PROPOSED
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Parcel Map GLN 1637
Case Nos. PPM 1804173 and PVAR 1817259
601 – 603 Bohlig Road

The following Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.	
Project Title/Common Name:	Parcel Map GLN 1637
Project Location:	601 – 603 Bohlig Road, Glendale, Los Angeles County
Project Description: The proposed project includes a parcel map application to re-subdivide five existing parcels, with a combine total of 23,866 square feet, into two parcels. Upon creation of the two parcels, the proposed project includes the demolition of an existing house (built in 1953) and the construction of a new 3-story, 4,152 square-foot single-family house and an attached three-car garage on Parcel 1 (601 Bohlig Rd.) and a new 3-story, 2,529 square-foot single-family house with an attached two-car garage on Parcel 2 (603 Bohlig Rd.). The applicant is also requesting an exception from the subdivision code to allow the creation of two new residential parcels that are less than the 30,000 square-foot average required for new parcels created and less than the neighborhood average lot size within 500 feet. Also, Parcel 2 will be less than the minimum lot size of 12,000 square feet required for newly created parcels and will provide dual frontage (Bohlig Rd. and Melwood Dr.). As proposed, the new residences will require approval of variances from the Zoning Ordinance as follows: 601 Bohlig Road will require variances to reduce the front setback, exceed height and number of stories, and reduce the driveway length; and 603 Bohlig Road requires variances to reduce the front and interior setback and reduce the driveway length in the R1R zone. The average current slope for 601 Bohlig Road is 34.96% and 67.46% for 603 Bohlig Road. Total proposed grading for the entire site is 2,087 cubic yards of cut and 90 cubic yards of fill. There are 11 oak trees identified on or within 20 feet of the subject site. Out of the 11 oak trees, seven are protected by the City's Indigenous Tree Protection Ordinance. As proposed, five protected oak trees will be preserved and two protected trees that will be compromised due to grading and/or construction will be removed and four oak trees less than six inches in diameter will be removed. In addition, four oak trees less than six inches in diameter will be removed. Future residential development on the newly created lots will require approval by the Design Review Board.	
Project Type:	☒ Private Project ☐ Public Project
Project Applicant:	Alen Malekian & Anet Minasian 2255 Honolulu Ave. #1A Montrose, CA 91020 Phone: (818) 249-5522
Findings:	The Director of the Community Development, on **March 4, 2019**, after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Division, found that the above referenced project, as mitigated would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be prepared.
Mitigation Measures:	See attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).
Attachments:	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Philip Lanzafame, Director of Community Development City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386

	Tel: (818) 548-2140; Fax: (818) 240-0392

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

The following mitigation measure shall apply to the Parcel Map GLN 1637 project located at 601-603 Bohlig Road to reduce identified impacts to less than significant levels.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

MM-1 The applicant shall comply with all Recommendations and Construction Impact Guidelines for Pre-Construction, During-Construction and Post Construction included in the arborist report prepared by James Komen, dated July 18, 2018.

MM-2 An Indigenous Tree Permit shall be obtained prior to building permit issuance. The approved Indigenous Tree Permit shall be maintained on the project site at all times and shall be presented upon request to any City official.

Timing: Prior to Building Permit issuance
During all site preparation and construction activities

Responsibility: Director of Public Works
Project applicant

CULTURAL RESOURCES

MM-3 If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 60-foot buffer of the find) shall cease and the County coroner shall be contacted. If the human remains provide to be Native American in origin by the County Coroner, the applicant shall immediately notify the lead agency and all consulting Tribes.

MM-4 In the event that Native American cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall assess the find. The Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians shall be contracted to consult if any such find occurs. The archaeologist shall complete all relevant California State Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 Series forms to document the find and submit this documentation to the applicant, Lead Agency and the FTBMI. If the Native American cultural resource is determined to be significant, as defined by consulting Tribes, a Native American monitor procured by the FTBMI shall be present for all ground disturbing activities that occur within the proposed project area.

- The archaeologist and Tribal monitor will have the authority to request ground disturbing activities cease within the area of a discovery to assess and document potential finds in real time.
- The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with FTBMI on the disposition and treatment of any artifacts or other cultural materials encountered during the project.

Timing: During all site preparation and construction activities

Responsibility: Project applicant

Agreement to Proposed Mitigation Measures and Mitigation Monitoring Program

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

Dated: _____ _____

Signature(s) of the Project Applicant(s)

Dated: _____ _____

Signature(s) of the Project Applicant(s)

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Parcel Map GLN 1637
Case Nos. PPM 1804173 and PVAR 1817259
601 – 603 Bohlig Road

1.	**Project Title:** Parcel Map GLN 1637
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:** Milca Toledo, Senior Planner Tel: (818) 548-2115 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	**Project Location:** 601 and 603 Bohlig Road, Glendale, Los Angeles County
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Alan Malekian & Anet Minasian 2255 Honolulu Ave. #1A Montrose, CA 91020 Phone: (818) 249-5522
6.	**General Plan Designation:** Very Low Density Residential
7.	**Zoning:** R1R, Restricted Residential Zone, Floor Area Ratio District II
8.	**Description of the Project:** The proposed project includes a parcel map application to re-subdivide five existing parcels, with a combine total of 23,866 square feet, into two parcels. Upon creation of the two parcels, the proposed project includes the demolition of an existing house (built in 1953) and the construction of a new 3-story, 4,152 square-foot single-family house and an attached three-car garage on Parcel 1 (601 Bohlig Rd.) and a new 3-story, 2,529 square-foot single-family house with an attached two-car garage on Parcel 2 (603 Bohlig Rd.). The applicant is also requesting an exception from the subdivision code to allow the creation of two new residential parcels that are less than the 30,000 square-foot average required for new parcels and less than the neighborhood average lot size within 500 feet. Also, Parcel 2 will be less than the minimum lot size of 12,000 square feet required for newly created parcels and will provide dual frontage (Bohlig Rd. and Melwood Dr.). As proposed, the new residences will require approval of variances from the Zoning Ordinance as follows: 601 Bohlig Road will require variances to reduce the front setback, exceed height and number of stories, and reduce the driveway length and 603 Bohlig Road will request variances to reduce the front and interior setback and reduce the driveway length in the R1R zone. The average current slope for 601 Bohlig Road is 34.96% and 67.46% for 603 Bohlig Road. Total proposed grading for the entire site is 2,087 cubic yards of cut and 90 cubic yards of fill. There are 11 oak trees identified on or within 20 feet of the subject site. Out of the 11 oak trees, seven are protected by the City's Indigenous Tree Protection Ordinance. As proposed, five protected oak trees will be preserved and two protected trees that will be compromised due to grading and/or construction will be removed and four oak trees less than six inches in diameter will be removed. Future residential development on the lots will require approval by the Design Review Board.
9.	**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *North:* Residential *South:* Residential *East:* Residential

	West: Residential
10.	**Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).** None

11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

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

LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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

Prepared by: _____ Date: 3/4/19

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.

Director of Community Development: _____ Date: 3/4/19

12. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

A. AESTHETICS

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The surrounding area is developed with single-family hillside residences. Presently, the property addressed as 601 Bohlig Road is developed with a single-family residence and the remainder of the property is undeveloped. No scenic vistas, as identified in the Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993), exist within or in proximity to the project site. Once subdivided, the any new residence will require approval of the Design Review Board.

The subject property is not located on a primary ridgeline. No scenic vistas exist within, or in proximity to the project site. Therefore, no significant impacts on a scenic vista will occur.

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. There are no state scenic highways within the City of Glendale. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway. No impacts would occur.

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

Less Than Significant Impact.

The area surrounding the project site includes vacant lands and single-family residences, which are located to the north, south, east and west of the subject property. The existing residences along Bohlig Road were constructed between the 1950's and 1990's.

The building footprint for new residences will be situated towards the front of the property and will be set back approximately 9'-5" for the property at 601 Bohlig Road and 4'-9" for 603 Bohlig Road and more than 15 feet from Melwood Drive. The residences will be located in the lower elevations and built into the natural slope. The design of the new homes on the each lot will require Design Review Board approval. The Board will review the site planning, mass and scale, architecture, materials and landscaping to ensure the project's design is compatible with the surrounding built environment.

There are Coast Live Oak trees throughout the site and on adjacent lots, within close proximity to the subject property. According to the Indigenous Tree Report submitted by the applicant for this project and prepared by James Komen, Class One Arboriculture Inc. dated July 18, 2018, there are 11 oak trees identified on or within 20 feet of the subject site. Out of the 11 oak trees, seven are protected by the City's Indigenous Tree Protection Ordinance. Two of the protected trees are growing on the adjacent parcels, four oaks are less than 6-inches in diameter, so they are not protected by the ordnance and one tree, larger than 6-inches in diameter, is dead and should be removed. One living protected tree, Tree No. 25, is proposed to be removed because it is located within the footprint of the proposed construction/grading activity on Lot 2. Also, the property has many other tree species and native shrubs and grasses. Some trees that are not protected by the Indigenous Tree ordinance will be removed. Oak trees located on the neighboring properties are outside the development footprint of the proposed residences and will be preserved. The City's urban forester reviewed plans and the arborist report prepared for the project. The applicant will be required to comply with all Recommendations and Construction Impact Guidelines for Pre-Construction, During-Construction and Post Construction included in the arborist report prepared by James Komen, dated July 18, 2018. Impacts to visual character and quality of the site caused by the construction of the residence would be less than significant.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

C. AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed re-subdivison of the existing five lots would create two new lots for the construction of two new single-family houses. Only minimal construction impacts are expected with the demolition of the existing house, grading and construction of two new homes. The average current slope for 601 Bohlig Road is 34.96% and 67.46% for 603 Bohlig Road. Total proposed grading for the entire site is 2,087 cubic yards of cut and 90 cubic yards of fill. The proposed project would not result in any significant increase in criteria pollutants or contribute to an existing air quality violation or exceed SCAQMD threshold. Additionally, the project will be required to comply with all applicable rules to reduce construction impacts. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if objectionable odors are generated that would adversely impact sensitive receptors. During the construction phase, activities associated with the operation of construction equipment may produce discernible odors typical of most construction sites. Although these odors could be a source of nuisance to adjacent receptors, they are temporary and intermittent in nature given the scope of the project. As construction-related emissions dissipate, the odors associated with these emissions would also decrease, dilute and become unnoticeable. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is not located within any significant vegetation community, including chaparral areas, oak woodlands and southern oak riparian as shown in Map 4-9 of the City's Open Space and Conservation Element. Also, the project site is not located within any Significant Ecological Area (SEA) as shown in Map 4-12 of the Element. 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. No riparian habitat and/or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are present onsite or adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located in a developed area where there are many constraints to wildlife movement. Existing and proposed development and associated fencing severely limit wildlife movement. Consequently, wildlife movement on the project site is limited to local movement of wildlife within the immediate vicinity. Construction of two single-family residents would not result in any significant barrier to wildlife moving through the area and therefore, no adverse effect on regional movement corridors would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

There are Coast Live Oak trees throughout the site and on adjacent lots, within close proximity to the subject property. According to the Indigenous Tree Report submitted by the applicant for this project and prepared by James Komen, Class One Arboriculture Inc. dated July 18, 2018, there are 11 oak trees identified on or within 20 feet of the subject site. Out of the 11 oak trees, seven are protected by the City's Indigenous Tree Protection Ordinance. Two of the protected trees are growing on the adjacent parcels and four are less than 6-inches in diameter, and one tree, is in bad health and should be removed. Tree no. 25, which is protected by ordinance, is proposed to be removed because it is located within the footprint of the proposed development on Lot 2. Oak trees located on the neighboring properties are outside the development footprint of the proposed residences and will be preserved. The City's urban forester reviewed plans and the arborist report prepared for the project. The applicant will be required to comply with all Recommendations and Construction Impact Guidelines for Pre-Construction, During-Construction and Post Construction included in the arborist report prepared by James Komen, dated July 18, 2018. Further, the City's urban forester determined that the proposed tree mitigation per the Indigenous Tree ordinance for the two protected tree removals will be determined upon review of the landscaping plan. Mitigation measures have been added to the project to further reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measure would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

MM-1 The applicant shall comply with all Recommendations and Construction Impact Guidelines for Pre-Construction, During-Construction and Post Construction included in the arborist report prepared by James Komen, dated July 18, 2018.

MM-2 An Indigenous Tree Permit shall be obtained prior to building permit issuance. The approved Indigenous Tree Permit shall be maintained on the project site at all times and shall be presented upon request to any City official.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

No Impact. The single-family dwelling located at 601 Bohlig Road (built in 1953) that is proposed to be demolished is not identified as a historic resource. The proposed re-subdivision and development would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. 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 mitigations measures identified below, 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 with Mitigation Incorporated. 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 mitigation measures identified below, 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 with Mitigation Incorporated. 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).

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

MM – 3 In the event that archaeological and/or paleontological 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.

MM – 4 In the event that resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work must be temporarily suspended or redirected until NAHC has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume.

F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Geologic and Soils Engineering Exploration report dated December 8, 2017, the subject property is located within an active seismic region. The mapped fault closes to the project site is the Verdugo Fault, a Holocene to Late Quaternary fault, located approximately 1,700 feet southwest of the site according to Dibblee and approximately 1,550 feet southwest of the site according to Jennings and Bryant, 2010. However, the site is not located within a currently-designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (CGS, 2000) and does not represent a fault rupture hazard to the proposed development. Based on the available geologic data, active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are not known to be located directly beneath or projecting toward the project site. Therefore, the potential for surface rupture as a result of fault plane displacement is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

ii) ***Strong seismic ground shaking?***

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iii) ***Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?***

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) ***Landslides?***

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Per the Geologic and Soils Engineering Exploration report dated December 8, 2017, slopes analyzed for stability show that the existing slopes are grossly stable with a factor of safety in excess of 1.5. As noted in their findings, the recommended bearing material is bedrock. Conventional foundations may be used to support portions of the residence provided the footings are adequately setback from descending slopes and from retaining walls. Deepened foundations are recommended for the southern portions of the residence on the easterly lot (parcel 1) to ensure embedment below a 1:1 plane from the bottom of the subterranean garage. Soils to be

exposed at finished grade will be in the non-expansion range. Geotechnical issues affecting the project include the presence of old uncertified fill and deep excavations.

Shoring, consisting of soldier piles, will be required to support the majority of the temporary excavations for the garages and for the portions of the residence with basement where slope trimming is not feasible or desired. The remaining portion of the existing road cut should be trimmed back to gradient no steeper than 1 ¼:1. Any fill mantling the descending slope should be removed or trimmed to a gradient no steeper than 2:1. The garage roofs should be designed as structural slabs capable of supporting the future backfill.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As part of the Geologic and Soils Engineering Exploration report dated December 8, 2017, a swell test was performed using the procedures outlined in ASTM D 4829-11. Based upon the testing, the earth materials are expected to exhibit a low expansion potential. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soil would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

G. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. 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 6-months). 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 resident vehicles traveling to and from the existing and future residence. 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?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would be required to comply with all applicable rules established by the SCAQMD, including Rule 403 and 402, during the future construction phases of the project that would prevent dust from migrating beyond the project site. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. There are no schools located within ¼ mile of the project site. In addition, as indicated in Response H-1 above, single-family residential uses do not involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of significant amounts of hazardous materials. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is neither located within an airport land use plan nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest public airport or public use airport to the project site is the Hollywood Burbank Airport located approximately 10 miles to the northwest. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, Brand Boulevard located approximately 1.2 miles south of the project site is a City Disaster Response Route. Implementation of the proposed project would neither result in a reduction of the number of lanes along this roadway nor result in the placement of an impediment to the flow of traffic. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

requirements, and public awareness. In order to minimize damage due to fire, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable fire prevention, vegetation management, and construction requirements. Therefore, impacts related to exposure to wildland fire hazards would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

I. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As part of Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established regulations under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program to control direct storm water discharges. In Glendale, the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWCQB) administers the NPDES permitting program and is responsible for developing NPDES permitting requirements. The NPDES program regulates industrial pollutant discharges, including construction activities. Implementation of the proposed project will require compliance with all the NPDES requirements including the submittal and certification of plans and details showing both construction and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) that are integrated into the design of the project. The submittal of a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) approved by the City Engineer is also required to be integrated into the design of the project. Impacts related to water quality are considered to be less than significant with the compliance of all applicable permitting requirements.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is served by an existing storm water collection and conveyance system. The quantity of runoff would not change substantially with implementation of the proposed project, including future development of the two single-family residences. All runoff would continue to be conveyed via streets and gutters to storm drain facilities located near the project site. As a result, the proposed parcel map and subsequent development of two single-family residences 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 are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

10) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

J. LAND USE AND PLANNING

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

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

1) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. There is one existing single-family house on the project site. The proposal to re-subdivide five lots and the creation of two lots, demolition of one house, and development of two single-family houses are permitted uses in the zone in which is it located. No established community would be divided as a result of the project. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The current General Plan designation is Low Density Residential and the site is currently zoned R1R-II (Restricted Residential zone, Floor Area Ratio District II). The proposed use complies with the Land Use Element of the General Plan. The proposed project involves re-subdividing five lots and the creation of two lots in conjunction with the demolition of an existing house and construction of two new single-family dwelling units (one dwelling per lot). The uses are consistent with the zoning and general plan designation of the property.

The applicant is requesting an exception from the subdivision code to allow the creation of two new residential parcels that are less than the 30,000 square-foot average required for new parcels created and less than the neighborhood average lot size within 500 feet. Also, Parcel 2 will be less than the minimum lot size of 12,000 square-feet required for newly created parcels and will provide dual frontage (Bohlig Road and Melwood Drive). As proposed, the new residences will require approval of variances from the Zoning Ordinance as follows: 601 Bohlig Road will require variances to reduce the front setback and driveway length and exceed height and number of stories and 603 Bohlig Road will request variances to reduce the setback (front and interior) and reduce the driveway length in the R1R zone. The variances are requested in order to minimize the amount grading at the rear of the lot and negatively impacting existing protected oak trees on and within 20 feet of the subject site. The proposed residences will be located towards the lower elevations and extending up the slope with the garage built into the natural slope. This design approach reduces potential visual impacts related to the development. As a result of the sensitivity towards the existing topography of the subject property, less than significant impact are anticipated.

Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. A portion of the project site and surrounding area have been developed and affected by past activities. The project site and immediate area are not located in an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan area. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan. 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 within Mineral Resource Zone-3 (MRZ-3), as defined in the City of Glendale General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element. The MRZ-3 zone is defined as an area where adequate information is not available to determine whether valuable mineral resources are deposited. However, the property at 601 Bohlig Road has been developed for several decades with a residential use, which has precluded its use for mineral extraction. While the remaining portions of the existing lots have remained undeveloped, it is not expected that the site contains mineral deposits. In addition, the site is zoned for residential uses. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. Please refer to Response K-2 above.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

L. NOISE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				X
2. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
3. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
4. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?				X

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

No Impact. The proposed project involves the re-subdivision of five lots to create two lots in conjunction with the construction of two new single-family dwellings. Single-family uses are permitted on the subject site, which is zoned R1R. Surrounding land uses include other single-family residences. The future demolition of an existing single-family and construction of two new single-family dwelling units (one dwelling per lot) would not generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Excessive ground borne vibration is typically associated with activities such as blasting used in mining operations, or the use of pile drivers during construction. The project would not require any blasting activities and any earth movement or grading activities associated with project construction and is not anticipated to require pile driving. Therefore, the project is not expected to generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No 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. There are no private airstrips located on or within the vicinity of the project site. 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)?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. There is one existing single-family dwelling currently on the project site proposed to be demolished on the lot addressed 601 Bohlig Road. As proposed, two new homes will be constructed, one on each parcel. Therefore, no housing or residential population would be displaced by development of the proposed subdivision, and the construction of replacement housing elsewhere would not be necessary. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

N. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Glendale Fire Department (GFD) provides comprehensive emergency services for the City of Glendale, including fire, rescue, and emergency medical (paramedic) services, as well as fire prevention and code enforcement functions. The project site is located between two fire stations, Fire Station No. 24, is located at 1734 Canada Blvd., approximately 2.3 miles northeast of the project site, and Fire Station No. 26, located at 1145 N. Brand Blvd., approximately 1.1 miles southwest of the project site. In the event that any of the units of Fire Station Nos. 24 or 26 are not available, other units would be available for dispatch from other GFD fire stations or adjacent jurisdictions.

The proposed project would add one additional single-family residence. This increase would not substantially affect provision of fire protection given that the project site is located close to existing

fire stations. Furthermore, compliance with the applicable Fire Code and the Building Code provisions would minimize the project's impact on fire services. The future development of the newly created lots will be required to meet all code provisions. As a result, the proposed project would be adequately served by existing fire stations and would not require the provision of any new fire stations or the expansion of existing fire stations. Therefore, the overall need for fire protection services is not expected to substantially increase. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Glendale Police Department (GPD) provides police protection services to the project site from its station at 131 North Isabel Street, approximately 1.9 miles to the south. The project can be adequately served by existing police protection services and is not anticipated to result in substantial adverse impacts. The overall need for police protection services is not expected to substantially increase as a result of the proposed project. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c) Schools?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d) Parks?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e) Other public facilities?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

O. RECREATION

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

P. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			X	
2. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
4. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
5. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
6. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) Result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact. No changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the project. Access to the property will be taken from Bohlig Road, which is a Local Street. No impacts to emergency assess would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding alternative transportation since no changes to the existing transportation policies, plans, or programs would result from project implementation. No 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 with Mitigation Incorporated. Written notice was given to the Fernandeño 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 30-days.

As indicated in Response E-4 above, impacts would be potentially significant if human remains are encountered during excavation and grading activities. State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then serve as a consultant on how to proceed with the remains (i.e., avoid removal or rebury).

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measure MM-3 identified above would address a potential substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.

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

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

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 Fernandeño 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 30-day. 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 storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
4. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
5. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
6. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
7. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

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		X		

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project would allow for the future development of two single-family residences in a single-family residential area. As described in Section D, Biological Resources, implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-1 and MM-2 would address protection of indigenous tree species such as the Coast Live Oak. As noted in Sections E and Q, Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources, no historical or archaeological resources were identified on site. Nevertheless, implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-3 and MM-4 would reduce impacts to unanticipated cultural resources to a less than significant level by providing a process for evaluating and, as necessary, avoiding impacts to any identified resources during construction. Impacts would be less than significant with the mitigation incorporated for Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Tribal Cultural Resources.

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

No Impact. Development of the proposed project will not substantially increase traffic nor would it result in a substantial increase in population, as this project will result in new single-family residential dwellings which are permitted in the zone. No impact would 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. Development of the proposed project would not create direct and indirect adverse effects on humans. Many of the less than significant impacts that were identified are considered short-term and no significant impacts are anticipated.

13. Earlier Analyses

None

14. Project References Used to Prepare Initial Study Checklist

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

1. The City of Glendale's General Plan, as amended.
2. The City of Glendale's Municipal Code, as amended.
3. "Guidelines of the City of Glendale for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended," August 19, 2003, City of Glendale Planning Division.
4. Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq and California Code of Regulations, Title 14 Section 15000 et seq.
5. *"CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook,"* updated October 2003, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
6. *"CEQA & Climate Change: Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act,"* California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA), January 2008.
7. Indigenous Tree Report prepared by James Komen, Class One Arboriculture Inc., July 18, 2018.
8. Geological and Soils Engineering Exploration Report, December 8, 2017.