

Executive Summary

This section summarizes the characteristics of the proposed Revised Rose Bowl Stadium Renovation project (also referred to as the revised project), the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts of the proposed project.

PROJECT APPLICANT

Rose Bowl Operating Company
1001 Rose Bowl Drive
Pasadena CA 91103

PROJECT LOCATION

The City of Pasadena is located approximately 10 miles northeast of the City of Los Angeles in the County of Los Angeles. Regional access to the city and the project site is provided by State Route 134 (SR-134, Ventura Freeway) and Interstate 210 (I-210, Foothill Freeway). The Rose Bowl stadium is located at 1001 Rose Bowl Drive in the City of Pasadena, nestled into the San Rafael Hills on the southwest side of the I-210 and north of SR-134. Main access points to the stadium are Rosemont Avenue, Seco Street, Salvia Canyon Road, West Washington Drive, and Rose Bowl Drive (shuttle access).

The stadium and associated facilities are located within the Central Arroyo Seco on the western edge of the city. The Arroyo Seco is a deeply cut canyon that links the San Gabriel Mountains and the Los Angeles River and is comprised of three sections, the Upper, Central, and Lower. The Central Arroyo is 550 acres in size, and is the most developed section.

SUMMARY OF PRIOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Rose Bowl Stadium Renovation Project was prompted, in part, by discussions with the NFL and the potential to locate an NFL franchise at the Rose Bowl. These discussions have been terminated and the RBOC has been exploring potential renovations to achieve the listed objectives.

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) was distributed to various public agencies, citizen groups, and interested individuals for a 45-day public review period, which began on February 2, 2005, and ended on March 21, 2005. The Draft EIR was circulated to state agencies for review through the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research. Copies of the Draft EIR were available for review at all libraries within the City of Pasadena, as well as at the City Planning Counter and the City Clerk's Office. During the review period, the public was provided with the opportunity to submit written comments on the Draft EIR. Seven public hearings were held during the review period. The public was invited to attend all of these hearings through publication of a hearing notice in the appropriate venues.

and the local newspapers. Oral comments were received at these hearings from commission members as well as the public.

The Final EIR (FEIR) for the Rose Bowl Stadium Renovation Project as originally proposed allowed the public and the Lead Agency an opportunity to review revisions to the Draft EIR, the responses to comments, and other components of the EIR—such as the Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP)—prior to approval of the project. The FEIR serves as the environmental document used by the City when considering approval of the Rose Bowl Stadium Renovation Project.

The Pasadena City Council made the following three certifications as required by Section 15090 of the CEQA Guidelines:

- That the FEIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA
- That the FEIR was presented to the decision-making body of the Lead Agency, and that the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information in the FEIR prior to approving the project
- That the FEIR reflects the Lead Agency’s independent judgment and analysis

The FEIR was certified by the Pasadena City Council on May 9, 2005. The project was neither approved nor denied at that time, and the City Council asked the Rose Bowl Operating Company (RBOC), the project Applicant, to consider further alternatives to the NFL proposal. No Statement of Overriding Considerations was approved.

The previously certified FEIR is available at the City’s Permit Center at 175 North Garfield Avenue, the Pasadena Central Library at 285 East Walnut Street, the Linda Vista Branch Library at 1281 Bryant Street, and the San Rafael Branch Library at 1240 Nithsdale Road, as well as on the City’s website, at the following URL: www.cityofpasadena.net/planning. To view the document, click on “environmental notices.”

UNDERSTANDING THE SUPPLEMENTAL EIR

The project as described and analyzed in the certified FEIR has been revised as described in Chapter 2 (Description of the Revised Project). Section 15163 of the CEQA Guidelines provides that:

- (a) The lead or responsible agency may choose to prepare a supplement to an EIR rather than a subsequent EIR if:
 - 1) Any of the conditions described in Section 15162 would require the preparation of a subsequent EIR, and
 - 2) Only minor additions or changes would be necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation.
- (b) The supplement to the EIR need contain only the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised.
- (c) A supplement to an EIR shall be given the same kind of notice and public review as is given to a draft EIR under Section 15087.

- (d) A supplement to an EIR may be circulated by itself without recirculating the previous draft or final EIR.
- (e) When the agency decides whether to approve the project, the decision-making body shall consider the previous EIR as revised by the supplemental EIR. A finding under Section 15091 shall be made for each significant effect shown in the previous EIR as revised.

The impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Rose Bowl Stadium Renovation Project as previously proposed were disclosed in the FEIR. The analysis in this Draft Supplemental EIR (Draft SEIR) is focused on the potential changes in environmental effects that could result from project design changes. Therefore, this Draft SEIR is being prepared to analyze only the changes in the project since certification of the previous FEIR, which are described in Chapter 2 of this Draft SEIR. Each section analyzes whether the proposed revisions to the project would result in new significant effects, a decrease in the severity of previously identified significant effects, or an increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. The cumulative impacts discussions are based on a related projects list as of June 2007, the date of issuance of the Notice of Preparation for the revised project, or other documents as noted in the individual sections. Baseline conditions are noted to be substantially the same as when the original FEIR was prepared and any minor changes would not affect the impact analysis or significance conclusions.

Existing parking, traffic, and circulation conditions are considered as the baseline and would not change with the proposed revised project. These baseline conditions are essentially the same as when the original FEIR was certified, unless otherwise noted in the technical sections. The concept of a significant effect on the environment focuses on changes to the baseline setting that will arise as a result of the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a)). A lead agency's legal authority to impose mitigation measures is limited to those effects that arise from a project, and exceed an adopted threshold of significance (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4.) Accordingly, the Draft SEIR will not analyze why the existing baseline conditions exist, and will only require mitigation measures that have the legally required "nexus" and "rough proportionality" to the revised project's impacts.

A complete description of the proposed project is provided in Chapter 2 of this Draft SEIR, and a summary of the proposed revised project is provided below. This Draft SEIR provides a discussion of impacts by issue area and provides mitigation measures, where appropriate. The technical sections that follow analyze beneficial impacts, if any, as well as adverse environmental impacts of the revised project. The ultimate determination of whether overall impacts in a particular resource area are, on balance, beneficial rather than adverse will be left to the decision-makers when considering certification of this Draft SEIR and approval of the project.

Specific issue areas discussed in this Draft SEIR include aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, public services, recreation, traffic, and utilities, which are provided in Section 3.1 through Section 3.13. Mineral resources, agricultural resources, and population and housing were determined to result in no environmental impacts or less-than-significant environmental impacts in the original FEIR. These issue areas were fully evaluated in the Initial Study/Notice of Preparation

(IS/NOP) for the original project and the analysis remains unchanged with the project revisions. In addition, the public review and approval process for the Draft SEIR is outlined.

This Draft SEIR has also been prepared to address appropriate and feasible mitigation measures that would minimize or eliminate these impacts. This document is intended to serve as an informational document and will provide the primary source of environmental information for the lead agency to consider when exercising any permitting authority or approval power directly related to implementation of this project. It should be noted that three new mitigation measures are required for the project as revised, but some of the mitigation measures incorporated into the previously adopted MMRP are no longer required for the revised project. Table ES-1 includes a complete listing of all mitigation measures that are required for the revised project's impacts, and it is indicated whether they are new mitigation measures or incorporated from the previous MMRP.

To gain the most value from this report, certain key points recommended in the CEQA Guidelines should be kept in mind:

- This report should be used as a tool to give the reader an overview of the possible ramifications of the proposed project. It is designed to be an “early warning system” with regard to potential environmental impacts and subsequent effects on the local community’s environmental resources.
- A specific environmental impact is not necessarily irreversible or permanent. Most impacts, particularly in urban, more developed areas, can be wholly or partially mitigated by incorporating changes recommended in this report during the design and construction phases of project development.
- This report, while a summary of facts, reflects the professional judgment of the author. Therefore, the reader will have to individually weigh the facts that it reports.

INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

The CEQA Guidelines set forth three methods that may be used to incorporate data from other sources in EIRs, including incorporation by reference (14 *California Code of Regulations* Section 15150). An EIR may incorporate by reference all or portions of another document that is a matter of public record or is generally available to the public. Incorporation by reference is particularly appropriate for long, descriptive, or technical materials that provide general background but do not contribute directly to analysis of problems to be addressed in the EIR. When all or part of another document is incorporated by reference, the incorporated portion is treated as if it were set forth in full in the EIR. The CEQA Guidelines include a description of the environmental setting from another EIR and a description of the city or county general plan that applies to the project, among others. As noted, above, previously certified FEIR is available at the City Permit Center, the Linda Vista and San Rafael Branch Libraries and Pasadena Central Library, and on the City’s website.

The CEQA Guidelines do not require that incorporated materials be circulated for public review with the EIR. For the Draft SEIR, the environmental setting and regulatory framework as set forth in the FEIR are incorporated by reference, summarized where feasible, and any changes noted. Specific references to

sections of the FEIR, prior impact analyses, and mitigation measures contained in the FEIR are included in the Draft SEIR.

OBJECTIVES OF REVISED PROJECT

The purpose of the renovation of the Rose Bowl is to extend the building's long-term use and financial viability by upgrading the stadium and maintaining its character-defining features. The project objectives are as follows:

- To upgrade the major infrastructure of the stadium, including plumbing, electrical, safety, and mechanical systems
- To create a revenue stream for long-term reinvestment in the stadium
- To enhance the fan experience through incorporation of a variety of premium amenities, including outdoor club seats, loge boxes, and suites, as well as a club for game-day activities and year-round events
- To maintain the historic landmark status of the stadium
- To enhance facility operations, including improving storage facilities and visitor circulation throughout the stadium

CHARACTERISTICS OF REVISED PROJECT

The replacement of all seating in the Rose Bowl is a project priority. While some seats would be removed to accommodate the project renovations, club seating would be increased and would offset the removed seating. Thus, the existing seating capacity of 92,000 would remain relatively unchanged by the proposed revised project and seating capacity would remain sufficient to accommodate all existing events. Upon completion of the project, seating in the Rose Bowl would include general seating, club seating, and luxury suite seating.

The proposed revised project would include demolition of existing ancillary structures around the base of the stadium and the perimeter structures at the fence line, along with removal of asphalt surfacing and landscaping. Selective removal, retention, and reconstruction of the stone terraces and planting material adjacent to the stadium would also occur as required by project design. A new structure containing the stadium's club and associated support facilities would be constructed outside, but connected to, the existing seating bowl along the west side of the stadium structure. The existing suites and press box structure located along the western rim of the stadium would be removed and replaced with a new three-level structure that includes one club level and two levels of suites and press facilities on the west side of the stadium only. A lighted animated ribbon sign would be attached on the interior-facing façade of each level of the press box. In total, approximately 340,000 square feet (sf) of existing structures and paved areas would be demolished. It should be noted that the new west-side structure would be within the development envelope (i.e., length, width, and height) analyzed in the previous EIR. New restroom and concession buildings (and possibly a structure housing the proposed Hall of Fame museum and stadium store) would be constructed between the stadium and the fence line, facing inward toward the stadium. Alternatively, the museum and stadium store may be constructed within the new west sideline structure.

The museum and team store would consist of 9,000 sf of museum space, 2,000 sf of retail store, and 2,000 for a coffee/snack area, and would be open Monday through Friday 8:00 A.M. through 6:00 P.M. and during special events.

Improvements to the entry plaza with new paving and landscaping would formalize the south end of the stadium as the main entrance, and the neon “Rose Bowl” sign would be preserved. The roadway at the south end of the stadium would be improved as a roundabout to serve the main entrance. Additional improvement would be provided to spectator facilities, circulation elements, press box/media facilities, administrative facilities, team facilities, playing field, lighting systems, stadium services, and stadium systems. These improvements were part of the original project and were analyzed in the FEIR certified in May 2005.

Emergency exiting from the stadium would be improved by one of two options, or a combination of both:

Option A: Construction of a New Concourse at the Horizon Level

This option would involve the installation of additional exit aisles inside the stadium located midway between existing aisles. These aisles would lead patrons up to a new horizon level concourse constructed at the rim of the existing stadium that would be connected to the plaza level concourse by vertical circulation towers at four locations, one on each side of the new press box structure and two on the east side of the stadium. This option would require the removal of approximately 2,800 seats.

Option B: Tunnel Widening and Internal Concourse

Under this option, up to twenty-eight existing access tunnels would be doubled in width to provide additional exiting capacity (the tunnels currently accommodate only 54 percent of the appropriate capacity per existing Code requirements). Additional exit aisles inside the stadium located midway between existing aisles would be installed to improve access to the vomitoria. The renovation would require appropriate shoring of the tunnels to allow for expansion, excavation, and reconstruction and resurfacing of the tunnel walls, along with the installation of additional exit aisles as noted above inside the stadium. This option would require removal of approximately 4,300 stadium seats.

Option C: Horizon-Level Concourse, Tunnel Widening, and Internal Concourse

This option represents a hybrid of Options A and B: the horizon-level concourse would be constructed, but some or all of the existing twenty-eight tunnels may also be widened to provide even greater exiting capacity. This option would require the equivalent level of excavation, landscape and stone berm removal as identified for options A and B above. Up to 4,300 seats could be removed under this option if all twenty-eight tunnels were to be widened.

Excavation for building foundations would take place on the west side to accommodate the stadium's new club lounges, suites, and associated support facilities, and on the north and east sides to accommodate the new horizon level. On the north side, excavation to accommodate underground program areas such as the loading dock, stadium operations, administration, food service operations, would occur. A vehicular entrance and required ingress/egress would be provided at Stadium Plaza Level on the north side through a new truck ramp. In total, approximately 100,000 cubic yards of soil would be removed to accommodate the new structures. The subterranean area would be covered with paving and landscaping to match other public areas.

AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

The discussion of environmental effects, mitigation measures, and alternatives, as summarized in Table ES-1 and evaluated in detail in this Draft SEIR, constitutes the identification of issues to be resolved and areas of controversy, as required for compliance with Section 15123(b)(2) and Section 15123(b)(3) of the *California Environmental Quality Act* (CEQA) Guidelines. Additionally, oral and written comments received during the public review period for the NOP indicated that areas of controversy and potential issues to be resolved included the following: (1) the potential for diminishing the integrity of the historic Rose Bowl stadium as a National Historic Landmark and (2) impacts associated with visual quality, i.e., impacts on adjacent residential neighborhoods due to impedance of views of the San Gabriel Mountains and San Rafael Hills.. These issues are addressed within Section 3.1 (Aesthetics) and Section 3.4 (Cultural Resources).

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table ES-1 provides impact statements applicable to the revised project, the FEIR significance conclusion, whether that conclusion would change with the revised project, the revised project significance conclusion, and applicable mitigation measures that would be implemented with the revised project.

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
----------------	-------------------------------------	--	---	--	---

LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact

AESTHETICS

Impact 3.1-1 The revised project would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	SU	Yes	LTS	None	None
Impact 3.1-2A Implementation of Option B of the revised project would not substantially change the existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings.	SU	Yes	LTS	<p>MM 3.1-1 The City of Pasadena shall require construction contractors to strictly control the staging of construction equipment and the cleanliness of construction equipment stored or driven beyond the limits of the construction work area as a means of minimizing temporal degradation of the visual character of surrounding areas and the associated impact to aesthetics. Prior to completion of final plans and specifications, the City of Pasadena shall review the plans and specifications to ensure that all construction vehicles and equipment shall be parked in designated staging areas when not in use. Vehicles shall be kept clean and free of mud and dust before leaving the project site. Completion of this measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Pasadena.</p> <p>MM 3.1-2 The City of Pasadena shall require construction contractors to provide temporary screening from the present public view site, around construction work areas, for all improvements that require grading during construction and enhancement, as a means of minimizing the temporal effects to the visual character of the surrounding area and the associated impacts to aesthetics.</p> <p>MM 3.1-3, MM 3.3-1, and MM 3.3-2a would also apply.</p>	None

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
<p>Impact 3.1-2B Implementation of Options A or C of the revised project would change the existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings.</p>	SU	No	SU	<p>MM 3.1-1, MM 3.1-2, MM 3.1-3, MM 3.3-1, and MM 3.3-2a would also apply.</p>	None
<p>Impact 3.1-3 The revised project could substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a scenic highway.</p>	LTS	No	LTS	<p>MM 3.1-3 Consistent with the implementation methods MM 3.3-2a (see Section 3.3 Biology) and the provisions of the Tree Protection Ordinance, the City of Pasadena shall also require that any Replacement Tree Canopy Coverage (for removed or damaged trees) be concentrated on the east side of the stadium. Also replacement plantings (24-inch box minimum) of one tree for every one lost or removed shall be installed along the edges of existing hardscape parking lots within the Arroyo. In addition, vines shall be permanently secured to vertical building wall surfaces on the east side of the stadium. At retaining walls, vines and shrubs shall be installed and spaced so as to completely cover walls when mature. All plantings shall be implemented in accordance with a City approved landscape plan. Planting off site within the Arroyo shall be done under the direction of the City.</p> <p>MM 3.3-2a The Applicant, prior to being issued a grading permit, shall submit a tree report prepared by a certified arborist that meets the requirements of the Pasadena City Tree Ordinance identifying trees to be removed and trees to be saved. It shall also include the preparation and submission of a tree protection and replacement plan. The tree replacement</p>	None

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<p>plan shall include replanting for increased canopy and include a minimum replacement ratio for removed or damaged trees of 1:1. The plan shall be prepared and approved by the City prior to grading or construction and shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The details and procedures required to prepare the restoration site for planting (i.e. grading, soil preparations, soil stocking, etc.). ■ The methods and procedures for the installation of the plant materials. ■ Guidelines for the maintenance of the mitigation site during the establishment phase of the plantings. The maintenance program shall contain guidelines for the control of nonnative plant species and the replacement of plant species that have failed to recolonize. ■ The revegetation plan shall provide for monitoring to evaluate the growth of the trees. Annual monitoring of the replacement trees shall occur for the first five years after which it shall be performed on the seventh and tenth year. Specific success criteria for replaced trees shall include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > For a replacement ratio greater than 1:1: 90 percent or more of the transplanted/ replacement trees surviving ten years after transplantation with overall no net loss of trees > For replacement ration of 1:1: 100 percent survival 	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Contingency plans and appropriate remedial measures shall also be outlined in the replacement plan should the plantings fail to meet designated success criteria and planting goals. <p>When construction activities occur near protected tree species that are proposed to be saved, Best Management Practices (BMPs) to avoid damage to the trees shall be implemented, and verified by the developer. The BMPs will include, but are not limited to (1) installing protective fencing prior to and during construction, using wire mesh or plastic barrier fencing placed at 2.25 times the canopy of the tree; (2) avoiding disturbance and trenching within the tree drip line; (3) maintaining the surface grade around the tree; and (4) prohibiting the placement of paving or landscaping requiring summer irrigation in the vicinity of trees.</p>	
<p>Impact 3.1-4 The revised project would result in new sources of increased light and glare from new lighting systems.</p>	LTS	No	LTS	<p>MM 3.1-4 The City of Pasadena shall specify the lighting type and placement on the project site to ensure that the effects of security lighting are limited as a means of minimizing night lighting and the associated impacts to aesthetics. Prior to completion of final plans and specifications, the City of Pasadena shall review the plans and specifications to ensure that all light fixtures will use glare-control visors, arc tube suppression caps, and will use a photometric design that maintains 70 percent of the light intensity in the lower half of the light beam. Completion of this measure shall be monitored and enforced by the</p>	None

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<p>City of Pasadena.</p> <p>MM 3.1-5 Prior to opening the stadium, the Applicant shall test the installed field-lighting system to ensure that lighting meets operating requirements in the stadium and minimizes obtrusive spill lighting in the stadium facility. Testing would include light-meter measurements at selected locations in the vicinity to measure spill lighting from field-lighting fixtures, permit adjustment of lighting fixtures, and confirm that spill-lighting effects would not exceed 3 foot-candles one block from the stadium and no more than 1 foot-candle three blocks from the stadium.</p> <p>MM 3.1-6 Stadium lighting and advertising (including signage) shall be oriented in such a manner to reduce that amount of light shed onto sensitive receptors and incorporate "cut-off" shields as appropriate to minimize any increase in lighting at adjacent properties.</p> <p>MM 3.1-7 All interior floodlights, exterior parking lot, and other security lighting shall be directed away from sensitive receptors and towards the specific location intended for illumination. State-of-the-art fixtures shall be used, and all lighting shall be shielded to minimize the production of glare and light spill onto both existing and proposed residential units on the adjacent hillsides. A lighting design plan shall be submitted to the City for approval at plan check.</p> <p>MM 3.1-8 Landscape illumination and exterior sign lighting shall follow <i>Pasadena Municipal Code</i> guidelines and be accomplished with low-</p>	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				level unobtrusive fixtures. MM 3.1-9 All facilities shall emphasize the natural setting and use of natural materials. Building color shall be warm and earth-toned. Non-reflective materials shall be used on the exterior surfaces. Where appropriate, arroyo stone shall be incorporated into the design.	
AIR QUALITY					
Impact 3.2-1 The revised project would be consistent with the AQMP, and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of air quality standards.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
Impact 3.2-2 Revised project implementation would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
Impact 3.2-3 Revised project implementation would not release significant amounts of toxic air contaminants.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
Impact 3.2-4 Revised project implementation would not create objectionable odors affecting nearby sensitive receptors.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
Impact 3.2-5 Site preparation and construction activities would contribute to an existing air quality violation (VOC and NO _x only).	SU	Yes (for VOC, but a reduction in PM ₁₀)	SU	MM 3.2-1 The project builder(s) shall develop and implement a construction management plan, as approved by the City of Pasadena, which includes the following measures recommended by the SCAQMD, or equivalently effective measures approved by the City of Pasadena:	None

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference ■ Provide temporary traffic controls during all phases of construction activities to maintain traffic flow (e.g., flag person) ■ Schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow on the arterial system to off-peak hours to the degree practicable ■ Consolidate truck deliveries when possible ■ Maintain equipment and vehicle engines in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturers' specifications and per SCAQMD rules, to minimize exhaust emissions ■ Use methanol- or natural gas-powered mobile equipment and pile drivers instead of diesel to the extent commercially practical ■ Use propane- or butane-powered on-site mobile equipment instead of gasoline to the extent commercially practical <p>MM 3.2-2 The project builder(s) shall implement all rules and regulations by the Governing Board of the SCAQMD that are applicable to the development of the Project (such as Rule 402—Nuisance and Rule 403—Fugitive Dust) and that are in effect at the time of development. The following measures are currently recommended to implement Rule 403—Fugitive Dust. These measures have been quantified by the SCAQMD as being able to reduce dust generation between 30 and 85 percent depending on the source of the dust generation:</p>	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Water trucks will be utilized on the site and shall be available to be used throughout the day during site grading and excavation to keep the soil damp enough to prevent dust from being raised by the operations ■ Wet down the areas that are to be graded or that are being graded and/or excavated, in the late morning and after work is completed for the day ■ All unpaved parking or staging areas, or unpaved road surfaces shall be watered three times daily or have chemical soil stabilizers applied according to manufacturers' specifications ■ Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply approved soil binders to exposed piles (i.e., gravel, sand, and dirt) according to manufacturers' specifications ■ The construction disturbance area shall be kept as small as possible ■ All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials shall be covered or have water applied to the exposed surface prior to leaving the site to prevent dust from impacting the surrounding areas ■ Wheel washers shall be installed where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads and used to wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip ■ Streets adjacent to the project site shall be swept at the end of the day if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent roads 	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Wind barriers shall be installed along the perimeter of the site ■ All excavating and grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour over a 30-minute period ■ A traffic speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be posted and enforced for the unpaved construction roads (if any) on the project site ■ Remediation operations, if required, shall be performed in stages concentrating in single areas at a time to minimize the impact of fugitive dust on the surrounding area 	
Impact 3.2-6 Revised project implementation would exceed daily operational emissions thresholds.	SU	No	SU	None	None
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
Impact 3.3-1 Implementation of the revised project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species, riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, or federally protected wetlands.			LTS	None	None

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
Impact 3.3-2 Implementation of the revised project would not interfere substantially with the movement or any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
Impact 3.3-3 Implementation of the revised project could, through habitat modifications, result in a potential reduction in nesting opportunities for resident and migratory avian species of special concern, including raptors or the loss of an active avian nest.	LTS	No	LTS	<p>MM 3.3-1 To ensure that avian species of concern, protected migratory species (e.g., MBTA), or raptors species are not injured or disturbed by construction in the vicinity of nesting habitat, the project applicant shall implement the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ When feasible, all tree removal shall occur between August 30 and February 15 to avoid the breeding season of any raptor species that could be using the area, and to discourage hawks or bats from nesting/roosting in the vicinity of an upcoming construction area. This period may be modified with the authorization of the DFG; or if it is not feasible to remove trees outside this window then, prior to the beginning of mass grading, including grading for major infrastructure improvements, during the period between February 15 and August 30, all trees and potential burrowing owl habitat within 350 feet of any grading or earthmoving activity shall be surveyed for active raptor nests or burrows by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to disturbance. If 	None

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<p>active raptor nests are found, and the site is within 350 feet of potential construction activity, a fence shall be erected around the tree at a distance of up to 350 feet, depending on the species, from the edge of the canopy to prevent construction disturbance and intrusions on the nest area. The appropriate buffer shall be determined by the City in consultation with CDFG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No construction vehicles shall be permitted within restricted areas (i.e., raptor protection zones), unless directly related to the management or protection of the legally protected species. ■ In the event that a nest is abandoned, despite efforts to minimize disturbance, and if the nestlings are still alive, the developer shall contact CDFG and, subject to CDFG approval, fund the recovery and hacking (controlled release of captive reared young) of the nestling(s). ■ If a legally protected species nest is located in a tree designated for removal, the removal shall be deferred until after August 30th, or until the adults and young of the year are no longer dependent on the nest site as determined by a qualified biologist. 	
<p>Impact 3.3-4 Implementation of the revised project could conflict with the City of Pasadena Tree Ordinance.</p>	LTS	No	LTS	<p>MM 3.3-2(a) The Applicant, prior to being issued a grading permit, shall submit a tree report prepared by a certified arborist that meets the requirements of the Pasadena City Tree Ordinance identifying trees to be removed and trees to be saved. It shall also include the</p>	None

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<p>preparation and submission of a tree protection and replacement plan. The tree replacement plan shall include replanting for increased canopy and include a minimum replacement ratio for removed or damaged trees of 1:1. The plan shall be prepared and approved by the City prior to grading or construction and shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The details and procedures required to prepare the restoration site for planting (i.e. grading, soil preparations, soil stocking, etc.). ■ The methods and procedures for the installation of the plant materials. ■ Guidelines for the maintenance of the mitigation site during the establishment phase of the plantings. The maintenance program shall contain guidelines for the control of nonnative plant species and the replacement of plant species that have failed to recolonize. ■ The revegetation plan shall provide for monitoring to evaluate the growth of the trees. Annual monitoring of the replacement trees shall occur for the first five years after which it shall be performed on the seventh and tenth year. Specific success criteria for replaced trees shall include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > For a replacement ratio greater than 1:1: 90 percent or more of the transplanted/ replacement trees surviving ten years after transplantation with overall no net loss of trees 	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > For replacement ration of 1:1: 100 percent survival ■ Contingency plans and appropriate remedial measures shall also be outlined in the replacement plan should the plantings fail to meet designated success criteria and planting goals. <p>When construction activities occur near protected tree species that are proposed to be saved, Best Management Practices (BMPs) to avoid damage to the trees shall be implemented, and verified by the developer. The BMPs will include, but are not limited to (1) installing protective fencing prior to and during construction, using wire mesh or plastic barrier fencing placed at 2.25 times the canopy of the tree; (2) avoiding disturbance and trenching within the tree drip line; (3) maintaining the surface grade around the tree; and (4) prohibiting the placement of paving or landscaping requiring summer irrigation in the vicinity of trees.</p> <p>MM 3.3-2(b) A drainage plan shall be designed in such a way as to avoid changes to hydrology in the vicinity of the protected trees.</p> <p>MM 3.3-2(c) Construction staging areas shall be designated on the construction plans and parking, loading, and grading during all construction activities prohibited within the root zone of the protected trees.</p> <p>MM 3.1-3 also applies to this impact.</p>	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
Impact 3.3-5 The revised project would increase nighttime illumination, but no adverse effect on wildlife within the area would occur.	LTS	No	LTS	MM 3.3-3 All lighting along the perimeter of natural areas such as the channel shall be downcast luminaries with light patterns directed away from natural areas, as coordinated with a certified lighting engineer and project biologist.	None
Impact 3.3-6 The revised project could have direct and indirect effects upon the hydrology and aquatic habitat quality of the Arroyo Seco.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact 3.4-1 The revised project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	LTS	No	LTS	<p>MM 3.4-1(a) Prior to site preparation or grading activities, the Applicant shall retain a qualified (ROPA-listed) archaeologist to inform construction personnel of the potential for encountering unique archaeological resources and the regulatory framework of cultural resources protection. All construction personnel shall be instructed to stop work within 50 feet of a potential discovery until a qualified (ROPA-listed) archaeologist assesses the significance of the find and implements appropriate measures to protect or scientifically remove the find. Construction personnel shall also be informed that unauthorized collection of archaeological resources is prohibited.</p> <p>MM 3.4-1(b) The Applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist to provide spot-checks—on a schedule approved by the City—during grading and excavation activity and to be available on-call in the event of a discovery. In the event of a discovery, the archaeologist shall first determine whether an archaeological</p>	None
---	-----	----	-----	---	------

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<p>resource uncovered during construction is a “unique archaeological resource” under Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(g). If the archaeological resource is determined to be a “unique archaeological resource,” the archaeologist shall formulate a mitigation plan in consultation with the City that satisfies the requirements of Section 21083.2.</p> <p>If the archaeologist determines that the archaeological resource is not a unique archaeological resource, the archaeologist shall record the site and submit the recordation form to the California Historic Resources Information System South Central Coastal Information Center, and no further investigation of the particular find would be required.</p> <p>The archaeologist shall prepare a report of the results of any study prepared as part of a mitigation plan, following accepted professional practice. Copies of the report shall be submitted to the City and to the California Historic Resources Information System South Central Coastal Information Center.</p> <p>MM 3.4-2(a) Prior to site preparation or grading activities, the Applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist to inform construction personnel of the potential for encountering paleontological resources and the regulatory framework of cultural resources protection. All construction personnel shall be instructed to stop work within 50 feet of a potential discovery until a qualified paleontologist assesses the significance of the find and implements appropriate measures to</p>	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<p>protect or scientifically remove the find. Construction personnel shall also be informed that unauthorized collection of paleontological resources is prohibited.</p> <p>MM 3.4-2(b) The Applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist to provide spot-checks—on a schedule approved by the City—during grading and excavation activities and, in the event of a discovery, shall first determine whether a paleontological resource uncovered during construction meets the definition of a “unique archaeological resource” under Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(g). If the paleontological resource is determined to be a “unique archaeological resource,” the paleontologist shall formulate a mitigation plan in consultation with the campus that satisfies the requirements of Section 21083.2.</p> <p>If the paleontologist determines that the paleontological resource is not a unique resource, the paleontologist shall record the site and submit the recordation form to the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, and no further investigation of the particular find would be required.</p> <p>The paleontologist shall prepare a report of the results of any study prepared as part of a mitigation plan, following accepted professional practice. Copies of the report shall be submitted to the City and to the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.</p>	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
<p>Impact 3.4-2 The revised project with Option B would not cause alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of the historical resource would be materially impaired.</p>	SU	Yes	LTS	None	None
<p>Impact 3.4-3 The revised project would not alter the significance of other historic resources in the project vicinity.</p>	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
<p>Impact 3.4-4 The revised project with Options A or C would cause alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of the historical resource would be materially impaired.</p>	SU	No	SU	<p>MM 3.4-3(a) Compliance with the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties</i>. The scope of work is currently schematic and will be defined further as the project progresses. All work on elements of the Rose Bowl to be retained shall be designed for maximum possible compliance with the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties</i>. This shall be accomplished through the oversight of an independent historic preservation consultant and City staff, as described below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Historic Preservation Consultant. The City shall retain the services of a qualified historic preservation consultant with experience in architectural preservation. The role of the historic preservation consultant shall be to review structural designs and construction activities that could potentially affect character-defining features as identified in this EIR and the Historic Structure Report. All reviews by the historic 	None

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<p>preservation consultant shall be carried out by a person or persons meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards. Knowledge of historic architecture, materials, surface finishes, and historic restoration techniques is required. This consultant shall have a structural engineer and conservator available for consultation. The consultant's main responsibility shall be to monitor and advise the City regarding compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards with respect to elements of the Rose Bowl that would be retained, as well as approved design criteria. Through a series of development, design, and specification review meetings, as well as construction monitoring, the historic preservation consultant shall work in conjunction with City and with the Applicant's project and construction management teams. In addition, the consultant shall review the historic record and photo documentation, protection of historic fabric, mock-ups, and test panels of treatments to historic fabric. In consultation with other experts, the consultant shall approve the materials and replica designs used in the restoration, rehabilitation and new construction related to the historic resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Construction Monitoring. On-site construction monitoring by a historic preservation consultant shall be undertaken throughout the construction phase to ensure 	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<p>protection of historic fabric and compliance with the Standards and approved design and construction documents. Monitoring will be scheduled based on potential construction impacts and specific scope of work and will vary between daily and weekly visits upon approval by the City. In addition, all submittals, mock-ups, and change orders that affect historic fabric shall be reviewed by the consultant. On-site changes that might affect historic fabric shall be undertaken in consultation with the historic consultant. If the historic preservation consultant determines that construction does not substantially conform to the approved criteria, the historic preservation consultant will immediately notify the City. The City will require any contractors, vendors etc. to take all reasonable measures to avoid or minimize harm to the property until the issue is resolved. The historic preservation consultant, design team, and construction management will work cooperatively and diligently to resolve issues in a timely manner.</p> <p>MM 3.4-3(b) Documentation. A Historical Resource Documentation Report shall be prepared for the Rose Bowl. The resources shall be described photographed in a manner that conforms to Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) Level I documentation standards, as well as the HABS/HAER Guidelines for HABS Historical Reports. The documentation shall</p>	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				amend the existing HABS report for the Rose Bowl in the Library of Congress collection, focusing on those areas that would be directly affected by the proposed project. The documentation shall be donated to suitable repositories selected by the City, one of which shall include the main branch of the Pasadena Library.	
Impact 3.4-5 The revised project could alter the significance of the Arroyo Seco Cultural Landscape.	SU	No	SU	MM 3.4-3(b) would also apply to this impact.	None
GEOLOGY AND SOILS					
Impact 3.5-1 The revised project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
Impact 3.5-2 The revised project would not be located on expansive soil.	LTS	No	LTS	MM 3.5-2 would also apply to this impact.	None
Impact 3.5-3 The revised project could expose people or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects from seismic activity or landslides.	LTS	No	LTS	MM 3.5-1 The Applicant shall incorporate site-specific ground motion criteria, as described in the current Pasadena Building Code Chapters 16, 18, and A33, and reviewed by the city's California-registered geotechnical and/or structural engineer, in the design of trenches, slopes, foundations, and structures for the project. Implementation of this measure is required by the Building Code and includes the following provisions:	None

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The minimum seismic-resistant design standards for all proposed facilities shall conform to the California Building Code Seismic Zone 4 Standards ■ Additional seismic-resistant earthwork and construction design criteria shall be incorporated in the project as necessary, based on the site-specific recommendations of a California Certified Engineering Geologist in cooperation with California-registered geotechnical and structural engineering professionals ■ During site preparation, the registered geotechnical professional shall be on the site to supervise implementation of the recommended criteria ■ The California Certified Engineering Geologist consultant shall prepare an “as built” map/report, to be filed with the City, showing details of the site geology, the location and type of seismic-restraint facilities, and documenting the following requirements, as appropriate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Engineering analyses shall demonstrate satisfactory performance of compacted fill or natural unconsolidated sediments where either forms part or all of the support for any structures, especially where the possible occurrence of liquefiable soils exists > Access roads, foundations, and underground utilities in fill or alluvium shall be designed to accommodate 	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<p>settlement or compaction estimated by the site-specific geotechnical investigations of the geotechnical consultant</p> <p>MM 3.5-2 Site-specific soil suitability analysis and stabilization procedures, and design criteria for foundations and road bases (described in the current Pasadena Building Code Chapters 16, 18, and A33) shall be required, as recommended by a California-registered soil engineer, during the design phase for each site where the existence of unsuitable soil conditions is known or suspected. During the design phase, where the existence of unsuitable soil conditions is known or suspected, the Developer's registered soil engineering consultant shall provide documentation to the City that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Site-specific soil suitability and stability analyses have been conducted in the area of the proposed foundations and road bases to establish the design criteria for appropriate foundation or road base type and support ■ The recommended criteria have been incorporated in the design of foundation <p>During grading, the registered soils professional shall be on the site to do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Observe areas of potential soil unsuitability or instability ■ Supervise the implementation of soil remediation or reconstruction programs ■ Verify final soil conditions prior to setting the 	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				foundations The registered soils engineering consultant shall prepare an "as built" map/report, to be filed with the City, showing details of the site soils, the location of foundations, retaining walls, sub-drains, clean-outs, etc., and the results of suitability/stability analyses and compaction tests.	
Impact 3.5-4 The revised project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	LTS	No	LTS	MM 3.5-3 The following actions shall be taken: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ To the extent practicable, project site grading shall be scheduled for the dry season (April through September) ■ In addition, NPDES permit requirements shall be fulfilled prior to issuance of building permits ■ The Applicant shall submit a soil erosion and sedimentation control plan for the project to the City of Pasadena prior to grading, subject to the following recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The Erosion and Sediment Transport Control Plan (as part of the overall SWPPP) shall be submitted, reviewed, implemented, and inspected as part of the approval process for the grading plans > The Plan shall be designed by the Applicant's erosion control consultant, using concepts similar to those formulated by the state of California, as appropriate, based on the specific erosion and sediment transport control needs of the site where grading, 	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				excavation, and construction is to occur. Those concepts include some that apply generally to the entire project area and some that would be appropriate only for specific sites. The possible methods are not necessarily limited to the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Confine grading and activities related to grading (demolition, excavation, construction, preparation and use of equipment and material storage areas and staging areas) to the dry season, whenever possible ○ Locate staging areas outside streams and drainage ways ○ Keep the lengths and gradients of constructed slopes (cut or fill) as low as possible ○ Discharge grading and construction runoff into small drainages at frequent intervals to avoid buildup of large potentially erosive flows ○ Prevent runoff from flowing over unprotected slopes ○ Keep disturbed areas (areas of grading and related activities) to the minimum necessary for demolition or construction of the project ○ Keep runoff away from disturbed areas during grading and related activities ○ Stabilize disturbed areas as quickly 	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				as possible, either by vegetative or mechanical methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Direct runoff over vegetated areas prior to discharge into public storm drainage systems, whenever possible ○ Trap sediment before it leaves the site with such techniques as check dams, sediment ponds, or siltation fences ○ Use interceptor ditches, drainage swales, or detention basins to prevent storm runoff from transporting sediment into drainage ways and to prevent sediment-laden runoff from leaving any disturbed areas ○ Install silt fences to prevent sedimentation in areas adjacent to grading and down gradients into drainage ways. Design fences using the Universal Soil Loss Equation to calculate their proper storage capacity. The contractor shall implement installation by prior to mass grading and other soil disturbing construction activities on site ○ The contractor shall be responsible for the removal and disposal of all project-related sedimentation in off-site retention ponds ○ Use landscaping and grading 	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<p>methods that lower the potential for down-stream sedimentation. Modified drainage patterns, longer flow paths, encouraging infiltration into the ground, and slower stormwater conveyance velocities are examples of effective methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Control landscaping activities carefully with regard to the application of fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides, or other hazardous substances. Provide proper instruction to all landscaping personnel on the construction team ○ During the installation of the erosion and sediment transport control structures, the erosion control professional shall be on the site to supervise the implementation of the designs, and the maintenance of the facilities throughout the demolition, grading, and construction period 	
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS					
<p>Impact 3.6-1 The revised project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.</p>	LTS	No	LTS	None	None

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
Impact 3.6-2 The revised project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
Impact 3.6-3 Construction and operation of the revised project would not expose workers and visitors to a safety hazard from helipad operations.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
Impact 3.6-4 Implementation of the revised project would not interfere with response and/or evacuation requirements in the case of an emergency.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
Impact 3.6-5 Operation of the revised project would not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY					
Impact 3.7-1 The revised project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
<p>Impact 3.7-2 The revised project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity or existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, nor would it provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The revised project would require the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities, the construction of which would not cause significant environmental effects.</p>	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
<p>Impact 3.7-3 The revised project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off site.</p>	LTS	No	LTS	<p>MM 3.7-1 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project Applicants shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State and comply with the requirements of the NPDES General Construction Permit, including the preparation of a SWPPP and a SUSMP incorporating BMPs for construction and post-construction control of runoff. A Civil Engineer shall prepare the SWPPP and SUSMP for City review and approval. The plans shall reduce the discharge of pollutants, including sediment, to the maximum extent practical using management practices, control techniques and systems, design and engineering methods, and such other provisions that are appropriate. The plans shall include applicable post-construction measures such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Control of impervious area runoff, including installation of detention basins, retention areas, filtering devices, energy dissipaters, pervious drainage systems, porous 	None

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<p>pavement alternatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Implement regular sweeping of impervious surfaces such as streets and driveways ■ Use of efficient irrigation practices ■ Provision of infiltration trenches and basins ■ Linings for urban runoff conveyance channels ■ Vegetated swales and strips ■ Protection of slopes and channels ■ Landscape design such as xeriscape or other design minimizing use of fertilizers <p>MM 3.7-2 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall submit and obtain approval of construction drainage and erosion control plans for in connection with site grading activities. The control measures contained in the plan shall be approved by the City of Pasadena prior to starting construction. The plans shall serve as the basis for the construction portion of the SWPPP and shall include the applicable measures such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Diversion of off-site runoff away from the construction site ■ Prompt revegetation of proposed landscaped areas ■ Perimeter sandbagging and silt fences and/or temporary basins to trap sediment ■ Regular sprinkling of exposed soils to control dust during construction ■ Installation of a minor retention basin(s) to alleviate discharge of increase flows 	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Specifications for construction waste handling and disposal, including wheel washing activities ■ Erosion control measures maintained throughout the construction period ■ Construction stabilized construction entrances to avoid trucks from imprinting debris on City roadways ■ Construction timing to minimize soil exposure to storm events ■ Training of subcontractors on general site housekeeping <p>The SWPPP is a "live" document and shall be kept current by the person responsible for its implementation.</p>	
<p>Impact 3.7-4 Implementation of the revised project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk involving flooding due to the failure of Devil's Gate Reservoir.</p>	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
<p>Impact 3.7-5 Implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by seiche.</p>	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
LAND USE AND PLANNING					
<p>Impact 3.8-1 The revised project would not result in incompatibility with adjacent land uses, or cause a substantial adverse change in existing land use patterns.</p>	LTS	No	LTS	None	None

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
Impact 3.8-2 The revised project would not result in substantial alteration of the type or intensity of development in the immediate area.	SU	Yes	LTS	None	None
Impact 3.8-3 The revised project would not be inconsistent with applicable adopted land use plans, policies, and regulations.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
Impact 3.8-4 The revised project could interfere with existing other uses in the immediate area.	LTS	No	LTS	MM 3.8-1 If the parking areas that currently accommodate the monthly Flea Market are unavailable due to construction of the proposed project, the RBOC shall make an alternate location available, and shall notify the Flea Market operators in writing at least 90 days in advance of any such unavailability as well as to advise of the alternative location.	None
Impact 3.8-5 The revised project would not result in adverse neighborhood impacts.	SU	Yes	LTS	None	None

NOISE

Impact 3.9-1 The revised project could expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.	LTS	No	LTS	MM 3.9-1 To mitigate potential pile driving or other extreme noise-generating impacts, a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures shall be completed under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. This plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the City to ensure that feasible noise attenuation is achieved to satisfy standards contained in the City of Pasadena Noise Ordinance. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible and shall be implemented prior to any required pile	None
--	-----	----	-----	--	------

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<p>driving activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Implement “quiet” pile driving technology (e.g., cast-in-drilled hole piles, soil-mix wall technology, shielded pile drivers, vibratory pile driving or pre-drilled pile holes), where feasible, in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions ■ Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around the entire construction site ■ Adjust the scheduling and duration of pile driving ■ Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements during pile driving activities <p>MM 3.9-2 Prior to the issuance of each building permit, along with the submission of construction documents, the Project Applicant shall submit to the City a list of measures to respond to and track complaints pertaining to construction noise. These measures shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A procedure for notifying City staff ■ A plan for posting signs on the project site pertaining to permitted construction days and hours, complaint procedures, and who to notify in the event of a problem ■ A listing of telephone numbers (during regular construction hours and off hours) ■ The designation of an on-site construction complaint manager for the proposed project ■ Notification of residents within 800 feet of the proposed project construction area at least 30 days in advance of pile-driving 	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				<p>along with the estimated duration of the activity</p> <p>MM 3.9-3 (a) Prior to installation of the new sound system, the project operator shall present a noise analysis to the City that demonstrates that the new sound system will meet the City's Noise Regulations.</p> <p>(b) Stadium noise level in the residential areas surrounding the project site shall be monitored periodically during the first year of operation by the operator in cooperation with the City.</p> <p>(c) Based on the monitoring results, the operator shall modify operation of the loudspeaker system to reduce noise levels observed at the residential areas to meet City Noise Regulations. Modifications may include adjustments to volumes or relocation of individual loudspeakers and shall ensure any necessary modifications to provide the maximum feasible reduction of noise to the surrounding community.</p> <p>(d) Prior to the first special event associated with a NFL football game at the Rose Bowl, the operator shall develop noise performance standards for the stadium loudspeaker system to minimize noise effects at the residential areas surrounding the Rose Bowl. The performance standards shall specify a noise limit and may include suggestions for sound equipment orientation or other measures. The performance standards shall be subject to review and</p>	

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
				approval by the Director of Community Development.	
Impact 3.9-2 The revised project would not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
Impact 3.9-3 The revised project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels associated with the operation of advertisement-related aircrafts (e.g., blimps, banner aircrafts) during special events.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
Impact 3.9-4 The revised project would not cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
----------------	-------------------------------------	--	---	--	---

LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact

PUBLIC SERVICES

Impact 3.10-1 The revised project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for public services.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
--	-----	----	-----	------	------

RECREATION

Impact 3.11-1 The revised project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
Impact 3.11-2 The revised project would not increase recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	SU	Yes	LTS	None	None

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
Impact 3.11-3 The revised project would not substantially interfere with or preclude use of existing recreational facilities in the Central Arroyo Seco.	SU	Yes	LTS	None	None
TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC					
Impact 3.12-1 The revised project would not substantially increase hazards due to design features. The revised project would not result in inadequate emergency access or inadequate parking, nor will it conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
Impact 3.12-2 The revised project would not cause an increase in traffic or exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency.	SU	Yes	LTS	None	None
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS					
Impact 3.13-1 The revised project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board and would not require the construction of new facilities. The revised project would not exceed the wastewater treatment providers' ability to the serve the project.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
Impact 3.13-2 The revised project would not result in an increase in water demand that could affect existing water supplies.	LTS	No	LTS	None	<p>MM 3.13-1 The project Applicant shall install low-flow plumbing fixtures in all new or renovated construction areas.</p> <p>MM 3.13-2 The project Applicant shall utilize landscape irrigation water conservation methods as feasible, including, but not limited to, weather-based "smart" irrigation controllers and/or drip irrigation.</p>
Impact 3.13-3 The revised project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Additionally, the revised project would continue to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.	LTS	No	LTS	None	None
Impact 3.13-4 Implementation of the revised project could require an increase in electricity and natural gas, but would not require the construction of new energy production or transmission facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	No	LTS	MM 3.13-3 Project design and construction shall be coordinated with SCG and the City's Department of Water Power, and improvements provided if necessary in order to ensure that connections are adequate and capacity is available to accommodate estimated demand for gas and electric utilities.	None

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts of the Revised Project

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
LTS = Less than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; NI = No Impact					
<p>Impact 3.13-5 Implementation of the revised project is expected to increase and potentially overload existing stormwater drainage facilities.</p>	SU	Yes	LTS	<p>MM 3.13-4 The project Applicant shall provide a storm drainage analysis to ensure that storm drain lines and connections are adequate and that capacity is available to accommodate the anticipated increase in stormwater flows. If the report provides recommendations for on-site storm drainage improvements, the recommendations must be followed and implemented. If found that off-site improvements would be necessary, the project Applicant shall pay in-lieu fees to the City for the future construction of those facilities.</p>	None