PROPOSED
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
New Four Story Commercial Office Building
727 Sonora Avenue

The following Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.

Project Title/Common Name:	New Four Story Commercial Office Building
Project Location:	727 Sonora Avenue, Glendale, Los Angeles County

Project Description: The proposed project includes the development of a new four-story, 33,053 square-foot, commercial office building with a three-level subterranean garage with 91 parking spaces on a 12,482 square-foot parcel, located in the IND (Industrial) zone. The proposed project requires approval from the Design Review Board.

The project site is located at the mid-block of Sonora Avenue, between North San Fernando Road and Flower Street) and on the north side of the street. Surrounding the project site are other IND zoned properties with single-family residences/industrial to the north, and commercial/ industrial uses to the east, south, and west. The project site is developed with two, one-story industrial buildings (7,641 square-feet and 3,800 square-feet in area), constructed in 1945 and 1946, respectively. The existing two industrial office buildings will be demolished.

The project's construction will take place over a period of approximate 18 months. The amount of grading will be approximately 17,000 cubic yards (all export). Due to the nature of the project, excavation would not occur over the entire 18 month period, but would be concentrated over approximately two weeks within the first eight weeks. The primary inbound haul route to the project site is projected to be from the Western Avenue exit of the Interstate 5 Freeway, then right onto Flower Street, and then left onto Sonora Avenue. The same route would be used for outbound trucks. The north side (south bound) Sonora Avenue would be used as the staging area and parking during the construction period.

Project Type:		☒	Private Project	☐	Public Project

Project Applicant:	Rodney Khan c/o Khan Consulting 1111 North Brand Avenue, Suite 403 Glendale, CA 91202
Findings:	The Director of the Community Development, on **April 2, 2019**, after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Division, found that the above referenced project would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be prepared
Mitigation Measures:	See attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
Attachments:	Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Dennis Joe, Planner City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 548-8157; Fax: (818) 240-0392

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

The following mitigation measure shall apply to the proposed commercial office building located at 727 Sonora Avenue to reduce identified impacts to less than significant levels.

MM –1 The applicant shall comply with all guidelines recommended in the Report of Geotechnical Investigation prepared by AES, dated October 10, 2018.

Monitoring Action:	Compliance with October 10, 2018 Geotechnical Investigation
Timing:	Prior to issuance of grading permit 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 ENVIRONMENTAL AND PLANNING BOARD WILL RECONSIDER THE ISSUES AND TAKE ACTION AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE.)

Dated: _____ _____

Signature(s) of the Project Applicant(s)

Dated: _____ _____

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

New Four Story Commercial Office Building
727 Sonora Avenue

1.	**Project Title:** New Four Story Commercial Office Building
2.	**Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Glendale Community Development Department Planning Division 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	**Contact Person and Phone Number:** Dennis Joe, Planner Tel: (818) 937-8157 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	**Project Location:** 727 Sonora Avenue, Glendale, Los Angeles County
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Rodney Khan c/o Khan Consulting 1111 North Brand Avenue, Suite 403 Glendale, CA 91202 Tel: (818) 507-1605
6.	**General Plan Designation:** Industrial
7.	**Zoning:** IND (Industrial) Zone

Description of the Project: The proposed project includes the development of a new four-story, 33,053 square-foot, commercial office building with a three-level subterranean garage with 91 parking spaces on a 12,482 square-foot parcel, located in the IND (Industrial) zone. The proposed project requires approval from the Design Review Board.

The project site is located at the mid-block of Sonora Avenue, between North San Fernando Road and Flower Street) and on the north side of the street. Surrounding the project site are other IND zoned properties with single-family residences/industrial to the north, and commercial/ industrial uses to the east, south, and west. The project site is developed with two, one-story industrial buildings (7,641 square-feet and 3,800 square-feet in area), constructed in 1945 and 1946, respectively. The existing two industrial office buildings will be demolished.

The project's construction will take place over a period of approximate 18 months. The amount of grading will be approximately 17,000 cubic yards (all export). Due to the nature of the project, excavation would not occur over the entire 18 month period, but would be concentrated over approximately two weeks within the first eight weeks. The primary inbound haul route to the project site is projected to be from the Western Avenue exit of the Interstate 5 Freeway, then right onto Flower Street, and then left onto Sonora Avenue. The same route would be used for outbound trucks. The north side (south bound) Sonora Avenue would be used as the staging area and parking during the construction period.

9.	**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *North*: IND Zone, Single-family/ Industrial *South*: IND Zone, Commercial and Industrial *East*: IND Zone, Commercial and Industrial *West*: IND Zone, Commercial and Industrial
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	☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☐ Geology / Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards / Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology / Water Quality	☐ Land Use / Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population / Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☐ 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: Dennis Joe, planner April 1, 2019

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: Erik Krause, Deputy Director of Community Development

Date: April 2, 2019

A. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, 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. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X	
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. The approximate 12,482 square-foot project site is and located on north side of Sonora Avenue between North San Fernando Road and Flower Street, which is an urbanized area. The project is surrounded by commercial and industrial uses to the east, south, and west, and approximately six single-family residential buildings to the north on the Ruberta Avenue. The project site is currently developed with two, one-story industrial buildings (7,641 square-feet and 3,800 square-feet in area), constructed in 1945 and 1946, respectively. There are no protected indigenous trees species on or within twenty feet of the site.

The project proposes to demolish the two, one-story industrial buildings and the surrounding paved area at the rear and construct a new four-story, 33,053 square-foot, commercial office building with a three-level subterranean garage with 91 parking spaces. The new four-story commercial office building will be set back approximately one-foot, three-inches from the southern street front property line along Sonora Avenue, as well as along the western, eastern and northern property lines.

The building will be constructed with quality materials, such as metal panels above the ground level, IPE Wood siding at the ground level facing the street, and vertical scored block concrete at the

ground level facing the rear alley, and metal awnings facing the street. The overall pattern and placement of materials complement the contemporary design of the new building. Review and approval of the Design Review Board along with compliance with the zoning standards and City's Comprehensive Design Guidelines would ensure that the proposed projects would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. As a result, impacts to visual character and quality of the site are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Day and night time lighting for the project would increase as a result of the proposed project, but would not be significantly greater than any other similar commercial office buildings permitted in the IND zone. Lighting for the proposed building will be similar to existing commercial and industrial uses along Sonora Avenue. Any external lighting of the property is required to be directed towards the subject property and shielded to prevent light from spilling over onto neighboring properties. With these requirements in place, and because the surrounding area is already developed with primarily commercial and industrial buildings, and several residences to the north, no significant impacts associated with lighting are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997, as updated) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?				X
4. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?***

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

C. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied on 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. 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?			X	
3. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
4. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

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

No Impact. The project site is located within the City of Glendale, which is part of the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) and is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD is the agency responsible for preparing the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the Basin. Since 1979, a number of AQMPs have been prepared. The most recent comprehensive plan fully approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) is the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which includes a variety of strategies and control measures.

The AQMP was prepared to accommodate growth, to reduce the high levels of pollutants within the areas under the jurisdiction of SCAQMD, to return clean air to the region, and to minimize the impact on the economy. Projects that are considered to be consistent with the AQMP would not interfere with attainment because this growth is included in the projections utilized in the formulation of the AQMP. Therefore, projects, uses, and activities that are consistent with the applicable assumption used in the development of the AQMP would not jeopardize attainment of the air quality levels identified in the AQMP, even if they exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily emissions thresholds.

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

Population growth associated with the Project is included in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) projects for growth in the City of Glendale. The project does not result in population and housing growth that would cause growth in Glendale to exceed the SCAG forecast, because the project is consistent with the General Plan and therefore is included in SCAG's growth projections. Consequently, implementation of the project would be consistent with AQMP attainment forecasts and with applicable air quality plans. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. The nonattainment status of regional pollutants is a result of past and present development, and the Southern California

Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) develops and implements plans for future attainment of ambient air quality standards. Based on these considerations, project-level thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants are relevant in the determination of whether a project's individual emissions would have a cumulatively significant impact on air quality.

A quantitative analysis was conducted to determine whether proposed construction and operational activities may result in emissions of criteria air pollutants that may cause exceedances of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), or contribute to existing nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Pollutants that are evaluated herein include reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NOx), which are important because they are precursors to O3, as well as CO, sulfur oxides (SOx), PM10, and PM2.5.

Construction of the project would result in the temporary addition of pollutants to the local airshed caused by on-site sources (i.e., off-road construction equipment, soil disturbance, and ROG off-gassing) and off-site sources (i.e., on-road haul trucks, vendor trucks, and worker vehicle trips). Construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of activity, the specific type of operation, and for dust, the prevailing weather conditions. Therefore, such emission levels can only be approximately estimated with a corresponding uncertainty in precise ambient air quality impacts.

Criteria air pollutant emissions associated with temporary construction activities were quantified using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2. Implementation of the project would generate air pollutant emissions from entrained dust, off-road equipment, vehicle emissions, and architectural coatings. Entrained dust results from the exposure of earth surfaces to wind from the direct disturbance and movement of soil, resulting in PM10 and PM2.5 emissions. The project would be required to comply with applicable rules under SCAQMD Rule 403 to control dust emissions generated during grading activities. Standard construction practices that would be employed to reduce fugitive dust emissions include watering of the active sites. Internal combustion engines used by construction equipment, vendor trucks (i.e., delivery trucks), and worker vehicles would result in emissions of ROG, NOx, CO, PM10, and PM2.5.

Results from the model indicate that the proposed project would not exceed thresholds for construction, area, or operational impacts. A summary of the results are attached. As a result, less than significant impacts will occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. Sensitive receptors are located near the Project site that includes single-family dwellings located to the north and across an existing 20-foot wide alley. The applicant would be required to adhere to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403 - Fugitive Dust, which would further reduce the less than significant impact related to construction-related impacts identified in Response C-2 above. As a result, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration or create emissions that exceed known thresholds. No significant impacts are anticipated.

4) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact. Odors are a form of air pollution that is most obvious to the general public and can present problems for both the source and surrounding community. Although offensive odors seldom cause physical harm, they can be annoying and cause concern. Odors would be

potentially generated from vehicles and equipment exhaust emissions during construction of the project. Odors produced during construction would be attributable to concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from the tailpipes of construction equipment. Such odors would be temporary and generally occur at magnitudes that would not affect substantial numbers of people. Therefore, less than significant construction related odor impacts are anticipated to occur from the project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

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

No Impact. The project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for decades. The subject site is currently developed with two one-story industrial buildings (7,641 square-feet and 3,800 square-feet in area), constructed in 1945 and 1946, with paved surfaced areas at the rear. No wildlife species other than those which can tolerate human activity and/or are typically found in urban environments are known to exist on or near the project site. These human-tolerant species are neither sensitive, threatened, nor endangered. Implementation of the project would not result in any impact to species identified as endangered, threatened, sensitive or being of special concern by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. In addition, the project site does not provide suitable habitat for endangered or rare species given the pattern, type, and level of development in the area. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

No Impact. The proposed project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years and surrounded by other IND zoned properties with single-family residences/industrial to the north, commercial and industrial to the east, south, and west. No riparian habitat and/or other sensitive natural communities are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present on or adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?***

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years. The area has been substantially modified by human activity, as evidenced by other developments of similar type and uses, and human activity associated with these types of development. Implementation of the proposed project will not interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No Mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?			X	
3. 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 pursuant to §15064.5?*

No Impact. The subject site is currently developed with two one-story industrial buildings (7,641 square-feet and 3,800 square-feet in area), constructed in 1945 and 1946, with paved surfaced areas at the rear. The City's Historic Preservation Planner has determined that the two existing industrial buildings are not eligible for designation at the local, state or national level and are not considered historic resources. No historic resources are located on the project site. As a result, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change to a historical resource.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites are not known to exist within the project area. The City's Open Space and Conservation Element indicate that no significant archaeological sites have been identified in this area of Glendale. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, compliance to regulations outlined by California Public Resource Code PRC21083.2 (i) will be adhered to, which 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. As a result, less than significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam of Mission Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by either tribe within the 30-days of the notice. No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the project site or surrounding area. However, impacts would be potentially significant if human remains were to be encountered during excavation and grading activities. State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then serve as a consultant on how to proceed with the

remains (i.e., avoid removal or rebury). With implementation of this standard requirement, less than significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

F. ENERGY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	
2. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X	

1) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Construction of the project would require consumption of nonrenewable energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels (including fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline) for automobiles and construction equipment, and other resources including, but not limited to, lumber, sand, gravel, asphalt, metals, and water. Construction would include energy used by construction equipment and other activities at the project site (e.g., building demolition, excavation, paving), in addition to the energy used to manufacture the equipment, materials, and supplies and transport them to the project site. Energy for maintenance activities would include day-to-day upkeep of equipment and systems, as well as energy embedded in any replacement equipment, materials, and supplies. It is expected that nonrenewable energy resources would be used efficiently during construction and maintenance activities given the financial implications of inefficient use of such resources. Therefore, the amount and rate of consumption of such resources during construction and maintenance activities would not result in the unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of energy resources.

Operation of the project would involve consumption of electricity and natural gas; however, these resources are already consumed on the project site, and an incremental increase in the consumption of these resources associated with project operation would not represent unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of resources. The project would be designed to comply with Title 24 Building, Energy and Green Buildings Standards (California Building Code, Title 24, Parts 4, 6, and 11). Sustainable design strategies for the new building would include the use of high performance glazing and a light-colored, single-ply, thermoplastic roof membrane over a well-insulated roof assembly to reduce heat gain during the summer. Other sustainable features would include energy-efficient light fixtures, lighting controls, and water-conserving plumbing fixtures. The building roof would be solar ready and able to support future installation of a photovoltaic system. Given the foregoing, the project's consumption of energy resources would be less than significant, as it would not represent unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of energy resources.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. As described above, the new commercial office building's energy efficiency would, at a minimum, comply with the California Energy Code and the California Building Code. While not specifically applicable to the project, Senate Bill 350 sets ambitious 2030 targets for energy efficiency and renewable electricity, increasing California's renewable electricity procurement

goal from 33 percent by 2020 to 50 percent by 2030. As described in Section F-1, the new commercial office building would include a solar-ready roof which could support future installation of a photovoltaic system. As such, the project would not conflict with or obstruct state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

G. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Directly or indirectly cause 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 Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial direct or indirect 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
6. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	

1) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less Than Significant Impact. A geotechnical investigation report was prepared by Applied Earth Sciences (AES, dated October 10, 2018), which field exploration borings were drilled at the subject site to a maximum depth of 51 feet. Generally, the site, to the depths explored, was found to be covered by surficial fill underlain by natural deposits of silty sand, sandy silt and relatively clean sand soils with variable amounts of gravel and few cobbles. Thickness of the existing fill was found to be as much as 2 feet at the location of the borings. The upper native soils through which the basement garage excavations will be made were found to be medium dense to dense to very dense silty sand and sand and stiff sandy silt. The results of the laboratory investigation indicated that these materials were of moderate to high strengths.

The soils near the planned foundation levels were found to be consist of generally very dense, silty and/or gravely sand soils with little to no fines. The results of the laboratory testing indicated that these materials were of high strengths and low compression. The site soils (including those at the subterranean garage level) were found to be granular in nature. Additionally, an evaluation for liquefaction analysis was included within the geotechnical investigation report and concluded that the soils are considered to be virtually non-expansive and liquefaction will not occur at the site.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) Landslides?

No impact. The project site is not located within a landslide hazard zone area, as indicated by the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). The project site is relatively flat and not located in a hillside or mountainous area of the city. Therefore, no impacts associated with landslides would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact.

Construction activity associated with the proposed project development may result in wind and water driven erosion of soils due to grading activities if soil is stockpiled or exposed during construction. However, this impact is considered short-term in nature since the site would expose small amounts of soil during construction activities. Further, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the Glendale Municipal Code Section 13.42.060 to prepare and administer a plan that effectively provides for a minimum stormwater quality protection

throughout project construction. The plan would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to less than significant. In addition, the applicant would be required to adhere to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403—Fugitive Dust, which would further reduce the impact related to soil erosion to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Per the Report of Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Applied Earth Sciences (AES, dated October 10, 2018), subsurface condition between the borings were considered to be good. Generally, the site, to the depths explored, was found to be covered by surficial fill underlain by natural deposits of silty sand, sandy silt and relatively clean sand soils with variable amounts of gravel and few cobbles. Thickness of the existing fill was found to be as much as two feet at the location of the borings. Deeper fill, however, may be present between and beyond the borings. Such fill soils; however, are expected to be automatically removed by the planned garage excavations. The upper native soils through which the subterranean garage excavations will be made were found to be medium dense to dense to very dense silty sand and sand and stiff sandy silt. The results of our laboratory investigation indicated that these materials were of moderate to high strengths. The soils near the planned foundation levels were found to be consist of generally very dense, silty and/or gravely sand soils with little to no fines. The results of our laboratory testing indicated that these materials were of high strengths and low compression. The site soils (including those at the basement garage level) were found to be granular in nature. These soils are considered to be virtually non-expansive.

Site grading for the proposed project is expected to include excavation in order to create the subterranean garage and backfilling behind the basement walls. The wall backfill materials are to consist of non-expansive granular soils. Prior to placing any fill, the Soil Engineer should observe the excavation bottoms. In the areas of fill, all soils should be removed until bedrock is exposed. The areas to receive compacted fill should be scarified to a depth of about 8 inches, moistened as required to bring to approximately optimum moisture content, and compacted to at least 90 percent of the maximum dry density.

The following mitigation measure have been added to the project to prevent on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse during site preparation and construction activities.

Mitigation Measure: Compliance with Mitigation measure MM-1 will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

MM –1 The applicant shall comply with all guidelines recommended in the Report of Geotechnical Investigation prepared by AES, dated October 10, 2018.

4) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating direct or indirect substantial risks to life or property?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?

Less than Significant Impact. Plant and animal fossils are typically found within sedimentary rock deposits. Most of the City of Glendale consists of igneous and metamorphic rock, and the local area is not known to contain paleontological resources. Nonetheless, paleontological resources may possibly exist at deep levels and could be unearthed with implementation of the project. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during the project-related subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until a paleontologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, less than significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

H. 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 adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

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

Less than Significant Impact. Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels.

Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution from increased formation of ground level ozone and particulate matter, ecosystem changes, increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects.

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. GHG

as defined under AB 32 includes: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the State agency charged with regulating statewide air quality, adopt rules and regulations that would achieve greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to statewide levels in 1990 by 2020 by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has prepared the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), which is part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Glendale has an adopted Greener Glendale Plan which meets regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by SCAG and adopted by the ARB. The Greener Glendale Plan uses land use development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, transportation measures and other policies that are determined to be feasible to reduce GHG.

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

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

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

Since this project is consistent with Greener Glendale Strategies to reduce GHGs and the SCS prepared by SCAG, this project would result in a less than cumulatively considerable impact on GHG emissions and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. For the reasons discussed in Response H-1 above, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

I. 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X
6. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
7. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Searches of the Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database and California State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker database indicated no contamination on the project site. The federal government banned consumer use of lead-based paint (LBP) in 1978 and many, but not all, asbestos-containing materials (ACM) were banned in construction products in 1989. As the structures on the project site were constructed between 1956 and 1963, prior to the ban of these materials, it is possible that they contain LBP or ACMs. In addition, other regulated materials such as fluorescent lights may be present.

The project would result in a slight increase in the routine use of hazardous materials. The project would include use of heavy equipment for demolition, grading, excavation, and construction. Fueling and maintenance of such equipment could result in incidental spills of petroleum products and hazardous materials in construction staging areas. However, such incidental spills would likely be minor and would be minimized through implementation of standard best management practices (BMPs) included in a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) mandated Storm

Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) during construction. Relevant BMPs would typically include creation of designated fueling and maintenance areas located not in proximity to drainages and equipped with temporary spill containment booms, absorbent pads, and petroleum waste disposal containers. Some hazardous materials use would continue to occur in association with project operations, including natural gas for the emergency generator, fertilizers, cleaning supplies, etc. Use of hazardous materials would be required to meet all applicable regulations related to the transport, use, and storage of such materials. All businesses within the City of Glendale, as mandated by the California Health and Safety Code Chapter 6.95, are required to file a Hazardous Material Business Plan (HMBP) with the Glendale Fire Department. The HMBP covers the use and storage of all regulated hazardous chemicals and materials to be used and/or stored onsite. Therefore, project impacts associated with routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would include demolition activities prior to new construction. Given the age of the structures on site, LBP and ACMs may be encountered during demolition activities. Project construction would be required to comply with applicable state regulations regarding LBP work practices, including testing and abatement. The removal of ACMs would be subject to the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1403, which governs work practice requirements for asbestos in all renovation and demolition activities. Rule 1403 includes an onsite survey and notification requirements prior to beginning a project, as well as work practice standards and disposal requirements.

Additionally, under California law, fluorescent lamps cannot be disposed as municipal waste. Fluorescent tubes and bulbs may be managed as universal wastes under Title 22, Chapter 23 of the California Code of Regulations and are typically recycled. With adherence to applicable regulations, project impacts related to removal of hazardous materials during demolition would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, Sonora Avenue is a City Disaster Response Route, which is a road that can best move emergency services and supplies to where they are needed the most immediately following a major disaster. Implementation of the project would neither result in a reduction of the number of lanes along this roadway nor result in the placement of an impediment, such as medians, to the flow of traffic. During construction, the contractor shall notify the City of Glendale Police and Fire Departments of construction activities that would involve the movement of equipment to give first emergency response teams the option of rerouting traffic an alternative route, if needed. Further, during construction the applicant would be required to obtain any necessary permits from the City of Glendale Public Works Department for all work occurring within the public right-of-way. Implementation of these requirements would be incorporated as typical condition of approval. Consequently, project impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

8) ***Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?***

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

J. 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 or otherwise substantially degrade surface of groundwater quality?			X	
2. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X	
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			X	
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;			X	
iii) 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; or			X	
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
4. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
5. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X	

1) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface of groundwater quality?

Less than Significant Impact. The project would be required to comply with all NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirements including pre-construction, during construction and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs). In addition, the project will be required to submit an approved SUSMP (Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan) to be integrated into the design of the project. As a result of the NPDES and SUSMP requirements, impacts associated with water quality standards or waste discharge requirements are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less than Significant Impact.

The City currently utilizes water from Glendale Water and Power (GWP), which relies on primarily importing water from the Metropolitan Water District, some local groundwater basins and from the San Fernando Basin. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would result in development that could indirectly require a slight increased use of groundwater through the provision of potable water by GWP; however, as discussed in Response S-4 below, the proposed project's water demand is within water projections. This project was routed to GWP for comment and this department did not comment with concerns that the project will 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. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies.

Per the City's Open Space and Conservation Element, the north and easterly facing slopes of the Verdugo Mountains drain into the Arroyo Verdugo drainage basin and directly fee aquifers and wells reserved exclusively for the City of Glendale. The south-facing slopes of these mountains drain into the Los Angeles River basin which feed aquifers, ground water basins and wells shared by the Cities of Glendale, Burbank and Los Angeles. The largest flood control basin is the Verdugo basin, which is located adjacent to the Oakmont Country Club in the northern portion of the city. Maps 4-21 and 4-

22 of the Open Space and Conservation Element show this, as well the other basins, within the city. Per Maps 4-21 and 4-22, the subject property is not located on or within the watershed or aquifer recharge areas.

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 or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

Less than Significant Impact.

The project site is currently improved with two, one-story, industrial buildings (7,641 square-feet and 3,800 square-feet in area) with a surface parking lot at the rear accessed from the alley. Stormwater runoff currently flows into existing city streets and drains. The applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) Permit set forth by the RWQCB (Regional Water Quality Control Board), and to prepare and submit a SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan) to be administered throughout proposed project construction. The SWPPP would incorporate BMPs (Best Management Practices) to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The proposed project will modify the existing drainage pattern of the site and would slightly decrease the runoff, given the limited amount of existing landscaped area. All subsequent runoff would be conveyed via streets and gutters to storm drain locations around the project site. Development of the proposed project would not require any substantial changes to the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area, nor would it significantly affect the capacity of the existing storm drain system. In addition, in accordance with Chapter 13.42, Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Control and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan of the Glendale Municipal Code, a SUSMP (Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan) containing design features and BMPs to reduce post-construction pollutants in stormwater discharges would be required as part of the project. Impacts are considered to be less than significant as a result of the conditions and measures required by the NPDES permit, SWPPP and SUSMP.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

ii) 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. There are no natural drainage features on or near the project site. The subject property, in its existing condition, is occupied with the existing two one-story industrial buildings and a paved parking lot at the rear. Limited landscaping exists on the site, which is an approximately 200 square-foot (5-feet by 40-feet) landscaped area at the front along the Sonora Avenue public right-of-way. Construction activities would entail grading, excavation, and other ground-disturbing activities, which could temporarily alter surface drainage patterns and increase the potential for flooding, erosion, or siltation. However, the project would be required to comply with the NPDES Construction General Permit, which would require implementation of BMPs and erosion control measures, thereby reducing the effects of construction activities on erosion and drainage patterns. While the project will include a smaller landscaped area at the front of the building (approximately 55 square-feet), the amount of hardscape on the property will be substantially same.

As a result, the project will not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in a flooding on or off-site.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iii) 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; or

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed above (Response J-3ii), post-construction stormwater runoff would increase an insignificant amount because the amount of landscaping at the project site will decrease from 200 square-feet to approximately 55 square-feet (approximately 145 square-feet). Therefore, impacts relating to increased runoff to less than significant levels.

With respect to water quality, as described above in Response I-1, with implementation of BMPs mandated by the MS4 (municipal separate storm sewer systems) permit, SWQMP, and construction-related NPDES permit, water quality impacts associated with project construction and operation would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

Less than Significant Impact. According to Plate P-2 by the City's Safety Element, the project site is not located within a Dam Inundation Zone that would be inundated during the failure of an up-gradient water reservoir or dam. Additionally, FEMA Flood Maps do not identify the project site to be located within a 100-year flood zone. The project site is located with flood Zone X with a 0.2-percent annual chance of flooding or a 1-percent annual chance of flooding with an average depth of less than 1 foot. Therefore, less-than-significant flood-related impacts would occur in association with construction and operation of the project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

No Impact. Seiches are typically caused when strong winds and rapid changes in atmospheric pressure push water from one end of a body of water to the other, causing the water then continues to oscillate back and forth for hours or even days. The proposed project site is not located downslope of any large body of water that would produce a seiche. Tsunamis are large ocean waves generated by sudden water displacement caused by a submarine earthquake, landslide, or volcanic eruption. A review of the County of Los Angeles Flood and Inundation Hazards Map indicates that the site is not within the mapped tsunami inundation boundaries. Last, the project location is not located in an area susceptible to mudflow due to proximity to slopes. Surrounding the project site are other IND zoned properties with single-family residences/industrial to the north, and commercial/ industrial uses to the east, south, and west. No impacts would occur

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

No Impact. The project site is not located within a mapped groundwater basin. The existing project site is almost completely paved and stormwater that falls the site discharges onto the Sonora Avenue public right-of-way and into the sewer system. The project would be required to comply with

the Phase 1 MS4 permit requiring runoff to be treated using LID treatment controls, such as biotreatment facilities and other hydromodification features, to improve stormwater quality, and NPDES requiring the development and implementation of a SWPPP, which describes BMPs to control erosion and water quality. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact as it would not conflict with a water quality control plan or a sustainable groundwater management plan.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

K. 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. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	

1) *Physically divide an established community?*

No Impact. The project site is located at the mid-block of Sonora Avenue, between North San Fernando Road and Flower Street) and on the north side of the street. Surrounding the project site are other IND zoned properties with single-family residences/industrial to the north and commercial/ industrial uses to the east, south, and west. The project site is developed with two one-story industrial buildings (7,641 square-feet and 3,800 square-feet in area) constructed in 1945 and 1946, respectively. The two existing industrial office buildings will be demolished. Commercial office buildings are a permitted use in the IND zone and the project complies with all of the development standards. Therefore, the project will not divide an established community. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) *Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

Less than Significant Impact. The zoning land use designation for the subject site is IND (Industrial), and the General Plan Land Use Element designation is Industrial. The IND zone allows for a variety of land uses, such as, but not limited to, entertainment production, manufacturing, general offices, and research and development, in conformance with the General Plan. General office uses are consistent with the intent of the land use designation and are permitted by right in the IND zoning district. The project complies with the parking chapter provisions, including the number of required parking spaces and dimensions. After improvements, the site will be developed with a total of 91 parking spaces for the new four-story general office building. The project will be reviewed by the Design Review Board per GMC 30.47, to ensure compatibility with surrounding environment. Less than significant impacts would occur..

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

L. 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 City's Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993) does not identify the project site as within an area containing valuable mineral resources. 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?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

M. NOISE

Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
2. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
3. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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 area to excessive noise levels?				X

1) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project involves construction of a new four-story commercial office building. This is a permitted use on the subject property, which is zoned IND. Surrounding the project site are other IND zoned properties with single-family

residences/industrial to the north, and commercial/industrial uses to the east, south, and west. The development of an office building on this site would not generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element.

Short-term noise impacts could occur as a result of construction activities. All development within the project site will be required to comply with the City of Glendale Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 8.36), which prohibits construction activities to between the hours of 7:00 p.m. on one day and 7:00 a.m. of the next day or from 7:00 p.m. on Saturday to 7:00 a.m. on Monday or from 7:00 p.m. preceding a holiday. Compliance with the City's noise ordinance would ensure that noise impacts will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?***

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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 area to excessive noise levels?***

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

N. 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 unplanned 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 people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

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

Less than Significant Impact. The project consists of new four-story, 33,053 square-foot, commercial office building and three-level subterranean garage with 91 parking spaces. The project does not include any new residential units and would not result in substantial new population growth in the city. Any indirect growth occurring as a result of employees from the four-story general office project would be inconsequential. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. No residential dwelling units currently exist on the project site. Therefore, no housing or residential populations would be displaced by development of the proposed project, and the construction of replacement housing elsewhere would not be necessary. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

O. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

a) ***Fire protection?***

Less than Significant Impact. The City of Glendale Fire Department (GFD) provides fire and paramedic services to the project site. The project will require compliance with the Uniform Fire Code, including installation of fire sprinklers, and to submit plans to the Glendale Fire Department at

the time building permits are submitted for approval. Comments received from GFD indicate the project is not expected to significantly increase calls for service. Less than significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b) Police protection?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c) Schools?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d) Parks?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not involve the development or displacement of a park. The property is zoned for industrial and was not planned for use as a park. In accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the project applicant will be required to pay the Development Impact Fee to the city based on the current fee schedule prior to the issuance of building permits. Payment of the impact fees would result in less than significant impact to park facilities.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e) Other public facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project is to construct a new four-story, 33,053 square-foot, commercial office building with a three-level subterranean garage with 91 parking spaces on a 12,482 square-foot parcel. The additional employees at the new commercial office building could increase the demand for library services an incremental amount; however, in accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the project applicant will be required to pay the Development Impact Fee to the City based on the current fee schedule for commercial use developments prior to the issuance of building permits. Payment of the impact fees would result in less than significant impact to library facilities.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

P. RECREATION

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project, which will result in a new four-story, 33,053 square-foot, commercial office building with a three-level subterranean garage with 91 parking spaces, is not expected to generate a substantial increase in demand for existing park or recreational facilities. As discussed in Response O-1d, the project applicant will be required to pay the City's Park and Library Development Impact Fee to provide for park and recreation facilities based on the current fee schedule for commercial development prior to the issuance of building permit. Payment of the impact fee would result in a less than significant impact to park and recreational facilities.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Q. 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. The project site is located on Sonora Avenue, which is identified as an "Urban Collector" in the City's Circulation Element. The proposed project includes demolition of the two, one-story industrial buildings (7,641 square-feet and 3,800 square-feet in area) and the development of a new four-story, 33,053 square-foot, commercial office building and three-level subterranean garage with 91 parking spaces. Based upon trip generation factors published in Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 8th Edition, 2008, the project would generate fewer than 50 vehicle trips during both the weekday morning peak hour (typically occurring between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m.) and the weekday evening peak hour (typically occurring between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m.). Because the project's peak-hour trip generation would not exceed the established threshold of 50 vehicle trips during peak hours, no significant and adverse impacts on the area street system is anticipated.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. No changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the project. Direct access to the property will be taken from Sonora Avenue, which is a designed as an Urban Collector in the City's Circulation Element. As indicated in Section Q-1 above, a traffic control plan will be required for the construction phase of the project. The plan will be reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Division to ensure that emergency access is not impacted during construction, nor is the City's Disaster Response Route impacted. As a result, less than significant impacts to emergency access are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Glendale Beeline provides bus services within the City of Glendale and along Sonora Avenue. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding alternative transportation because no changes to the existing transportation policies, plans, or programs would result from project implementation. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

R. TRIBAL 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 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,				

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in the 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) 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).

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site and surrounding area are not known to contain tribal cultural resources. Nonetheless, resources may possibly exist and could be unearthed with implementation of the project. In the event that tribal cultural 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 representative from the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians has been contacted and evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, less than significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact

As mentioned previously, no known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the project site and surrounding area. Therefore, the potential for impact on known human remains or a resource determined to be significant by a California Native American tribe is low. No resources have been identified on the project site pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. Written notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam of Mission Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

S. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
2. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X	
3. 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
4. Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			X	
5. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

1) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No Impact. Under Section 401 of the CWA, the RWQCB issues NPDES permits to regulate waste discharged to "waters of the nation," which includes reservoirs, lakes, and their tributary waters. Waste discharges include discharges of stormwater and construction related discharges. Construction projects are also required to prepare a SWPPP. In addition, the proposed project would be required to submit an SUSMP to mitigate urban stormwater runoff. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant would be required to satisfy the requirements related to the payment of fees and/or the provisions of adequate wastewater facilities. The proposed project would comply with the RWCQB-established waste discharge prohibitions and water quality objectives, which will be incorporated into the proposed project as a project design feature. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

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

The proposed project would result in an increase in demand for operational uses, including landscape irrigation, maintenance and other activities on the site. Based on an Average Daily Flow (gallons per day) generation factor of 150/1,000 gr.sq.ft. (gross square feet), proposed 33,053 square-foot office building project would result in a demand of approximately 4,958 gallons per day that equates to 5.55 acre feet per year (afy) of water (based on Sewage Generation Factors for Residential and Commercial Categories, L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide).

The total water demand in 2020 in the City of Glendale is expected to be 28,182 af with a total available supply of 39,540 af, resulting in a surplus of 11,358 af for that year. The City of Glendale has identified an adequate supply of water to meet future City demands under normal conditions. Future water demand in the City is based on projected development contained in the General Plan. For purposes of this assessment, the demand of the proposed project was assumed not to have been included in this demand projection. However, even with the additional demand of 5.55 afy generated by the proposed project, ample supply exists to meet remaining city demand under normal conditions.

The new 33,053 square-foot office building and three-level parking structure project must comply with the provisions of Glendale's Mandatory Water Conservation Ordinance, as well as the 2016 California Green Building Standards (CALGreen) of the Glendale Green Building Code and the water conserving fixture and fittings requirements per the current California Plumbing Code. All new buildings must utilize higher efficiency plumbing fixtures (low-flush toilets, low-flow showerheads and faucets) and automatic irrigation system controllers based on water or soil moisture, and demonstrate an indoor net reduction in the consumption of potable water.

Normal Weather Conditions

The City of Glendale has identified an adequate supply of water to meet future city demands under normal conditions. As indicated in the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, a surplus exists that provides a reasonable buffer of approximately 1,500 to 2,500 afy of water. Future water demand in the city is based on projected development contained in the General Plan. For purposes of this assessment, the demand of the proposed project was assumed not to have been included in this demand projection. However, even with the addition of 5.55 afy of demand generated by the proposed project, there is ample supply to meet remaining city demand under normal conditions.

Dry Weather Conditions

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

It is anticipated that during any 3-year drought, the city would have sufficient water supply to meet demand. According to the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, the City would use less MWD water supplies in the future compared to its current use. With the City's reduction of dependency on imported water from MWD, GWP has a higher level of reliability in meeting water demands during drought conditions. Even with the addition of 5.55 afy of demand generated by the proposed project, there is sufficient supply to meet city demand under drought conditions.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. Sewage from the City of Glendale is treated by the City of Los Angeles Hyperion System, which includes the Los Angeles/Glendale Water Reclamation Plant, located outside the Glendale City limits in Los Angeles, and the Hyperion Treatment Plant, located in Playa del Rey. The City of Glendale and the City of Los Angeles jointly own and share operating capacity of the Los Angeles/Glendale Water Reclamation Plant. The City of Glendale entered into an amalgamated treatment and disposal agreement (Amalgamated Agreement) with the City of Los Angeles, which eliminates entitlements and reduces limitations on the amount of sewage discharged into the Hyperion system. Any City of Glendale sewage not treated at the Los Angeles/Glendale Water Reclamation Plant is treated at the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP).

The HTP has a dry-weather design capacity of 450 million gpd and is currently operating below that capacity, at 362 million gpd. As a result, adequate capacity exists to treat the proposed project-generated effluent. Therefore, the proposed project would not require the expansion or construction of sewage treatment facilities. No impact would result with regard to impacts to the available sewage treatment capacity.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Glendale's Zero Waste Action Plan (2011) contains zero waste policies to increase its diversion rate from landfills and incinerators from 61% in 2009 to 70% by 2015 of current disposal tonnage of the 162,000 tons per year, and if feasible, 90% by 2025. The year 2025 was selected as a target year because this is approximately when the landfill at Scholl Canyon is scheduled to close. By diverting more materials, the life of the existing landfill could be extended significantly, particularly if the communities that share Scholl Canyon implement similar Zero Waste resource management initiatives. Waste reduction strategies within this plan require new buildings to comply with the 2016 CALGreen Code, as well as promote Green Building Policy that provides incentives for construction materials that are more durable, have a longer lifespan, require no additional finishing on-site, have less frequent maintenance and repair cycles, and give credits for products made from recycled content. Given the foregoing, the project will not generate solid waste in excess of local standards or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. As a result, less than significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

T. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility area or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, *would the project:*	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
1. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
2. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				X
3. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel, breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				X
4. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				X

1) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) maps areas of significant fire hazards based on fuels, terrain, weather, and other relevant factors, pursuant to Public Resources Code 4201-4204 and Government Code 51175-51189. These areas are referred to as Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZs) and are identified for areas where the state has financial responsibility for wildland fire protection (i.e., state responsibility areas, or SRAs), and areas where local governments have financial responsibility for wildland fire protection (i.e., local responsibility areas, or LRAs).

There are three FHSZ mapped for SRAs (moderate, high, and very high), while only lands zoned as very high are identified in LRAs (CAL FIRE 2007). The project site is not located within a LRA and is not located near a SRA or a very high FHSZ. As a result, no impact would occur related to wildfire hazards, including emergency response/evacuation, pollutants and uncontrolled wildfire spread, associated infrastructure, or post-fire effects.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

No Impact. As indicated in Response T-1 above, project site is not located within a LRA and is not located near a SRA or a very high FHSZ. No impacts would occur related to wildfire hazards due to

slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel, breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?***

No Impact. As indicated in Response T-1 above, project site is not located within a LRA and is not located near a SRA or a very high FHSZ. No impacts would occur related to the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?***

No Impact. As indicated in Response T-1 above, project site is not located within a LRA and is not located near a SRA or a very high FHSZ. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

U. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

1) ***Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?***

No Impact. The project site is a currently developed and located within an urbanized area along Sonora Avenue. No biological species or habitat for biological species exists on site or within the project vicinity. In addition, no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or

other approved habitat conservation plans apply to the project site. As such, the proposed project would not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Furthermore, the proposed project would not have the potential to eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory, including historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant environmental impacts that have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. No impacts would occur.

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

Cumulative impacts may occur when the proposed project in conjunction with one or more related projects would yield an impact that is greater than what would occur with the development of only the proposed project. Approximately within half mile southwest of the project, are separate proposals to construct a new three-story, 37,858 square-foot hotel with a two-level subterranean garage with 65 parking spaces located at 1633 Victory Boulevard, and two, 600 square-foot, accessory dwelling units to two separate single-family residences located at 327 Sonora Avenue and 1538 Garden Street. As a result, the incremental effect of the new office building is not cumulatively considerable. All environmental issues considered in this Initial Study were found to have either no impact, a less than significant impact or less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. As discussed in Section H (Greenhouse Gas Emissions), the project would not exceed State or regional thresholds for the emission of criteria air pollutants or greenhouse gases. With implementation of mitigation measures for impacts associated with air quality, cultural resources, noise, and traffic, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. With regard to cumulative effects for the issues of agricultural, biological, and mineral resources, the project site is located in an urbanized area and therefore, other developments occurring in the area of the project would largely occur on previously disturbed land and are not anticipated to have an impact. Thus, no cumulative impact to these resources would occur. Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials are generally confined to a specific site and do not affect off-site areas.

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. This Project is to construct a new four-story, 33,053 square-foot, commercial office building with a three-level subterranean garage with 91 parking spaces. As mentioned in Response Q-1, the Project will increase the number of vehicles using the area streets. However, based upon the traffic analysis, net change in trips generated by the project is less than 50 trips in both the AM and PM peak periods and no significant traffic impacts are anticipated. The duration for construction will be approximately 18 months and will be temporary. As discussed in Response N-1d, the project applicant will be required to pay the City's Park and Library Development Impact Fee to provide for park and recreation facilities based on the current fee schedule prior to the issuance of building permit. Last, the overall number of employment opportunities resulting from this development will not lead to a significant number of new workers moving to the area. Therefore, the

Project is not considered growth inducing and will not directly or indirectly lead to increased population that would generate additional calls for fire, paramedic or police services.

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

13. Earlier Analyses

None

14. Project References Used to Prepare Initial Study Checklist

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

1. The City of Glendale's *General Plan,* "Open Space and Conservation Element," as amended.
2. California Department of Conservation, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program,* Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2010 (September 2011).
3. South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning* (May 2005).
4. City of Glendale, *General Plan,* "Safety Element" (2003).
5. California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State of California General Plan Guidelines (October 2003).
6. City of Glendale Municipal Code, as amended.
7. Report of Geotechnical Investigation (prepared by Applied Earth Sciences, October 10, 2018)
8. California Emissions Estimator Module (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) Report.
9. City of Glendale, Green Glendale Plan (March 27, 2012)
10. City of Glendale, Zero Waste Action Plan (2011)