glendale
Community Development

PROPOSED
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
New Commercial Building
501 S. Central Ave. and 308 W. Lomita Ave.

The following Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.	
Project Title/Common Name:	New Commercial Building
Project Location:	501 South Central Avenue and 308 West Lomita Avenue, Glendale, CA 91204
Project Description:	The applicant is proposing to construct a 17,826 square-foot, 3- story office/retail building, over a one-level 8,325 square-foot subterranean parking garage on an 8,400 square-foot lot. Development of the project will require the demolition of the existing 720 square-foot counter service restaurant located at 501 South Central Avenue (built in 1948) and the existing 918 square-foot house located at 308 West Lomita (built in 1921). The applicant is asking to provide 51 on-site parking spaces of which 30 are accessible, four are tandem, and 17 are lift operated, where 49 accessible parking spaces are required. The subject property is zoned C3-1 (Commercial Service – Height District 1). Planning Hearing Officer approval of a Parking Reduction Permit and environmental, and Design Review Board approval of the project design is required.
Project Type:	☒ Private Project ☐ Public Project
Project Applicant:	Aram Alajajian Alajajian Marcoosi Architects Inc. 320 West Arden, Suite 120 Glendale, CA 91203
Findings:	The Director of the Community Development Department, on **September 20, 2018**, after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Division, found that the above referenced project would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be prepared.
Mitigation Measures:	See attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).
Attachments:	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Kathy Duarte, Planner City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 937-8163; Fax: (818) 240-0392

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The following mitigation measure shall apply to the New Commercial Building project located at 501 South Central Avenue and 308 West Lomita Avenue to reduce identified impacts to less than significant levels.

NOS-1 The following construction best management practices (BMPs) shall be implemented to reduce construction noise levels:

- Ensure that construction equipment is properly muffled according to industry standards and be in good working condition.
- Place noise-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses, where feasible.
- Schedule high noise-producing activities between the hours of 7:00 AM and 5:00 PM to minimize disruption on sensitive uses.
- Implement noise attenuation measures to the extent feasible, which may include, but are not limited to, temporary noise barriers or noise blankets around stationary construction noise sources.
- Use electric air compressors and similar power tools rather than diesel equipment, where feasible.
- Construction-related equipment, including heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment, shall be turned off when not in use for more than 30 minutes.
- Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the job superintendent shall be clearly posted at all construction entrances to allow surrounding owners to contact the job superintendent. If the City or the job superintendent receives a complaint, the superintendent shall investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action taken to the reporting party.

Monitoring Action:	Plan check and site inspection
Timing:	Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during construction activities
Responsibility:	Department of Public Works

NOS-2 Construction staging areas along with the operation of earthmoving equipment within the Project area shall be located as far away from vibration- and noise-sensitive sites as possible.

Monitoring Action:	Plan check and site inspection
Timing:	During construction activities
Responsibility:	Department of Public Works

Agreement to Proposed Mitigation Measures and Mitigation Monitoring Program

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

Dated: _____ _____

Signature(s) of the Project Applicant(s)

Dated: _____ _____

glendale
Community Development

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
New Commercial Building
501 South Central Ave.
308 West Lomita Ave.

1.	**Project Title:** New Commercial 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:** Kathy Duarte, Planner Tel: (818) 937-8163 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	**Project Location:** 501 South Central Avenue and 308 West Lomita Avenue, Glendale, CA 91204
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Aram Alajajian Alajajian Marcoosi Architects Inc. 320 West Arden, Suite 120 Glendale, CA 91203
6.	**General Plan Designation:** Community Services
7.	**Zoning:** C3-1 (Commercial Service) Zone
8.	**Description of the Project:** The applicant is proposing to construct a 17,826 square-foot, 3- story office/retail building, over a one-level 8,325 square-foot subterranean parking garage on an 8,400 square-foot lot. Development of the project will require the demolition of the existing 720 square-foot counter service restaurant located at 501 South Central Avenue (built in 1948) and the existing 918 square-foot house located at 308 West Lomita (built in 1921). The applicant is asking to provide 51 on-site parking spaces of which 30 are accessible, four are tandem, and 17 are lift operated, where 49 accessible parking spaces are required. The subject property is zoned C3-1. Planning Hearing Officer approval of a Parking Reduction Permit and Design Review Board approval of the environmental and project design is required.
9.	**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *North:* C3 – Commercial Service Zone, Lomita Avenue *South:* C3 – Commercial Service, funeral home *East:* C3 – Commercial Service, Central Avenue *West:* C3 – Commercial Service, 2-story apartment building
10.	**Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).** None.

11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

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

LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

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

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

Prepared by: _____ _____

Reviewed by: _____ Date: 9/20/18

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

Director of Community Development: _____ Date: 9/20/18

A. AESTHETICS

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

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

No Impact. The project site is proposed to be developed with a three-story commercial building. There are no scenic vistas, as identified in the Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993), within or in proximity to the project site. Therefore, no impacts to scenic vistas would result from project implementation.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The new building will not substantially degrade the visual character of the site and surroundings. The area surrounding the project site contains a mix of commercial and multi-family residential uses and buildings. The Design Review Board will review and approve the architectural style of the proposed building before plan check and building permit issuance. The Board will also review the site planning, mass and scale, materials and landscaping to ensure the project's design is 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 most likely represent an increase over existing lighting levels, since the site is currently developed with smaller structures. Lighting for the proposed building will be similar to existing commercial uses within the project vicinity. 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. 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. The proposed project does not result in population and housing growth that would cause growth in Glendale to exceed the SCAG forecast. 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, no construction or operational impacts are anticipated. 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 odors typical of most construction sites. Although these odors could be a source of nuisance to adjacent receptors, they are temporary and intermittent in nature. As construction-related emissions dissipate, the odors associated with these emissions would also decrease, dilute and become unnoticeable. Therefore, 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 commercial and residential uses. Other lots surrounding the subject property have been developed with commercial and residential projects. 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 Wildlife 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, the proposed project implementation 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. Therefore, 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?

Less than Significant Impact. The existing 720 square-foot counter service restaurant located at 501 South Central (built in 1948) and the existing 918 square-foot house located at 308 West Lomita (built in 1921) that are proposed for demolition are not identified as historic resources. The proposed development would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. No 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 is developed with a single family residence and commercial use. 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 indicates that no significant archaeological sites have been identified in this area of Glendale. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an

archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Plant and animal fossils are typically found within sedimentary rock deposits. Most of the City of Glendale consists of igneous and metamorphic rock, and the local area is not known to contain paleontological resources. 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. 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). Notice was given to the Tribal Cultural Resource, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resource Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. 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?

No Impact. According to the City's Safety Element (August 2003),the project site is not located within a mapped liquefaction hazard zone. No impact related to liquefaction would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. The topography of the site is relatively flat 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. 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, the soil under the project site is not prone to liquefaction. Therefore, impacts related to unstable soils are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The soils underlying the project site and surrounding area are considered to have a low expansion potential. Additionally, 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. 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. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop

integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has prepared the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), which is part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Glendale has an adopted Greener Glendale Plan which meets regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by SCAG and adopted by the ARB. The Greener Glendale Plan uses land use development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, transportation measures and other policies that are determined to be feasible to reduce GHG.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

H. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project is a new 17,826 square-foot, three-story commercial building (17,451 SF general office and 375 SF retail) with one level of below ground parking. All businesses within the City of Glendale, as mandated by the California Health and Safety Code Chapter 6.95, are required to file a Hazardous Material Business Plan (HMBP) with the Glendale Fire Department. The HMBP covers the use and storage of all regulated hazardous chemicals and materials to be used and/or stored onsite. The proposed project will not involve the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is currently developed with a commercial built in 1948 and a residence built in 1921. Structures constructed or remodeled between 1930 and 1981 have the potential of containing Asbestos Containing Building Materials(ACM). In addition, buildings constructed prior to 1978 may contain lead based pants. Testing and removal of lead-based paints is subject to regulation established by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). As such, the existing structure is required to be tested for ACM and lead-based pant in accordance with applicable rules and regulations and remediated accordingly prior to demolition. Compliance with the applicable rules and regulations would ensure that significant impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.

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. No school sites are located within one-quarter mile of the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

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, Brand Boulevard, located approximately 0.2 miles to the east of the project site, is a City Disaster Response 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. The project would be required to comply with all NPDES requirements including pre-construction, during construction and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs). In addition, the project will be required to submit an approved SUSMP (Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan) to be integrated into the design of the project. Impacts associated with water quality standards or waste discharge requirements are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

The amount of hardscape proposed on the project site would be more than current on-site conditions. However, the property is relatively small in area and is zoned for commercial uses which anticipate the proposed amount of hardscape 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, and stormwater runoff is either absorbed into the 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. 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 by the building and associated improvements upon completion of the project. Furthermore, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the NPDES Permit set forth by the RWQCB, and to prepare and submit a SWPPP to be administered throughout proposed project construction. The SWPPP would incorporate BMPs to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The proposed project will modify the existing drainage pattern of the site and would slightly increase the runoff, given the construction of a building over the existing 8,400 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 Best Available Technology (BAT) and Best Control Technology (BCT) to reduce pollutants. In addition, in accordance with Chapter 13.42, Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Control and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan of the Glendale Municipal Code, a SUSMP containing design features and BMPs to reduce post-construction pollutants in stormwater discharges would be required as part of the project. Consequently, impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. According to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone. In addition, the proposed does not include the construction of any housing. 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. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, the proposed project is not located within the inundation zone of a reservoir or dam located within the City or elsewhere. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

J. LAND USE AND PLANNING

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

1) *Physically divide an established community?*

No Impact. The proposed commercial building is located on developed lot. The proposed uses are permitted uses in the C3 zone. No established community would be divided as a result of the project. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located just south of downtown Glendale. For the site and the surrounding area, the General Plan land use designations are Community Services, Medium Density Residential, and Medium High Density Residential and the zoning designations are Commercial Service (C3), Medium Density Residential (R2250), and Medium High Density Residential (R1650). The proposed project complies with all the development standards contained in the C3 zone with one exception. The applicant is requesting that of the required 49 accessible, on-site parking spaces, 21 spaces are allowed to be non-accessible with four tandem spaces and 17 lift spaces. 30 spaces would be accessible with a total of 51 on-site parking spaces provided. The parking will be operated by a valet, except for the parking on the first floor, which includes ADA parking. It is estimated that it will take less than five minutes to park or remove a car from a lift, so no significant impact will be created. With the use of a valet service or parking monitor, the total number of space required for the project would be provided. The proposed contemporary design of the project also would be consistent with the surrounding architectural styles of commercial and residential buildings. The project complies with the intent of the Land Use Element of the General Plan. Because of their minor nature, the requested deviation from the zoning ordinance will not have an adverse environmental impact. 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 is completely urbanized and is not within an area that has been identified as containing valuable mineral resources, as indicated in the City's Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993). No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

L. NOISE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
2. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
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 Central Avenue. Surrounding land uses include multi-family residential uses to the north and west, an institutional building to the east, and commercial uses to the south. Long-term operation of the proposed project would have a minimal effect on the noise environment in proximity to the project site. Noise generated by the commercial building would result primarily from normal operation of the building mechanical equipment and off-site traffic.

The City of Glendale Noise Element of the General Plan includes community noise equivalent level (CNEL) noise contours along roadways within the City. As shown in the City's 2003 Noise Element, the project site is located "70 CNEL and over" noise contour area. The project site would be located within a normally acceptable noise level for the nature of the proposed use. 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 (HVAC, etc.) 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 proposed parking facility would be located within the building and would minimize noise levels associated with parking. The proposed office use is not anticipated to generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element. Any noise produced would not be out of the normal range for a commercial building and will be contained in the building. Therefore, 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. No pile driving for construction would be necessary. Piles would be drilled and cast in place. Thus, significant vibration impacts from pile installation would not occur.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. As indicated in Response L-1 above, significant noise impacts 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 with Mitigation Incorporated. 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.

Construction activities associated with the proposed project would occur adjacent to existing multi-family residential uses to the west, and a funeral home to the south. To reduce potential temporary increases in ambient noise levels during construction, mitigation measures NOS-1 through NOS-2 would be implemented. Therefore, temporary or periodic noise impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce potential construction related noise impacts to less than significant.

NOS-1 The following construction best management practices (BMPs) shall be implemented to reduce construction noise levels:

- Ensure that construction equipment is properly muffled according to industry standards and be in good working condition.
- Place noise-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses, where feasible.
- Schedule high noise-producing activities between the hours of 7:00 AM and 5:00 PM to minimize disruption on sensitive uses.
- Implement noise attenuation measures to the extent feasible, which may include, but are not limited to, temporary noise barriers or noise blankets around stationary construction noise sources.
- Use electric air compressors and similar power tools rather than diesel equipment, where feasible.
- Construction-related equipment, including heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment, shall be turned off when not in use for more than 30 minutes.
- Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the job superintendent shall be clearly posted at all construction entrances to allow surrounding owners to contact the job superintendent. If the City or the job superintendent receives a complaint, the superintendent shall investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action taken to the reporting party.

NOS-2 Construction staging areas along with the operation of earthmoving equipment within the Project area shall be located as far away from vibration- and noise-sensitive sites as possible.

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

No Impact. The project site is neither located within an airport land use plan nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

M. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
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 does not include any residential uses and would not result in new population growth in the City. Any indirect growth occurring as a result of employees from the proposed commercial 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?

Less than Significant Impact. One 918 square-foot residential dwelling unit with two bedrooms and one bathroom currently exists on the project site. This unit would be demolished as a result of the project. A less than significant impact would occur as the loss of one dwelling unit is not considered substantial.

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. A less than significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

N. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

a) Fire protection?

Less than Significant Impact. The City of Glendale Fire Department (GFD) provides fire and paramedic services to the project site. The project will require compliance with the Uniform Fire Code, including installation of fire sprinklers, and to submit plans to the Glendale Fire Department at the time building permits are submitted for approval. The overall need for fire protection services is not expected to substantially increase. No significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b) Police protection?

Less than Significant Impact. The Glendale Police Department (GPD) provides police protection services to the project site. The site is located in an urban, developed area of the City and similar uses exist along Central Avenue and Brand Boulevard. The additional day-time population that this project will bring is not anticipated to have a significant impact on Police services.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c) Schools?

Less than Significant Impact. Section 65995 of the Government Code provides that school districts can collect a fee on a per-square-foot basis to assist in the construction of or additions to schools. Pursuant to Section 65995, the project applicant is required to pay school impact fees to the Glendale Unified School District based on the current fee schedule for commercial 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 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 commercial developments prior to the issuance of building permits. Commercial establishments impact parks through the addition of new employees, and such new employees are likely to use parks only sporadically. No significant increase in demand for existing park or recreational facilities is anticipated due to the negligible increase in employees generated by the project. Payment of the park impact fees would mitigate any indirect impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e) Other public facilities?

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is currently developed. A new commercial building 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 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 commercial building, 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 Development Impact Fee to the City based on the current fee schedule for commercial 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. There would be a slight increase in day time population (construction, office and retail workers) as a result of the construction activities and the office and retail uses. However, the increase in daytime population is not considered substantial since the construction phase is short-term in nature. The site is planned for commercial uses in the General Plan, which are the uses proposed. The project site is served by Central Avenue, which is classified as a major arterial and is capable to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed commercial use. Lomita Avenue is classified as a Local Street for which through traffic is discouraged. The City's Traffic Engineer reviewed the proposed project and determined it would not require a traffic study. As a result, the proposed project would not significantly and adversely impact the public street system and therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is not located near an 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)?***

No Impact. The proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing roadway or alley network. As a result, no impacts would result.

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. 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. Written notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam of Mission Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by either tribe. In addition, 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, no known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the Project site and surrounding area. Therefore, 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. Written notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam of Mission Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseno indians, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by either tribe. 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. Construction projects are also required to prepare a SWPPP. In addition, the proposed project would be required to submit a SUSMP to mitigate urban stormwater runoff. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant would be required to satisfy the requirements related to the payment of fees and/or the provisions of adequate wastewater facilities. The proposed project would comply with the RWCQB-established waste discharge prohibitions and water quality objectives, which will be incorporated into the proposed project as a project design feature. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The project would result in an increase in the amount of runoff since the site is currently developed with small single family house and a commercial facility. Runoff from the project site would be conveyed via streets and gutters to storm drain locations around the project site. The 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. Glendale Water and Power has reviewed the proposed project and has determined that the existing water supplies and infrastructure are adequate to provide for the project. No new or expanded facilities as a result of the project are anticipated. No significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in commercial development on site. Solid waste generated on the project site would be deposited at the Scholl Canyon Landfill, which is owned by the City of Glendale, or one of the landfills located within the County of Los Angeles. The annual disposal rate at the Scholl Canyon facility is 340,000 tons per year. The Integrated Waste Division of the Public Works Department has reviewed the proposed project with respect to waste generation and disposal. Combined with the increase in solid waste generated by the proposed project, the Scholl Canyon facility would accommodate the annual disposal amount. Also, 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. Examples of waste diversion efforts would include recycling programs for cardboard boxes, paper, aluminum cans, and bottles through the provision of recycling containers. As a result, no significant impacts area anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

S. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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.

1. The City of Glendale's General Plan, as amended.
2. The City of Glendale's Municipal Code, as amended.
3. "Guidelines of the City of Glendale for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended," August 19, 2003, City of Glendale Planning Division.
4. Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq and California Code of Regulations, Title 14 Section 15000 et seq.
5. *"CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook,"* updated October 2003, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
6. "California Emissions Estimator Model", version 2016.3.2
7. Environmental Information Form (EIF) form submitted on September 14, 2018.l