PROPOSED
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
Parcel Map GLN 1634
Secondary Ridgeline Exception PRBSE1603704
Variance PVAR 1724105
2942 and 2950 Oak Glen Road

The following Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.	
Project Title/Common Name:	Parcel Map GLN 1634
Project Location:	2942 and 2950 Oak Glen Road, Glendale, Los Angeles County
Project Description:	Parcel map application to subdivide an existing 269,200 square foot lot into four lots for the construction of three new single-family dwellings, maintaining the single-family dwelling at 2950 Oak Glen (built in 1947), and demolishing a single-family dwelling at 2942 Oak Glen Road (built in 1944). The applicant is also requesting an exception from the subdivision code to allow the creation of new residential lots on a site that contains a secondary ridgeline and less than the required lot width for three lots, and a variance from the Zoning Ordinance to allow a shared driveway for two lots. Future residential development on the lots will require approval by the Design Review Board.
Project Type:	☒ Private Project ☐ Public Project
Project Applicant:	Alan Malekian 2255 Honolulu Ave. #1A Montrose, CA 91020 Phone: (818) 249-5522
Findings:	The Director of the Community Development, on **October 10, 2017**, after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Division, found that the above referenced project would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be prepared.
Mitigation Measures:	See attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).
Attachments:	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Philip Lanzafame, Director of Community Development City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 548-2140; Fax: (818) 240-0392

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

The following mitigation measure shall apply to the Parcel Map GLN 1634 project located at 2942 and 2950 Oak Glen Road to reduce identified impacts to less than significant levels.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Lot 1 - The applicant shall demolish/deconstruct the existing house or a portion of the existing house within the dripline of the Tree #16 by hand to reduce the risk of demolition damage.
2. Lot 3 - Installation protective measures shall be provided to limit construction activities to outside the dripline of Tree #14.
3. Lot 4 - The applicant shall reduce the area of driveway pavement to the greatest extent possible (for example, the triangle of pavement that extends toward Tree #10 and #11) to reduce the impact to Trees #7-13. Installation protective measures shall be provided to limit construction impacts to the area within the footprint of the driveway.
4. Trees #7-14 and 16 – Construction material and debris sites should be identified prior to the start of construction and located away from any of the protected trees on the property to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works. Vehicle access, in particular heavy construction equipment, should be limited to existing pavement or driveways. To the greatest extent possible the existing soil within the dripline of the protected trees on the property should be left undisturbed.
5. An indigenous tree permit must be obtained prior to the final approval of the site plans and the property owners agree to adhere to a set of tree protection requirements developed by Forestry for the project.

Monitoring Action:	Plan review; Site Inspection
Timing:	Prior to approval of Final Parcel Map; during all construction activities
Responsibility:	Director of Public Works; Director of Community Development

Agreement to Proposed Mitigation Measures and Mitigation Monitoring Program

I/WE THE UNDERSIGNED PROJECT APPLICANT (S), HEREBY AGREE TO MODIFICATION OF THE PROJECT TO CONFORM WITH THE IMPACT MITIGATION MEASURES AND THE MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM SPECIFIED HEREIN REGARDLESS OF CHANGE OF OWNERSHIP. IF I/WE DISAGREE WITH ANY RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES OR ALL OR PART OF THE MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM, IN LIEU OF MY/OUR SIGNATURE HEREON, I/WE MAY REQUEST RECONSIDERATION OF THE MATTER UPON SUBMITTAL OF THE APPLICABLE FEE AND DOCUMENTATION IN SUPPORT OF MY/OUR POSITION ON SAID MITIGATION MEASURES AND/OR MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM. (THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD WILL RECONSIDER THE ISSUES AND TAKE ACTION AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE.)

Dated: _____ _____
Signature(s) of the Project Applicant(s)

Dated: _____ _____
Signature(s) of the Project Applicant(s)

11. 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	☐ Agricultural and Forest Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology / Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology / Water Quality
☐ Land Use / Planning	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise
☐ Population / Housing	☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation / Traffic	☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:

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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. 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.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Prepared by: _____ Date: 10/10/17

Reviewed by: _____ Date: 10/10/17

Signature of Director of Community Development or his or her designee authorizing the release of environmental document for public review and comment.

For Director of Community Development: _____ Date: 10/10/17

glendale
Community Development

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Parcel Map GLN 1634
Secondary Ridgeline Exception PRBSE1603704
2942 and 2950 Oak Glen Road

1.	**Project Title:** Parcel Map GLN 1634
2.	**Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Glendale Community Development Department Planning Division 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	**Contact Person and Phone Number:** Kathy Duarte, Planner Tel: (818) 548-2115 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	**Project Location:** 2942 and 2950 Oak Glen Road, Glendale, Los Angeles County
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Alan Malekian 2255 Honolulu Ave. #1A Montrose, CA 91020 Phone: (818) 249-5522
6.	**General Plan Designation:** Very Low Density Residential
7.	**Zoning:** R1R, Restricted Residential Zone, Floor Area Ratio District II
8.	**Description of the Project:** Parcel map application to subdivide an existing 269,200 square foot lot into four lots for the construction of three new single-family dwellings, maintaining the single-family dwelling at 2950 Oak Glen (built in 1947), and demolishing a single-family dwelling at 2942 Oak Glen Road (built in 1944). The applicant is also requesting an exception from the subdivision code to allow the creation of new residential lots on a site that contains a secondary ridgeline and less than the required lot width for three lots, and an exception to the Zoning Ordinance for a shared driveway on two lots. Future residential development on the lots will require approval by the Design Review Board.
9.	**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *North:* Residential *South:* Residential *East:* Residential *West:* Residential
10.	**Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).** None

12. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The following section provides an evaluation of the impact categories and questions contained in the checklist, and identifies mitigation measures, if applicable.

A. AESTHETICS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

1) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Less Than Significant Impact. The surrounding area is developed with single-family hillside residences. In addition, no scenic vistas, as identified in the Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993), exist within or in proximity to the project site. A portion of the site does contain a protected secondary ridgeline; however, the locations for future residences on the newly created lots are not located on any designated ridgeline area. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is not located within the view corridor of any state scenic highway, as there are no state-designated scenic highways within the City of Glendale. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway, and no impact will result.

3) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Less Than Significant Impact. The site is currently developed with one single-family house that is proposed to remain on Parcel 4 of the proposed four lot parcel map. The existing two-story house on Parcel 1 is proposed to be demolished. The four newly created lots will allow for the development of three new single-family houses. Future development of the three newly created lots will require review and approval by the Design Review Board. Although, future development is proposed, the majority of the new lots would remain undeveloped in their natural state. As a result, no significant impacts to the visual character or quality of the site are anticipated.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The site is currently developed with two single-family houses. The proposed four lot subdivision will result in three new lots, with the demolition of one existing house and the construction of three new single-family houses. The proposed development is located within a developed residential area and new light sources associated with the project are not expected to significantly increase the existing ambient lighting in the area. As such, impacts associated with increased ambient lighting affecting nighttime views in the project area are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project, and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project.	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)?				X
4. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

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

No Impact. There is no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance within or adjacent to the proposed project site and no agricultural activities take place on the project site. No agricultural use zones currently exist within the city, nor are any agricultural zones proposed. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is located in an urbanized area. No portion of the project site is proposed to include agricultural zoning designations or uses, nor do any such uses exist within the city under the current General Plan and zoning. There are no Williamson Act contracts in effect for the project site or surrounding vicinity. No conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contract would result. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)?***

No Impact. There is no existing zoning of forest land or timberland in the City of Glendale. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?***

No Impact. There is no forest land within the City of Glendale. No forest land would be converted to non-forest use under the proposed project. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) ***Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?***

No Impact. There is no farmland or forest land in the vicinity of or on the proposed project site. No farmland would be converted to non-agricultural use and no forest land would be converted to non-forest use under the proposed project. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

C. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

1) ***Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?***

No Impact. The *2016 AQMP* is designed to accommodate growth, to reduce the high levels of pollutants within the areas under the jurisdiction of SCAQMD, to achieve the federal 8-hour ozone standard by 2024 and to minimize the impact on the economy. Projects that are considered to be consistent with the AQMP do not interfere with attainment and do not contribute to the exceedance of an existing air quality violation because this growth is included in the projections utilized in the formulation of the AQMP. Therefore, projects, uses, and activities that are consistent with the applicable assumptions used in the development of the AQMP would not jeopardize attainment of the air quality levels identified in the AQMP, even if they exceed the SCAQMD's recommended thresholds.

The project would not increase population figures over those that have been planned for the area and would be consistent with the AQMP forecasts for this area. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the air quality-related regional plans, and would not jeopardize attainment of state and federal ambient air quality standards in the region. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed four lot subdivision would create three new lots for the construction of three new single-family houses. Only minimal construction impacts are expected with the demolition of the existing house, grading and construction of the three new houses. The proposed project would not result in any significant increase in criteria pollutants or contribute to an existing air quality violation or exceed SCAQMD threshold. Additionally, the project will be required to comply with all applicable rules to reduce construction impacts. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As described above, the proposed project is not expected to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. No significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?***

Less Than Significant Impact. Sensitive receptors are defined as schools, hospitals, resident care facilities, daycare centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The proposed project is located within a residential area with no known sensitive receptors located nearby. Impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) ***Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?***

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if objectionable odors are generated that would adversely impact sensitive receptors. During the construction phase, activities

associated with the operation of construction equipment may produce discernible odors typical of most construction sites. Although these odors could be a source of nuisance to adjacent receptors, they are temporary and intermittent in nature given the scope of the project. As construction-related emissions dissipate, the odors associated with these emissions would also decrease, dilute and become unnoticeable. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
4. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	
5. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		X		
6. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The San Rafael Hills are not identified as a Significant Ecological area in the Open Space and Conservation Element. San Rafael parcels have a high degree of fragmentation resulting from urban expansion. Although deer, bobcat, and coyotes are presently found in the San Rafael Hills, as fragmentation continues, populations occupying these parcels will be reduced or eliminated. The lack of a clear corridor of open space with appropriate resources into these isolated parcels will impede re-colonization. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. No riparian habitat and/or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are present onsite or adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is neither in proximity to, nor does it contain, wetland habitat or a blue-line stream. Therefore, the proposed project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located in a developed area where there are many constraints to wildlife movement. Development and associated fencing, as well as the State Route 2, severely limit wildlife movement. Consequently, wildlife movement on the project site is limited to local movement of wildlife within the immediate vicinity. In addition, the majority of the newly create parcels would remain undeveloped and contained large amounts of opens space that would remain in their natural state. Construction of future single-family residents would not result in any significant barrier to wildlife moving through the area and therefore, no adverse effect on regional movement corridors would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The Glendale Municipal Code, Chapter 12.44 Indigenous Trees, contains guidelines for the protection and removal of indigenous trees. These trees are defined as any Valley Oak, California Live Oak, Scrub Oak, Mesa Oak, California Bay, and California Sycamore, which measure 6 inches or more in diameter breast height (DBH).

The proposed project contains several lots located on the East side of the Verdugo Woodlands. The project area contains the valley located at the end of Oak Glen Road with the hillside up to the ridgeline to the east of Oak Glen Road. With the exception of the valley bottom, the project area is undeveloped; vegetation consists of native an Oak woodland-chaparral mix on the lower slopes that transitions to a chaparral cover on the mid-slope and the ridgeline. The developed valley bottom contains a mix of neglected turf grass and herbaceous cover with scattered native Oak trees, native Elderberry trees, and non-native trees. An indigenous tree report (dated August 30, 2017) was prepared for this project by Craig Crotty. Forestry reviewed the site plans, the indigenous tree report, visited the site, and provided the following comments.

There are 17 protected indigenous trees within the project area. The majority of the protected trees are mature Coast Live Oaks, mainly located in the valley bottom and on the lower slopes. The remaining protected trees in the project area are Scrub Oaks located on the lower and mid slope. The submitted plans accurately show all of the protected trees in the project area. Of the 17 protected trees on the property, 8 are within the vicinity of the proposed construction. There are no protected trees being proposed for removal; however, Tree # 8 & 13 were in very poor condition during Forestry's visit to the site and Forestry would permit the removal of these trees based on their condition. Based on the site plans there will be the following encroachments on the protected trees.

- Trees # 7-13 will be impacted by the demolition and installation of the driveways on Lot #4. The proposed driveway is located within a significant portion of the dripline of these trees and there is the potential for the proposed construction to damage tree roots when existing driveways are removed, as well as with any excavation that occurs to prepare the base of the new driveways. Of particular concern is Tree# 9 as this tree appears to be located less than 10' from the existing/proposed replacement driveway. The severity of the impacts to these trees would be lessened by reducing the area of pavement being replaced. Forestry recommends that the driveway width be reduced where possible (for example; the triangle of pavement that extends towards Tree # 10 & 11). In addition to reducing the area of the driveway on Lot 4, Forestry will also require the installation of protective measures, such as fencing, to limit construction impacts to the area within the footprint of the driveway.

- The house on Lot 3 is located close to Tree #14. The developer has located the footprint of the building outside of the dripline of this tree: however, construction activities, including grading, are being proposed up to the edge of the tree's dripline. Forestry will require the installation of protective measures to limit construction activities to outside of the dripline.

- There is the potential for significant impacts to occur to tree # 16 on Lot 1 from the demolition of the existing house and the construction of the new house. Specifically, there is a mature Oak tree that is less than 10' from the existing house that is proposed for demolition. It is difficult to install effective protective measures when a tree is this close to a structure and mechanical demolition methods can be very damaging to a tree. An alternative would be to demolish/deconstruct the existing house by hand or a portion of the existing house within the dripline by hand to reduce the risk this tree will be damaged by the demolition activity.

- Trees # 7-14 & 16 are located in the middle of the project area and there is the potential for additional impacts beyond the construction that occurs within these trees driplines. Construction material and waste sites should be identified prior to the start of construction and located well away from any of the protected trees on the property. Vehicle access, in particular heavy construction equipment, should be limited to existing pavement or driveways. To the greatest extent possible the existing soil within the dripline of the protected trees on the property should be left undisturbed.

There are no existing street trees on the property. The submitted plans propose the installation of three new street trees in a public right of way that is only three feet wide. In order to fit these proposed trees wholly within the public right of way the trees would have to be installed within 2 feet of the proposed curb. At this distance the trees, when full grown, would likely result in conflicts with the proposed new curb and street. Forestry would support the installation of these trees along Oak Glen Road, but further back from the curb on private property.

Due to the fact that the trees onsite will be preserved, the project would not result in significant unavoidable impacts. However, mitigation measures have been added to the project to further reduce the less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

1. Lot 1 - The applicant shall demolish/deconstruct the existing house or a portion of the existing house within the dripline of the Tree #16 by hand to reduce the risk of demolition damage.
2. Lot 3 - Installation protective measures shall be provided to limit construction activities to outside the dripline of Tree #14.
3. Lot 4 - The applicant shall reduce the area of driveway pavement to the greatest extent possible (for example, the triangle of pavement that extends toward Tree #10 and #11) to reduce the impact to Trees #7-13. Installation protective measures shall be provided to limit construction impacts to the area within the footprint of the driveway.
4. Trees #7-14 and 16 – Construction material and debris sites should be identified prior to the start of construction and located away from any of the protected trees on the property to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works. Vehicle access, in particular heavy construction equipment, should be limited to existing pavement or driveways. To the greatest extent possible the existing soil within the dripline of the protected trees on the property should be left undisturbed.
5. An indigenous tree permit must be obtained prior to the final approval of the site plans and the property owners agree to adhere to a set of tree protection requirements developed by Forestry for the project.

6) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact. No adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Conservation Plan exists for the project site or immediate area. Consequently, implementation of the Project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?				X
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?			X	
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	
4. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	

1) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?

No Impact. The single-family dwelling located at 2950 Oak Glen (built in 1947) will be maintained. The single-family dwelling at 2942 Oak Glen Road (built in 1944) that is proposed to be demolished is not identified as a historic resource. The proposed subdivision and development would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact. Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites are not known to exist within the local area. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less Than Significant Impact. Plant and animal fossils are typically found within sedimentary rock deposits. Most of the City of Glendale consists of igneous and metamorphic rock, and the local area is not known to contain paleontological resources. There is a possibility that paleontological resources may exist at deep levels and could be unearthed with implementation of the proposed project. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during the proposed project-related subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until a paleontologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban landscape. No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the project site or surrounding area. Nonetheless, if human remains are encountered during excavation and grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then serve as a consultant on how to proceed with the remains (i.e., avoid removal or rebury). With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?			X	
2. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
3. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
4. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
5. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

1) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Geologic and Soils Engineering Exploration report dated November 23, 2015, no known active faults cross the project site and the project site is not located within a currently-designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (CGS, 2000) and does not represent a fault rupture hazard to the proposed development. Based on the available geologic data, active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are not known to be located directly beneath or projecting toward the project site. Therefore, the potential for surface rupture as a result of fault plane displacement is less than significant.

***Mitigation Measures*:** No mitigation measures are required.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less than Significant Impact. The project site could be subject to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake originating along one of the faults listed as active or potentially active in the Southern California area. This hazard exists throughout Southern California and could pose a risk to public safety and property by exposing people, property, or infrastructure to potentially adverse effects, including strong seismic ground shaking. Compliance with applicable building codes would minimize structural damage to buildings and ensure safety in the event of a moderate or major earthquake. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No Impact. The project site is not located within a mapped liquefaction hazard zone. Compliance with applicable building would minimize the exposure of people and the proposed building from the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Therefore, no impacts related to liquefaction would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) Landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is not located within a mapped landslide prone area and the California Geologic Survey has not designated the property within a state zone requiring seismic landslide investigation per Public Resources Code, Section 2693 (c). There are neither known landslides near the project site nor is the project site in the path of any known or potential landslides. Therefore, impacts related to landslides would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activity associated with the proposed project development may result in wind and water driven erosion of soils due to grading activities if soil is stockpiled or exposed during construction. However, this impact is considered short-term in nature. Further, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit set forth by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and prepare and submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be administered throughout proposed project construction. The SWPPP would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water driven erosion during construction would be reduced to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an onsite or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Less Than Significant Impact. Per the Geologic and Soils Engineering Exploration report dated November 23, 2015, slopes analyzed for stability show that the existing slopes are grossly stable with a factor of safety in excess of 1.5. As noted in their findings, the recommended bearing material is bedrock and future compacted fill and the soils to be exposed at finished grade are expected to exhibit a very low expansion potential. Remedial grading may be used to improve site conditions as the upper 10 to 12 feet of alluvium is soft and prone to consolidation upon saturation and loading.

As an alternative to removal and re-compaction of the alluvium under the west portion of the southern two proposed residences, the residences may be supported on cast-in-place concrete friction piles supported in the bedrock.

As previously discussed, the potential for hazards such as landslides and liquefaction is considered low. Since the liquefaction potential at the project site is low, earthquake-induced lateral spreading is not considered to be a significant seismic hazard at the site.

Ground surface subsidence generally results from the extraction of fluids or gas from the subsurface that can result in a gradual lowering of the ground level. No regional subsidence as a result of groundwater pumping has been reported in Glendale area. Therefore, the potential for ground collapse and other adverse effects due to subsidence to occur on the Project site is considered low.

In order to minimize damage due to geologic hazards, design and construction of the proposed project would comply with applicable building codes. Therefore, impacts related to exposure to hazards including landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction and collapse would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Geologic and Soils Engineering Exploration report dated November 23, 2015 notes that the soils to be exposed at finished grade are expected to exhibit a very low expansion potential. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soil would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

No Impact. Septic tanks will not be used in the proposed project. The proposed project would connect to and use the existing sewage conveyance system. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

G. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
2. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

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

Less Than Significant Impact.

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels.

Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution from increased formation of ground level ozone and particulate matter, ecosystem changes, increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects.

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has prepared the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) which is part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Glendale has an adopted Greener Glendale Plan which meets regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by SCAG and adopted by the ARB. The Greener Glendale Plan uses land use development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, transportation measures and other policies that are determined to be feasible to reduce GHG.

Presently SCAG is reevaluating GHG reduction targets for compliance with SB32 (2016) and no new targets have been identified at this time. Glendale will reevaluate the Greener Glendale Plan when new SGAG regional targets are finalized.

It should be noted that an individual project's GHG emissions will generally not result in direct impacts under CEQA, as the climate change issue is global in nature, however an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. This project is consistent with current Greener Glendale Strategies to reduce GHGs. Therefore, it is determined that the project would result in less than cumulatively considerable impacts associated with GHG emission and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. For the reasons discussed in Response G.1 above, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

H. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?				X
7. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
8. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X	

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

No Impact. The proposed project involves the future construction of three new single-family houses. The development of a single-family residence does not involve any use, routine transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. No new hazardous materials will be generated at the site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would be required to comply with all applicable rules established by the SCAQMD, including Rule 403 and 402, during the future construction phases of

the project that would prevent dust from migrating beyond the project site. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The nearest schools are John C. Fremont Elementary School (3320 Las Palmas Ave.) located approximately 1.1 miles northwest of the project site and Verdugo Woodlands Elementary School (1751 N. Verdugo Rd.) located approximately 1.1 miles south of the project site. However, as indicated in Response H-1 above, the proposed uses do not involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of significant amounts of hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) ***For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?***

No Impact. The project site is neither located within an airport land use plan nor is it located within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest public airport or public use airport to the project site is the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport located approximately 14 miles to the west. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) ***For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?***

No Impact. The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

7) ***Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

No Impact. According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, Canada Boulevard, which is approximately 0.5 miles southwest of the project site, is a County evacuation route. Implementation of the proposed project would neither result in a reduction of the number of lanes along this roadway nor result in the placement of an impediment to the flow of traffic. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

8) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located in a High Fire Hazard Area as identified in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element. The Glendale Fire Department rates almost two-thirds of the City as highly susceptible to wildland fires, as the City's High Fire Hazard Area includes all areas with a medium, high or extreme brush fire hazard. California State law requires that fire hazard areas be disclosed in real estate transactions to ensure homeowners are informed of landscaping and structural requirements for fire safety. Additionally, hazard mitigation programs in fire hazards areas currently include fire prevention, vegetation management, legislated construction requirements, and public awareness. In order to minimize damage due to fire, the proposed project would comply with applicable fire prevention, vegetation management, and construction requirements. Therefore, impacts related to exposure to wildland fire hazards would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

I. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
4. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
6. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
7. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
8. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
9. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
10. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

1) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Less Than Significant Impact. As part of Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established regulations under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program to control direct storm water discharges. In Glendale, the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWCQB) administers the NPDES permitting program and is responsible for developing NPDES permitting requirements. The NPDES program regulates industrial pollutant discharges, including construction activities. Implementation of

the proposed project will require compliance with all the NPDES requirements including the submittal and certification of plans and details showing both construction and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) that are integrated into the design of the project. The submittal of a

Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) approved by the City Engineer will also be required to be integrated into the design of the project. Impacts related to water quality are considered to be less than significant with the compliance of all applicable permitting requirements.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site does not serve as a primary area of groundwater recharge within the San Fernando or Verdugo Basins, which are both located within the City of Glendale. In addition, the increase in impervious surfaces with implementation of the proposed project is not significant when compared to the overall size of the site. Consequently, impacts related to groundwater extraction and recharge will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is served by an existing storm water collection and conveyance system. Since the project site is relatively small, the quantity of runoff would not change substantially with implementation of the proposed project. All runoff would continue to be conveyed via streets and gutters to storm drain locations around the project site. As a result, the proposed project would not require any substantial changes to the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area, nor would it affect the capacity of the existing storm drain system. Consequently, impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Please refer to Response I-3 above.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) ***Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?***

Less Than Significant Impact. Please refer to Response I-3 above.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) ***Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?***

Less Than Significant Impact. Please refer to Response I-3 above.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

7) ***Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?***

No Impact. According to Federal Emergency Management Agency flood hazard maps, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone; therefore, the proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area or result in structures being constructed that would impede or redirect flood flows. The proposed project would not be subject to flooding, and, therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

8) ***Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?***

No Impact. As indicated in Response J-1 above, the project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain or other flood hazard area, as shown on the latest FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003), the project site is not located within inundation zones from failure of upstream dams. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

10) ***Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?***

No Impact. The project site is not within a coastal area. Therefore, tsunamis (seismic sea waves) are not considered a significant hazard at the site. In addition, the project site is not located downslope of any large bodies of water that could adversely affect the site in the event of earthquake-induced seiches, which are wave oscillations in an enclosed or semi-enclosed body of water. Therefore, no impact related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow would result from implementation of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

J. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community?				X
2. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

1) ***Physically divide an established community?***

No Impact. There are two existing single family houses on the project site. The proposed four lot subdivision, demolition of one house, and development of three single-family houses are permitted uses in the zone in which is it located. No established community would be divided as a result of the project. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project and uses are consistent with the zoning of the property, Restricted Residential (R1R), and the general plan designation (Very Low Density Residential). The applicant is requesting an exception from the subdivision code due to the fact that the site contains a secondary ridgeline on Lot 4, and for three lots (Lots 1, 2 and 3) less than 100 feet in width, where 100 feet is required. Lots 1 and 2 are each 55.72 feet wide and Lot 3 is a 20.05 wide flag lot. A variance is requested for a shared driveway for Lots 3 and 4 in order for Lot 4 to meet fire department access requirements. No future development is proposed in the location of the ridgeline and all maintenance will be provided by one property owner. The exceptions and variance are requested in order to minimize the amount of grading and to preserve the existing oak trees. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?***

No Impact. A portion of the project site and surrounding area have been developed and affected by past activities. The project site and immediate area are not located in an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan area. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

K. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
2. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

1) ***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?***

No Impact. The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban landscape and include commercial, industrial, residential uses and specialized uses. The State Geologist has mapped the Glendale area for aggregate resources. According to Map 4-28 of the City of Glendale General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element, the project site is located within a

Mineral Resource Zone-1 (MRZ-1). MRZ-1 is defined as an area where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence. As a result, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***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?***

No Impact. As indicated in Response K-1 above, there are no known mineral resources within the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

L. NOISE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				X
2. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
3. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
4. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?				X

1) ***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?***

No Impact. The proposed project involves a four lot subdivision of a single residential parcel for the construction of three new single-family dwellings. This is a permitted use on the subject site, which is zoned R1R. Surrounding land uses include other single-family residences. The future development of three single-family residences would not generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?***

Less Than Significant Impact. Excessive ground borne vibration is typically associated with activities such as blasting used in mining operations, or the use of pile drivers during construction. The project would not require any blasting activities and any earth movement or grading activities

associated with project construction is not anticipated to require pile driving. Therefore, the project is not expected to generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

No Impact. As indicated in Response L-1 above, significant noise impacts are not anticipated to result from the long-term operation of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

Less Than Significant Impact. A temporary periodic increase in ambient noise would occur during construction actives associated with the proposed project. Noise from the construction activities would be generated by vehicles and equipment involved during various stages of construction operations: site grading, foundation, and building construction. The noise levels created by construction equipment will vary depending on factors such as the type of equipment and the specific model, the mechanical/ operational condition of the equipment and the type of operation being performed.

Construction associated with the project will be required to comply with the City of Glendale Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 8.36), which prohibits construction activities to between the hours of 7:00 p.m. on one day and 7:00 a.m. of the next day or from 7:00 p.m. on Saturday to 7:00 a.m. on Monday or from 7:00 p.m. preceding a holiday. Compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance would ensure that no significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) ***For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?***

No Impact. There are no private airstrips located on or within the vicinity of the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

M. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
3. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

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

No Impact. The proposed residential project is consistent with the R1R Zone of the project site, which is intended for residential development. The proposed project is also consistent with the General Plan and intended purpose to provide for very low-density residential uses. In addition, as indicated in Section C-1 above, the project would not cause population growth in Glendale to exceed regional SCAG forecasts. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

No Impact. There are two existing dwelling units currently on the project site. One building is proposed to remain on one of the subdivided lots and the other is proposed to be demolished. However, three new units are proposed. Therefore, no housing or residential population would be displaced by development of the proposed subdivision, and the construction of replacement housing elsewhere would not be necessary. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

No Impact. Please refer to Response M-2 above. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

N. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire protection?			X	
b) Police protection?			X	
c) Schools?			X	
d) Parks?			X	
e) Other public facilities?			X	

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

a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Glendale Fire Department (GFD) provides fire and paramedic services to the project site. The project will be required to comply with the Uniform Fire Code, including installation of fire sprinklers, and to submit plans to the Glendale Fire Department at the time building permits are submitted to ensure adequate fire flow protection. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Glendale Police Department (GPD) provides police protection services to the Project Site from its station at 131 North Isabel Street, approximately 4 miles to the southwest. The project can be adequately served by existing public services and is not anticipated to result in substantial adverse impacts. The overall need for police protection services is not expected to substantially increase as a result of the proposed project. No significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c) ***Schools?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on schools. Section 65995 of the Government Code provides that school districts can collect a fee on a per square foot basis for new residential development to assist in the construction of or addition to schools. The State has determined that payment of the school fee mitigates impacts to schools to a level less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d) ***Parks?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed subdivision project would result in the construction three new single-family dwelling units. The project applicant will be required to pay a development impact fee which would offset impacts to parks, in accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5575 and Resolution No. 07-164). Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e) ***Other public facilities?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed subdivision project would result in the construction three new single-family dwelling units. The project applicant will be required to pay a development impact fee which would offset impacts to library facilities, in accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5575 and Resolution No. 07-164). Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

O. RECREATION

Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed subdivision project would result in the construction three new single-family dwelling units. The project applicant will be required to pay a development impact fee which would offset impacts to recreational facilities, in accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5575 and Resolution No. 07-164). Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not include recreational facilities. The project applicant will be required to pay a development impact fee which would offset impacts to recreational facilities, in accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5575 and Resolution No. 07-164). Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

P. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			X	
2. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
3. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
4. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
5. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
6. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

1) ***Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?***

Less than Significant Impact. There would be a slight increase in day time population (construction workers) as a result of the construction activities. However, the increase in daytime population is not considered substantial since the construction phase is short-term in nature. Also, the project site will be served by Oak Glen Road, which is classified as local street and is able to accommodate the traffic generated by the residential uses. As a result, for the proposed project would not significantly and adversely impact the public street system and therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed above in Response P-1, the proposed project would not result in any significant increase in traffic on the area roadway network. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?***

No Impact. The project site is not located in the vicinity of an airport. Consequently, the proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns that would result in safety risks. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing roadway network. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) ***Result in inadequate emergency access?***

No Impact. The project will involve improvements to the existing street, which will provide a cul-de-sac that will meet emergency access requirements. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority and Glendale Beeline provide bus service within the City of Glendale. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding alternative transportation since no changes to the existing transportation policies, plans, or programs would result from project implementation. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Q. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
3. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
4. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
5. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
6. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
7. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

1) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

No Impact. Construction work associated with the proposed project as well as project operation would be required to comply with all applicable wastewater treatment requirements included NPDES and Best Management Practices (BMPs). No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. No new sources of water supply, such as groundwater, are required to meet the proposed project's water demand. Water serving the proposed project would be treated by existing extraction and treatment facilities, and no new facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, would be required. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is currently developed with two houses. Although impervious services would increase with the construction of three new single-family dwellings, the increase is not expected to be significant given that there will be a net increase of two houses and the large amount of open space that will remain. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Although a water main extension is required to obtain service for the proposed project, Glendale Water and Power has reviewed the proposed project and determined that the existing water supplies are adequate to provide for the project. No significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. See response provided under Section Q-2.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in residential development on site. Solid waste generated on the project site would be deposited at the Scholl Canyon Landfill, which is owned by the City of Glendale, or one of the landfills located within the County of Los Angeles. The Integrated Waste Division of the Public Works Department has reviewed the proposed project with respect to waste generation and disposal. Combined with the increase in solid waste generated by the proposed project, the Scholl Canyon facility would accommodate the annual disposal amount. Also, the city has implemented a waste-diversion program aimed at reducing the amount of solid waste disposed in the landfill. This program would reduce the amount of solid waste generated by the new residences that would be disposed of at the landfill. Examples of waste diversion efforts would include recycling programs for cardboard boxes, paper, aluminum cans, and bottles through the provision of recycling containers. As a result, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

7) ***Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations relating to solid waste. All construction debris will be disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local statutes. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

R. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				X
3. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

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

No Impact. No impacts are anticipated to occur to the quality of the environment, fish or wildlife habitats, fish or wildlife populations, plant or animal communities, or to rare, threatened or endangered plant and animal species as a result of the proposed project. No impacts to cultural resources would occur.

2) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

No Impact. Development of the proposed project will not substantially increase traffic nor would it result in a substantial increase in population, as this is project will result in three new single-family residential dwellings which are permitted in the zone. No impacts would occur.

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

No Impact. Development of the proposed project would not create direct and indirect adverse effects on humans. No impacts would occur.

13. Earlier Analyses

None

14. Project References Used to Prepare Initial Study Checklist

One or more of the following references were incorporated into the Initial Study by reference, and are available for review in the Planning division Office, 633 E. Broadway, Rm. 103, Glendale, CA 91206-4386. Items used are referred to by number on the Initial Study Checklist.

1. The City of Glendale's General Plan, as amended.
2. The City of Glendale's Municipal Code, as amended.
3. "Guidelines of the City of Glendale for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended," August 19, 2003, City of Glendale Planning Division.
4. Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq and California Code of Regulations, Title 14 Section 15000 et seq.
5. *"CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook,"* updated October 2003, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
6. Indigenous Tree Report prepared by Craig Crotty, Arbor Culture LLC, August 30, 2017.
7. Geological and Soils Engineering Exploration Report, November 23, 2015.
8. Addendum to Geotechnical and Soils Engineering Exploration Report, Byer Geotechnical, Inc., July 29, 2016.