PROPOSED
NEGATIVE DECLARATION
Television and Radio Upgrades
Broadcast Transmission Facilities
3600 Marengo Drive – aka Flint Peak

The following Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.	
Project Title/Common Name:	Television and Radio Broadcast Transmission Facilities Upgrades
Project Location:	3600 Marengo Drive, Glendale (Flint Peak), Los Angeles County
Project Description:	The proposed project is a consolidation of broadcast equipment on Flint Peak and involves: constructing new 140-foot and 160-foot high broadcast towers; constructing a new 1,750 square foot, 15-foot high unstaffed communications building and removal of a 100-foot high H-frame tower and the 79-foot and 58-foot high wooden monopoles. The modification of an existing broadcast and transmission facility that includes the addition of two new towers and equipment building in the ROS Residential Open Space Zone on a primary ridgeline require the approval of a conditional use permit (CUP). Variances are required for the heights of the two new towers. The proposal will require design review approval. The project site is generally located beyond the gated terminus of East Glenoaks Boulevard on Flint Peak. Entrance to the project site is provided by the Radio Lateral fire road via East Glenoaks Boulevard or Marengo Drive. Properties surrounding the project site include vacant open space to the east, north and west, and Scholl Canyon Landfill to the south. The nearest single-family residences are approximately 2,200 feet away to the northeast. The project site is currently developed with television and radio broadcast towers and monopoles ranging in height from 50-feet to 160-feet, and three equipment buildings. There are no protected indigenous trees species on or within 20 feet of the scope of work. Construction of the project will occur over two phases as follows: • Phase I – construction of a new 140-foot and 160-foot high broadcast towers and a new 1,750 square foot, 15-foot high unstaffed communications building; and • Phase II – demolition of a 100-foot high H-frame tower and a 79-foot and 58-foot high wooden monopoles. Consolidate existing equipment onto the two new towers. Both phases of construction will take place over a period of approximately 10 weeks. The amount of soil export from the site will be approximately 407 cubic yards). Based on this estimate, the excavation material would require approximately 29 truck trips, assuming 16 cubic yards per truck. Due to the nature of the project, excavation would not occur over the entire 10 week period, but would be concentrated over approximately one week within the first three weeks. The maximum number of haul truck trips per eight-hour work day is anticipated to be five. The inbound haul route to the project site is projected to be from the East Glenoaks Boulevard and onto the

	Radio Lateral fire road. . The same route would be used for outbound trucks. Exported grade and demolition material will be transported to the Scholl Canyon Landfill.
Project Type:	☒ Private Project ☐ Public Project
Project Applicant:	Adam Corsi c/o American Towers Corporation 10 Presidential Way Woburn, MA 01801
Findings:	The Director of the Community Development, on **January 25, 2019**, 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:	No mitigation measures are required.
Attachments:	Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Dennis Joe, Planner City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 548-8157; Fax: (818) 240-0392

This page left intentionally blank.

PROPOSED
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
Television and Radio Upgrades
Broadcast Transmission Facilities
3600 Marengo Drive – aka Flint Peak

1.	**Project Title:** Television and Radio Broadcast Transmission Facilities Upgrades
2.	**Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Glendale Community Development Department Planning Division 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	**Contact Person and Phone Number:** Dennis Joe, Planner Tel: (818) 937-8157 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	**Project Location:** 3600 Marengo Drive, Glendale (Flint Peak), Los Angeles County
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Adam Corsi c/o American Towers Corporation 10 Presidential Way Woburn, MA 01801
6.	**General Plan Designation:** Residential Open Space
7.	**Zoning:** ROS (Residential Open Space) Zone, Floor Area District III

Description of the Project: The proposed project is a consolidation of broadcast equipment on Flint Peak and involves: constructing new 140-foot and 160-foot high broadcast towers; constructing a new 1,750 square foot, 15-foot high unstaffed communications building and removal of a 100-foot high H-frame tower and the 79-foot and 58-foot high wooden monopoles.

The modification of an existing broadcast and transmission facility that includes the addition of two new towers and equipment building in the ROS Residential Open Space Zone on a primary ridgeline require the approval of a conditional use permit (CUP). Variances are required for the heights of the two new towers. The proposal will require design review approval.

The project site is generally located beyond the gated terminus of East Glenoaks Boulevard on Flint Peak. Entrance to the project site is provided by the Radio Lateral fire road via East Glenoaks Boulevard or Marengo Drive. Properties surrounding the project site include vacant open space to the east, north and west, and Scholl Canyon Landfill to the south. The nearest single-family residences are approximately 2,200 feet away to the northeast.

The project site is currently developed with television and radio broadcast towers and monopoles ranging in height from 50-feet to 160-feet, and three equipment buildings. There are no protected indigenous trees species on or within 20 feet of the scope of work.

Construction of the project will occur over two phases as follows:

- Phase I – construction of a new 140-foot and 160-foot high broadcast towers and a new 1,750 square foot, 15-foot high unstaffed communications building; and
- Phase II – demolition of a 100-foot high H-frame tower and a 79-foot and 58-foot high wooden monopoles. Consolidate existing equipment onto the two new towers.

Both phases of construction will take place over a period of approximately 10 weeks. The amount of soil

	export from the site will be approximately 407 cubic yards). Based on this estimate, the excavation material would require approximately 29 truck trips, assuming 16 cubic yards per truck. Due to the nature of the project, excavation would not occur over the entire 10 week period, but would be concentrated over approximately one week within the first three weeks. The maximum number of haul truck trips per eight-hour work day is anticipated to be five. The inbound haul route to the project site is projected to be from the East Glenoaks Boulevard and onto the Radio Lateral fire road. The same route would be used for outbound trucks. Exported grade and demolition material will be transported to the Scholl Canyon Landfill.
9.	**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *North:* Vacant – ROS Residential Open Space Zone and Special Recreation Zone *South:* Vacant – SR Special Recreation Zone *East:* Vacant – ROS Residential Open Space Zone *West:* Vacant – SR Special Recreation Zone
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
- ☐ Biological Resources
- ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- ☐ Land Use / Planning
- ☐ Population / Housing
- ☐ Transportation / Traffic
- ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance
- ☐ Agricultural and Forest Resources
- ☐ Cultural Resources
- ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- ☐ Mineral Resources
- ☐ Public Services
- ☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Geology / Soils
- ☐ Hydrology / Water Quality
- ☐ Noise
- ☐ Recreation
- ☐ Utilities / Service Systems

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.

Dennis Joe — 1/23/19
Prepared by:

1/23/19
Reviewed by: — Date:

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

For Director of Community Development: — Date: 1/23/19

A. AESTHETICS

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. Flint Peak is located on an irregular-shaped 23.4 acre property on a primary ridgeline as identified by the City's ridgeline maps. It is presently occupied by an array of six broadcast and transmission facilities including towers and monopoles ranging in height from 58-feet to 160-feet and three unstaffed equipment buildings, since the 1950s (last updated in 2013). The proposal is to remove three older towers/monopoles (58-feet, 79-feet and 100-feet high) and replace them with two new towers (140-feet and 160-feet high). A new ancillary 1,750 square-foot equipment building will be added to accommodate the new towers and future equipment.

The Project will not have a substantial adverse effect on the primary ridgeline because the development will be clustered on the property and will be situated adjacent to existing broadcast towers ranging 100-feet to 160-feet in height. The new 160-foot high tower will be approximately 12-feet taller (8.6 percent) than the existing towers because the tower building pads are at a slightly higher grade on the site. The number of towers/poles on the Project site decrease by one.

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 subject site is currently developed with television and radio broadcast towers and monopoles ranging in height from 50-feet to 160-feet, and three equipment buildings. The area immediately surrounding the project site is vacant and the nearest residential buildings are to the northeast approximately 2,200 feet away. Impacts to visual character and quality of the site would be less than significant because two new towers will replace three towers and the new equipment building will be constructed with beige concrete blocks to blend into the natural hillside and is screened by an existing security fence and landscaping.

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 not increase beyond the existing condition. Lighting for the proposed broadcast towers will be similar to existing broadcast towers onsite. Any external lighting on the towers (other than Aircraft and Federal Aviation Administration required tower lighting) on the proposed towers and equipment shelters are required to be directed towards the subject property and shielded to prevent light from spilling over onto neighboring properties. With these requirements in place, and because the project site is already developed with broadcast towers, no significant impacts associated with lighting are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

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

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

No Impact. There is no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance within or adjacent to the proposed Project site, and no agricultural activities take place on the Project site. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. No portion of the Project site is proposed to include agricultural zoning designations or uses, nor do any such uses exist within the City under the current General Plan and zoning. There are no Williamson Act contracts in effect for the Project site or surrounding vicinity. No conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts would result. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

C. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				**X**
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			**X**	
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.

No population growth is associated with the proposed project because it consists of removing three towers, adding two new towers and an unstaffed equipment building. As a result, the proposed project will 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. Therefore, no impact would occur with relation to a conflict with, or obstruction of, the implementation of the SCAQMD AQMP.

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. Approximately 407 cubic yards of grading is required for site preparation for two new towers and for the proposed 1,750 square-foot unstaffed communications building on a property that is currently developed with television and broadcast towers and unstaffed equipment buildings.

Short-Term Air Quality Impacts associated with construction activities would result in the generation of air pollutants. These emissions would primarily be 1) exhaust emissions from off-road diesel-powered construction equipment; 2) dust generated by grading, earthmoving, and other construction activities; and 3) exhaust emissions from on-road vehicles. Construction of the proposed cell tower would generate minimal amounts of air pollutants from construction equipment exhaust and fugitive dust from soil disturbance during demolition of the existing asphalt, construction of a concrete pad, drilling to accommodate the monopole structure, and installation of service equipment (see Figures 5 and 6, and reference Appendix A). Construction activities would take approximately ten weeks. Construction emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), version 2013.2.2. Results of the construction emission modeling are shown in Table 1, Maximum Daily Regional Construction Emissions. As shown in the table, air pollutant emissions from construction-related activities would be less than their respective SCAQMD regional significance

threshold values. Therefore, air quality impacts from project-related construction activities would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. The nearest sensitive residential receptors are located approximately 2,200 feet northeast of the project site. As indicated above, the project would be required to comply with all applicable rules that govern construction related impacts. In addition, 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.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The type of facilities that are typically associated with objectionable odors include wastewater treatments plants, compost facilities, landfills, solid waste transfer stations, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), dairy farms, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing, and food manufacturing facilities. Broadcast towers would not result in the types of odors generated by the aforementioned land uses. During construction and emergency generator operation activities, equipment exhaust and application of asphalt would temporarily generate odors. Any construction- and operation-related odor emissions would be temporary and intermittent. Additionally, noxious odors would be confined to the immediate vicinity of the equipment. By the time such emissions reach any sensitive receptor sites, they would be diluted to well below any level of air quality concern. Therefore, impacts associated with operation- and construction-generated odors would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is already developed with broadcast towers, monopoles and equipment buildings and surrounded by a security fence. The removal of existing facilities and construction of new ones will occur only as part of an overall consolidation and upgrade of broadcast facilities within the same enclosed and developed location. A biological resources survey was conducted as part of the City's Open Space and Conservation Element. The purpose of the survey was to map significant vegetation communities that include chaparral areas, oak woodlands, southern oak riparian, and walnut. The results of surveys are shown in Map 4-10 of the Element. As shown on the map, the project site is located within a chaparral community; however, the project site is already developed and no new undeveloped area will be added as part of the proposed improvements.

The Element also includes information on the open space areas within Glendale identified by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Natural Diversity Data Base and the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning "Significant Ecological Area" (SEA) program. The Natural Diversity Data Base and SEA program analyze biotic resources and identify areas with sensitive plant and animal communities. Map 4-13, "Southern Oak Riparian Forest," shows the findings of the Natural Diversity Data Base, and Map 4-12 illustrates the locations of Glendale's Significant Ecological Areas. The project site is not located within the Significant Ecological Area (SEA) or within a Southern Oak Riparian Forest. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to have a significant impact on biological resources.

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 project site is presently a developed site located at the terminus of a fire road accessed through Marengo Drive or Glenoaks Boulevard via Scholl Canyon landfill. The property surrounding the site includes vacant open space land and the Scholl Canyon Landfill. The nearest single-family residences are approximately 2,200 feet away to the northeast. There are no known riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities that may be affected by the project. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is neither in proximity to, nor does it contain, wetland habitat or a blue-line stream. No federally protected wetlands are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present on or adjacent to the project site. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The 23.4 acre site is primarily undeveloped open space except for Flint Peak which contains broadcast towers, monopoles and equipment buildings which are surrounded by an eight-foot high security fence. A series of broadcast facilities within the fenced area has continuously occupied Flint Peak since the 1950s. The proposed project will be located within the existing security fence. It would not result in any barrier to the movement of wildlife since the security fence has been in place for several decades. Therefore, no impact will occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Glendale Municipal Code, Section 12.44 specifically protects six different native or "indigenous" species of trees that include the Coast Live Oak, Valley Oak, Mesa Oak, Scrub Oak, California Sycamore and California Bay. There are no protected trees located on or within twenty feet of Flint Peak where the proposed development will be located. As a result, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No Mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. No adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plan has been adopted to include the project site. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any such plans. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

No Impact. The project site is currently developed with six towers, two unstaffed equipment buildings and an equipment enclosure surrounded within a security fence. The proposed project will remove the 100-foot high H-frame tower, the 79-foot and 58-foot high wooden monopoles, and construct two new broadcast towers and an accessory unmanned communications building. The remainder of the towers, monopoles, equipment buildings and equipment enclosure will remain. No historic resources have been identified on this site and the property is not within a historic district. No impact to a historical resource would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites are not known to exist within the project area. The City's Open Space and Conservation Element indicate that no significant archaeological sites have been identified in this area of Glendale. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Plant and animal fossils are typically found within sedimentary rock deposits. Most of the City of Glendale consists of igneous and metamorphic rock, and the local area is not known to contain paleontological resources. Nonetheless, paleontological resources may possibly exist at deep levels and could be unearthed with implementation of the Project. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during the Project-related subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until a

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the City's Safety Element (August 2003), the subject site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Based on the available geologic data, active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are not known to be located directly beneath or projecting toward the project site. Therefore, impacts from the rupture of a seismic fault are considered to be less than significant.

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

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No Impact. The project site is not located within an area prone to liquefaction as indicated in the City's Safety Element (August 2003). Therefore, no impacts associated with liquefaction would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) Landslides?

Less than Significant Impact. The subject property is located in the San Rafael Hills where landslide activity has been identified; however, Flint Peak is not located in a landslide hazard area. Therefore, no significant landslide impacts are anticipated to occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed plan for the construction of two new towers and an ancillary equipment building will require 407 cubic yards of cut of the slope. Soils on the project site would only be exposed for a limited amount of time during site preparation activities; thus, substantial erosion is not expected to occur. An erosion control plan, subject to review and approval by the City Engineer, will be required prior to any construction-related activities. Further, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the Glendale Municipal Code Section 13.42.060 to 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 that can be caused by tectonic forces deep within the earth or by consolidation and densification of sediments sometimes due to withdrawal of fluids such as groundwater. The project site is not located in an area of significant subsidence activity and would not include fluid withdrawal or removal. In addition, as indicated in Response F-1 (iii), above, the soil under the project site is not prone to liquefaction. Therefore, impacts related to unstable soils are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The soils underlying the project site and surrounding area are considered to have a low expansion potential. In addition, development of the project will be required to comply with applicable building codes which would minimize structural damage to buildings and ensure safety in the event of a moderate or major earthquake. No significant impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project site will not be connected to the City's sewer system since the equipment buildings are not staffed. No septic tanks will be utilized as part of the project. 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. CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064.7) provide that, when available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make determinations of significance for greenhouse gas emissions. Neither the City of Glendale nor the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has adopted specific thresholds of significance for impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions or global climate change. The SCAQMD did establish a working group that came up with recommended thresholds, which are utilized in this analysis.

The SCAQMD has released Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold for Stationary Sources, Rules and Plans (December 2008), which includes a GHG emissions threshold of 10,000 metric tons (MT) of CO2 equivalents (CO2e) per year to determine the significance of industrial Project GHG impacts. This is consistent with the threshold used by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District. A threshold of 3,000 MT CO2e/year is also suggested for residential projects. SCAQMD recommends that GHG emissions from construction be amortized over 30 years and added to operational GHG emissions in order to determine the overall Project impact.

Please note that "CO2 equivalents" (CO2e) is the quantity of CO2 that would cause the same level climate change as a given type and quantity of a GHG emission. This variation of effect between gases is also known as global warming potential (GWP). For example, one unit of methane emissions has the same GWP as 21 units of carbon dioxide. Therefore, one (1) metric ton of methane is equivalent to 21 metric tons of CO2e. Emissions of multiple types of GHGs are represented collectively in units of CO2e.

Construction Phase Impacts:

GHG emissions from construction occur as a result of fuel combustion in heavy duty off-road equipment. Construction activities would be temporary in nature (approximately 10 weeks). As described above, GHG emissions from construction are supposed to be amortized over a 30-year period and added to operational emissions to determine significance. GHG emissions were calculated using CalEEMod. The output of the model is attached. CalEEMod predicts that the Project will generate 47.2674 MT of CO2e construction emissions total. Per SCAQMD methodologies, this total is divided by 30 and added to the operational GHG emissions presented in the operation phase section below.

Operation Related Impacts:

Once construction activities are complete, the only direct source of GHG emissions associated with the project will be from maintenance vehicles traveling to and from the transmission facility. Indirect emissions are included with direct emissions for the GHG impacts. Operational GHG emissions calculations are presented in Attachment C. Total operation phase GHG emissions generated by Project direct and indirect sources are 43.5244 MT CO2e/year. Adding the operational GHG emissions to the construction GHG emissions, amortized over a 30-year period, the total Project GHG emissions are 45.09998 MT CO2e/year. This is well below the significance threshold of 3,000 MT CO2e/year selected for the Project.

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?

No Impact. For the reasons discussed in 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 impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

H. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project involves the removal of three towers and the construction of two new ones and an equipment building on a site that has been developed with broadcast and transmission towers and buildings since the 1950s. This type of development and operation does not involve any use, routine transport, or disposal of hazardous materials and no new hazardous materials will be generated at the site.

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 broadcast facilities 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 meafsures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would be required to comply with all applicable rules established by the SCAQMD, including Rules 403, during construction that would prevent dust from migrating beyond the project site. Compliance with these rules will result in a less than significant impact.

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

No Impact. There are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

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

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

No Impact. No private airstrips are located in the City of Glendale or in the vicinity of the Project site. No impact would occur.

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

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

No Impact. There is no “City Disaster Response Route” located on any streets adjacent to the project site. The nearest designated streets are Glenoaks Boulevard and East Chevy Chase Drive, as identified in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). Verdugo Road, a “County Evacuation Route”, is accessed from either of the two designated streets listed above. The proposed project does not involve any changes to these streets nor would the project result in the alteration of an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. As such, no impacts to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project is located within a "Fire Hazard Area" and would be required to comply with Glendale Fire Department (GFD) brush clearance requirements. The brush clearance requirements call for the removal of continuous stands of brush and all dead vegetation 100 feet from any structure. The project will be required to comply with the GFD brush clearance requirements throughout the life of the project. Since there are only unstaffed buildings on the site, no impacts are anticipated.

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. The project site consists of mostly open space areas occupied with natural vegetation. The proposed project involves removal of three broadcast towers and the construction of two new ones along with an unstaffed equipment building on a 23.4 acre property. With the exception of the new 1,750 square foot unstaffed communications building, the amount of hardscape proposed on the project site would be similar to current on-site conditions. As a result, the project will minimally interfere with groundwater recharge.

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 mostly ungraded open space area presently occupied by an array of broadcast and transmission facilities including towers and monopoles ranging in height from 58-feet to 160-feet and three unstaffed equipment buildings. Currently, water which falls on the project site is either absorbed into the ground on-site or will run off the hillsides. This project would not significantly change as a result of the project because the new towers and unstaffed equipment building will be essentially located on previously graded flat areas, and the amount of hardscape will largely remain the same.

Furthermore, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the NPDES Permit set forth by the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB), and to prepare and submit a stormwater pollution prevention plan (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. 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. The SWPPP would incorporate BMPs by requiring controls of pollutant discharges that utilize BAT and BCT to reduce pollutants. In addition, in accordance with Chapter 13.42, Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Control and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan of the Glendale Municipal Code, a SUSMP containing design features and BMPs to reduce post-construction pollutants in stormwater discharges would be required as part of the project. Consequently, impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. According to Federal Emergency Management Agency flood hazard maps, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. As indicated in Response I-7 above, the project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain or other flood hazard area, as shown on the latest FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

10) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

J. LAND USE AND PLANNING

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

1) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. Flint Peak is located on the highest point of an undeveloped open space property consisting of 23.4 acres. The property is surrounded by vacant open space and the Scholl Canyon Landfill. The nearest residential buildings are approximately 2,200 feet away to the east. Flint Peak is accessed from Marengo Drive or Glenoaks Boulevard via the Scholl Canyon landfill. It is developed with broadcast towers and unstaffed equipment buildings and surrounded by security fencing. The proposed project includes removing three towers, constructing two new ones and constructing an unstaffed equipment building. 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 zoning designation on the project site is ROS (Residential Open Space) and the General Plan designation is Residential Open Space. The City's Zoning Code requires approval of a conditional use permit when a transmission facility is located in the ROS Zone. A conditional use permit is also required by the Subdivision Code when a transmission facility is located on a protected ridgeline. The purpose of the conditional use permit process is to consider whether certain uses, because of their particular characteristics, will be suitable and compatible at a specific location within their surroundings. The project also requires approval of variances for the height of the two new towers that will replace three existing ones. Broadcast and transmission towers, monopoles and equipment buildings have occupied Flint Peak since the 1950s. All the existing towers exceed the 15-height limit in order to be above the surrounding natural and man-made obstructions so there can be a clear unobstructed line of sight to meet broadcast objectives. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact since the two new towers and an unstaffed equipment building are similar in size and use to the existing facilities that have historically operated at this site. Furthermore, the project upgrade removes three tower/monopoles and replaces them with two which is an overall reduction of one.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site and immediate area are not located in an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan area. As such, implementation of the project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

K. MINERAL RESOURCES

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

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

No Impact. The project site is located in an area that may contain mineral deposits the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data as indicated in the City's Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993). Although data evaluating deposits is not available, the project site is already developed with broadcast towers and equipment buildings. The development will occur within the developed area on top of Flint Peak. A less than significant impact would occur as a result of the project.

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?

Less than Significant Impact.

Per the City's Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993), the State Geologist has mapped the Glendale area for aggregate resources. Aggregate includes rock, sand and gravel, which is primarily used for construction and the manufacturing of concrete. Since aggregate is readily available and currently mined nearby in Lake View Terrace, Sun Valley and Irwindale, it does not appear likely that Glendale will have a need to develop its potential mineral resources. A less than significant impact would occur as a result of the project.

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			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
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 proposed project involves removal of three towers and the construction of two new ones and an unstaffed equipment building on Flint Peak located within a 23.4 acre property. The new towers and equipment building would be constructed consistent with the building code and, therefore, short-term construction noise levels are not expected to exceed the standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. In addition, the surrounding land is vacant open space and the nearest residential buildings are 2,200 feet away to the east. No significant 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.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A temporary periodic increase in ambient noise would occur during construction activities associated with the proposed project. Noise from construction activities would be generated by vehicles and equipment involved during various stages of construction operations: site grading, foundation, and building construction. The noise levels created by construction equipment will vary depending on factors such as the type of equipment and the specific model, the mechanical/operational condition of the equipment and the type of operation being performed. Short-term noise impacts could occur as a result of construction activities. All development within the project site will be required to comply with the City of Glendale Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 8.36), which prohibits construction activities except between the hours of 7:00 p.m. on one day and 7:00 a.m. of the next day or from 7:00 p.m. on Saturday to 7:00 a.m. on Monday or from 7:00 p.m. preceding a holiday. Compliance with the City's noise ordinance would ensure that noise impacts will be less than significant

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

M. POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. The area immediately adjacent the 23.4 acre property is vacant open space zoned either for special recreation or single-family hillside residences. The new development is located on Flint Peak where existing broadcast and transmission facilities have operated since the 1950s. The proposed broadcast facilities are a permitted use subject to the approval of a conditional use permit. As broadcast facilities are not considered growth inducing, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. No existing housing will be removed as part of the proposed project. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The subject site is currently developed with broadcast facilities; as such, no residents would be displaced as a result of the proposed project. No 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 nearest fire station is Station 23 located at 3303 E. Chevy Chase Drive near the northeasterly City boundary. The project will be required to comply with the Uniform Fire Code by providing either a fire sprinkler system or a self-contained fire extinguishing system when the Glendale Fire Department reviews plans during the plan check process. In addition, the property owner will be required to comply with GFD brush clearance requirements. Impacts to fire protection are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b) Police protection?

Less than Significant Impact. The Glendale Police Department (GPD) provides police services to the project site. The nearest police facility is located at 131 North Isabel Street. The project consists of removing three broadcast towers and constructing two new ones and an unstaffed equipment building. The improvements will be located with other broadcast facilities on Flint Peak in an undeveloped area of the City. No population increase would result from the proposed project; therefore, it would not have a significant impact on police services.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c) Schools?

No Impact. Section 65995 of the Government Code provides that school districts can collect a fee on a per square foot basis for new residential units or additions to existing units to assist in the construction of or additions to schools. Since no residential development is associated with this project and no permanent new jobs would be created, payment of these fees under the provisions of Government Code Section 65995.5 would not be required; therefore, no impact would occur to schools.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d) Parks?

No Impact. The proposed project would not involve the development or displacement of a park. The subject site is not planned for use as a park. The property is zoned ROS for single-family residential use; however, no residential development is associated with the project. The development will remove three existing broadcast towers and replace them with two new ones and an unstaffed equipment building. The proposed project would not contribute to additional need for parks. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e) Other public facilities?

No Impact. The project site is undeveloped and vacant open space. It is zoned ROS for single-family development. Transmission and broadcast facilities are allowed in this zone with the approval

of a conditional use permit. Currently, Flint Peak is already developed with several towers and monopoles and communications buildings. The project proposal will be to remove three broadcast towers and construct two new ones and an unstaffed equipment building. As a result, the proposed project can be adequately served by existing public facilities. No impact would occur.

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 project site is undeveloped and zoned for single-family use. The project consists of removing three towers and constructing two new ones and an unstaffed equipment building. No residential dwelling is associated with this project. The proposed project is not anticipated to significantly increase the demand on existing parks. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The project consists of removing three towers and constructing two new ones and an unstaffed equipment building. No residential dwellings and no recreational facilities are included in the proposed project. As indicated in Response O-1 above, the broadcast facility project is not anticipated to increase the demand on existing parks. No 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	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
3. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
4. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
5. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
6. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

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

Less than Significant Impact. The project consists of removing three towers and constructing two new ones and an unstaffed equipment building. The project site is generally located beyond the gated terminus of East Glenoaks Boulevard on Flint Peak. Entrance to the Project site is provided by the Radio Lateral fire road via East Glenoaks Boulevard or Marengo Drive. Construction activities for the proposed project would generate additional traffic as a result of employee vehicle trips and construction truck transport of equipment and building material during the 10 week construction period; however, will not exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system. Because Scholl Canyon Landfill is within a mile distance from the project site and can be accessed by East Glenoaks and/or fire roads behind locked gates prohibiting access by the general public, the disposal of demolition materials and export of soil/material will not interfere with public streets. No changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the project. As a result, no significant impacts to emergency access are anticipated. Less than significant impact would occur.

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

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed above in Response P-1, the proposed project would not result in any significant increase in traffic on the area roadway network. Less than significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in P-1 above, the project site is located beyond the gated terminus of East Glenoaks Boulevard on Flint Peak. Entrance to the Project site is provided by the Radio Lateral fire road via East Glenoaks Boulevard or Marengo Drive. Construction activities for the proposed project would generate additional traffic as a result of employee vehicle trips and construction truck transport of equipment and building material during the 10 week construction period; however, will not exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system. Because Scholl Canyon Landfill is within a mile distance from the project site and can be accessed by East Glenoaks and/or fire roads behind locked gates prohibiting access by the general public, the disposal of demolition materials and export of soil/material will not interfere with public streets. No changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the project. As a result, no significant impacts to emergency access are anticipated. Less than significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The 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 impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Q. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. 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 within the 30-days of notice.

As indicated in Response E-4 above, 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).

***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 within the 30-days of notice. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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 an SUSMP to mitigate urban stormwater runoff. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant would be required to satisfy the

requirements related to the payment of fees and/or the provisions of adequate wastewater facilities. The proposed project would comply with the RWCQB-established waste discharge prohibitions and water quality objectives, which will be incorporated into the proposed project as a project design feature. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Runoff from the project site is absorbed into the ground on-site or will run off the hillsides. The proposed project slight increase in runoff would not require any substantial changes to the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area, nor would it affect the capacity of the existing storm drain system. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would require the use of water for dust control and cleanup purposes. The use of water during construction would be short term in nature. Therefore, construction activities are not considered to result in a significant impact on the existing water system or available water supplies.

Water is not provided to the project site and no new water supplies are anticipated for the proposed project. No impact to the availability of water is anticipated since no residential development is associated with this development and Flint Peak is located in an area with natural open space hillside vegetation that does not require maintenance beyond providing a self-contained fire extinguishing system and compliance with the high fire area hazard abatement programs.

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. The proposed unstaffed equipment building would not create an increase in the generation of wastewater and will comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to wastewater. No impacts would occur.

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.

The proposed towers and equipment buildings will be unmanned. As a result, operational solid waste disposal for the proposed project is minimal. During the construction phase, the removal and disposal of an existing 100-foot high H-frame tower and the 79-foot and 58-foot high wooden monopoles will occur. Solid waste generated on the project site could be deposited at the Scholl Canyon Landfill (owned by the City of Glendale) or at one of the landfills located within the County of Los Angeles. The annual disposal rate at the Scholl Canyon facility is 200,000 tons per year. As a result, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

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?

No Impact. The project site is mostly ungraded open space area with presently occupied by an array of broadcast and transmission facilities including towers and monopoles ranging in height from 58-feet to 160-feet and three unstaffed equipment buildings. The location of the proposed towers

and equipment building will be located at previously graded areas on the site. No biological species or habitats for biological species are known to exist on site or within the project vicinity. In addition, no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plans apply to the project site. As such, the proposed project would not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Furthermore, the proposed project would not have the potential to eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory, including historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant environmental impacts that have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. No impact would occur.

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

Less than Significant Impact.

Cumulative impacts may occur when the proposed project in conjunction with one or more related projects would yield an impact that is greater than what would occur with the development of only the proposed project. The proposed project is a consolidation of broadcast equipment on Flint Peak and involves: constructing new 140-foot and 160-foot high broadcast towers; constructing a new 1,750 square foot, 15-foot high unstaffed communications building; and removal of the 100-foot high H-frame tower and the 79-foot and 58-foot high wooden monopoles. As a result, the incremental effect of the new towers is not cumulatively considerable. All environmental issues considered in this Initial Study were found to have either no impact or a less than significant impact. As discussed in Section G (Greenhouse Gas Emissions), the project would not exceed State or regional thresholds for the emission of criteria air pollutants or greenhouse gases. With regard to cumulative effects for the issues of agricultural, biological, and mineral resources, the location for the new towers and equipment building on the project site will take place on previously disturbed areas occurred by existing broadcast towers and equipment. Thus, no cumulative impact to these resources would occur. Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials are generally confined to a specific site and do not affect off-site areas.

Therefore, the proposed project would have not cumulatively considerable effects, and as such, cumulative impacts would not occur.

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

Less than Significant Impact. This Project is to construct a 140-foot and 160-foot high broadcast towers and 1,750 square foot unstaffed communications building. As mentioned in Response P-1, , no increase of traffic would occur because the facility will be unmanned. The overall number of employment opportunities resulting from this development will not lead to a significant number of new workers moving to the area. The duration for construction will be approximately ten weeks and will be temporary. Therefore, the project is not considered growth inducing and will not directly or indirectly lead to increased population that would generate additional calls for fire, paramedic or police services.

Development of the proposed Project would not create direct and indirect adverse effects on humans. Less than significant impact would occur.

13. Earlier Analyses

None.

14. Project References Used to Prepare Initial Study Checklist

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

1. The City of Glendale's *General Plan,* "Open Space and Conservation Element," as amended.
2. California Department of Conservation, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program,* Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2010 (September 2011).
3. South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning* (May 2005).
4. City of Glendale, *General Plan, "*Safety Element" (2003).
5. California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State of California General Plan Guidelines (October 2003).
6. City of Glendale Municipal Code, as amended.
7. California Emissions Estimator Module (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) Report.
8.