PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Holy Family Campus Master Plan
214 E. Elk Ave., 209 E. Lomita Ave., 400 E. Lomita Ave., and 404 S. Louise St.

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:	Holy Family Campus Master Plan
Project Location:	214 E. Elk Ave., 209 E. Lomita Ave., 400 E. Lomita Ave., and 404 S. Louise St.

Project Description:

The proposed project encompasses the expansion of and improvements to the Holy Family Campus ("Campus") in conjunction with the proposed "Master Plan" for Holy Family. The Campus is located in the R-1650 multi-family residential zone on three corner properties and includes the Holy Family Elementary School located at 404 South Louise Street, Holy Family Church located at 214 East Elk Avenue and the Parish Office/Rectory at 209 East Lomita Avenue, and Holy Family High School located at 400 East Lomita Avenue. The proposed expansion of and improvements to the existing private school (Holy Family High School) and the existing church (Holy Family Church) will occur over two phases as described below. No changes to the elementary school are proposed as part of the Master Plan.

Holy Family High School (400 East Lomita Avenue) – The expansion of the existing private high school includes the development of two new buildings on the 124,338 square-foot site: a 12,600 square-foot, two-story building (Parish Center) and a 2,900 square-foot, one-story building. The high school project site is located on the south-east corner of Lomita Avenue and South Louise Street, and is currently developed with three buildings, as well as associated playground areas for the students and parking for the Holy Family Campus. The current student capacity for the all-girls High School will remain at 280 students, and the proposal does not include expanding the enrollment capacity. The existing high school building was built in 1950 and will remain; no changes are proposed to the high school building. The proposed project will require demolition of the other two buildings on-site that include the existing Parish Hall (originally built in 1923) and an existing, ancillary storage building (St. Anthony's, built in 1964). Development of the site also includes improvements to the existing playground areas and reconfiguration of the on-site parking. The applicant is requesting the following discretionary approvals: a parking reduction to provide a total of 162 stalls for the private school and new buildings, where 287 parking spaces are required; a conditional use permit to allow the expansion of the existing private school; and a setback and standards variance to allow the construction of a new fence in the street-front and street-side setback areas and to provide less landscaping than required by code.

Holy Family Church (214 East Elk Avenue and 209 East Lomita Avenue) – The proposal is to demolish an existing two-story, 3,055 square-foot office building (209 East Lomita Avenue) to provide 22 on-site parking spaces on the 19,450 square-foot project site. The site is currently developed with two buildings that include the Holy Family Church and Parish Office/Rectory. The existing church located at 214 East Elk Avenue was built in 1921 and will remain; no changes are proposed to the church building. The existing parish office building located at 209 East Lomita Avenue (west of the church) was built in 1977 and will be replaced with a surface parking lot for the church. A lot line adjustment application and a demolition clearance application have been submitted for this portion of the project.

The proposed "Master Plan" for the Holy Family Campus will be implemented over two phases as follows:

- Phase 1 – This phase involves improvements to the church and high school that will be completed in three sub-phases that include the following:
    - Phase 1A - Demolition of the existing storage building (St. Anthony's) on the high school site, development of the new two-story, 12,600 square-foot Parish Center, and changes

to the existing parking layout to provide 162 stalls. The new building will be used by both the high school and the church and will contain meeting rooms, offices for school and clergy staff, a chapel, and a welcome center;
  - Phase 1B - Demolition of the existing Parish Office/Rectory building to provide a surface parking lot for the church; and
  - Phase 1C – Renovations to the Phase 1A parking lot on the high school site including installation of new fencing and gates, reconfiguring of certain parking spaces, and new landscaping.
- Phase 2 – This phase deals with the high school site only:
  - Demolition of the existing Parish Hall building and construction of a new one-story, 2,900 square-foot building to be used for the school's "Lifeteen" and music programs; and
  - Improvements to the existing playground and parking areas, including installation of new fencing and gates, new landscaping, new outdoor seating and play areas.

Discretionary Permits:

Development of the high school portion of the project will require approval by the Planning Hearing Officer for the Parking Reduction Permit, Conditional Use Permit, and Variances. The project will also have to obtain approval from the Design Review Board for the new construction.

Development of the parking lot adjacent to the church will require approval by the Director of Community Development for a Lot Line Adjustment and a Demolition Clearance application.

The applicant is also requesting a development agreement to maintain all discretionary approvals for a maximum of ten (10 years); the development agreement will require recommendation by the Planning Commission and approval by City Council.

Project Type:	☒ Private Project ☐ Public Project
Project Applicant:	Khan Consulting, Inc. c/o Rodney V. Khan 1111 North Brand Boulevard, Suite 403 Glendale, CA 91202
Findings:	The Director of the Community Development, on **October 17, 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 Negative Declaration be prepared.
Mitigation Measures:	No mitigation measures are required.
Attachments:	Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Vista Ezzati, Planner City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 937-8180; Fax: (818) 240-0392

This page left intentionally blank.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Holy Family Campus Master Plan
214 E. Elk Ave., 209 E. Lomita Ave., 400 E. Lomita Ave., and 404 S. Louise St.

1.	**Project Title:** Holy Family Campus Master Plan
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:** Vista Ezzati, Planner Tel: (818) 937-8180 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	**Project Location:** 214 E. Elk Ave., 209 E. Lomita Ave., 400 E. Lomita Ave., and 404 S. Louise St.
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Khan Consulting, Inc. c/o Rodney V. Khan 1111 North Brand Boulevard, Suite 403 Glendale, CA 91202 Tel: (818) 507-1605
6.	**General Plan Designation:** Medium High Density
7.	**Zoning:** R-1650 – Medium-High Density Residential Zone
	Description of the Project: The proposed project encompasses the expansion of and improvements to the Holy Family Campus ("Campus") in conjunction with the proposed "Master Plan". The Campus is located in the R-1650 (Medium-High Density Residential) Zone and includes the Holy Family Elementary School, Holy Family Church, and Holy Family High School. The proposed project includes the demolition of two ancillary buildings and development of two new buildings at the Holy Family High School site that include a 12,600 square-foot, two-story building and a 2,900 square-foot, one-story building. The project will provide a reconfigured, surface parking lot with 162 parking stalls on the high school site, where 287 parking spaces are required. The proposal also includes demolition of an existing two-story, 3,055 square-foot Parish Office/Rectory building, built in 1977 and located on the Holy Family Church site. This building will be replaced with a 22 space surface parking lot. When the project phasing is completed, there will be a total of 184 parking stalls to serve the Campus. The applicant is requesting the following discretionary approvals a parking reduction permit to provide a total of 162 stalls for the private school and new buildings, where 287 parking spaces are required; a conditional use permit to allow the expansion of the existing private school; and a setback and standards variance to allow the construction of a new fence in the street-front and street-side setback areas and to provide less landscaping than required by code. Please refer to page 1 and 2 for a detailed project description.
9.	**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *North*: Single-family and Multi-family Residential Development, Glendale Armory National Guard *South*: Single-family and Multi-family Residential Development, Place of Worship/Church *East*: Multi-family Residential Development, Commercial Uses

	West: Multi-family Residential Development, Vehicle dealership
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: _____ 10/16/2019

Reviewed by: _____ Date: 10/16/19

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

Director of Community Development: _____ Date: 10/16/19

A. AESTHETICS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessibly 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 Impact. 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) 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 public 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 proposed expansion of and improvements to the existing private high school will be reviewed by the Design Review Board in regard to site planning, mass and scale, architectural materials, and landscaping to ensure the project's design is compatible with the surrounding built environment. The design of the new development features well-articulated façades, with building placement appropriately integrated into the overall site plan with consideration given to the use of the property. The new buildings have been designed to be architecturally compatible with the existing main high school building, originally built in 1950. The detailing, materials and treatment will be compatible with the existing high school. The new buildings will comply with the maximum height standards permitted in the R-1650 zone, where the maximum allowed is 3 stories and 41 feet. The proposal will feature the new "Parish Center" which will be two stories, and 36 feet in overall height, and the new "LifeTeen building" which will be one-story, and 20 feet in overall height. The new parking lot improvements to the existing church site will feature a five-foot landscape buffer from the street which provides appropriate screening and will have the code required landscaping and canopy trees for parking lots. Impacts to visual character are anticipated to be less than significant given the project review processes.

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 the existing on-site conditions. 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 commercial and residential buildings, no significant impacts associated with lighting are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				**X**
2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				**X**
3. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), 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)) or 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, or timberland zoned Timberland Production 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 forest land 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 upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				**X**
2. 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) 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 will not result in an increase in enrollment and 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. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod Versions 2016.3.2) was used to estimate air quality impacts during the construction and operation stages of the project. Results from the model indicate that the proposed project would not exceed thresholds for construction, area, or operational impacts. A summary of the results are attached. No significant impacts are anticipated. Based on the model run, construction of the project would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds of significance for construction.

Area sources emissions would be generated during the consumption of natural gas for space and water heating devices, by natural gas fireplaces, and during the operation of gasoline-powered landscape maintenance equipment and use of consumer products (e.g., hair spray, deodorants, lighter fluid, air fresheners, automotive products, and household cleaners). Mobile source emissions would be generated by the motor vehicle traveling to and from the project site.

Area and mobile source emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Module (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2). The project's land uses were entered into the model to estimate area source emissions. It was assumed that all buildings would combust natural gas. Based on the California Emissions Estimator Module (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) model run, the project would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds of significance for construction or operations. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less than Significant Impact: As indicated in the model run performed for this project, no construction or operational impacts are anticipated. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration and impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activity associated with the project may generate detectable odors from equipment exhaust. However, any detectable odors or equipment exhaust would be associated with initial construction and would be considered transitory and/or short-term. 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. Natural vegetation does not exist on-site. The site is surrounded by densely developed urban properties and is unsuitable for use as a wildlife habitat due to its location. 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. 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. The project site is neither in proximity to, nor does it contain, wetland habitat or a blue-line stream. No federally protected wetlands are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present on or adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Glendale Municipal Code, Chapter 12.44 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 or within 20 feet of 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 CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?				X
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?			X	
3. 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 CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?

No Impact. The proposed project encompasses the expansion of and improvements to the Holy Family Campus in conjunction with the proposed "Master Plan". The Campus is not contiguous and is located on three corner properties which include Holy Family Elementary School located at 404 South Louise Street, Holy Family Church located at 214 East Elk Avenue and 209 East Lomita Avenue, and Holy Family High School located at 400 East Lomita Avenue. The proposed expansion of and improvements to the existing private school (Holy Family High School) and the existing church (Holy Family Church) will occur over two phases as detailed in the Project Description.

The existing church site, Holy Family Church, was originally developed in 1921 and currently features two buildings with an associated parking lot. The existing one-story, 12,764 square-foot church building (214 East Elk Avenue) was constructed in 1921 and will be maintained as part of the project. The improvements to the church site will involve demolition of the existing two-story, 3,055 square-foot Parish Office/Rectory building (209 East Lomita Avenue), built in 1977. The existing private school site, Holy Family High School, was originally developed in 1923, and currently features three buildings with associated parking lots and playground areas. The existing two-story, 28,000 square-foot high school building was constructed in 1950 and will be maintained as part of the project. The expansion of and improvements to the existing high school will involve demolition of the other two buildings on-site which include the one-story, 548 square-foot Saint Anthony's storage building, originally built in 1964, and the one-story, 2,827 square-foot Parish Hall, originally built in 1923. According to City records and available Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, the Parish Hall was originally the assembly hall portion of a larger building belonging to the Knights of Columbus organization. City records indicate that the existing private school, Holy Family High School, began to operate on the site sometime between 1935 and 1940. Based on available records, it appears that a portion of the original larger Knights of Columbus building was demolished circa 1951, and the remainder of the building remodeled circa 1952.

The buildings described in this section that will be demolished do not meet any criteria for historic designation as the national state, or local level. As a result, the project will not cause a substantial adverse change to a historical resource, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. No impact to a historic resource would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites are not known to exist within the 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 impact 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. The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of commercial and residential land uses. No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the project site or surrounding area. However, impacts would be potentially significant if human remains were to be encountered during excavation and grading activities. State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then serve as a consultant on how to proceed with the remains (i.e., avoid removal or rebury). With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impact is anticipated.

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) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less than Significant Impact. 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 that for 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) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Less than Significant Impact. As described above, the proposed expansion of and improvements to the existing private school and church'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 above, the new buildings 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 California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
5. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
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?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) Landslides?

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). 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 impacts related to soil erosion to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Subsidence is the process of lowering the elevation of an area of the earth's surface that can be caused by tectonic forces deep within the earth or by consolidation and densification of sediments sometimes due to withdrawal of fluids such as groundwater. According to the City's Safety Element (August 2003), the project site is not located in an area of significant subsidence activity and would not include fluid withdrawal or removal. In addition, as indicated in Response G-1 (iii), above, the soil under the project site is not prone to liquefaction. Therefore, impacts related to unstable soils are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The soils underlying the project site and surrounding area are considered to have a low expansion potential. Additionally, in order to minimize damage due to geologic hazards, design and construction of the proposed project would comply with applicable building codes. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soil would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. Septic tanks will not be used in the project. The project would connect to and use the existing sewage conveyance system. 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 geologic feature?

Less Than Significant Impact. Plant and animal fossils are typically found within sedimentary rock deposits. Most of the City of Glendale consists of igneous and metamorphic rock, and the local area is not known to contain paleontological resources. The project site has already been subject to disruption and development. Any superficial paleontological resources which may have existed at one time on the project site have likely been previously unearthed by past development activities. Nonetheless, there is a possibility that paleontological resources may 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, compliance to regulations outlined by California Public Resource Code PRC21083.2(i) will be adhered to, which requires all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius to 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. As a result, less than significant impacts 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			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
environment?				
2. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

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

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

Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution from increased formation of ground level ozone and particulate matter, ecosystem changes, increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects. In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. GHG as defined under AB 32 includes: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the State agency charged with regulating statewide air quality; adopt rules and regulations that would achieve greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to statewide levels in 1990 by 2020 by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

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

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

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

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

Since this project is consistent with Greener Glendale Strategies to reduce GHGs and the SCS prepared by SCAG, the project would result in a less than cumulatively considerable impact on GHG emissions.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. For the reasons discussed in Response 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. No 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 site?				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. The proposed project involves the expansion of and improvements to an existing private school (Holy Family High School) and existing church (Holy Family Church). Such uses do not generally involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of significant amounts of hazardous materials. No new hazardous materials will be generated at the site. All businesses within the City of Glendale, as mandated by the California Health and Safety Code Chapter 6.95, are required to file a Hazardous Material Business Plan (HMBP) with the Glendale Fire Department. The HMBP covers the use and storage of all regulated hazardous chemicals and materials to be used and/or stored onsite. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the project at the existing private school and the existing church will require the demolition of three existing buildings on the two properties. The expansion of and improvements to the existing high school (Holy Family High School) will require the demolition of two buildings originally developed in 1923 (Parish Hall) and 1964 (Saint Anthony's storage building). The improvements to the existing church site (Holy Family Church) will require the demolition of the existing Parish Office/Rectory building originally built in 1977 (209 East Lomita Avenue). Structures constructed, repaired or remodeled between 1930 and 1981 have the potential of containing Asbestos Containing Building Materials. In addition, buildings constructed prior to 1978 may contain lead based paints. Testing and removal of lead-based paints is subject to regulations established by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The proposed project could 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. As such, the existing structures are required to be tested in accordance with applicable rules and regulations and remediated accordingly prior to demolition. The project would be required to comply with all applicable rules established by the SCAQMD, including Rules 403 and 402, during the construction phase that would prevent dust from migrating beyond the project site. Compliance with the applicable rules and regulations would ensure that significant impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site includes an existing private high school, and directly across the street to the north of the high school is Holy Family Catholic Grade School, a private elementary school that is part of the Holy Family Campus. The project would not emit any new hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials since the proposal is an expansion of and improvements to an existing private school (Holy Family High School) and an existing church (Holy Family Church). No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. There are no City or County Disaster Response Routes located on any of the streets abutting the project site, which include South Louise Street, East Elk Avenue, East Lomita Avenue, and East Chestnut Street. The project site is one block south of East Colorado Street, which is designated as a County Evacuation Route, as identified in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). Additionally, the project site is near South Brand Boulevard (west of the site), and South Glendale Avenue (east of the site), which are designated as City Disaster Response Routes, as identified in the Safety Element. The proposed project does not involve any changes to East Colorado Street, South Brand Boulevard, or South Glendale Avenue, nor would the project result in the alteration of an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. 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 a typical condition of approval. Consequently, project impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

7) 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 and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban landscape. The project site is not within a fire hazard area as identified in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element. 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 deplete 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:				
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			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
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. Under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established regulations under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program to control direct storm water discharges. In the City of Glendale, the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWCQB) administers the NPDES permitting program and is responsible for developing NPDES permitting requirements. The NPDES program regulates industrial pollutant discharges that include construction activities. Implementation of the proposed project will require with all of the NPDES requirements including the submittal and certification of plans and details showing both construction and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) that are integrated into the design of the project. The submittal of a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), as approved by the City Engineer, will also be required to be integrated into the design of the project. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface of groundwater quality since the project will be required to comply with applicable permitting requirements. No significant impacts are anticipated.

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 proposed project does not involve additions to or withdrawals of groundwater. The amount of hardscape proposed on the project site is similar to the current on-site conditions. Development of the project would not result in a substantial increase in runoff in the surrounding neighborhood since the area is already densely developed. The proposed project would not significantly interfere with the recharge of local groundwater or deplete the groundwater supplies. No significant impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river 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 includes two properties that are essentially flat lots featuring Holy Family Church and Holy Family High School. The project will not alter the course of a stream or river, since no stream or river is located on the site, nor would the project result in a substantial increase in runoff since the project site is already developed and the surrounding neighborhood is densely developed. Impacts to drainage patterns would be less than significant.

Furthermore, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the NPDES Permit set forth by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and to prepare and submit a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) to be administered throughout proposed project construction. The SWPPP would incorporate BMPs to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to less than significant levels. Development of the proposed project would not require any substantial changes to the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area, nor would it significantly affect the capacity of the existing storm drain system. The SWPPP would incorporate BMPs by requiring controls of pollutant discharges that utilize BAT and BCT to reduce pollutants. In addition, in accordance with Chapter 13.42, Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Control and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan of the Glendale Municipal Code, a SUSMP containing design features and BMPs to reduce post-construction pollutants in stormwater discharges would be required as part of the project. Consequently, impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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. The proposed project would not alter the course of a stream or river. Flood hazards due to heavy precipitation can result in inundation of developed areas due to overflow of nearby stream courses or from inadequate local storm drain facilities, if not sized to accommodate large storm events. The City has developed a flood control system that provides protection for its residents. The amount of surface runoff will not change as a result of the project. In addition, no Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated flood zones are located within the project site, as indicated in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). Therefore, flooding impacts would be less than significant.

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?

Less than Significant Impact. Please refer to Response J-3 above. The amount of on-site impervious surfaces would not increase significantly as a result of the project since the site is already fully developed. The project includes minor changes to the site, with alterations to the parking lot and play areas, additional parking lot landscaping, and new building footprints. Impacts from runoff as a result of the proposed project are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

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

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. 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?

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is not located within a mapped groundwater basin. The project would be required to comply with the Phase 1 municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4) permit requiring runoff to be treated using Low-Impact Development (LID) treatment controls, such as bio-treatment facilities and other hydro-modification 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 proposed project encompasses the expansion of and improvements to the existing private school (Holy Family High School) and the existing church (Holy Family Church) located in the R-1650 multi-family residential school. The proposed expansion of the existing private high school includes the development of two new buildings on the site: a 12,600 square-foot, two-story building, and a 2,900 square-foot, one-story building. The project site is adjacent to one- and two-story multi-family residential development, with two-story apartment buildings directly abutting the high school to the south. The proposed project is consistent with the permitted zoning which allows private schools to operate in multi-family residential zones subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The existing high school has operated on this site for approximately 80 years and will continue to operate as such. Furthermore, the demolition of the Office/Rectory in order to provide a larger, surface parking lot adjacent to the Church will not be inconsistent with the existing development. No established community would be divided as a result of the project. No impact 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 designation for the project site is R-1650 (Medium-High Density Residential Zone), and the General Plan designation is Medium High Density. The project includes the expansion of and improvements to the existing private school, Holy Family High School, which is a conditionally permitted use in the R-1650 zone, as well as the demolition of an ancillary church building to provide a larger surface parking lot. The applicant is requesting approval of three discretionary permits: a parking reduction permit to provide 162 stalls for the private school and new buildings, where 287 parking spaces are required by Code; a conditional use permit to allow the expansion of the existing private school; and a setback and standards variance to allow the construction of a new fence in the street-front and street-side setback areas along South Louise Street, East Lomita

Avenue, and East Chestnut Street, and to provide less landscaping than what is required by code.) A Conditional Use Permit is required for places of worship and private schools in multi-family residential zones to ensure compatibility of adjacent uses; the Church and High School have been in existence at this location for decades and development of the new Parish Center and ancillary school building will remain compatible with the adjacent residential uses. Approval of the requested reduction in parking will not be detrimental to the surrounding neighborhood because, based on a Parking Study provided by the applicant the number of parking spaces provided will not exceed the demand of the campus. Additionally, the campus will operate with overflow parking allowances at both the elementary school and the high school for those occasions where it is necessary (i.e. major event or religious function) Approval of the setback and standards variance to allow for fencing along the street front and side street property lines and for less landscaping than required by Code will also not produce significant environmental impacts. Regulations regarding fencing in street front and street-side setbacks are meant to ensure the residential streetscapes appear open inviting; the proposed wrought iron fencing around the high school site will maintain a sense of visual openness, while ensuring security around the school located within a residential neighborhood. Therefore, 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 project site is located in an area that has been completely urbanized for many years and is not within an area that has been identified as containing valuable mineral resources, as indicated in the City's Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1992). Therefore, development within the project site would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

M. NOISE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
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 existing noise environment in the project vicinity is dominated by traffic noise from nearby roadways (Colorado Street to the north, Glendale Avenue to the east, and Brand Boulevard to the west), as well as typical residential activities in the surrounding area along the residential streets. Long-term operation of the proposed project would have a minimal effect on the noise environment in proximity to the project site above the existing conditions. The proposed project involves the demolition of two buildings and construction of two new buildings on the existing private school site. This type of use is a conditionally permitted use on the subject site, located in a multi-family zone. The project also includes demolition of an existing building to provide a surface parking lot for the church. Based on the proposed phasing of the project described on page 1, the demolition for the project will not occur at the same time. As shown in the City's Noise Element, the existing private high school site is located in an area identified as being in all three noise contours. The easterly portion of the lot which contains the existing high school building is located in the 70 dB and over noise contour, the central portion of the lot where the existing Parish Hall and St. Anthony's storage building are located is in the 65-70 dB noise contour, and the remainder of the site that contains primarily the playground and parking areas is located in the 60-65 dB noise contour; the noise contour levels decrease the further distance away (west) from Glendale Avenue. The new project would be constructed to reduce interior noise to acceptable levels as required by the building code, and the project is not anticipated to generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element. Construction associated with the project will be required to comply with the City of Glendale Noise Ordinance (GMC Chapter 8.36), which prohibits construction activities between the hours of 7:00 PM on one date and 7:00 AM of the next day or from 7:00 PM on Saturday to 7:00 AM on Monday or from 7:00 PM preceding a holiday. Once completed, the proposed project and its on-site standard mechanical equipment (air handling unit and exhaust fans) would need to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance, which establishes maximum permitted noise levels from mechanical equipment. Project compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance would ensure that noise levels from building mechanical equipment would not exceed thresholds of significance. The current student capacity for the High School will remain at 280 students, and the proposal does not include expanding the enrollment capacity. As such, noise created from outdoor activities typically associated with a school is not anticipated to increase above existing conditions. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Excessive groundborne vibration is typically associated with activities such as blasting used in mining operation, or the use of pile drivers during construction. The proposed project would be constructed using typical construction techniques. No pile driving for construction would

be necessary. Structural support required for the development of the project would be installed by drilling bore holes, installing steel I beams, and grouting with concrete. Heavy construction equipment (e.g. bulldozer and excavator) would generate a limited amount of groundborne 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 vibration or groundborne noise. As such, temporary groundborne vibration and noise levels associated with the proposed construction 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 the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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 does not include any residential uses and would not result in new population growth in the City. Any indirect growth occurring as a result of employees relocating to the proposed project would be inconsequential such that impacts would be less than significant. Since the project site is located within an urban area and is currently served by existing circulation and utility infrastructure, no major extension of infrastructure is required as part of the proposed project. Additionally, no expansion to the existing service area of a public service provider is required. Therefore, development of the project site would not induce population growth, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

a) Fire protection?

Less than Significant Impact. The City of Glendale Fire Department (GFD) provides fire and paramedic services to the project site. The nearest fire stations are Station No. 21, located at 421 Oak Street (0.7 miles north), and Station No. 22, located at 1201 South Glendale Avenue (0.7 miles south). The project will be required to comply with the Uniform Fire Code and to submit plans to the Glendale Fire Department at the time building plans are submitted for approval. Impacts to fire protection are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b) Police protection?

Less than Significant Impact. The Glendale Police Department (GPD) provides police services to the project site. The nearest police facility is located at 131 North Isabel Street, which is 0.6 miles from the subject property. The site is located in an urban, developed area of the City. Impacts to police protection are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c) Schools?

No Impact. Section 65995 of the Government Code provides that school districts can collect a fee on a per-square-foot basis to assist in the construction of or additions to schools. Pursuant to Section 65995, the use is exempt from paying school impact fees to the Glendale Unified School District. Additionally, the proposed project encompasses the expansion of and improvements to the Holy Family Campus, which includes the existing private high school. The current student capacity for the all-girls High School will remain at 280 students, and the proposal does not include expanding the enrollment capacity. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d) Parks?

No Impact. The proposed project would not involve the development or displacement of a park. The project site is located in a multi-family residential zone where a private school is a conditionally permitted use, and the project site 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 is exempt from paying the Development Impact Fee to the City since the proposed uses of the project site, which includes a church and a private high school, are identified as special uses that serve the public. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e) Other public facilities?

No Impact. The proposed project is not anticipated to increase the demand for library services. In accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the project applicant is exempt from paying the Development Impact Fee to the City since the proposed use of the project site which includes a church and a private high school are identified as special uses that serves the public. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

P. RECREATION

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project is consistent with the Land Use Element, which designates the project site for residential uses and which allows churches and private schools to operate with a conditional use permit. The proposed project does not include the development of new housing, which would result in new residential population. The potential demand for new parks, or increased maintenance and additional improvements at existing parks, would be minimal due to the nature of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts associated with the demand of existing park facilities.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed above in Response P-1, the project is not anticipated to create a significant demand on parks facilities that would require the construction or expansion at existing public recreational facilities. In addition, the project does not include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, no significant 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	
3. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
4. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
5. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
6. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

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

Less than Significant Impact. There would be an increase in day-time traffic as a result of the construction activities. However, this increase is not considered substantial since the construction phase is short-term. A Construction Traffic Management Plan will be required to be submitted to the City's Public Works Department for approval for project construction. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will include a Construction Traffic Control Plan, a Construction Parking Plan, a Haul Routes Plan, and construction hours. The project site is served by four local streets: South Louise Street, East Elk Avenue, East Lomita Avenue, and East Chestnut Street. The City's Traffic Engineer reviewed the proposed project and determined that no significant increase in traffic would occur as a result of the project, as it would not generate a significant increase in the number of trips and/or vehicles (less than 50 net peak-hour trips). Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing roadway network or the locations of existing driveways accessing the project site. All driveway locations along Lomita Avenue and South Louise Street will remain the same as existing. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) Result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact. The proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing street networks or to existing emergency response plans. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority and Glendale Beeline provide bus service within the City of Glendale. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding alternative transportation, since no changes to the existing transportation policies, plans, or programs are proposed. 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. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and this is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or			X	
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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.				

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Written notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam of Band Mission Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB52 and codified in the Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by either tribe within the 30-days of notice.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As mentioned previously, the project site is already fully developed and currently features the existing church and private high school. 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 Ban of Mission Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by either tribe within 30-days of notice. 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, 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, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No Impact. No new sources of water supply, such as groundwater, are required to meet the proposed project's water demand. Water serving the proposed project would be treated by existing extraction and treatment facilities, and no new facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, would be required. No construction or relocation of electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities are required or proposed. 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.

Based on a generation factor of 12 gpd/student, the proposed project will not result in an increase in a significant demand for operational uses, including landscaping, irrigation, maintenance and other activities on site as there is no increase in the student enrollment capacity at the existing private high school (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 afy with a total available supply of 39,540 afy, resulting in a surplus of 11,358 afy 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.

The 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 above, a surplus exists that provides a buffer of approximately 11,358 afy of water. Future water demand in the City is based on projected development contained in the General Plan.

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 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, the City would use less MWD water supplies in the future compared to its current use because of implemented water conservation efforts (such as, City Best Management Practices, Water-Efficient Landscape Programs and Water-Efficient Indoor Programs). With the City's reduction of dependency on imported water from MWD, GWP has a higher level of reliability in meeting water demands during drought conditions. Even with the implementation of the proposed project, the GWP would continue to have adequate supply to meet citywide demand under drought conditions.

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 project site goes to the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP), which the City of Glendale has access to through the Amalgamated Wastewater Agreement between the City of Glendale and the City of Los Angeles. 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 as 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, the 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, the 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, the 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

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Does the project have the potential to 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?			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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is a currently developed and located within an urbanized area in South Glendale. No biological species or habitat for biological species exists on site or within the project vicinity. In addition, no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plans apply to the project site. As such, the proposed project would not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Furthermore, the proposed project would not have the potential to eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory, including historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant environmental impacts that have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. No significant impacts are anticipated.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Cumulative impacts may occur when the proposed project in conjunction with one or more related projects would yield an impact that is greater than what would occur with the development of only the proposed project. With regard to cumulative effects for the issues of agricultural, biological, and mineral resources, the project site is located in an urbanized area and therefore, other developments occurring in the area of the project would largely occur on previously disturbed land and are not anticipated to have an impact. Thus, no cumulative impact to these resources would occur. Impacts related to archaeological resources, paleontological resources and hazards and hazardous materials are generally confined to a specific site and do not affect off-site areas. Therefore, the proposed project would have no 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. As detailed throughout this Initial Study, the proposed project does not exceed any significance thresholds or result in significant impacts in the environmental categories typically associated with indirect or direct effects to human beings, such as aesthetics, agriculture, biological resources, energy, geology/soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use, mineral resources, population/housing, public services, recreation, transportation utilities/service systems, or wildfire. 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. Environmental Information Form application and materials submitted on April 9, 2019.
2. The City of Glendale's *General Plan,* "Open Space and Conservation Element," January 1993.
3. The City of Glendale's *General Plan,* "Noise Element," May 2007.
4. The City of Glendale's *General Plan, "*Safety Element," August 2003.

5. The City of Glendale's *General Plan,* "Recreation Element," April 1996.
6. The City of Glendale's Municipal Code, as amended.
7. "City of Glendale and Glendale Housing Authority Guidelines for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as Amended, and the State CEQA Guidelines, as Amended," November 1, 2016, City of Glendale Planning Division.
8. Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq and California Code of Regulations, Title 14 Section 15000 et seq.
9. "CEQA Air Quality Handbook," April, 1993, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
10. "CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook," updated October 2003, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
11. California Emissions Estimator Module (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) Report.