PROPOSED
NEGATIVE DECLARATION
New Mixed Use Building
3510 N. Verdugo Road
(3506-3514 North Verdugo Road)

The following 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 Mixed Use Building
Project Location:	3510 N. Verdugo Road, Glendale, CA, 91208, Los Angeles County (3506-3514 North Verdugo Road)
Project Description:	To demolish the existing buildings and construct a new three-story mixed use project, which consists of 14 residential dwelling units (three two-bedroom units, seven three-bedroom units, and four four-bedroom units) on the upper two floors and 2,762 square feet of retail/office space on the ground floor with 49 parking spaces located within two levels (ground floor and subterranean level), on an 18,000 square-foot (0.41 acre) lot, zoned C3-I (Height District I). The overall building height will be 41 feet. Common open space and private open space are proposed for the residential units. Per Code, the residential portion must comply with the R-1250 development standards. As proposed, the project requires approval of Standard Variances to allow additional lot coverage greater than 50% on the ground floor and additional floor area greater than 1.2, and a reduction in the minimum 20-foot street front setback to allow residential private patios and landscape planters on the second floor deck above the ground floor retail space. The project also requires Design Review Board approval.
Project Type:	☒ Private Project ☐ Public Project
Project Applicant:	Hamlet Zohrabians 3467 Ocean View Blvd., Suite B Glendale, CA 91208 Phone: (818)236-3619
Findings:	The Director of the Community Development, on **June 14, 2018**, after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning and Neighborhood Services Division, found that the above referenced project would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Negative Declaration be prepared.
Mitigation Measures:	No mitigation measures are required.
Attachments:	Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Vilia Zemaitaitis, AICP, Senior Planner City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 548-2140; vzemaitaitis@glendaleca.gov

glendale
Community Development

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

New Mixed Use Building
3510 N. Verdugo Road
(3506-3514 North Verdugo Road)

1.	**Project Title:** New Mixed Use Building
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:** Vilia Zemaitaitis, Senior Planner Tel: (818) 937-8154 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	**Project Location:** 3510 N. Verdugo Road, Glendale, CA, 91208, Los Angeles County (3506-3514 North Verdugo Road)
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Hamlet Zohrabians 3467 Ocean View Blvd., Suite B Glendale, CA 91208
6.	**General Plan Designation:** Community Services
7.	**Zoning:** C3-I (Commercial Service - Height District I)
8.	**Description of the Project:** To demolish the existing buildings and construct a new three-story mixed use project, which consists of 14 residential dwelling units (three two-bedroom units, seven three-bedroom units, and four four-bedroom units) on the upper two floors and 2,762 square feet of retail/office space on the ground floor with 49 parking spaces located within two levels (ground floor and subterranean level), on an 18,000 square-foot (0.41 acre) lot, zoned C3-I (Height District I). The overall building height will be 41 feet. Common open space and private open space are proposed for the residential units. Per Code, the residential portion must comply with the R-1250 development standards. As proposed, the project requires approval of Standard Variances to allow additional lot coverage greater than 50% on the ground floor and additional floor area greater than 1.2, and a reduction in the minimum 20-foot street front setback to allow residential private patios and landscape planters on the second floor deck above the ground floor retail space. The project also requires Design Review Board approval.
9.	**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *North:* C3 – Commercial Service/Commercial building (one-story) *South:* C3 – Commercial Service/Commercial building (two-stories) *East:* Sparr Boulevard (20' improved roadway), and SR – Special Recreation/Montrose Community Park and R-2250 - Medium Density Residential/Apartment Buildings (two-stories) *West:* Verdugo Road and C3 - Commercial Service/Commercial buildings (one- and two-stories)
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	☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ 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.

Vilin Zymaitaitis — 6/14/18

Prepared by: Date:

Reviewed by: Date:

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

6/14/18

Director of Community Development: Date:

A. AESTHETICS

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is located in a developed area of the City on a major north-south arterial (Verdugo Road). The project is not located on a protected ridgeline and will not affect any scenic vistas, as identified in the Open Space and Conservation Element. As such, it was determined that, the project will have a less than significant impact to scenic vistas.

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. Demolition of the existing buildings and construction of the new mixed use project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site or surrounding neighborhood. The project site consists of Lots 9-14 in the Sparr Heights Tract: 3508 N. Verdugo Road is a vacant lot (Lot 14), 3510 N Verdugo Road features a 380 SF commercial building and parking lot (developed in 1945; Lots 11, 12 and 13), and 3512-3514 N. Verdugo Road (Lots 9 & 10) has two attached commercial structures: 3512 N. Verdugo is a two-story, 2,560 SF building (developed in 1939 and expanded in 1946) and 3514 N. Verdugo is an attached one-story, 1,120 SF commercial building with parking at the rear (constructed in 1949). These structures will be demolished and replaced with three-story (with mezzanine) mixed use project with ground floor commercial retail and parking, and three levels of multi-family residential above (upper units also have a mezzanine loft, which it not considered a story according to the Zoning Code definition). The area surrounding the project site contains a mix of uses/buildings, including a one-story commercial building abutting the project site to the north (and a large storage building, Andy's Transfer & Storage, to the north), Montrose Community Park and two-story apartment buildings to the east across the 20-ft. alley, two-story commercial building directly south on the corner of North Verdugo Road and Sunview Drive, and one- and two-story commercial buildings across Verdugo Road to the west. In addition to the tall, blocky storage building

two parcels to the north, there is a three-story, commercial building on the north-east corner of N. Verdugo Road and Broadview Drive.

The project site is zoned C3-I (Commercial Service - Height District I), which allows commercial buildings up to a maximum of 50 feet in height and three stories, with no street front, side street or interior setback required. By Code, the residential portion of the mixed use project must comply with the R-1250 residential standards, including setbacks, height/stories, FAR, etc. The proposal is for a three-story (with mezzanines) mixed use building with an overall height of 41 feet (from grade, as defined as the average top of curb). The applicant is requesting variances for the mixed use project based on the R-1250 standards for an increased FAR of 1.25 (1.2 FAR maximum), increased lot coverage of 77% (50% maximum), and private patios and landscape planters for the residential units on the second level atop the commercial ground floor (20-foot minimum setback). There are no lot coverage, FAR and street front setback standards for commercial-only developments in the C3-I zone. If the project was completely commercial in use, the proposed development would be in compliance with the C3-I standards. Besides the required Standards Variance process, the project will have to go through the Design Review Board for review and approval of the site planning, mass and scale, and architectural style of the proposed building before plan check and building permit issuance. The Board will also review the proposal to ensure the project's design is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Design Guidelines and compatible with the surrounding built environment, particularly its relationship to other commercial and residential developments in the area. Therefore, impacts are 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 nighttime lighting for the project would represent an increase over existing lighting levels, since the site is currently occupied by one-story commercial buildings. Lighting for the proposed development will be similar to existing commercial uses on the ground floor and existing residential apartment buildings within the project vicinity. The light from the rear ground level parking lot will be shielded by the building fence wall from spilling onto adjoining properties, particularly the residential developments located along the east (rear) of the subject property. Additionally, 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, in compliance with GMC 30.30.040. Therefore, no significant impacts associated with day and nighttime lighting are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

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 impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. 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 impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. There is no farmland or forestland in the vicinity of or on the proposed 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 impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

C. AIR QUALITY

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

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

No Impact. The 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 proposed project is included in the Southern California Associations of Government (SCAG) projects for growth in the City of Glendale. The proposed project does not result in population and housing growth that would cause growth in Glendale to exceed the SCAG forecast, since it is consistent with the General Plan and therefore is included in SCAG's growth projections. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with AQMP attainment forecasts. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The URBEMIS 2007 model (Version 9.2.4) 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. As indicated in the air quality model run described above, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. No significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact: Sensitive residential receptors are located adjacent to the project site. However, as indicated in the model run performed for this project, less than significant construction or operational impacts are anticipated. The calculations ensure that appropriate dust control, motor idling, and other regulations are implemented during the construction as required by the GMC and SCAQMD rules, and as noted in F-2 GEOLOGY AND SOILS. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration and therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if objectionable odors are generated that would adversely impact sensitive receptors. Good housekeeping practices, such as the use of trash receptacles, would be sufficient to prevent nuisance odors. Therefore, potential odor impacts would be less than significant.

During the construction phase, activities associated with the operation of construction equipment, the application of asphalt, and the application of architectural coatings and other interior and exterior finishes may produce discernible doors typical of most construction sites. Although these odors could be a source of nuisance to adjacent receptors, they are temporary and intermittent in nature. As construction-related emissions dissipate, the odors associated with these emissions would also decrease, dilute and become unnoticeable. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

1) *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife 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. The subject site is currently developed with three commercial structures and other than potted trees and shrubs, there is no natural vegetation existing onsite. Other lots surrounding the subject property have been developed with commercial uses along Verdugo Road to the north and south, and multi-family residential units and a public park along Sparr Boulevard to the east. No wildlife species other than those which can tolerate human activity and/or are typically found in urban environments are known to exist onsite or near the 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. The 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 Wildlife 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 and residential developments. No riparian habitat and/or other sensitive natural communities are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present onsite or adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is neither in proximity to, nor does it contain, wetland habitat or a blue-line stream. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands. 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, Chapter 12. 44 Indigenous Trees, contains guidelines for the protection and removal of indigenous trees. These trees are defined as any Valley Oak, California Live Oak, Scrub Oak, Mesa Oak, California Bay, and California Sycamore, which measure 6 inches or more in diameter breast height (DBH). 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 similar plan has been adopted to include the project site. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan. No impacts 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 two one-story and one two-story commercial structures, constructed between 1939 and 1949. These buildings are slated for demolition as part of the project. The buildings are not listed and 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 local area. In addition, the project site had already been developed between 1939 and 1949 with commercial structures and surface parking lots. Any archaeological resources that may have existed at one time on or beneath the site have likely been previously disturbed. 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. Notice was given to the

Tribal Cultural Resources, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq.

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. In addition, the project site has already been subject to extensive disruption and development. Any superficial paleontological resources that may have existed at one time on the project site have likely been previously unearthed by past development activities. Nonetheless, paleontological resources may possibly exist at deep levels and could be unearthed with implementation of the proposed project. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during the proposed project-related subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until a paleontologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant 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. Notice was given to the Tribal Cultural Resources, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. 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			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				
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. The project site is not located within an established Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or designated Fault-Rupture Hazard Zone for surface fault rupture hazards (City's Safety Element August 2003). Based on the available geologic data, active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are not known to be located directly beneath or projecting toward the project site. Therefore, the potential for surface rupture as a result of fault-plane displacement during the design life of the proposed project is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Less than Significant Impact. According to the City's Safety Element (August 2003), the project site is located within a mapped liquefaction hazard zone. The applicant submitted a geotechnical report ("Report of Geotechnical Investigation Proposed New Mixed-Use Building Project 3506-3514 Verdugo Road, Glendale, California", prepared by AES, Applied Soil Technology, Inc., and dated December 13, 2017, Project No. 16-428-02). Based on the field exploration and the significant presence of large gravel/cobbles in the subsurface materials, the report concluded that soil liquefaction at this site will not be significant. The project will be required to comply with the Building Code standards, including the new Code requirement that basement walls be designed for both static and seismic lateral earth pressures. As a result, no significant impacts related to liquefaction are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. According to the City's Safety Element (August 2003), the project site is not located within a mapped landslide hazard zone. The topography of the site is relatively flat (with a very minor downslope across the lot from north to south) and thus devoid of any distinctive landforms. There are no known landslides near the project site, nor is the project site in the path of any known or potential landslides. Therefore, no impact related to 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 for a long period of time. However, this impact is considered short-term in nature since the site would expose small amounts of soil during construction activities and would then be covered upon completion of construction activity. 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, liquefaction at this site will not be significant. 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 natural soils underlying the Project site are alluvium fan sediments. Such soils are typically in the low to moderately low range for shrink-swell (e.g., expansion). To minimize damage due to geologic hazards, design and construction of the proposed project would comply with applicable building codes. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soil would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. Septic tanks will not be used in the proposed project. The proposed project would connect to and use the existing sewage conveyance system. Therefore, no impacts 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 is a new three-story (with mezzanine) mixed use building with two levels of parking (one at-grade and one subterranean), 2,762 SF of commercial retail space and 14 residential units. The existing commercial buildings will be demolished.

The proposed residential uses would not involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of significant amounts of hazardous materials, but may involve the use of small amounts of cleaning products and related materials that may be categorized as hazardous. The limited use of various pesticides and fertilizers may also be used for landscape maintenance. These materials would be used and stored on the Project site in accordance with applicable federal, State, and local regulations. Additionally, the City of Glendale Fire Department and Los Angeles County have the authority to perform inspections and enforce state and federal laws governing the storage, use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes. As such, the proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No impacts would occur.

The commercial retail uses proposed on the ground floor are not anticipated to involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of significant amounts of hazardous materials, yet 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 commercial businesses will have to comply with all applicable laws, rules and regulations, including California Health and Safety Code Section 117600 et seq., which regulate 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. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), which included a survey of the Project site, was prepared in July 2016 (Attachment 3). The Phase I ESA concluded that there are no recognized environmental conditions (RECs), controlled recognized environmental conditions (CRECs), or historical recognized environmental conditions (HRECs) connected with the project site.

The existing buildings on the Project site will be demolished. Structures constructed, repaired, or remodeled between 1930 and 1981 have the potential of containing Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM). Overall, suspect ACMs and painted surfaces were observed in good condition and do not appear to pose a health and safety concern to the occupants of the subject property at this time. The buildings are managed under an Asbestos Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Plan and asbestos was removed from the buildings during prior renovations. However, any asbestos or lead-based paint found would be properly removed and abated as required by State law, specifically Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), the California Health and Safety Code, including the Hazardous Waste Control Law. The handling of hazardous materials would be required to adhere to applicable federal, state and local requirements that regulate work and public safety, as noted above in Section H.1. Given established regulations, the project is not expected to provide the opportunity to cause a significant foreseeable impact to the public or the environment from a reasonable foreseeable upset and accident condition involving the release of hazardous materials. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. There is one public school (John C. Fremont Elementary School), located at 3320 Las Palmas Avenue, approximately half a mile of the project site. No schools are proposed within a quarter mile of the site. As indicated above in Response Section G-2 above, the project would be required to comply with all of applicable rules established by the SCAQMD, including Rule 403 and 402, during the construction phase of the project that would prevent any dust from migrating beyond the project site. Such Best Management Practices and rules include: use of on-site water trucks and track-out controls during construction; utilizing sweeping and vacuum trucks on off-site public streets; employing full-time, on-site monitors during construction and hauling; and restricting activity during periods of high wind. As a result, no significant impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. A Phase I ESA was conducted in accordance with ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 and United States Environmental Protection Agency standards. A hazardous materials database search was completed as part of the ESA. Search results show that the Project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites. The Phase I ESA determined that there are no RECs, CRECs, or HRECs on the Project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project site is located approximately 13 miles from the Hollywood Burbank Airport. The airport flight path and airport noise contours do not extend to the project area. Therefore, the project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) ***For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project 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 impacts would occur. The nearest airport is the Hollywood Burbank Airport, which is located approximately 13 miles northwest of the proposed project area and is a public use airport. A total of six helipads currently operate within the City of Glendale; however, all helipad operations are subject to all FAA regulations, and operations do not occur often enough to represent a significant hazard to residents, visitors, employees, or construction workers in the Project area. Consequently, no impacts would occur with the implementation of the proposed project.

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, Verdugo Road is a County Evacuation Route to be used by emergency response services during an emergency and, if the situation warrants, the evacuation of an area. 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 map?				X
8. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
9. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
10. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

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

Less than Significant Impact. Grading activities associated with construction may temporarily increase the amount of suspended solids from surface water flows from the Project site during a concurrent storm event due to sheet erosion of exposed soil. The applicant is required to satisfy all applicable Control and

Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) of the Glendale Municipal Code, at the time of construction to the satisfaction of the City of Glendale Public Works Department.

These requirements include preparation of a SWPPP containing structural treatment and source control measures appropriate and applicable to the proposed Project. The SWPPP will incorporate best management practices (BMPs) by requiring controls of pollutant discharges that utilize best available technology (BAT) and best conventional pollutant control technology (BCT) to reduce pollutants. Examples of BAT/BCT that may be implemented during site grading and construction of the proposed Project could include straw hay bales, straw bale inlet filters, filter barriers, and silt fences. Preparation of the SWPPP would be incorporated as a condition of approval. Implementation of BMPs such as fences, sand bag barriers, and/or stabilization of the construction entrance/exit would ensure that Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) water quality standards are met during construction activities of the proposed Project. Therefore, no significant impact during construction would occur.

The Project site is currently developed and consists of mostly impervious surfaces. Development of the proposed project will result in a minimal change in the amount of impervious surfaces and drainage characteristics of the site. The proposed Project would increase the intensity of activities on the site and would likely result in an increase in typical urban pollutants generated by motor vehicle use on roadways and parking areas adjacent to the Project site, and the maintenance and operation of landscaped areas. Stormwater quality is generally affected by the length of time since the last rainfall, rainfall intensity, urban uses of the area and quantity of transported sediment. Typical urban water quality pollutants usually result from motor vehicle operations; oil and grease residues; fertilizer/pesticide uses; human/animal littering; careless material storage; and poor handling and property management. The majority of pollutant loads are usually washed away during the first flush of the storm occurring after the dry-season period.

These pollutants have the potential to degrade water quality. However, the quality of runoff from the Project site would be subject to Section 401 of the CWA under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). 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 surface water runoff from a Project. The new project will include drainage features to clean runoff as required by the applicable NPDES permit. Impacts related to water quality are considered to be less than significant with the compliance of all applicable permitting requirements.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The 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 Q-4 below, the proposed project's water demand is within the City's 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 more than current on-site conditions. 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 is either absorbed into the parkway soil or 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 for a long period of time. 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 be required 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 incrementally increase the runoff, given the construction of a building over the existing, 18,000 SF lot. 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. As mentioned above, construction of the proposed Project would result in minimal change to the amount of impervious surfaces and drainage characteristics that currently exist on the site. Impacts from runoff as a result of the proposed Project are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. According to Federal Emergency Management Agency flood hazard maps, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone; therefore, the proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area or result in structures being constructed that would impede or redirect flood flows. 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. 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, and would not place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Map No. 06037C1345F, September 2008). 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. The project site is not located within a coastal area. Therefore, tsunamis (seismic sea waves generated by sudden water displacement caused by a submarine earthquake, landslide, or volcanic eruption) are not considered a significant hazard at the site. 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. Also, the project is not located near a large topographic feature that would generate mudflow. 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

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 mixed use project is located mid-block on a Major Arterial with a 117.5 public right-of-way (property line to property line) in the C3-I (Commercial Service - Height District I) zone. Mixed use projects are a permitted use in the C3 zone, and the project complies with the standards for height (50 feet maximum for commercial structures and 41 feet maximum for residential with a 3:12 pitched roof), number of stories and parking. 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?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The current General Plan designation is Community Services and the site is currently zoned C3 (Commercial Service). The proposed project involves the development of a mixed use building featuring 14 residential units and 2,762 SF of commercial space (1,762 SF of retail/personal service and 984 SF of professional office).

The project site is located towards the northern portion of the City, on a Major Arterial street linking the Montrose Shopping Park Area to the southern portion of the City south of the 134 Freeway and the Downtown Specific Plan area. The General Plan land use and zoning designations for the site and the surrounding blocks along North Verdugo Road between Ocean View Boulevard and Honolulu Avenue are Community Services and Commercial Service - Height District I (C3-I), respectively. The C3-I zone allows for a maximum height of 50 feet and three stories, with residential development in accordance with the R-1250 zoning standards of 41 feet and three stories for projects with pitched roofs on lots with a minimum width greater than 90 feet. The proposed project would be 41 feet in height (from grade, as defined as the average top of curb) and three stories (with mezzanine), which is consistent with permitted height standard for the R-1250 and C3 zones. The project requires variances for the mixed use project based on the R-1250 standards for an increased FAR of 1.25 (1.2 FAR maximum permitted by code), increased lot coverage of 77% (50% maximum), and private patios and landscape planters for the residential units on the second level atop the commercial ground floor (20-foot minimum setback). The project will provide a total of 49 on-site parking spaces within two garage levels (at-grade and one level subterranean); the project is providing the required number of on-site parking spaces. The mixed-use

project complies with the Land Use Element of the General Plan (Community Services), which permits general commercial uses and residential units. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

K. MINERAL RESOURCES

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

1) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

No Impact. The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban environment and include residential and commercial uses. The Project site is located within Mineral Resource Zone-3 (MRZ-3), as defined in the City of Glendale General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993). MRZ-3 is defined as an area where adequate information is not available to determine whether valuable mineral resources are deposited. However, the project site has been developed for several decades with school, office and residential uses, which have precluded its use for mineral extraction. As a result, no impacts 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, the project is located within MRZ-3 and 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

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

1) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less than Significant Impact. The existing noise environment in the project vicinity is dominated by traffic noise from nearby roadways, as well as typical commercial activities in the surrounding area along Verdugo Road. The area surrounding the project site contains a mix of uses/buildings, including a one-story commercial building abutting the project site to the north (and a large storage building, Andy's Transfer & Storage, to the north), Montrose Community Park and two-story apartment buildings to the east across Sparr Boulevard (looks like an alley), two-story commercial building directly to the south on the corner of North Verdugo Road and Sunview Drive, and one- and two-story commercial buildings across Verdugo Road to the west. In addition to the tall storage building two lots to the north, there is a three-story, commercial building on the north-east corner of N. Verdugo Road and Broadview Drive. Long-term operation of the proposed mixed-use project would have a minimal effect on the noise environment in proximity to the project site. Noise generated by the proposed retail/commercial uses on the ground floor of the project would be similar to the noise generated from adjacent uses.

Construction

In accordance with Noise Ordinance in Section 8.36.080, construction would be prohibited from 7:00 PM to 7:00 AM every night and from 7:00 PM on Saturday to 7:00 AM on Monday. Construction is prohibited from taking place on Sundays and holidays. Furthermore, the Project would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) in order to minimize offsite sound propagation during construction. For these reasons, the temporary construction impacts would result from the proposed project would be less than significant. The City of Glendale Noise Element of the General Plan includes community noise equivalent level (CNEL) noise contours along roadways within the City.

Operation

According to the City's Noise Element, the Project is located within the 70 CNEL and over noise contour. The Project would be constructed to reduce interior noise to acceptable levels. While the proposed

building will produce a more intensive use than the existing condition, it is not anticipated to generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element. On-site noise sources typically consist of traffic to/from the project site, and the operation of on-site, project-related mechanical equipment, such as air conditioning equipment and exhaust fans that may generate audible noise levels. The proposed project's mechanical equipment would need to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance, which establishes maximum permitted noise levels from mechanical equipment. Project compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance would ensure that noise levels from building mechanical equipment would not exceed thresholds of significance. Additionally, the at-grade parking spaces will be enclosed within the building, and will be screened by a six foot high concrete masonry wall and additional landscaping. The block wall and building will also help shield the residential neighborhood and park east of the project site from noise generated by the existing traffic on North Verdugo Road. Therefore, implementation of the project, a mixed-use development, would not exacerbate the noise levels in this area and less than significant noise impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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 and would minimize the use of pile driving for construction, thus reducing significant vibration impacts from pile installation. 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 grading and excavation activities. 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 are not anticipated to result from the long-term operation of the proposed project. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant. 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.

Construction associated with the project will be required to comply with the City of Glendale Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 8.36), which prohibits construction activities between the hours of 7:00 PM on one day and 7:00 AM of the next day or from 7:00 PM on Saturday to 7:00 AM on Monday or

from 7:00 PM preceding a holiday. Compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance would ensure that no significant impacts would occur.

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 with the implementation of the proposed project.

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 associated with noise 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 includes 14 residential units (three 2-bedroom units, seven 3-bedroom units, and four 4-bedroom units) and 2,792 SF of commercial space (retail or personal service uses); the existing commercial buildings (3510 N. Verdugo Road. – 380 SF (constructed in 1945), 3512 N. Verdugo Road.- 1,120 and 2,560 SF, for a total of 3,680 SF onsite). However, the project would not result in substantial new population growth in the City. Based on the mix of residential dwelling units and an average household size of 2.6 residents for dwelling unit, the Project would generate approximately 36 residents, which is within the SCAG growth projections for Glendale (would not exceed the growth projections outlined in the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 RTP/SCS) adopted by SCAG). Additionally, any indirect growth occurring as a result of employees from the 2,792 SF commercial portion project would be inconsequential, and 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 GFD at the time building permits are submitted for approval. The overall need for fire protection services is not expected to substantially increase, given the project would add approximately 36 more residents and limited numbers of new employees to the City of Glendale. This increase would not substantially affect provision of fire protection given that the Project Site is located in a highly urbanized area and close to existing fire stations (Fire Station No. 29 at 2465 Honolulu Avenue, 0.6 miles away, and Fire Station No. 24 at 1734 Canada Boulevard, 2.2 miles away). As a result, the Project would be adequately served by existing fire stations and would not require the provision of any new fire stations or the expansion of existing fire stations. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in substantial adverse impacts. The overall need for fire protection services is not expected to substantially increase. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b) Police protection?

Less than Significant Impact. The Glendale Police Department (GPD) provides police protection services to the Project site from its station at 131 North Isabel Street, approximately 6.7 miles to the southeast. The proposed Project would introduce approximately 36 new residents and limited numbers of new employees to the City of Glendale. This increase would not substantially affect provision of police protection given the proximity of the Project Site to existing police protection services. The Project would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. The overall need for police protection services would not increase substantially as a result of Project implementation. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c) Schools?

Less than Significant Impact. Pursuant to Section 65995 of the Government Code, 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. In accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the project applicant will be required to pay the Development Impact Fee to the City based on the current fee schedule for mixed use developments (commercial uses and residential units) prior to the issuance of building permits. Payment of the impact fees would result in a less than significant impact to park facilities.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e) Other public facilities?

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is currently occupied by commercial uses (4,060 SF total) and development would result in a three-story mixed use building with 2,792 square-feet of commercial area on the ground floor and 14 residential units above; the additional employees and residents could result in an increase in demand for library services. However, in accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the project applicant will be required to pay the Development Impact Fee to the City based on the current fee schedule for commercial and residential developments prior to the issuance of building permits. Payment of the impact fee would result in a less than significant impact to library facilities.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

O. RECREATION

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project, which would result in a new three-story mixed use building with 14 residential units, is not expected to generate a substantial increase in demand for existing park or recreational facilities. As discussed in Response N-1d, the project applicant will be required to pay the City's Parks and Library Development Impact Fee to provide funding for park and recreation facilities based on the current fee schedule for commercial and residential development prior to the issuance of building permits. Payment of the impact fee would result in a less than significant impact to park and recreational facilities.

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 project site is located on Verdugo Road, which is identified as a "Major Arterial" in the City's Circulation Element and serves as an alternate north-south route to the California State Route 2 Freeway from the southerly half of the City to Montrose Shopping Park and beyond. The proposed project includes demolition of the three existing commercial buildings (4,060 SF total) and the development of a mixed use building with 2,792 SF of commercial area (retail and/or personal service) and 14-unit multi-family residential units. Based upon trip generation factors published in *Trip Generation*, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 8th Edition, 2008, the mixed use project would generate fewer than 50 vehicle trips during both the weekday morning peak hour (typically occurring between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m.) and the weekday evening peak hour (typically occurring between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m.). Because the project's peak-hour trip generation would not exceed the established threshold of 50 vehicle trips during peak hours, no significant and adverse impacts on the area street system is anticipated.

To ensure all construction traffic impacts (including construction worker trips and truck traffic for material delivery and material import/export) are less than significant during construction, a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be prepared and submitted to the City's Public Works Department for approval. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will include a Construction Traffic Control Plan, a Construction Parking Plan, a Haul Routes Plan, and construction hours. Construction traffic impacts 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. As such, impacts related to conflicting with a congestion management program would be less than significant.

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 (approximately 13 miles from the Hollywood Burbank Airport). Consequently, the proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns that would result in safety risks. No impacts 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 Signicant Impact. Access to the 10 parking spaces for the commercial component will be provided via a two-way driveway off of Verdugo Road, while access to the 39 parking spaces for the residential component of the project will be provided via a two-way driveway off Sparr Boulevard to the rear. All on-site driveways would be designed to adhere to the standard engineering practices and recommendations by the City of Glendale Public Works and Fire Departments. No new hazards or design features would be introduced that would alter the logistical configuration of traffic entering and existing the project site. No changes are proposed to the existing street system. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project does not involve changes to the existing street network or to existing emergency response plans. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority and Glendale Beeline provide bus service within the City of Glendale and specifically along Brand Boulevard. 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. 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 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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site has been developed with commercial resources since the late 1930s and 1940s: 3506-3508 N. Verdugo Road is a vacant lot (Lot 14), 3510 N Verdugo Road features a 380 SF commercial building and parking lot (developed in 1945; Lots 11, 12 and 13), and 3512-3514 N. Verdugo Road (Lots 9 & 10) has two attached commercial structures: 3512 N. Verdugo is a two-story, 2,560 SF building (developed in 1939 and expanded in 1946) and 3514 N. Verdugo is an attached one-story, 1,120 SF commercial building with parking at the rear (constructed in 1949). As mentioned previously, none of the existing commercial buildings are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Place, the California Register of Historical Resources, or for designated as a Glendale Historic Resource.

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 this standard requirement, no significant impact is anticipated.

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. As mentioned previously, the project site has been disturbed and excavated in the past and is currently developed with the commercial buildings and parking lots. No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the Project site and surrounding area. The potential for impact on known human remains or a resource determined to be significant by a California Native American tribe is low. No resources have been identified on the Project site pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. No tribal consultation has been requested and no significant impact to tribal cultural resource is anticipated. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

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	
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, so no NPDES permit is required. Construction projects are also required to prepare a SWPPP; 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. Groundwater extracted from the Verdugo and San Fernando Basins are treated at facilities within the City; however, the amount of water treated is restricted to the City's right to extract. The City's current water treatment facilities, the Glendale Water Treatment Plan and Verdugo Park Water Treatment Plan, have enough capacity to treat the City's current groundwater rights. In an effort to lessen its reliance upon MWD water, the City is actively exploring constructing new facilities to extract additional water from the Verdugo Basin because it is currently not being utilized to its full potential. Therefore, no new sources of water supply, such as groundwater, are required to meet the proposed Project's water demand. No new facilities or expansion of existing facilities would be required. No impact would occur 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. The project is not expected to result in an increase in the amount of runoff, since the project site is currently developed and fully paved; the new project will span across the site. 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 develop 14 multi-family residential units including three two-bedroom apartments, seven three-bedroom apartments, and four four-bedroom apartments, and approximately 2,762 SF of commercial area (ex. 984 SF office and 1,762 SF retail). The Project would increase demand by approximately 3,129 gallons per day, or 3.51 acre feet (af) per year over existing uses

(based on Sewage Generation Factors for Residential and Commercial Categories, L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide).

Type Description	Average Daily Flow (Gpd/unit)
Residential: Apt. - 2 Bedroom	160/dwelling Unit
Residential: Apt. - 3 Bedroom	200/dwelling Unit
Residential: Apt. - >3 Bedroom	40/additional bedroom
Retail Area	80/1,000 Gross SF
Office Building	150/1,000 Gross SF

The total water demand in 2020 in the City of Glendale is expected to be 28,182 af with a total available supply of 39,540 af, resulting in a surplus of 11,358 af for that year. The City of Glendale has identified an adequate supply of water to meet future City demands under normal conditions. 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 additional demand of 3.51 afy generated by the proposed project, ample supply exists to meet remaining City demand under normal conditions.

To address the drought that California is currently facing, the State is taking action to curb water use with mandatory statewide water use reduction. On January 17, 2014, Gov. Brown declared a "Drought State of Emergency", where State agencies were directed to take all necessary actions to prepare for drought conditions. On February 11, 2014, the Metropolitan Water District Board declared a water supply alert throughout Southern California in response to statewide drought, and called for water-use reductions and doubling of water conservation rebate and public outreach budgets. On July 15, 2014, the State Water Resources Control Board (Water Board) adopted the emergency water conservation regulations requiring all Californian's to stop washing down driveways and sidewalks; excess run-off caused by watering outdoor landscapes; using a hose to wash a car- unless the hose is equipped with a shut-off-nozzle; and using potable water in decorative water features and fountains - unless the water is recirculated.

Glendale's Water Conservation Ordinance, Glendale Municipal Code (GMC) Chapter 13.36, Section 13.36.060, already addresses the State's mandates by having in effect, at all times, the City's "no water waste" policy prohibiting certain uses and setting restrictions which include said mandates. The "no water waste" policy is classified as Phase I of the City's conservation ordinance, per GMC Section 13.36.070(A). On May 10, 2017, Glendale City Council implemented Phase I of the City's Water Conservation Ordinance. Previously, Glendale had been in Phase II of mandatory water conservation, restricting watering to Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays. The change comes after Governor Brown issued Executive Order B-40-17 on April 7, 2017, ending California's drought state of emergency.

The new three-story (with mezzanine) mixed use project must comply with the provisions of Glendale's Mandatory Water Conservation Ordinance, as well as the 2016 California Green Building Standards (CALGreen) of the Glendale Green Building Code and the water conserving fixture and fittings requirements per the current California Plumbing Code. All new buildings must utilize higher efficiency plumbing fixtures (low-flush toilets, low-flow showerheads and faucets) and automatic irrigation system controllers based on water or soil moisture, and demonstrate an indoor net reduction in the consumption of potable 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 3.5 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 three-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 3.5 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?

Less than Significant 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 handles a current demand of approximately 275 mgd on a dry weather day (Glendale Water and Power, *Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan* (April 2016)). The Project would increase wastewater generated by approximately 1,901 gallons per day (gpd) (based on Sewage Generation Factors for Residential and Commercial Categories, *City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation Sewage Generation Factors.* - 80 gal/1,000 sf/day for retail/restaurant/commercial, and 120 gal/unit/day for multifamily residential) for the proposed 14 residential units and 2,762 SF of commercial area; the existing 4,060 SF of commercial area (three existing buildings) generate approximately 324 gpd, so the net increase is 1,577 gpd. Given that the HTP is currently operating 175 million gpd below capacity, the addition of approximately 1,577 gpd of sewage generated by the proposed Project would not result in the plant's exceeding capacity. 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 significant 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 and residential development on site. The proposed project would generate approximately 70 pounds per day, or 12.7 tons of solid waste per year (multifamily residential at 4 lb/unit/day and commercial at 0.005 lb/sf/day).

Solid waste generated on the project site would 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 12.7 tons per year in solid waste generated by the proposed project, the annual disposal amount would increase to approximately 200,013 tons per year. With a total annual disposal amount of 200,013 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?***

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would comply with AB 939, known as the California Integrated Waste Management Act, which requires 50 percent diversion of cities and counties solid waste from landfills by 2000; AB 341, which establishes a State policy goal that no less than 75 percent of solid waste generated be source reduced, recycled, or composted by 2020; and the City's Construction and Demolition Debris Diversion Program section of the Municipal Code, which states that demolition, construction, and remodeling shall divert 50 percent of waste tonnage from area landfills. Consistent with code requirements, the Project would provide a recycling area to reduce the amount of solid waste sent to the landfill.

In addition, the project would comply with federal, State, and local statues and regulations. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

R. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
3. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

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

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is currently developed and located within an urbanized area. 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 significant impacts are anticipated.

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.

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. Environmental Information Application, submitted on May 8, 2017.
2. "Report of Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed New Mixed-Use Building Project, 3506-3514 Verdugo Road, Glendale, California", dated December 13, 2017 and prepared by AES, C.M. Applied Earth Sciences, A Division of Applied Soil Technology, Inc.
3. "Report of Phase I Site Assessment, Lots 9 Through 14, Block 8, Sparr Heights Tract, APN Nos. 5613-006-004, -005, -006, 3506, 3510, 3512 & 3514 Verdugo Road, Glendale CA 91208", dated July 5, 2016, Prepared by Applied Earth Sciences
4. California Department of Conservation, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program,* Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2010 (September 2011).
5. South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning* (May 2005), p. 2-2.
6. City of Glendale, *General Plan*, "Noise Element" (2007).
7. City of Glendale, *General Plan,* "Safety Element" (2003).
8. City of Glendale, *General Plan*, "Open Space and Conservation Element" (1993).
9. City of Glendale, General Plan, "Recreation Element" (1996).
10. California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State of California General Plan Guidelines (October 2003).
11. City of Glendale Municipal Code, as amended.
12. CalRecycle, "Waste Characterization: Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates," http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/wastechar/wastegenrates/default.htm, accessed October 28, 2014.
13. Glendale Water and Power, Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (April 2016).