by the California Department of Water Resources, the State Water Resources Control Board, and other state agencies to implement the Governor's 20x2020 Water Conservation Initiative Program.

In September 2008, Council directed PWP to develop a Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan (CWCP) with a variety of approaches and recommendations for achieving 10 percent, 20 percent, and 30 percent reductions in water consumption as well as an analysis of the financial impacts on the Water Fund if those conservation targets were achieved. On April 13, 2009, Council voted to approve the CWCP presented by PWP and to replace the Water

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Shortage Procedure Ordinance with a new Water Waste Prohibition and Water Shortage Plan Ordinance (PMC 13.10). As a long-term goal, the CWCP presupposes an initial target of reducing per-capita potable water consumption 10 percent by 2015 and 20 percent by 2020.

The new Water Waste Prohibitions and Water Supply Shortage Plan Ordinance (PMC 13.10) became effective on July 4, 2009 and established 13 permanent mandatory restrictions on wasteful water use activities. In addition, statewide water demand reduction requirements began in 2009, as a result of Governor Arnold Schwarzenneger's 20x2020 Water Conservation Plan from April 30, 2009 (20x2020), and the current work being done by the California Department of Water Resources, the State Water Resources Control Board, and other state agencies to implement the Governor's 20x2020 Water Conservation Initiative Program.

The proposed project would increase the frequency of events that occur at the stadium over current conditions, which as noted above, will increase the amount of water used. However, the types of events are similar in nature to those currently occurring at the site, and an additional 13 events per year for a period of up to five years can be served. The Stadium is currently undergoing a renovation that will be completed prior to the commencement of any additional events. These renovations include the installation of water efficient fixtures and equipment that will greatly improve the efficiency of facilities. In addition, much of the water consumed by the Rose Bowl is used for landscaping and field maintenance, which would occur regardless of the proposed project. Any increase in water demand that would occur as a result of the proposed project would be considered minimal and can be served by the Department of Water and Power. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

C.	the alteration of the cousinesstantial erosion or silts	rse of a strea	m or river, in a	•	0
large inlacentrol of and gate The intervall. The the permodification propose	The stadium is served by a let structure located on the channel located just west es surrounding the stadium rior seating bowl drains out the playing field itself does not imeter gutter. The propositions to the Rose Bowl Stad project would not result patterns.	e southwest rof the stadium all drains over the edges of have an uncosed project adjum that we	amp and runs on. The interior control of the playing fied derdrain system; does not included	south to the Arroncourse area vion points outsided through oper the surface drawde any physicainage patterns	royo Seco flood within the fence de of the fence. nings in the field ins by gravity to cal changes or . Therefore, the
d.	Substantially alter the exthe alteration of the coulamount of surface runoff	rse of a strear	m or river, or su	ıbstantially incre	ease the rate or
				\boxtimes	
WHY?	As discussed above, the p	project does n	ot involve any p	ohysical change	s to the project

site and therefore would not affect the site's drainage patterns or course. Similarly, the proposed

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

project would not result in flooding as no changes to the site would be made and no impacts would occur.

e.	Create or contribute run planned stormwater drai polluted runoff? ()	•		, ,	
					\boxtimes
no phys would n	The proposed project would ical changes would occur ot change as a result of the can adequately serve the page 2.	as a result of e proposed pr	the proposed project. Therefore	roject. Storm wa , the City's exist	ter runoff rates ing storm drain
f.	Otherwise substantially d	egrade water	quality? ()		
and ther only lon- pollutan	As discussed above, the parefore the proposed project g-term water pollutants exts that are currently general ordinance will ensure thus ality.	t will not be a pected to be over the contract of a contract on site or contract on site or contract on site or contract on site or contract or contra	point-source ge generated on sit e. Continuation	nerator of water te are typical urb of compliance	pollutants. The can stormwater with the City's
g.	Place housing within a Hazard Boundary or Floothe City of Pasadena ad inundation delineation ma	od Insurance I lopted Safety	Rate Map or da	m inundation are	ea as shown in
					\boxtimes
WHY2 I	No portions of the City of	Pasadena are	ywithin a 100-v	ear floodolain id	lentified by the

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 percent Annual Chance of Flood" (100-year floodplain) and no floodplain management regulations are required. Further, the proposed project does not involve the construction of new housing, and therefore would not place housing in a floodplain or dam inundation area. No impact would occur.

	Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Significant Impact	No Impact	
h. Place within a 100-ye flood flows? ()	ar flood hazard	l area structures,	which would imp	pede or redirect	
				\boxtimes	
WHY? See response g, above floodplain identified by the FEM of the City is in Zone X with management regulations are reconstruction of any structures. The flow of the 100-year flood, as	MA. As shown on the some scatte equired. In add Therefore, the parts of the parts o	on FEMA map Co red areas in Zo lition, the propose proposed project v	mmunity Numbe ne D, for which ed project does vould not place s	er 065050, most h no floodplain not include the	
 Expose people or standard flooding, including flooding. 		•		•	
			\boxtimes		
WHY? Devil's Gate Dam is located north of the proposed project site. The dam, completed in 1920 for water storage and groundwater recharge but damaged in the 1971 Sylmar earthquake, no longer retains a reservoir on the Arroyo Seco. The County of Los Angeles rehabilitated the dam in 1997, restoring the ability of the dam to retain floods, but the basin remains dry most of the year. The dam is subject to periodic inspection by state authorities and the LADWP. The LADWP Reservoir Surveillance Section performs daily surveillance and periodic security inspections of all LADWP reservoirs and dam structures to ensure the safety of the structures and the water they contain. No unauthorized personnel are allowed at the reservoirs, access has been limited, and surveillance includes several helicopter flights per day over the LADWP reservoir structures. According to LADWP, tampering with the structures and water has not occurred, and such an event is considered remote. A catastrophic failure of this structure could, under worst-case scenarios, result in flooding in the project area. Plate 2, in the City's Safety Element indicates that the Rose Bowl is located in a dam inundation zone. Further, the County of Los Angeles is currently working on an EIR to implement a short-term sediment removal project and a long-term sediment management program at the Devil's Gate Dam area north of the Bowl, thereby ensuring that such risks remain remote and speculative. Short-term removal of sediment in the Devil's Gate Dam has already taken place, eliminating short-term risk of failure. In addition the proposed project would not alter any hydrological conditions that would increase the risk of dam failure/site inundation					
i. Inundation by seiche,	tsunami, or mu	udflow? ()			
			\boxtimes		
WHY? The City of Pasadena i Pacific Ocean to be inundated enclosed or semi-enclosed bas	by a tsunami. A	A seiche is an osc	illation of a bod	y of water in an	

enclosed basin to the project site is the Devil's Gate Dam; however, according to the LADWP, no seiche at a LADWP facility has ever been recorded, even during the Northridge Earthquake,

Significant

Unless

Less Than

Potentially

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

and the LADWP does not consider seiches to be a potentially significant hazard. Nonethless, sediment has been filled the Devil's Gate Dam, and short-term precautions have been taken to reduce the amount of sediment in the dam. Please see **12i**, above, for further discussion. As such, significant inundation by seiches, tsunami, or mudflow on the proposed project site would not be expected to occur, and, as the proposed project would not alter any conditions that would increase the risk of significant inundation by seiches tsunami or mudflow over that which currently exists within the project site, this impact would be less than significant.

13.	LAND USE AND PLANNING	. Would the proje	ect:					
a.	Physically divide an existing of	community? ()					
					\boxtimes			
physica	WHY? The project will not physically divide an existing community, as it does not include any physical changes such as new roads or buildings that could affect the surrounding communities. No adverse impact will result.							
b.	Conflict with any applicable jurisdiction over the project (or zoning ordinance) adopted effect? ()	including, but no	t limited to the g	eneral plan, spe	cific plan,			
displac Ordina Munici _l	The proposed project is not sement events for the site and nce, which is codified in the loal Code currently allows for v for 25 major events. This imp	would require ar Pasadena Munic 12 displacement	nendments to the ipal Code at Cha events. An ame	e Arroyo Seco Pu apter 3.32. The F	blic Land Pasadena			
C.	Conflict with any applicable conservation plan (NCCP)? (vation plan (HC	P) or natural c	ommunity			
					\boxtimes			
Conse	Currently, there are no rvation Plans within the City o abitat conservation plans. Coner analysis is required.	f Pasadena. The	re are also no a	pproved local, re	gional, or			

Significant Potentially Less Than Unless Significant Significant No Impact Mitigation is Impact Impact Incorporated 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? (\boxtimes 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 within the Devils Gate Reservoir area. However, the project does not involve grading or site preparation. The project does not include excavation activities or substantial export of earth materials. Therefore, the proposed project would not have significant impacts from the loss of a known mineral resource. 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? (\boxtimes 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? (\boxtimes

WHY? The proposed project has the potential to generate noise levels in the Central Arroyo, these noise levels are likely to vary but could exceed the standard established in the City of Pasadena Noise Regulations. Implementation of the proposed project would allow temporary use of the existing Rose Bowl by a NFL team. While the stadium would also continue to serve as the home field for the UCLA football team for up to five years and would also continue to host the annual Rose Bowl game, implementation of the proposed project would permit football games associated with the NFL to occur on Sunday afternoons and on some occasions, on weeknights during the regular season, for a limited duration of time. As is true for the college football games at the stadium, the primary source of noise would be crowd noise (yelling, applause, etc.) and the noise from the loudspeaker. The actual noise levels that would occur

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

would be extremely variable and would depend on factors such as attendance, the level of crowd excitement, and the volume of the speakers. The highest sound levels generated by the crowd noise and loudspeaker may last only for a few seconds or may last for much longer. While the NFL noise is anticipated to be similar to that of UCLA or other football games, this impact is considered potentially significant and will be discussed in the EIR.

b.	Exposure of persons to groundborne noise levels?		of excessive	groundborne	vibration or
to exce area p events	The proposed project does essive groundborne vibratio roposed. The NFL games would use the existing stacchange the current vibratio	on. There are no that would be policy dium facilities and	physical change ermitted with th would not insta	s to the site of e increase in Il or use any ed	r surrounding displacement quipment that
C.	A substantial permanent in levels existing without the p		nt noise levels i	in the project v	/icinity above
annual would be use is cons equipm use of	See response 15.a. Althory in which events occur do be temporary and similar in dot as a temporary facility (for structed in or near the City conent and facilities as used by the stadium for a specified will not lead to a significant	lue to the addition nature to the foot raperiod of up to of Los Angeles. They other games and period of up to five	nal NFL games ball games pres five years) for the NFL games volumes are properties. The properties maximum in the properties of the proper	at the stadium ently occurring he NFL while a vould use the s oject requests im. Therefore,	n, the effects . The site will new stadium same stadium the additional
d.	A substantial temporary or above levels existing witho		in ambient noise)	e levels in the p	roject vicinity
associa displac This co	The project would gener ated with an NFL football tement events that could occur result in a substantial tested in the EIR.	team as the projectur from 12 to 25	ect requests an 5 annually (for a	increase in the period of up to	ne amount of of five years).

		Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e.	For a project located wi adopted, within two mi expose people residing	les of a public	airport or public	use airport, wo	uld the project
airport located project	There are no airports of is the Bob Hope Airpord more than 10 miles from would not expose perated impacts.	rt (formerly the om Pasadena	e Burbank-Glenda in the City of Bu	ale-Pasadena Air rbank. Therefore	port), which is the proposed
f.	For a project within the residing or working in th				expose people
Howev helipad propos	There are no private-user, as discussed previous has been in operation sed project. Therefore, that a result of proximity to	usly a helipad i at its current le e proposed pro	s located north ocation and would	of the project site d not change as	. However, the a result of the
16. a.	POPULATION AND HO Induce substantial pop proposing new homes a roads or other infrastruc	oulation growth and businesses	n in an area, e		
				\boxtimes	
will not the pro	The project is in a dev directly induce growth a bject is temporary in nature by encouraging new si	s it does not co re and is there	ntain any housing fore not expected	g or other infrastrud to induce growt	ucture. Further,
b.	Displace substantial nu replacement housing els		sting housing, ne	ecessitating the o	construction of
					\boxtimes
	The project site does now would not displace any i				

Significant Unless

	Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Displace substantial n housing elsewhere? (•	ole, necessitating	the construction	of replacement
				\boxtimes
WHY? No persons currently re existing dwelling units. There would have no related impacts	fore, the propo			
17. PUBLIC SERVICES. associated with the provision or physically altered governmential impacts, in ord performance objectives for any	of new or physi ental facilities, er to maintain a	cally altered gove the construction of acceptable service	rnmental facilities of which could ca	s, need for new ause significant
a. Fire Protection? ()				
			\boxtimes	
why? Implementation of the services due to an increase is would be planned events and anticipated that the Pasadena could plan resources according any increase in fire protection new or expanded facilities to a	n the frequency similar in natur Fire Departmer ngly. Further, as services would	of events at the e to the events that (PFD) would have the NFL use of also be tempora	Rose Bowl. How at already occur ve adequate time the facility would ry and the PFD versions.	vever, as these at the site, it is to prepare and I be temporary,
b. <i>Libraries? (</i>)				
WHY? The proposed project increase the residential popula frequency and for individual exoccur only intermittently. Facil service visitors attending ever the frequency of events at the	ation. While visity ents, this increatities that accoments after implements.	tor attendance at a lase would not be of modate Rose Bow entation of the pr	the Rose Bowl co considered signifi wl patrons would oposed project.	ould increase in icant and would be adequate to
c. Parks?()				
	\boxtimes			
WHY? Implementation of the presult in the increased use of permanent increase in City p	f parks and rec	reational facilities	. There would be	e no significant

Significant

Unless

Potentially

Less Than

res contribute to an increased demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. It is anticipated that visitor population would increase for events, and the proposed project would increase the frequency of events, thus possibly accelerating the physical

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

deterioration of on-site and proximate parks and recreational facilities. Surrounding open space/park areas within the Upper, Central, and Lower Arroyo present opportunities for various active and passive recreational uses. Thus, Brookside Park, Rose Bowl Aquatics Center, and Rose Bowl Park to the south as well as Brookside Golf Course to the north could experience additional usage. The Parks and Natural Resources Division oversees the development and maintenance of Pasadena's parks. While operationally distinct, maintenance efforts in the Arroyo Seco as well as those in all other City parks similarly strive to keep parks safe, functional, and attractive for residents and visitors. Visitor population could increase given the increase in event frequency, however; visitors would primarily utilize designated recreational areas and facilities provided as part of the Rose Bowl Stadium and immediately surrounding the site, such as Lot H, rather than other City recreational facilities.

Even though the proposed project would not contribute a permanent population increase, the increase in the frequency of events would result in overall more patron visits. Therefore, park usage and potential impacts will be discussed with Recreation in the EIR.

d.	Police Protec	ction? ()				
protect propose period levels Howev immedencom major police	tion services a sed project we of up to five y provided by ver, the propo- diate area. In apasses NFL event days, t	as a result of buld increase years. It is an the Event Pused project vaddition, the events. Their here would regard to inc	an increase in the number of t	ct could result in the frequency of events held a che proposed proon of the Pasad act day-to-day so with City staff the dditional police or expansion of population and n	of events at the Interpretate the Rose Bownject would impact ena Police Depervice to the Rose formulate a series ources may police facilities,	Rose Bowl. The all annually for a ct police service partment (PPD). Use Bowl or the ecurity plan that be required on and impacts to
e.	Schools? ()				
					\boxtimes	

WHY? The proposed project does not include the construction of housing or commercial uses that would be expected to increase the resident population in the City and nearby areas. Employment for the additional events would likely continue to be drawn from the existing Rose Bowl labor force. Further, the additional events would be temporary and no new permanent employment would be anticipated. As no significant increase in employment would occur, there would be no direct increase in resident or student population. Therefore there would be no increase in demand for schools as a result of the proposed project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f. Other public facilities? (<i>'</i>			
WHY? The proposed project ncrease the residential popula requency and for individual evocur only intermittently. Facilitiervice visitors attending event	tion. While visite ents, this increaties that	or attendance at the use would not be o modate Rose Bow	ne Rose Bowl wo considered signifi vl patrons would	ould increase in cant and would
8. RECREATION.				
Would the project incre recreational facilities s occur or be accelerated	uch that substa	0 0	•	•
	\boxtimes			
why? See also response 1 ncrease the population and we acilities. There would be no single the proposed project that regional parks or other recrease for events, and the proposibly accelerating the physicacilities. Surrounding open some some some proportunities for various Rose Bowl Aquatics Center, and the north could experience oversees the development and maintenance efforts in the Arrowald surrounding the stadium site, Consequently, recreational usand the consequently, recreational usand the consequently, recreational facilities, we will be consequently the project included the consequently in the project included the	puld not result in gnificant perma could contribute ational facilities proposed projectal deterioration pace/park area us active and pad Rose Bowl Peradditional used maintenance of primarily utilized such as Lot use and potential erecreational face.	the increased usinent increase in Ce to an increase in of on-site and possive recreation ark to the south and presidents and ver residents and ver recreational ark, rather than on all impacts will be decilities or require	e of local parks a city population as d demand for not that visitor positive frequency of the construction as a city parks and natural Resorks. While operations and facilities and facilities and facilities and facilities ther City recreatiscussed in the Eather construction	and recreational is a direct result eighborhood or opulation would of events thus, and recreational in Lower Arroyo Brookside Park, and Golf Course Division tionally distinct, similarly strive to opulation would be immediately tional facilities. EIR.
WHY? The project does no construction or expansion of re	ecreational facil	ities. There are no	physical chang	es proposed to

٧ the stadium or the surrounding area as a result of the project. 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.

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

19.	TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.	Would the	proiect:

a.	Conflict with an applicable effectiveness for the performance of transportation included components of the circulation highways and freeways, pede	mance of the c uding mass tran n system, includ	irculation systen sit and non-mot ing but not limite	n, taking into ac orized travel and d to intersections	count all relevant	
during out of strateg project	WHY? The traffic control measures and traffic management strategies currently employed during displacement events at the Rose Bowl are effective in the movement of vehicles into and out of the stadium parking areas. As part of the proposed project, existing traffic management strategies would continue to be implemented. However, the overall impact of the proposed project on traffic and circulation beyond the Rose Bowl area could be potentially significant and this topic will be further analyzed in the EIR.					
b.	Conflict with an applicable co level of service standards an by the county congestion man	nd travel demand	l measures, or o	ther standards es	tablished	
increas impact patrons	As stated above in 19a , the se in traffic at area intersect thresholds. In addition, the cas utilizing alternative parking ays. This impact is potentially says.	tions and result operation of the site could also	in exceedance proposed shuttle adversely affect	of established se service to according levels of service	significant mmodate	
C.	Result in a change in air traff change in location that results			crease in traffic le)	evels or a	
					\boxtimes	
or pub at the Conse change	WHY? The project site is not within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. As discussed previously in this document, operation of the helipad located at the north end of the Arroyo Seco would not be impacted by the proposed project. 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 hazard intersections) or incompatible			harp curves or da	angerous	
				\boxtimes		
	The proposed project does r permanent modifications to th					

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

proposed project does not include construction activities that could result in temporary lane closures that could obstruct access or cause confusion on local roadways. Consequently, there would be no project related impacts to increase in hazards due to a design feature and impacts are less than significant.

e.	Result in inadequate emerge	ncy access? ()		
				\boxtimes	
roadwa continu events beyond propos project	The proposed project would ay system or block access to to uation of existing conditions at the Rose Bowl. There are discurrent capacity and there sed. Current emergency access would not result in inadequate	the project area. and would only re no changes to are no physical ess routes would emergency according.	Rather, the proposition increase the from the site that we changes to the discountry to the maintained.	osed project is ge requency of disp rould increase at stadium or parki	enerally a lacement tendance ng areas
f.	Result in inadequate parking	capacity ()			
WHY? As discussed above, on-site parking would be maintained and alternate parking would be available in downtown and Old Pasadena, along with shuttle service. It is possible that the parking demand created by an NFL team would be greater than current parking supply resulting in demand for parking beyond current supply. Therefore, this potentially significant impact will be discussed in the EIR. g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or					
	pedestrian facilities, or otherv	vise decrease the	e performance or	safety of such fa	cilities?
The pr variety is antic metro	Objective 3.2.2 of the City's roposed project would be sup of public transit options including the cipated this service would be a Gold Line light rail station. The tency with adopted policies supports the contract of the contract of the contract of the city	portive of this poding shuttle servex expanded to include EIR will include	olicy. Currently Fice from Old Pas ude a second Ol de additional and	Rose Bowl events adena. For NFL d Pasadena stop	utilize a games, it near the
20. a.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE S' Exceed wastewater treatment Control Board? ()			e Regional Wate	er Quality
				\boxtimes	
	The City requires a wastevercial facilities that plan to disc				

and treatment system. The purpose of the wastewater discharge permit program is to ensure

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

the City's compliance with the NPDES program, as administered by the RWQCB, for all facilities discharging to navigable waters of surface water of the state, including sewage treatment plants. The Rose Bowl Event Expansion project would comply with all provisions of industrial wastewater permits, if required, which regulates discharges. Through compliance with the City's wastewater discharge permit, which is administered subject to the requirements and limitations of the NPDES program and enforced by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, it can be assumed that the proposed project would not result in an exceedance of the Board's wastewater treatment requirements. Further, the NPDES permit system also regulates both point source discharges (a municipal or industrial discharge at a specific location or pipe) and nonpoint source discharges (diffuse runoff of water from adjacent land uses) to surface waters of the state (e.g., stormwater systems). For point source discharges, each NPDES permit contains limits on allowable concentrations and emissions of pollutants contained in the discharge. The Rose Bowl Stadium would continue to comply with all applicable wastewater discharge requirements issued by the SWRCB and RWQCB. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not exceed applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board with respect to discharges to the sewer system or stormwater system.

b.	Require or result in the co expansion of existing fac environmental effects? (cilities, the con			
events wastev reclam wastev	Implementation of the pro- held at the facility, which water requiring treatment a lation plants (WRPs). However water that would exceed the water treatment system in co	could result in at either Whittie ver, developmen e capacity of eitl	the generation a r Narrows or the it of the proposed ner the Whittier N	nd discharge of Los Coyotes w project would no arrows or the Lo	additional vastewater t generate s Coyotes
existing stadiur propos	nticipated that the overall ag g conditions from the addition m. However, these addition sed project would not affe ore, this impact would be les	onal displaceme nal events wou ct the overall i	nt events that woo ld result in an ir ntensity of land	uld occur at the F ncremental chang	Rose Bowl ge as the
C.	Require or result in the cor of existing facilities, the c effects ()				
				\boxtimes	
WHY?	The project will not require	the construction	of new storm wa	ter drainage facili	ties 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**, above, the project does not involve changes in the site's drainage patterns and does not involve altering any drainage courses or flood control channels.

		Significant Impact	Mitigation is Incorporated	Significant Impact	No Impact
d.	Have sufficient water su and resources, or are ne	• •	-	•	ng entitlements
WHY? As noted in Response 8b, above, in September 2008, Council directed PWP to develop a Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan (CWCP) with a variety of approaches and recommendations for achieving 10 percent, 20 percent, and 30 percent reductions in water consumption as well as an analysis of the financial impacts on the Water Fund if those conservation targets were achieved. On April 13, 2009, Council voted to approve the CWCP presented by PWP and to replace the Water Shortage Procedure Ordinance with a new Water Waste Prohibition and Water Shortage Plan Ordinance (PMC 13.10). As a long-term goal, the CWCP presupposes an initial target of reducing per-capita potable water consumption 10 percent by 2015 and 20 percent by 2020.					
The Water Waste Prohibitions and Water Supply Shortage Plan Ordinance (PMC 13.10) became effective on July 4, 2009 and established 13 permanent mandatory restrictions on wasteful water use activities. In addition, statewide water demand reduction requirements began in 2009, as a result of former Governor Arnold Schwarzenneger's 20x2020 Water Conservation Plan from April 30, 2009 (20x2020), and the current work being done by the California Department of Water Resources, the State Water Resources Control Board, and other state agencies to implement the Governor's 20x2020 Water Conservation Initiative Program.					
The proposed project does not propose a change of land uses on the project site, but would result in a change to the frequency of events held at the Rose Bowl. However, the majority of water that is consumed at the Rose Bowl is not consumed during events, but rather is used for overall maintenance of the site. As the project site has all necessary infrastructure in place and would not require any additional improvements, any change in water usage would be incremental. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.					
e.	Result in a determinatio serve the project that it haddition to the provider's	as adequate ca	pacity to serve th		
WHY? As discussed in Section 20.b , above, of this report, the proposed project would increase the frequency of events at the Rose Bowl Stadium and as a result, would increase the demand for wastewater service. However, the proposed increase to wastewater service demand is					

Significant

Less Than

Potentially

		•	incorporated	•			
f.	f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project solid waste disposal needs? ()						
the pr Canyo propo would ton ar would	? The project can be server oject's solid waste dispondent landfill, which is pernosed project does not include that generated during annually and has remaining be served by a landfill with a comply with federal, states.	sal needs. The onitted through 20 lude any construpted events. As of 20 g capacity of 5.0 th sufficient capa	City of Pasade 025, and seco ction activities, 009, Scholl Can willion tons. city to serve the	na is served prime ndarily by Puente the only solid way on receives appropriately the properties additional displace.	parily by Scholl e Hills. As the caste generated roximately 0.26 oposed project cement events.		
				\boxtimes			

Potentially

Significant

Impact

Significant

Unless

Mitigation is

Less Than

Significant

Impact

No Impact

WHY? In 1992, the City adopted the "Source Reduction and Recycling Element" to comply with the California Integrated Waste Management Act. This Act requires that jurisdictions maintain a 50 percent 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 percent 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. EARLIER ANALYSIS.

Earlier analysis may be used where an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. See *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15063(c)(3)(D).

Earlier Analysis Used. Background information on the Rose Bowl site was ascertained from the Rose Bowl Stadium Renovation Project Final EIR (2005) and the Rose Bowl Stadium Renovation project Supplemental EIR (2008). No tiering, or other process will be used for analysis of the project's environmental effects.

These documents are available for review at the Permit Center, 175 North Garfield Avenue between the hours of 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Monday through Thursday and from 8:00 AM to 12:00 PM every Friday and the City Clerk's Office Monday through Thursday from 7:30 AM to 5:30 PM and every other Friday during the same hours.

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

22. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a.	Does the project have the substantially reduce the has population to drop below s community, reduce the nur animal or eliminate important prehistory? ()	abitat of a fish o elf-sustaining lev mber or restrict t	or wildlife specie rels, threaten to he range of a ra	es, cause a fish eliminate a plant are or endangere	or wildlife or animal d plant or
		\boxtimes			
WHY? As discussed in Section 3 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to Aesthetics. Also, as discussed in Sections 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 prehistory. As discussed in Sections 12 and 14 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to Water Quality and Mineral Resources. However, since the proposed project would have potentially significant air quality, land use and planning, noise, recreation, and traffic impacts. Therefore, an EIR will be required to analyze these impacts.					
b.	Does the project have considerable? ("Cumulative project are considerable wheeffects of other current projects	ely considerable' en viewed in cor	' means that the nnection with the	e incremental eff effects of past pro	ects of a
		\boxtimes			
Greenh	The proposed project han nouse Gas Emissions, ortation/Traffic impacts. Cun	Land Use ar	nd Planning,	Noise, Recreati	ion, and

		Impact	Mitigation is Incorporated	Impact	No impact
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? ()					
		\boxtimes			

Potentially

Significant

Significant

Unless

Less Than

Significant

No Impact

WHY? As discussed in Sections 11, 12, and 19 of this document, the proposed project would not expose persons to the hazards of chemical or explosive materials, flooding, or transportation hazards. Although residents of the proposed would be exposed to typical Southern California earthquake hazards, modern engineering practices would ensure that geologic and seismic conditions would not directly cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

However, as discussed in Sections 5 Air Quality; 10 Greenhouse Gas Emissions; 13, Land Use and Planning; 15 Noise, 18 Recreation and 19 Transportation/Traffic, the project has the potential to indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on humans. Therefore, an EIR will be required to analyze these topic areas.

INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

Document

- 1 Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, California Public Resources Code, revised January 1, 1994 official Mt. Wilson, Los Angeles, and Pasadena quadrant maps were released March 25, 1999.
- 2 California Department of Water Resources DWR), 2004 California's Groundwater, Raymond Basin Groundwater Bulletin 118.
- 3 California Geologic Survey. 1991. State of California Seismic Hazard Zones, Pasadena Quadrangle, Official Map, California Geological Survey Seismic Hazards Mapping Program http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/html/pdf maps no.html
- 4 California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) 2009 Annual Report
- 5 California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB)
- 6 CEQA Air Quality Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, revised 1993
- 7 County of Los Angeles Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan 2009 Annual Report, February 2011
- 8 Land Use Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004
- 9 Pasadena Municipal Code, as amended
- 10 Rose Bowl Stadium Renovation Project, Final Environmental Impact Report, 2005
- 11 Rose Bowl Stadium Renovation Project, Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report, 2008
- 12 Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002
- 13 Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1975
- 14 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.
- 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
- 16 State Water Resources Control Board (SWRQB). 2001. *General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit.*
- 17 Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.70 Ordinance #6837
- 18 Tree Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.52 Ordinance # 6896
- 19 Zoning Code, Chapter 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code
- 20 Open Space and Conservation Element (January 2012)