PROPOSED
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

All For Health, Health For All
New Commercial Development – Medical/General Offices and Retail
517 E. Broadway

The following Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.	
Project Title/Common Name:	New Commercial Development - Medical/General Offices and Retail
Project Location:	517 E. Broadway, Glendale, Los Angeles County
Project Description:	The project involves the demolition of an existing one-story medical office building (built in 1948) and adjacent surface parking lot on a 12,086 square-foot property (before dedication) located on the northwest corner of Isabel Street and Broadway and construction of a new five-story, 32,500 square-foot commercial building containing medical/general offices and retail uses and on-site parking within a multi-level parking garage. The parking garage will provide 71 parking spaces including on-grade parking and three subterranean levels. The project will provide 1,810 square feet of publicly accessible open space on the ground level facing Isabel Street.
Project Type:	☒ Private Project ☐ Public Project
Project Applicant:	All For Health, Health For All c/o Todd Lynch and Marcelo Spina – All for Health Joint Venture 932 Wilson Street, Suite 1B Los Angeles, 90021
Findings:	The Director of the Community Development, on **December 2, 2019**, after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Division, found that the above referenced project would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be prepared.
Mitigation Measures:	See attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
Attachments:	MMRP; Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Milca Toledo, Senior Planner City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 548-2140; Fax: (818) 240-0392

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

The following mitigation measures shall apply to the proposed commercial medical/general office and retail development project, located at 517 E. Broadway, to reduce identified impacts to less than significant levels.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

MM-1 If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 60-foot buffer of the find) shall cease and the County coroner shall be contacted. If the human remains provide to be Native American in origin by the County Coroner, the applicant shall immediately notify the lead agency and all consulting Tribes.

Monitoring Agency:	Community Development Department
Timing:	During all site preparation and construction activities
Responsibility:	Project Applicant

MM-2 In the event that Native American cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall assess the find. The Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians shall be contracted to consult if any such find occurs. The archaeologist shall complete all relevant California State Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 Series forms to document the find and submit this documentation to the applicant, Lead Agency and the FTBMI. If the Native American cultural resource is determined to be significant, as defined by consulting Tribes, a Native American monitor procured by the FTBMI shall be present for all ground disturbing activities that occur within the proposed project area.

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

Monitoring Agency:	Community Development Department
Timing:	During all site preparation and construction activities
Responsibility:	Project Applicant

1.	**Project Title:** New Commercial Building - Medical/General Offices and Retail
2.	**Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Glendale Community Development Department Planning Division 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	**Contact Person and Phone Number:** Milca Toledo, Senior Planner Tel: (818) 937-8181 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	**Project Location:** 517 E. Broadway, Glendale, Los Angeles County
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** All For Health, Health For All c/o Todd Lynch or Marcelo Spina – All for Health Joint Venture 932 Wilson Street, Suite 1B Los Angeles, CA 90021
6.	**General Plan Designation:** Downtown Specific Plan (DSP) "East Broadway" District
7.	**Zoning:** DSP/EB (Downtown Specific Plan/East Broadway)
8.	**Project Description:** The project involves the demolition of an existing one-story medical office building (built in 1948) and adjacent surface parking lot on a 12,086 square-foot property (before dedication) located on the northwest corner of Isabel Street and Broadway and construction of a new five-story, 32,500 square-foot commercial building containing medical/general offices and retail uses and on-site parking within a multi-level parking garage. The parking garage will provide 71 parking spaces including on-grade parking and three subterranean levels. The project will provide 1,810 square feet of publicly accessible open space on the ground level facing Isabel Street.
9.	**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *North:* Public Alley and Civic / Government – Glendale Police Station (DSP/Civic Centers Zone) *South:* Commercial - Office buildings (DSP/EB Zone) *East:* Civic / Government, Glendale City Hall Campus (DSP/Civic Centers Zone) *West:* Commercial – Retail, Personal Service and Office uses (DSP/EB Zone)
10.	**Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).** None

11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

☐ Aesthetics	☐ 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: _____ November 27, 2019

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

Director of Community Development: _____ Date: 11/27/19

A. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
3. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X	
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

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

Less than Significant Impact. The open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan identifies the San Gabriel Mountains and the Verdugo Mountains as visual and scenic resources. Views of the Verdugo and San Gabriel Mountains are available along Brand Boulevard and Central Avenue, but these views are currently confined to looking down the streets themselves by existing buildings. The project site is located within a highly developed urban area of the City. The project site is currently developed with a one-story, 3,976 square-foot medical office building and an adjacent surface parking lot.

The existing commercial and surrounding multi-story buildings to the north obscures views of San Gabriel Mountains to the north and east, and Verdugo Mountains to the west. Looking across the surface parking at the northwest corner of the project site, development along Isabel Street fully obstructs views from the east while distant high-rise buildings and adjacent development severely limit views from the west and south.

While existing views from the west and south of the project would be modified with development of the proposed project, the changes would not substantially impact views of the San Gabriel Mountains or the Verdugo Mountains because views are generally confined to looking down the streets bordering the project site. As such, development of the proposed project would not significantly impede any existing views of the San Gabriel Mountains or Verdugo Mountains.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located in an urbanized area in the City's Downtown. The property is zoned DSP/EB (Downtown Specific Plan/ East Broadway). Currently, the property is developed with a one-story 3,976 square-foot commercial medical office building and

surface parking lot. The subject site is surrounded by commercial uses to the south and west and civic / government buildings to the north, east and southeast. These surrounding uses range from one to four stories in height.

The permitted height limit within the East Broadway District is 4 stories and 65 feet and maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 2.5. Projects within the East Broadway District may use any combination of the incentives identified in the DSP to increase the permitted height to 5 stories and 80 feet with a maximum FAR of 2.75. The proposed project is requesting to use the open space incentive to allow a building with maximum height of 69 feet, 8-inches, and an FAR of 2.74. In order to qualify for the height and density bonus under the open space incentive, the project would be required to provide one square foot of publicly accessible open space for every 10 square feet of floor area over the by right FAR of 2.5. The proposed Project would provide approximately 1,810 square feet (15.3%) of landscaped publicly accessible open space facing Isabel Street that meets the requirement to qualify the open space incentive under the DSP. The landscape design is interwoven into the new brick pavement, which will connect to the existing brick on the right-of-way along Isabel Street and Broadway. This area is publicly accessible area featuring benches and public art. No significant impacts associated with zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Day and nighttime lighting for the project would not increase beyond the existing condition. Lighting proposed for the building will be similar to existing commercial buildings in the area. A new light sources associated with the project will not significantly increase the ambient lighting in the area. All lighting associated with the proposed project would be subject to lighting regulations, including those set forth in the Glendale Comprehensive Design Guidelines. The lighting would not create substantial light and glare impacts based on the location and orientation of the proposed lighting fixtures. Further, proposed external lighting 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 project site is already developed with commercial uses, no significant impacts associated with lighting are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

C. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied on to make the following determinations.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
2. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			X	
3. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
4. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

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

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

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

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

No population growth is associated with the proposed project because the project involves the construction of a new commercial building provide general/medical offices and retail uses permitted

under existing zoning and does not involve residential housing. As a result, the proposed project will not result in population and housing growth that would cause growth in Glendale to exceed the SCAG forecast. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with AQMP attainment forecasts. Therefore, no impact would occur with relation to a conflict with, or obstruction of, the implementation of the SCAQMD AQMP.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***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.

Emission estimates where done using the California Emissions Estimator Model® (CalEEMod) which is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals to quantify potential criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. The model was developed for the California Air Pollution Officers Association (CAPCOA) in collaboration with the California Air Districts. The model quantifies direct emissions from construction and operation activities (including vehicle use), as well as indirect emissions, such as GHG emissions from energy use, solid waste disposal, vegetation planting and/or removal, and water use.

The proposed project's construction and land use information was entered into the model to estimate both construction and operation emissions. Based on the model run, construction of the project would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds of significance for either construction or operation. 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. The nearest sensitive residential receptors are located approximately 200 feet south of the project site. As indicated above, the project would be required to adhere to the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMAD) Rule 403-Fugitive Dust, which would further reduce the less than significant impact related to construction-related impacts identified in Response C.2 above and comply with all applicable rules that govern construction related impacts. In addition, as indicated in the air quality model run described above, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. . The project would not expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration and therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The type of facilities that are typically associated with objectionable odors include wastewater treatments plants, compost facilities, landfills, solid waste transfer stations, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), dairy farms, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing, and food manufacturing facilities. A new commercial building providing medical/general and retail uses and a subterranean parking structure would not result in the types of odors generated by the aforementioned land uses. During construction, equipment exhaust and application of asphalt would temporarily generate odors. Any construction- and operation-related odor emissions would be temporary and intermittent. Additionally, noxious odors would be confined to the immediate vicinity of the equipment. By the time

such emissions reach any sensitive receptor sites, they would be diluted to well below any level of air quality concern. Therefore, impacts associated with operation- and construction-generated odors would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the 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?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site and the surrounding area are completely developed and disturbed. The project site is currently developed with a one-story, 3,976 square-foot medical office building and associated surface parking lot and does not contain any native vegetation or habitat areas. The majority of the surrounding building area has also been developed and landscaped with largely non-native plants. Only a limited number of plant species common in urban environments, none of which are considered rare or endangered are found near the project site. The removal of existing building and parking lot and construction of the new commercial building and subterranean parking garage will be located within the same existing developed location.

Therefore, the project is not anticipated to have a significant impact on biological resources.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is presently a developed site located in the City's Downtown area and surrounded by commercial buildings. There are no known riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities that may be affected by the project. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on 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 impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is located in a developed commercial area where there are many constraints to wildlife movement. In addition, there are no wildlife migration corridors in the vicinity of the project site. No impact will occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No Mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X		
3. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		

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

No Impact. The project site is currently developed with a one-story, commercial medical office building constructed in 1948 and a surface parking lot. The proposed project will remove the existing one-story commercial building and a surface parking lot and construct a new five-story, 32,500 square-foot commercial building (medical/general offices and retail uses) and an on-site, multi-level parking structure providing 71 total parking spaces on-grade and three levels subterranean. No historic resources have been identified on this site and the property is not within a historic district. No impact to a historical resource would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites are not known to exist within the project area. The City's Open Space and Conservation Element indicate that no significant archaeological sites have been identified in this area of Glendale. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. Implementation of mitigation measures MM-1 and MM-2 identified below would reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: Refer to mitigation measures MM-1and MM-2 below.

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

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of commercial and residential land uses. No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the project site or surrounding area. Notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (FYBMI) and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians on April 26, 2019, 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 the notice; however, the FTBMI did review the grading plans and requested that mitigation measures be added to address as they believed potential impacts could occur. If human remains were to be encountered during excavation

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

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

MM – 1 If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 60-foot buffer of the find) shall cease and the County coroner shall be contacted. If the human remains provide to be Native American in origin by the County Coroner, the applicant shall immediately notify the lead agency and all consulting Tribes.

MM – 2 In the event that Native American cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall assess the find. The Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians shall be contracted to consult if any such find occurs. The archaeologist shall complete all relevant California State Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 Series forms to document the find and submit this documentation to the applicant, Lead Agency and the FTBMI. If the Native American cultural resource is determined to be significant, as defined by consulting Tribes, a Native American monitor procured by the FTBMI shall be present for all ground disturbing activities that occur within the proposed project area.

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

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. The construction of the project would require consumption of nonrenewable energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels (including fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline) for automobiles and construction equipment, and other resources including, but not limited to, lumber, sand, gravel, asphalt, metals, and water. Construction would include energy

used by construction equipment and other activities at the project site (e.g., building demolition, excavation, paving), in addition to the energy used to manufacture the equipment, materials, and supplies and transport them to the project site. Energy for maintenance activities would include day-to-day upkeep of equipment and systems, as well as energy embedded in any replacement equipment, materials, and supplies. It is expected that nonrenewable energy resources would be used efficiently during construction and maintenance activities given the financial implications of inefficient use of such resources. Therefore, the amount and rate of consumption of such resources during construction and maintenance activities would not result in the unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of energy resources.

Operation of the project would involve consumption of electricity and natural gas; however, these resources are already consumed on the project site, and an incremental increase in the consumption of these resources associated with the project operation would not represent unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of resources. Furthermore, 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); therefore, the project consumption of energy resources would be less than significant.

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 new building's energy efficiency would, at a minimum, comply with the California Energy Code and the California Building Code. 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	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
4. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X	
5. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
6. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	

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

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

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

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

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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 topography of the Project site and the surrounding area is relatively flat and, thus, devoid of any distinctive landforms. As identified in the City's Safety Element (August 2003), the project site is not located within a mapped landside hazard zone. Therefore, no impacts related to landslides would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Construction activities 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 because the site would expose small amounts of soil only during construction activities, and would then be covered with the proposed building and landscaping upon completion of construction. Soils on the project site would only be exposed for a limited amount of time during site preparation activities; thus, substantial erosion is not expected to occur. An erosion control plan, subject to review and approval by the City Engineer, will be required prior to any construction-related activities. Further, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the Glendale Municipal Code Section 13.42.060 to prepare and administer a plan that effectively provides for a minimum stormwater quality protection throughout project construction. The plan would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to less than significant. In addition, the applicant would be required to adhere to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403—Fugitive Dust, which would further reduce the impact related to soil erosion to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As identified in the City's Safety Element (August 2003), the project site is not located within a mapped liquefaction hazard zone. The relatively flat topography of the project site precludes both stability problems and the potential for lurching, which is earth movement at right angles to a cliff or steep slope during ground shaking. As previously discussed, the project is not subject to hazards such as landslides and liquefaction.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Plant and animal fossils are typically found within sedimentary rock deposits. Most of the City of Glendale consists of igneous and metamorphic rock, and the local area is not known to contain paleontological resources. Nonetheless, paleontological resources may possibly exist at deep levels and could be unearthed with implementation of the project. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during the project-related subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until a paleontologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

H. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are

now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels.

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

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. GHG as defined under AB 32 includes: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the State agency charged with regulating statewide air quality, adopt rules and regulations that would achieve greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to statewide levels in 1990 by 2020 thru reductions in 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 consequently, this project would result in a less than cumulatively considerable impact on GHG emissions and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

I. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

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

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

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 Rule 403 and 402, during the construction phase of the project 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.

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

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

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

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

No Impact. There is one public school located within a quarter mile from the subject site, Allan F. Daily High School located at 222 North Jackson Street and one private school operated at the First United Methodist Church of Glendale at 134 N. Kenwood Street. However, the project would not emit any new hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials since residential uses are proposed. No impact 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 area?***

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

No Impact. There is no "City Disaster Response Route" located on any streets adjacent to the project site. The nearest designated street is Brand Avenue, located approximately 0.3 miles west of the Project site and Glendale Avenue, located approximately 0.1 miles east of the Project site that are designated City Disaster Response Routes. Colorado Boulevard, which is located approximately 0.4 miles south of the Project site, is designated as a County Response Route as identified in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). The proposed project does not involve any changes to Glendale Avenue, Brand Boulevard or Colorado Street, nor would the project result in the alteration of an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. As such, no impacts to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would occur as a result of the proposed project. No impact would occur.

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 is not identified as a high fire risk site on the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) on the Local Responsible Area (LRA) map, as recommended by CAL Fire. 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 decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X	
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			X	
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;			X	
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
4. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
5. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The City currently utilizes water from Glendale Water and Power (GWP), which relies on primarily importing water from the Metropolitan Water District, some local groundwater basins and from the San Fernando Basin. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would result in development that could indirectly require a slight increased use of groundwater through the provision of potable water by GWP; however, as discussed in Response S-2 below, the proposed project's water demand is within water projections. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies.

Per the City's Open Space and Conservation Element, the north and easterly facing slopes of the Verdugo Mountains drain into the Arroyo Verdugo drainage basin and directly feed aquifers and wells reserved exclusively for the City of Glendale. The south-facing slopes of these mountains drain into the Los Angeles River basin which feed aquifers, ground water basins and wells shared by the Cities of Glendale, Burbank and Los Angeles. The largest flood control basin is the Verdugo basin, which is located adjacent to the Oakmont Country Club in the northern portion of the city. Maps 4-21 and 4-22 of the Open Space and Conservation Element show this, as well the other basins, within the city. Per Maps 4-21 and 4-22, the subject property is not located on or within the watershed or aquifer recharge areas. 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 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 applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) Permit set forth by the RWQCB (Regional Water Quality Control Board), and to prepare and submit a SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan) to be administered throughout proposed project construction. The SWPPP would incorporate BMPs (Best Management Practices) to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to a less than significant level.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

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

With respect to water quality, as described above in Response J-1 and J-5, with implementation of BMPs mandated by the MS4 (municipal separate storm sewer systems) permit, SWQMP, and construction-related NPDES permit, water quality impacts associated with project construction and operation would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is not located within a mapped groundwater basin. The project would be required to comply with the Phase 1 MS4 permit requiring runoff to be treated using 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 project site is located in the DSP/EB (Downtown Specific Plan/ East Broadway) District. The site is currently developed with a one-story 3,976 square-foot medical office building and an adjacent surface parking lot. The proposed project includes the construction of a 32,500 square-foot commercial building providing medical/general offices and retail uses with an on-site multi-level parking structure providing on-grade and underground parking spaces. The project is consistent with the development pattern in the area and its proposed uses (medical/general offices and retail) are permitted in the DSP/EB District. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The zoning designation on the project site is DSP/EB District and the General Plan designation is Downtown Specific Plan. The proposed project complies with the Land Use Element of the General Plan, as well as the zoning standards including the proposed uses, height/stories, landscape, open space, setbacks, and parking. The design of project will be reviewed pursuant to Glendale Municipal Code Section 30.47, to ensure compatibility with surrounding environment. As a result, no significant impacts associated with applicable land use plans and policies 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 located in an area that is 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 1993). 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 result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	

Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
3. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

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

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project involves the demolition of an existing one-story commercial medical office building and adjacent surface parking lot and the construction of a new five-story, 32,500 square-foot commercial building (medical/general offices and retail with on-site parking located within a multi-level parking structure (on-grade and three levels underground) located on a 12,086 square-foot lot. The proposed commercial building and uses are permitted on the subject property zoned DSP/EB. Surrounding land uses include commercial and government buildings (Police Station, City Hall Campus and County Court House). As shown in the City's Noise Element, the project site is located within the 70 CNEL and over projected 2030 noise contours. The new project would be constructed to reduce interior noise to acceptable levels. All development within the project site would be constructed consistent with the State of California Building Code and would be required to comply with the City of Glendale Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 8.36) which prohibits construction activities to between the hours of 7:00 p.m. on one day and 7:00 a.m. of the next day or from 7:00 p.m. on Saturday to 7:00 a.m. on Monday or from 7:00 p.m. preceding a holiday. Compliance with the City's noise ordinance would ensure that noise impacts will be less than significant. In addition, short-term construction noise levels are not expected to exceed the standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. While the proposed building will produce a more intensive use than the existing condition, it is not anticipated to generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element. 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 operations, 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. Thus, significant vibration impacts would not occur.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Project site is neither located within an airport land use plan nor is it located within two miles of a public airport 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 consists of a new five-story, 32,500 square-foot commercial (medical/general offices and retail) building and on-site parking within a new multi-level parking structure providing 71 parking spaces (on-grade and subterranean). The project does not include any new residential units and would not result in substantial new population grown in the city and is consistent with the allowable uses and standards of the DSP/EB District. Any indirect growth occurring as a result of employees from the new five-story building containing medical/general offices and retail uses would be inconsequential. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

O. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

a) Fire protection?

Less than Significant Impact. The City of Glendale Fire Department (GFD) provides fire and paramedic services to the project site. The nearest fire station is Station 25 located at 353 North Chevy Chase Drive, which is approximately one mile from the project site. The project will be required to comply with the Uniform Fire Code, including installation of fire sprinklers for the new commercial building and 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 directly north of the subject site at 131 North Isabel Street. The site is located in an urban, developed area of the City and similar uses exist along Broadway and Isabel Street. The additional daytime population that this project will bring is not anticipated to have a significant impact on Police services.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c) Schools?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d) Parks?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not involve the development or displacement of a park. The subject site is zoned DSP/EB. In accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the project applicant will be required to pay the Development Impact feet to the city based on the current fee schedule prior to the issuance of building permits. In addition, the Project would provide open space amenities on site, with approximately 1,810 square feet of at-grade, landscaped publicly accessible open space along Isabel Street. Payment of the impact would result in less than significant impact to park facilities.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e) Other public facilities?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project consist of the demolition of the existing one-story medical office building and adjacent surface parking lot and the construction of a new five-story, 32,500 square-foot commercial building with on-grade and subterranean parking structure providing 71 parking spaces on a 12,086 square-foot lot (before dedication). The additional employees at the new commercial building could increase the demand for library services and incremental amount; however, in accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the project applicant will be required to pay the Development Impact Fee to the City based on the current fee schedule for commercial developments prior to the issuance of building permits. Payment of the impact fees would result in less than significant impact to library facilities.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

P. RECREATION

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project is not expected to generate a substantial increase in demand for existing park or recreational facilities. As discussed in Response O-1(d), the project applicant will be required to pay the City's Park and Library Development Impact Fee to provide for park and recreational facilities based on the current fee schedule for commercial development prior to the issuance of building permit. Payment of the impact feet would result in a less than significant impact to park and recreational facilities.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. As indicated in Response P-1 above, the project is not anticipated to significantly increase the demand on existing parks. No significant impacts to recreation resources are anticipated with implementation of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Q. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			X	
2. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X	
3. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
4. Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	

1) *Conflict with program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?*

Less than Significant Impact. Construction activities for the proposed project would generate additional traffic as a result of employee vehicle trips and construction truck transport of equipment and building material during construction period. The increase in day time traffic is not considered substantial since the construction phase is short-term, approximately 18-24 months and will not exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system. No changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the project

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

The proposed project does not conflict with any program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities as the slight increase in the number of vehicles using the area streets resulting from the project is anticipated to create a less than significant impact. A traffic impact study (TIA) was prepared, which concluded that the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts at the study intersections under Existing plus Project and Future plus Project scenarios.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Q-1 above, the proposed project would not result in any significant increase in traffic on the area roadway network. A Construction Traffic Control plan approved by the Glendale Public Works Department will be required prior to construction. The plan is required to identify all traffic control measures, signs and delineators to be implemented by the construction contractor. The plan will also identify contractor information, hours of construction, construction worker parking information, as well as the proposed haul route. There would not be any access by the general public to the construction site and the disposal of demolition materials and export of soil/material will not interfere with pubic streets. In addition, the proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing roadway network. No significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. No changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the project. Direct access to the property will be taken from the northerly alley accessed from Isabel Street, which is a designed as a Local Street south of Wilson Avenue in the City's Circulation Element. As indicated in Section Q-1 above, a traffic control plan will be required for the construction phase of the project. The plan will be reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Division to ensure that emergency access is not impacted during construction. As a result, less than significant impacts to emergency access are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

R. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.				

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

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

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Written notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (FTBMI) and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by either tribe within the 30-days of notice.

As indicated in Response E-3 above, impacts would be potentially significant if human remains were to be encountered during excavation and grading activities. State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then serve as a consultant on how to proceed with the remains (i.e., avoid removal or rebury). Mitigation measure MM-1 identified above would reduce any potential substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: Refer to mitigation measures MM-1and MM-2 above.

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

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As mentioned previously, no known burial sites are known to exist within the vicinity of the project site and surrounding area. In addition, 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 FTBMI and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by either tribe within the 30-days of notice; however, FTBMI after reviewing the grading plans requested the mitigation measures be added to the project. Based on this request, mitigation measures have been added to the project that address impacts to tribal cultural resource should any be discovered during site disturbance associated with construction. With the implementation of these mitigation measures potential impacts would be reduce to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measure MM-1 and MM-2 identified above would address a potential substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.

S. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Future water demand in the city is based on projected development contained in the General Plan. The total water demand in 2020 in the City of Glendale is expected to be 28,182 acre feet per year (afy) with a total available supply of 39,540 afy.

Normal Weather Conditions

The City of Glendale has identified an adequate supply of water to meet future city demands under normal conditions. As indicated in the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, a surplus exists that provides a reasonable buffer of approximately 1,500 to 2,500 afy of water. Future water demand in the city is based on projected development contained in the General Plan. For purposes of this assessment, the demand of the proposed project was assumed to have been included in this demand projection. Therefore, with the demand generated by the proposed project, there will be ample supply to meet remaining city demand under normal conditions.

Dry Weather Conditions

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

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

The proposed project will be required to comply with the provisions of Glendale's Mandatory Water Conservation Ordinance, as well as the 2016 California Green Building Standards (CAL Green) 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.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. Sewage from the City of Glendale is treated by the City of Los Angeles Hyperion System, which includes the Los Angeles/Glendale Water Reclamation Plant (LAGWRP), located outside the Glendale City limits in Los Angeles, and the Hyperion Treatment Plant, located in Playa del Rey. The City of Glendale and the City of Los Angeles jointly own and share operating capacity of LAGWRP. The City of Glendale entered into an amalgamated treatment and disposal agreement (Amalgamated Agreement) with the City of Los Angeles, which eliminates entitlements and reduces

limitations on the amount of sewage discharged into the Hyperion system. Any City of Glendale sewage not treated at the LAGWRP is treated at the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP).

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in residential development onsite. Solid waste generated on the project site would be deposited at the Scholl Canyon Landfill, which is owned by the City of Glendale, or one of the landfills located within the County of Los Angeles. The annual disposal rate at the Scholl Canyon facility is approximately 340,000 tons per year. Combined with the increase in solid waste generated by the proposed project, the Scholl Canyon facility could accommodate the annual disposal amount. In addition, the proposed project would be required to implement a waste-diversion program aimed at reducing the amount of solid waste disposed in the landfill. Examples of waste diversion efforts would include recycling programs for cardboard boxes, paper, aluminum cans, and bottles through the provision of recycling containers. As a result, no significant impacts are anticipated.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

U. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

No Impact. The project site is currently developed and located within an urbanized area along Broadway and Isabel Street. 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, archeological, or paleontological resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant environmental impacts that have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. No impacts would occur.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Cumulative impacts may occur when the proposed project in conjunction with one or more related projects would yield an impact that is greater than what would occur with the development of only the proposed project. The proposed project involves the demolition of an existing one-story medical office building and adjacent surface parking lot and the construction of a new five-story, 32,500 square-foot multi-tenant commercial building providing medical/general offices and retail uses with on-site parking located within a 71-space multi-level parking garage located on-grade and three level subterranean. As a result, the incremental effect of the commercial building is not cumulatively considerable. All environmental issues considered in this

Initial Study were found to have either no impact, a less than significant impact or less than significant impact with mitigations incorporated. As discussed in Section H (Greenhouse Gas Emissions), the project would not exceed State or regional thresholds for the emission of criteria air pollutants or greenhouse gases. Development of the project will not substantially increase traffic nor would it result in a substantial increase in population. Public facilities are available to accommodate the proposed project. Therefore, no cumulative impact to these resources would occur. Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials are generally confined to a specific site and do not affect off-site areas. Therefore, the proposed project would have not cumulatively considerable effects, and as such, cumulative impacts would not occur.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project involves the demolition of an existing one-story medical office building and adjacent surface parking lot and the construction of a new five-story, 32,500 square-foot multi-tenant commercial building providing medical/general offices and retail uses with on-site parking located within a 71-space multi-level parking garage located on-grade and three level subterranean. As mentioned in Response Q-1, the project will increase the number of vehicles using the area streets; however the TIA prepared for the project concluded that no significant traffic impacts would occur. As discussed in Response N-1(d), the project applicant will be required to pay the City's Park and Library Development Impact Fee to provide for park and recreation facilities based on the current fee schedule prior to the issuance of building permit. Last, the overall number of employment opportunities resulting from this development will not lead to a significant number of new workers moving to the area. Therefore, the project is not considered growth inducing and will not directly or indirectly lead to increased population that would generate additional calls for fire, paramedic or police services. Development of the proposed Project would not create direct and indirect adverse effects on humans. Less than significant impact would occur.

13. Earlier Analyses

None

14. Project References Used to Prepare Initial Study Checklist

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

1. The City of Glendale's *General Plan,* "Open Space and Conservation Element," as amended.
2. California Department of Conservation, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program,* Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2010 (September 2011).
3. California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, *Special Publication 42* (Revised 1997, Supplements 1 and 2 added 1999).
4. South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning* (May 2005).
5. City of Glendale, *General Plan,* "Safety Element" (2003).
6. California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, *State of California General Plan Guidelines* (2017).
7. City of Glendale Municipal Code, as amended.

8. City of Glendale, "Green Glendale Plan" (March 27, 2012).

9. City of Glendale, "Zero Waste Action Plan" (2011).

10. California Emissions Estimator Module (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) Report.

11. Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Report, April 2, 2018 (Prepared By: SASSAN Geosciences, Inc.

12. Traffic Impact Study Report, September 2019 (Prepared By: FEHR & PEERS).