glendale Community Development

PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

New Three Story Hotel
1633 Victory Boulevard

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:	New Three-Story Hotel
Project Location:	1633 Victory Boulevard, Glendale, Los Angeles County
Project Description:	To demolish the existing one-story, 3,537 square-foot, commercial building and associated shade structures (constructed in 1966), and to construct a new three-story, 37,858 square-foot 64 room hotel with a two-level subterranean garage with 65 parking spaces on a 21,647 square-foot lot, located in the C3 (Height District I) Zone. As proposed, the development will involve a total export of 12,348 cubic yards of soil. The proposed hotel will require approval from the Design Review Board.
Project Type:	☒ Private Project ☐ Public Project
Project Applicant:	Jayesh Kumar 2010 North Highland Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90068
Findings:	The Director of the Community Development, on **May 03, 2018**, after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Division, found that the above referenced project as mitigated 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:	Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Dennis Joe, Planner City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 548-8157; Fax: (818) 240-0392

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

The following mitigation measure shall apply to the proposed hotel located at 1633 Victory Boulevard to reduce identified impacts to less than significant levels.

GEO -1 A soil management plan (SMP) shall be prepared prior to issuance of any grading permit on the subject property. The SMP shall require that a geologist/environmental professional be on-site during site grading and excavation activities to monitor for potentially impacted soils not identified during the Phase II assessment prepared by Conservation Consulting International (CCI) and to perform South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1166 monitoring. The SMP shall also include recommended actions for handling and disposing of potentially impacted soils, if identified during site grading and excavation activities.

Monitoring Action:	Preparation of Soil Management Plan Onsite monitoring during grading and excavation activities
Timing:	Prior to issuance of grading permit (plan review) During any site grading or excavation activities (site inspection)
Responsibility:	Director of Public Works Director of Community Development

NOISE -1 The hours of operation for the pool shall be between 8:00 AM to 8:00 PM Sunday through Monday. The application shall post the hours of operation in a location that is clearly visible to all guests of the hotel.

Monitoring Action:	Plan review; Site Inspection
Timing:	Prior to issuance of development permits (plan review). Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy (site inspection)
Responsibility:	Director of Community Development

NOISE -2 The use of amplified sound shall be strictly prohibited.

Monitoring Action:	Upon Complaints to Neighborhood Code Enforcement
Timing:	Ongoing
Responsibility:	Director of Community Development

TRIBAL-1 Prior to the issuance of demolition, grading or building permits for the project, the applicant shall submit written verification that a qualified archaeological monitor has been retained to monitor ground disturbance necessary to prepare the ground surface.

Monitoring Action:	**Plan review**
Timing:	**Prior to issuance of development permits (plan review).**
Responsibility:	**Director of Community Development**

TRIBAL-2 A Tribal representative, procured by the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians, shall monitor soil-disturbances occurring within the initial five (5) feet [in depth] of excavation from the surface.

Monitoring Action:	**Site Inspection**
Timing:	**During ground disturbing activities**
Responsibility:	**Tribal Representative**

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 ENVIRONMENTAL AND PLANNING BOARD WILL RECONSIDER THE ISSUES AND TAKE ACTION AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE.)

Dated: _____ _____

Signature(s) of the Project Applicant(s)

Dated: _____ _____

glendale
Community Development

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

New Three Story Hotel
1633 Victory Boulevard

1.	**Project Title:** New Three Story Hotel
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:** Dennis Joe, Planner Tel: (818) 937-8157 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	**Project Location:** 1633 Victory Boulevard, Glendale, Los Angeles County
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Jayesh Kumar 2010 North Highland Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90068 Tel: (323) 216-1818
6.	**General Plan Designation:** Commercial – Community Services
7.	**Zoning:** C3 (Commercial Service) Zone, Height District I
8.	**Description of the Project:** To demolish the existing one-story, 3,537 square-foot, commercial building and associated shade structures (constructed in 1966), and to construct a new three-story, 37,858 square-foot hotel with a two-level subterranean garage with 65 parking spaces on a 21,647 square-foot lot ("Hotel" or "Project"), located in the C3 (Height District I) Zone. As proposed, the development will involve a total export of 12,348 cubic yards of soil. The proposed hotel will require approval from the Design Review Board.
9.	**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *North*: R1 Low Density Residential, Floor Area District II / Single-Family Residential *South*: C3 Commercial Service Zone, Height District I / Commercial *East*: C3 Commercial Service Zone, Height District I / Multi- & Single-Family Residential *West*: C3 Commercial Service Zone, Height District I / Commercial
10.	**Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).** None.

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	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources	☐ 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: _____ 5/3/18

Reviewed by: _____ Date: 5/3/18

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

Director of Community Development: _____ Date: 5/3/18

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?*

No Impact. No scenic vistas, as identified in the Open Space and Conservation Element (January, 1993), exist within, or within view of the Project site. Therefore, no impacts to scenic vistas would result from project implementation.

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. No state scenic highway is located adjacent to or within view of the Project site. No impacts to scenic resources within a State scenic highway would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is an approximately 21,647 square-foot lot, located at the northwest corner of South Victory Boulevard and Winchester Avenue. Surrounding the Project site are R1 zoned properties with single-family residences to the north, C3 zoned properties with commercial uses to the west and south, and R1 and C3 zoned properties with single- and multi-family residences to the west. The subject property is currently occupied with a 3,537 square-foot 1-story commercial building that consists of offices, three automobile service bays, and a steel canopy over a former gas station pump island. The surface of the site is mostly paved with concrete and asphalt paving, with limited landscaping at the southwest portion of the site. There are no protected indigenous trees species on or within twenty feet of the site.

The Project proposes to demolish the existing one-story commercial building and associated shade structures to construct a new three-story, 37,858 square-foot hotel over a two-level subterranean garage with 65 parking spaces. A total of 12,348 cubic yards of soil will be graded and exported offsite. The three-story hotel will be set back ten-feet away from the northern interior property line and will include a landscaped buffer area to transition the proposed Hotel with the adjacent single-family dwelling. In addition, the building steps down to a 1-story element with a pool deck at this location with the 3-story portion of the building along Victory Boulevard. The 10 foot landscaped buffer and reduction in building height to 1-story provide visual separation from the residential uses adjacent to the rear of the site.

The proposed three-story hotel is designed in a modern style, with a variety of geometric patterns and framing elements providing architectural interest. The building will be constructed with quality materials, such as smooth stucco and Trespa Meteon laminate panels, and will contrast in color, pattern and placement to complement the contemporary design of the building. Review and approval of the Design

Review Board along with compliance with the zoning standards and City's Comprehensive Design Guidelines would ensure that no significant impacts would occur to the surrounding area.

As a result, impacts to visual character and quality of the site are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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. Day and night time lighting for the project would increase as a result of the three-story proposed project, but would not be significantly greater than any other similar commercial structure permitted in the C3 zone. Lighting for the proposed building will be similar to existing commercial uses along South Victory Boulevard Street. Any external lighting of the property is required to be directed towards the subject property and shielded to prevent light from spilling over onto neighboring properties. With these requirements in place, and because the surrounding area is already developed with commercial and residential buildings, no significant impacts associated with lighting are anticipated.

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. 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 forest carbon measurement methodology provided in 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 impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. 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 contracts would result. No impact 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. No impact 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 forestland within the City of Glendale. No forestland would be converted to non-forest use under the proposed project. No impact 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 forestland in the vicinity of or on the Project site. No farmland would be converted to non-agricultural use and no forestland would be converted to non-forest use under the proposed project. No impact 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	

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
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 Project site is located within the City of Glendale, which is part of the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) and is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD is the agency responsible for preparing the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the Basin. Since 1979, a number of AQMPs have been prepared. The most recent comprehensive plan fully approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) is the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which includes a variety of strategies and control measures.

The AQMP was prepared to accommodate growth, to reduce the high levels of pollutants within the areas under the jurisdiction of SCAQMD, to return clean air to the region, and to minimize the impact on the economy. Projects that are considered to be consistent with the AQMP would not interfere with attainment 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 assumption 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 daily emissions thresholds.

Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified in the Growth Management Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since the Growth Management Chapter forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP.

Population growth associated with the Project is included in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) projects for growth in the City of Glendale. The Project does not result in population and housing growth that would cause growth in Glendale to exceed the SCAG forecast, because the Project is consistent with the General Plan and therefore is included in SCAG's growth projections. Consequently, implementation of the Project would be consistent with AQMP attainment forecasts and with applicable air quality plans. 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. To demolish the existing one-story, 3,537 square-foot, commercial building and associated shade structures (constructed in 1966), and to construct a new three-story, 37,858 square-foot hotel and two-level subterranean garage with 65 parking spaces on a 21,647 square-foot lot. A total of 12,348 cubic yards of soil will be graded and exported offsite. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) was used to estimate air quality impacts

during the construction and operation stages of the project. Results from the model indicate that the proposed project would not exceed thresholds for construction, area, or operational impacts. A summary of the results are attached. 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 emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?***

Less Than Significant Impact. Please refer to Response C-1 and C-2 above.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact: Sensitive receptors are located near the Project site that includes single-family dwellings located immediately west and east. The applicant would be required to adhere to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403 - Fugitive Dust, which would further reduce the less than significant impact related to construction-related impacts identified in Response C-2 above. As a result, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration or create emissions that exceed known thresholds. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activity associated with the project may generate detectable odors from equipment exhaust. However, any detectable odors or equipment exhaust would be associated with initial construction and would be considered transitory and/or short-term. Therefore, less than significant construction related odor impacts are anticipated to occur from the project.

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				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
sites?				
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?***

No Impact. The project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for decades. No wildlife species other than those which can tolerate human activity and/or are typically found in urban environments are known to exist on or near the project site. These human-tolerant species are neither sensitive, threatened, nor endangered. Implementation of the project would not result in any impact to species identified as endangered, threatened, sensitive or being of special concern by the California Department of Fish and Game or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. In addition, the project site does not provide suitable habitat for endangered or rare species given the pattern, type, and level of development in the area. No impacts would occur.

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. The proposed project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years and surrounded by other commercial developments along Victory Boulevard and residential uses to the rear of the site. No riparian habitat and/or other sensitive natural communities are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present on 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. No federally protected wetlands are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present on or adjacent to the project site. No impacts 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?

No Impact. The proposed project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years. The area has been substantially modified by human activity, as evidenced by other developments of similar type and uses, and human activity associated with these types of development. Implementation of the proposed project will not interfere with the movement of 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. No impacts 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?

No Impact. The Glendale Municipal Code, Section 12.44 specifically protects six different native or "indigenous" species of trees that include the Coast Live Oak, Valley Oak, Mesa Oak, Scrub Oak, California Sycamore, and California Bay. No indigenous trees are located on the project site and implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No Mitigation measures are required.

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, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plan has been adopted to include the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any such plans. 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 project site currently features a one-story, 3,537 square-foot, commercial building and associated shade structures constructed in 1966. These buildings are slated for demolition as part of the project. The City's Historic Preservation staff has reviewed the proposed demolition of the existing structures, and has stated the buildings do not meet the criteria for listing on any National, State, or Local Register for Historic Resources, and are not considered historic resources under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No impact to a historic resource 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 project area. The City's Open Space and Conservation Element indicate that no significant archaeological sites have been identified in this area of Glendale. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources. 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 impact would occur.

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. Nonetheless, paleontological resources may possibly exist at deep levels and could be unearthed with implementation of the Project. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during the 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 impact would occur.

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 commercial and residential land uses. No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the project site or surrounding area. However, impacts would be potentially significant if human remains were to be 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 impact would occur.

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 City's Safety Element (August 2003), the subject site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. 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, impacts from the rupture of a seismic fault are considered to be 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 an area prone to liquefaction as indicated in the City's Safety Element (August 2003). Therefore, no impacts associated with liquefaction would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) Landslides?

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is not located within a landslide hazard zone area, as indicated by the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). Therefore, no impacts associated with landslides would occur.

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 since the site would expose small amounts of soil during construction activities. Further, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the Glendale Municipal Code Section 13.42.060 and prepare and administer a plan that effectively provides for a minimum stormwater quality protection throughout project construction. The plan 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. In addition, the applicant would be required to adhere to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403—Fugitive Dust, which would further reduce the impact related to soil erosion 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 on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Less Than Significant Impact. Subsidence is the process of lowering the elevation of an area of the earth's surface and can be caused by tectonic forces deep within the earth or by consolidation and densification of sediments sometimes due to withdrawal of fluids such as groundwater. The project site is not located in an area of significant subsidence activity and would not include fluid withdrawal or removal. In addition, as indicated in Response F-1 (iii), above, the soil under the project site is not prone to liquefaction. Therefore, impacts related to unstable soils are anticipated to 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 soils underlying the project site and surrounding area are considered to have a low expansion potential. In addition, development of the project will be required to comply with applicable building codes which would minimize structural damage to buildings and ensure safety in the event of a moderate or major earthquake. No significant impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

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 project. The project would not 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. GHG as defined under AB 32 includes: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the State agency charged with regulating statewide air quality, adopt rules and regulations that would achieve greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to statewide levels in 1990 by 2020 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.

At this time no air agency, including the SCAQMD, has adopted applicable project-level significance thresholds for GHGs emissions. AB 32 did not set a significance threshold for GHG emissions, although EPA, CARB or another agency may issue regulations at some point which may set forth significance criteria for CEQA analysis. In the interim, none of the CEQA Guidelines, the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the Air Quality Management Plan, or the SCAQMD set forth applicable significance thresholds for GHG emissions.

Due to the complex physical, chemical and atmospheric mechanisms involved in global climate change, there is no basis for concluding that the project's very small and essentially temporary (primarily from construction) increase in emissions could cause a measurable increase in global GHG emissions necessary to force global climate change.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(f) clarifies that the effects of GHG emissions are cumulative and should be analyzed in the context of CEQA's requirements for cumulative impact analysis. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 recommends consideration of qualitative factors that may be used in the determination of significance, including the extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a reduction or mitigation of GHGs. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3), a project 's incremental contribution to a cumulative impact can be found not cumulatively considerable if the project will comply with an approved plan or mitigation program that provides specific requirements that will avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem within the geographic area of the project. Examples of such programs include "plans or regulations for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions."

Since this Project is consistent with Greener Glendale Strategies to reduce GHGs and the SCS prepared by SCAG, this project would result in a less than cumulatively considerable impact on GHG emissions 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project involves the demolition of an existing 1-story, commercial building and construction of a new 3-story, 64-room hotel. All businesses within the City of Glendale, as mandated by the California Health and Safety Code Chapter 6.95, are required to file a Hazardous Material Business Plan (HMBP) with the Glendale Fire Department. The HMBP covers the use and storage of all regulated hazardous chemicals and materials to be used and/or stored onsite. The proposed hotel project will not involve the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

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 with Mitigation Incorporated. The project would be required to comply with all applicable rules established by the SCAQMD, including Rule 403 and 402, during the demolition and construction phases of the project that would prevent dust from migrating beyond the project site.

A Limited Phase II environmental site assessment (ESA) was conducted for the project site by Conserve Consultant International (CCI). The purpose of this Limited Phase II ESA was to assess whether historical uses of the Property, including a gasoline station and automobile repair shop, have adversely impacted the subsurface environment beneath the property. This assessment included the analysis of soil samples collected from inside the property building and from the exterior areas of the property.

Soil borings were advanced in the area of the former motor vehicle fuel underground storage tanks (USTs) on the east exterior portion of the property, in the area of the former waste oil UST on the north exterior portion of the property adjacent to the former fuel dispenser islands, product piping lines, hazardous waste storage enclosure, and the clarifier and in-ground hydraulic lifts located inside the property building.

Select soil samples collected from these soil borings were analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbons, VOCs, and/or lead. The results of the analysis did not detect concentrations of the targeted analytes above their respective PQLs in the soil samples collected from the area of the former waste oil UST, from adjacent to the hazardous waste storage enclosure, and from adjacent to the clarifier and in-ground hydraulic lifts located inside the Property building. Minor concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylenes, and/or total lead were detected in soil samples collected from the area of the former motor vehicle fuel USTs, from adjacent to the former fuel dispenser islands, and from adjacent to the former product piping lines. However, the detected concentrations of these targeted analytes were below their respective regulatory action level.

Based on the results of this assessment of the soil samples, it does not appear that the historical uses of the property, including a gasoline station and automobile repair shop, have significantly impacted the subsurface environment beneath the areas of the property assessed.

However, based on the 15-feet deep excavation needed for the subterranean parking garage, a mitigation measure has been added to the project requiring a soil management plan (SMP) for any soil excavation on the property. The SMP shall require that a geologist/environmental professional be on-site during excavation activities to monitor for potentially impacted soils not identified during this assessment and to perform South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1166 monitoring. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce potentially significant impacts to below the level of significance.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

GEO -1 A soil management plan (SMP) shall be prepared prior to issuance of any grading permit on the subject property. The SMP shall require that a geologist/environmental professional be on-site during site grading and excavation activities to monitor for potentially impacted soils not identified during the Phase II assessment prepared by Conservation Consulting International (CCI) and to perform South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1166 monitoring. The SMP shall also include recommended actions for handling and disposing of potentially impacted soils, if identified during site grading and excavation activities.

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. There are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project site. 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. A search of available environmental records was conducted by Environmental Data Resources, Inc (EDR). The subject property (1633 Victory Boulevard) was identified in the following records:

Site	Database(s)	EPA ID
BILL BRIGES AUTO 1633 VICTORY BLVD GLENDALE, CA 91201	RCRA-SQG EPA ID: CAD 982492993 CA SWEEPS UST Status: A Tank Status: A Comp Number: 389 CA FID UST Facility Id: 19027125 Status: A FINDS Registry ID: 110002830394 CA WIP Facility Status: Historical ECHO	CAD982492993
M & R AUTO TECH 1633 VICTORY BLVD GLENDALE, CA 91201	CA HAZNET GEPAID: CAL000279881	N/A
BOBS 1633 VICTORY BLVD GLENDALE, CA	EDR Hist Auto Database: EDR Hist Auto, Date of Government Version: 02/20/2007	N/A
ESTATE OF GLADYS B. 1633 VICTORY BLVD GLENDALE, CA 91206	CA HAZNET GEPAID: CAC000917720	N/A

No mapped sites were found in EDR's search of available ("reasonably ascertainable ") government records either on the target property or within the search radius around the target property that would create a would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. In addition, a mitigating measure has been added to the project requiring onsite monitoring during earth work. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measure GEO-1 identified above would address the sites identified above.

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 not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. 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. No private airstrips are located in the City of Glendale or in the vicinity of the Project site. 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?

Less than Significant Impact. According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, Victory Boulevard is not a City Disaster Response Route. In addition, implementation of the project would neither result in a reduction of the number of lanes along this roadway nor result in the placement of an impediment, such as medians, to the flow of traffic. During construction, the construction contractor shall notify the City of Glendale Police and Fire Departments of construction activities that would impede movement (such as movement of equipment) to allow for these first emergency response teams to reroute traffic to an alternative route, if needed. Further, during construction the applicant would be required to obtain any necessary permits from the City of Glendale Public Works Department for all work occurring within the public right-of-way. Implementation of these requirements would be incorporated as typical condition of approval. Consequently, project impacts would be less than significant.

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?

No Impact. The project site is not located in or near a designated wildland area. No impact would occur.

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				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
map?				
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. The project would be required to comply with all NPDES requirements including pre-construction, during construction and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs). In addition, the project will be required to submit an approved SUSMP (Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan) to be integrated into the design of the project. Impacts associated with water quality standards or waste discharge requirements are anticipated to be less than significant.

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 City currently utilizes water from Glendale Water and Power (GWP), which relies on some local groundwater supplies. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would result in additional development that could indirectly require a slight increased use of groundwater through the provision of potable water by GWP; however, as discussed in Response R-4 below, the proposed project's water demand is within water projections. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies.

The amount of hardscape proposed on the project site would not be similar to current on-site conditions, so the result would not be significant. The proposed project would comply with minimum landscape requirements and, therefore, would not significantly interfere with the recharge of local groundwater or deplete the groundwater supplies relative to existing conditions. 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 a 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 currently developed with several structures and the rest of the lot paved with asphalt. Stormwater runoff currently flows into existing City streets and drains. Construction activity associated with the proposed project development may result in wind- and water-driven erosion of soils due to minor grading activities if soil is stockpiled or exposed during construction. However, this impact is considered short term in nature because the site would expose small amounts of soil during construction activities and would then be covered with building, pavement and landscaping

upon completion of the project. Furthermore, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the NPDES Permit set forth by the RWQCB, and to prepare and submit a SWPPP to be administered throughout proposed project construction. The SWPPP would incorporate BMPs to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The proposed project will modify the existing drainage pattern of the site and would slightly decrease the runoff, given the limited amount of existing landscaped area. All subsequent runoff would be conveyed via streets and gutters to storm drain locations around the project site. Development of the proposed project would not require any substantial changes to the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area, nor would it significantly affect the capacity of the existing storm drain system. Furthermore, as discussed above, the SWPPP would incorporate BMPs by requiring controls of pollutant discharges that utilize BAT and BCT to reduce pollutants. In addition, in accordance with Chapter 13.42, Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Control and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan of the Glendale Municipal Code, a SUSMP containing design features and BMPs to reduce post-construction pollutants in stormwater discharges would be required as part of the project. 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 stormwater 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. The proposed project is a four-story hotel building and does not include the construction of any housing or dwelling units on site. According to Federal Emergency Management Agency flood hazard maps, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone. No impacts 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 I-7 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, the proposed project is not located within the inundation zone of a reservoir or dam located within the City or elsewhere. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

10) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No Impact. Tsunamis are large ocean waves generated by sudden water displacement caused by a submarine earthquake, landslide, or volcanic eruption. A review of the County of Los Angeles Flood and Inundation Hazards Map indicates that the site is not within the mapped tsunami inundation boundaries. No impacts would occur.

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. The proposed three-story, 64-room hotel project is located on a corner lot in the C3 (Height District I) zone. Hotels are a permitted use in the C3 zone and the project complies with all of the development standards for the C3 (I) zone. Therefore, the project will not divide an established community. 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?

No Impact. The existing zoning designation on the project site is Community Commercial – C3 Height District I and the General Plan designation is Commercial Services. The proposed project complies the Land Use Element of the General Plan the zoning standards in the C3 Height District I Zone. The project complies with the parking chapter provisions, including the number of required parking spaces and

dimensions. The project will be reviewed by the Design Review Board per GMC 30.47, to ensure compatibility with surrounding environment. No impacts would occur

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Project site and immediate area are not located in an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan area. As such, 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.

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 is not within an area that has been identified as containing valuable mineral resources, as indicated in the City's Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993). 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 impact 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	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed three-story hotel will be set back ten-feet away from the northern interior property line and will include a landscaped buffer area between the proposed Hotel the adjacent single-family dwelling at the rear of the subject site. The proposed building steps down to a 1-story element with a pool deck at this location with the 3-story portion of the building along Victory Boulevard. The 10 foot landscaped buffer and reduction in building height to 1-story provide visual separation from the residential uses adjacent to the rear of the site. Noise associated with the pool and pool deck could result in a significant impact to the adjacent residential uses. The city's noise ordinance is designed to prohibit unnecessary, excessive and annoying noise from all sources. Pursuant to GMC 8.36.110, it is unlawful for any person to wilfully make, continue or cause to be made or continued any loud, unnecessary or unusual noise which disturbs the comfort, peace, quiet or repose or endangers the health of inhabitants of any neighborhood or which causes discomfort or annoyance to any reasonable person of normal sensitiveness residing in the area. Although the city noise ordinance protects is residents from excessive sounds, mitigation measures have been added to the proposed project to ensure that noise impacts would be within allowable limits identified in the Section 8.36.080 of the GMC.

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of the mitigation measures identified below would reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level.

NOISE -1 The hours of operation for the pool shall be between 8:00 AM to 8:00 PM Sunday through Monday. The application shall post the hours of operation in a location that is clearly visible to all guests of the hotel.

Monitoring Action:	Plan review; Site Inspection
Timing:	Prior to issuance of development permits (plan review). Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy (site inspection)
Responsibility:	Director of Community Development

NOISE -2 The use of amplified sound shall be strictly prohibited.

Monitoring Action:	Upon Complaints to Neighborhood Code Enforcement
Timing:	Ongoing
Responsibility:	Director of Community Development

2) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would be constructed using typical construction techniques. No pile driving for construction would be necessary. Piles would be drilled and cast in place. Thus, significant vibration impacts from pile installation would not occur.

Heavy construction equipment (e.g. bulldozer and excavator) would generate a limited amount of ground-borne vibration during construction activities at short distances away from the source. The use of equipment would most likely be limited to a few hours spread over several days during demolition/grading activities. Post-construction on-site activities would be limited to mechanical equipment (e.g., air handling unit and exhaust fans) that would not generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise. As such, ground-borne vibration and noise levels associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. As indicated in Response L-1 above, significant noise impacts that could result from the long-term operation of the proposed project have been mitigated by restricted the time the pool and pool deck could be used on any given day. With implementation of this mitigation measure, no significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measure NOISE-1 identified above would address operational noise impacts associated with the proposed project.

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 activities associated with the proposed project. Noise from 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.

Short-term noise impacts could occur as a result of construction activities. All development within the project site 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 noise impacts will be less than significant.

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 neither located within an airport land use plan nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. 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 expose people residing or working in the Project site to excessive noise levels?***

No Impact. The Project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact 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)?***

Less than Significant Impact. The project consists of 64 hotel rooms and associated amenities, including and 65 parking spaces. The project does not include any new residential units and would not result in substantial new population growth in the City. Any indirect growth occurring as a result of employees from the 64-room hotel project would be inconsequential, and the hotel guests would only be staying in the city on a temporary basis, so impacts would be less than significant.

Since the project site is located within an urban area and is currently served by existing circulation and utility infrastructure, no major extension of infrastructure is required as part of the proposed project. Additionally, no expansion to the existing service area of a public service provider is required. Therefore, development of the project site would not induce population growth, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. No residential dwelling units currently exist on the project site. Therefore, no housing or residential populations would be displaced by development of the proposed project, and the construction of replacement housing elsewhere would not be necessary. No impacts 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 require compliance 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 for approval. The overall need for fire protection services is not expected to substantially increase. No significant impacts would occur.

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. The site is located in an urban, developed area of the City and similar uses exist along Victory Boulevard. The additional population that this project will bring is not anticipated to have a significant impact on Police services.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c) Schools?

Less than Significant Impact. Section 65995 of the Government Code provides that school districts can collect a fee on a per-square-foot basis to assist in the construction of or additions to schools. Pursuant to Section 65995, the project applicant is required to pay school impact fees to the Glendale Unified School District based on the current fee schedule for commercial and residential developments prior to the issuance of building permits. Payment of the school impact fees would mitigate any indirect impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d) Parks?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not involve the development or displacement of a park. The property is zoned for commercial and mixed uses and was not planned for use as a park. Since the proposed project would not include the development of new housing, no new residential population that would generate a demand for parks and recreational facilities would occur. On-site employees and hotel guests would have access to the hotel's in-house recreational amenities. Therefore, any use of the city's park and recreational facilities by hotel employees and guests would be minimal. As such, project impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e) Other public facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would not result in a residential population that would generate a demand on libraries. Any use of existing public libraries by on-site employees and hotel guests would be minimal. Given the transitory nature of hotels guests, hotel uses typically do not generate a substantial demand for library facilities. Therefore, project impacts regarding library services would be less than significant.

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. As indicated above, the proposed project would not include the development of new housing, which would result in new residential population. Therefore, no additional demand on parks and recreational facilities would occur. On-site employees and hotel guests would

have access to the hotel's recreational amenities. Therefore, any use of the city's park and recreational facilities by hotel employees and guests would be minimal. As such, the proposed project would not result in a significant increased use of existing parks such that substantial physical deterioration of the park facilities would occur or be accelerated.

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. As discussed above, the project is not anticipated to create a significant demand on parks facilities that would require the construction or expansion at existing public recreational facilities. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

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. The proposed project includes the development of a 64-room hotel that would increase the number of vehicles using the area streets. Public Works, Traffic Engineering had prepared a project trip generation estimate that is consistent with the traffic impact assessment guidelines set forth in the 2010 Congestion Management Program by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (October, 2010). Based upon the estimated project trip generation,

the Project is expected to generate fewer than 50 Net peak-hour trips (34 trips during the AM, and 39 during the PM); therefore, a traffic impact analysis is not required.

A traffic control plan will be required for project construction. The plan will be required to identify all traffic control measures, signs, and delineators to be implemented by the construction contractor. The plan will also be required to identify contractor information, hours of construction, construction worker parking information, as well as the proposed haul route.

As a result, based upon the project trip generation estimate finding and the requirement of a traffic control plan, project impacts regarding traffic would be less than significant.

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 impacts would occur.

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 near an airport. Consequently, the 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)?***

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in P-1 above, a Construction Traffic Control plan approved by the Glendale Public Works Department will be required prior to construction. The plan is required to identify all traffic control measures, signs, and delineators to be implemented by the construction contractor. The plan will also identify contractor information, hours of construction, construction worker parking information, as well as the proposed haul route. In addition, the proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing roadway network. No significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant impact. No changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the project. Direct access to the property will be taken from the existing alley from Victory Boulevard, which is a designed as a Minor Arterial in the City's Circulation Element. As indicated in Section P-1 above, a traffic control plan will be required for the construction phase of the project. The plan will be reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Division to ensure that emergency access is not impacted during construction, nor is the County's Evacuation Routed impact. As a result, less than significant impacts to emergency access are anticipated.

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 and along Colorado Street. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding alternative transportation because no changes to the existing transportation policies, plans, or programs would result from project implementation. The project will provide bicycle racks on-site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Q. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and this is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or			X	
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		X		

1) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in te1rms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and this is:

i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site and its associated existing structures, buildings or landscape are not listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 50201(k).

Mitigation measure TRIBAL-1 identified below would address tribal cultural resource impacts in the event that resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

ii) ***A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.***

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Written notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam of Mission Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was requested by the Fernandeno Tataviam of Mission Indians within the 30-days of notice. While no known tribal resource is located on the Project site, in the event that resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work must be temporarily suspended or redirected until NAHC 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 the mitigation measure identified below would reduce tribal cultural resource impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of the mitigation measures identified below would reduce tribal cultural resource impacts to a less than significant level.

TRIBAL -1 Prior to the issuance of demolition, grading or building permits for the project, the applicant shall submit written verification that a qualified archaeological monitor has been retained to monitor ground disturbance necessary to prepare the ground surface.

Monitoring Action:	Plan review
Timing:	Prior to issuance of development permits (plan review).
Responsibility:	Director of Community Development

TRIBAL -2 A Tribal representative, procured by the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians, shall monitor soil-disturbances occurring within the initial five (5) feet [in depth] of excavation from the surface.

Monitoring Action:	Site Inspection
Timing:	During ground disturbing activities
Responsibility:	Tribal Representative

R. 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 stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	

Would the project.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. Under Section 401 of the CWA, the RWQCB issues NPDES permits to regulate waste discharged to "waters of the nation," which includes reservoirs, lakes, and their tributary waters. Waste discharges include discharges of stormwater and construction related discharges. A construction project resulting in the disturbance of more than one acre requires a NPDES Permit; this project is under an acre. Construction projects are also required to prepare a SWPPP. In addition, the proposed project would be required to submit an SUSMP to mitigate urban stormwater runoff. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant would be required to satisfy the requirements related to the payment of fees and/or the provisions of adequate wastewater facilities. The proposed project would comply with the RWCQB-established waste discharge prohibitions and water quality objectives, which will be incorporated into the proposed project as a project design feature. Therefore, no impacts 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 stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less Than Significant Impact. Runoff from the project site would be conveyed via streets and gutters to storm drain locations around the project site. The proposed project slight increase in runoff 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. 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. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would require the use of water for dust control and cleanup purposes. The use of water during construction would be short term in nature. Therefore, construction activities are not considered to result in a significant impact on the existing water system or available water supplies.

The proposed project would result in an increase in demand for operational uses, including landscape irrigation, maintenance and other activities on the site. Based on a generation factor of 62.5 gpd/room/day, the 64-room hotel project would result in a demand of approximately 4,000 gallons per day that equates to 4.48 acre feet per year (afy) of water.

Normal Weather Conditions

The City of Glendale has identified an adequate supply of water to meet future City demands under normal conditions. As indicated in the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, a surplus exists that provides a reasonable buffer of approximately 1,500 to 2,500 afy of water. Future water demand in the City is based on projected development contained in the General Plan. For purposes of this assessment, the demand of the proposed project was assumed not to have been included in this demand projection. However, even with the addition of 4.4 afy of demand generated by the proposed project, there is ample supply to meet remaining City demand under normal conditions.

Dry Weather Conditions

Water supplies from the San Fernando and Verdugo Basins and recycled water would potentially be affected by drought conditions. If there is a shortage in water supply from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD), the City of Glendale's distribution system could be affected. However, MWD's completion of the Diamond Valley Reservoir near Hemet added to the reliability of MWD's supplies. This reservoir plus other MWD storage/banking operations increases the reliability of MWD to meet demands. MWD is also proposing contracts with its member agencies to supply water, including supply during drought conditions. These contracts would define the MWD's obligation to provide "firm" water supply to the City.

It is anticipated that during any 3-year drought, the City would have sufficient water supply to meet demand. According to the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, the City would use less MWD water supplies in the future compared to its current use. With the City's reduction of dependency on imported water from MWD, GWP has a higher level of reliability in meeting water demands during drought conditions.

Even with the implementation of the proposed project, the GWP would continue to have adequate supply to meet citywide demand under drought conditions. Even with the addition of 4.4 afy of demand generated by the proposed project, there is sufficient supply to meet City demand under drought conditions.

As indicated above, the City would continue to have adequate supply to meet citywide demand under normal and drought conditions with the proposed project. As a result, long-term impacts to water supply during operation of the proposed project under both normal and drought conditions would be less than significant.

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. Sewage from the project site goes to the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP), which the City of Glendale has access to through the Amalgamated Agreement. The HTP has a dry-weather design capacity of 450 million gpd and is currently operating below that capacity, at 362 million gpd. As a result, adequate capacity exists to treat the proposed project-generated effluent. Therefore, the proposed

project would not require the expansion or construction of sewage treatment facilities. No impact would result with regard to impacts to the available sewage treatment capacity.

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 commercial development on site. The proposed project would generate approximately 23.36 tons (64 rooms x 2 lbs./hotel room/day = 46,720 lbs. per year) of solid waste per year.

Solid waste generated on the project site could be deposited at the Scholl Canyon Landfill (owned by the City of Glendale) or at one of the landfills located within the County of Los Angeles. The annual disposal rate at the Scholl Canyon facility is 200,000 tons per year. Combined with the increase of approximately 23.36 tons per year in solid waste generated by the proposed project, the annual disposal amount would increase to approximately 200,024 tons per year. With a total annual disposal amount of 200,024 tons and a remaining capacity of 3.6 million tons, the Scholl Canyon facility would meet the needs of the City and the proposed project for approximately 18 years. Because the proposed project would be required to implement a waste-diversion program aimed at reducing the amount of solid waste disposed in the landfill, the amount of solid waste generated would likely be less than the amount estimated. 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?

No Impact. The Project will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. All construction debris will be disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local statutes, including Glendale Municipal Code Chapter 8.58. No impacts would occur as a result of the Project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

S. 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,			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
either directly or indirectly?				

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. The project site is a currently developed located within an urbanized area along Victory Boulevard. No biological species or habitat for biological species exists on site or within the project vicinity. In addition, no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plans apply to the project site. As such, the proposed project would not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Furthermore, the proposed project would not have the potential to eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory, including historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant environmental impacts that have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. No impacts 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)?***

   Less than Significant Impact. Cumulative impacts may occur when the proposed project in conjunction with one or more related projects would yield an impact that is greater than what would occur with the development of only the proposed project. With regard to cumulative effects for the issues of agricultural, biological, and mineral resources, the project site is located in an urbanized area and therefore, other developments occurring in the area of the project would largely occur on previously disturbed land and are not anticipated to have an impact. Thus, no cumulative impact to these resources would occur. Impacts related to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and hazards and hazardous materials are generally confined to a specific site and do not affect off-site areas.

   The City's approved and pending projects in the vicinity combined with the proposed project may result in cumulative effects in other environmental issue areas due to the aggregate development within an already urbanized area. However, project-related impacts that require mitigation measures to reduce the level of significance would not result in cumulative impacts when combined with the City's other related projects. Therefore, the proposed project would have not cumulatively considerable effects, and as such, cumulative impacts would not occur.

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

   Less than Significant Impact. Based on the analysis presented above, implementation of the aforementioned mitigation measures would reduce environmental impacts such that no substantial adverse effects on humans would occur. Less than significant impact 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,* "Open Space and Conservation Element," as amended.
2. California Department of Conservation, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program,* Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2010 (September 2011).
3. South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning* (May 2005).
4. City of Glendale, *General Plan,* "Safety Element" (2003).
5. California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State of California General Plan Guidelines (October 2003).
6. City of Glendale Municipal Code, as amended.
7. California Emissions Estimator Module (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) Report .
8. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Conservation Consulting International, August 26, 2016)
9. Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (Conservation Consulting International, October 11, 2016)