PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

General Commercial Offices
6231- 6325 San Fernando Road

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

Project Title/Common Name:	General Commercial Offices
Project Location:	6231- 6325 San Fernando Road, Glendale, Los Angeles County

Project Description:

The proposed Project is to construct a 6,200 square-foot addition to an existing one-story, 6,087 square-foot, commercial/industrial building (6325 San Fernando Road, constructed in 1968), located in the C3 I (Commercial Services) zone, Height District I; construction of a 2,780 square-foot ground level addition and 4,832 square-foot mezzanine addition within an existing 6,648 square-foot, commercial/industrial building (6311 San Fernando Road, constructed in 1972); the demolition of 848 square-feet and façade improvement to an existing 52,848 square-foot commercial/industrial building (6265 San Fernando Road, constructed in 1953); and the construction of a 7,789 square-foot addition to an existing one-story, 2,211 square-foot commercial/industrial building (6231 San Fernando Road, constructed in 1921). The project site is approximately 187,440 square-feet (4.3 acres) in size, located in the IMU (Industrial/Commercial Mixed Use) Zone. The Project will function as general commercial offices. The existing parking spaces at the Project site will be reconfigured with a code compliant amount of 263 parking spaces and 23 non-code compliant tandem parking spaces. The proposed project requires approval from the Design Review Board.

The Project site is generally located mid-block of San Fernando Road, between Sonora Avenue and Grandview Avenue. Surrounding the Project site are commercial businesses (retail, restaurants, auto repair, etc.) to the west (across San Fernando Road) located in the IMU (Industrial/Commercial Mixed Use) zone, office and retail to the north located within the C3-I (Commercial Service-Height District I) zone, auto repair to the south located in the IMU (Industrial/Commercial Mixed Use) zone, and the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way to the south located in the T (Transportation) zone.

Construction of the project will occur over a single phase, which will take place over a period of approximately 60 weeks or 14 months. The amount of soil import to the site will be approximately 574 cubic yards (426 cubic yards cut; 1,000 cubic yards fill). Based on this estimate, the excavation material would require approximately 56 truck trips, assuming 16 cubic yards per truck. Due to the nature of the project, excavation would not occur over the entire 60 week construction period, but would be concentrated over approximately two weeks within the first five weeks of construction. The maximum number of haul truck trips per eight-hour work day is anticipated to be 8. The primary inbound haul route to the Project site would be from the Western Avenue exit of the Interstate 5 Freeway, then right onto San Fernando Road ending at the Project site. The same route is anticipated to be used for outbound trucks. The project site is approximately 4.3 acres allowing for staging areas and construction worker parking to take place onsite.

Project Type:	☒ Private Project ☐ Public Project
Project Applicant:	Jakub Tejchman 7121 Fairway Drive, Suite 410 Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33418
Findings:	The Director of the Community Development, on **December 16, 2019**, after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Division, found that the above referenced project would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Negative

	Declaration be prepared.
Mitigation Measures:	See attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).
Attachments:	Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Dennis Joe, Planner City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 548-8157; Fax: (818) 240-0392

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

The following mitigation measure shall apply to the proposed project located at 6231, 6265, 6311 and 6265 San Fernando Road to reduce identified impacts to less than significant levels.

CR–1 In 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 Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians shall be contacted to consult if any such find occur. The archaeologist shall complete all relevant California State Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 Series forms to document the find. If the Native American cultural resource is determined to be significant, as defined by the consulting Tribe(s), 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 materials encountered during the project.

Timing: During all site preparation and construction activities
Responsibility: Project applicant

CR–2 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 remains are Native American in origin by the County Coroner, the applicant shall immediately notify the lead agency and all consulting Tribes.

Timing: During all site preparation and construction activities
Responsibility: Project applicant

M-1 The applicant shall comply with all guidelines recommended in the Report of Geotechnical Investigation and Infiltration Study was prepared by RTF&A, dated August 15, 2019.

Timing: Plan check, during all site preparation and construction activities
Responsibility: Director of Community Development; Project applicant

Agreement to Proposed Mitigation Measures and Mitigation Monitoring Program

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

Dated: _____ _____

Signature(s) of the Project Applicant(s)

Dated: _____ _____

PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

General Commercial Offices
6231-6325 San Fernando Road

1.	**Project Title:** General Commercial Offices
2.	**Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Glendale Community Development Department Planning Division 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	**Contact Person and Phone Number:** Dennis Joe, Planner Tel: (818) 937-8157 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	**Project Location:** 6231-6325 San Fernando Road , Glendale, Los Angeles County
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Jakub Tejchman 7121 Fairway Drive, Suite 410 Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33418 Tel: (561) 598-6700
6.	**General Plan Designation:** Mixed Use and Commercial – Community Services
7.	**Zoning:** IMU (Industrial/Commercial Mixed Use) and C3-I (Commercial Service-Height District I) Zones
	Description of the Project: The Project is to construct a 6,200 square-foot addition to an existing one-story, 6,087 square-foot, commercial/industrial building (6325 San Fernando Road, constructed in 1968), located in the C3 I (Commercial Services) zone, Height District I; construction of a 2,780 square-foot ground level addition and 4,832 square-foot mezzanine addition within an existing 6,648 square-foot, commercial/industrial building (6311 San Fernando Road, constructed in 1972); the demolition of 848 square-feet and façade improvement to an existing 52,848 square-foot commercial/industrial building (6265 San Fernando Road, constructed in 1953); and the construction of a 7,789 square-foot addition to an existing one-story, 2,211 square-foot commercial/industrial building (6231 San Fernando Road, constructed in 1921). The project site is approximately 187,440 square-feet (4.3 acres) in size, located in the IMU (Industrial/Commercial Mixed Use) Zone. The Project will function as general commercial offices. The existing parking spaces at the Project site will be reconfigured with a code compliant amount of 263 parking spaces and 23 non-code compliant tandem parking spaces. The proposed project requires approval from the Design Review Board.
9.	**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *North*: C3 (Commercial Service) Zone, Height District I / Commercial (office and retail) *South*: C3 (Commercial Service) Zone, Height District I / Commercial (primarily auto repair) *East*: IMU (Industrial/Commercial Mixed Use) Zone / Commercial (retail, restaurant, auto repair) *West*: T (Transportation) Zone, Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way
10.	**Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or**

participation agreement).
None.

11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

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

LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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

Prepared by: Dennis Joe, Planner — Date: 12/16/19

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

Director of Community Development: Kristen Asp, Principal Planner CDD — Date: 12/16/19

A. AESTHETICS

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site consists of eight parcels, approximately 4.3 acres, located mid-block along San Fernando Road, between Sonora Avenue and Grandview Avenue. Surrounding the Project site are general commercial businesses, such as retail, restaurants, auto repair, etc, to the west (and, across San Fernando Road), office and retail uses to the north, auto repair to the south, and the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way to the south. The subject site is currently developed with a four commercial buildings and surface parking lots with a total of 256 parking spaces. The surface of the site is mostly paved with asphalt with limited amount of landscaping primarily along the street front property lines. There are no protected indigenous trees species on or within twenty feet of the site.

The proposed Project is to construct a 6,200 square-foot addition to an existing one-story, 6,087 square-foot, commercial/industrial building (6325 San Fernando Road, constructed in 1968), located in the C3 I (Commercial Services) zone, Height District I; construction of a 2,780 square-foot ground level addition and 4,832 square-foot mezzanine addition within an existing 6,648 square-foot, commercial/industrial building (6311 San Fernando Road, constructed in 1972); the demolition of 848 square-feet and façade improvement to an existing 52,848 square-foot commercial/office building (6265 San Fernando Road, constructed in 1953); and the construction of a 7,789 square-foot addition to an existing one-story, 2,211 square-foot commercial/industrial building (6231 San Fernando Road, constructed in 1921). The project site is approximately 187,440 square-feet (4.3 acres) in size, located in the IMU (Industrial/Commercial

Mixed Use) Zone. The Project will function as general commercial offices. The existing parking spaces at the Project site will be reconfigured with a code compliant amount of 263 parking spaces, 23 non-code compliant tandem parking spaces, and new landscaping consisting of a variety of shrubs and shade trees.

The overall height for the four existing buildings located on the Project site will maintain with the same heights at approximately 20-feet, 32-feet, 30-feet and 17-feet (measured from the lowest adjacent grade to the uppermost portion of the parking garage). The four existing buildings are currently developed with setbacks ranging from zero to approximately five feet from the San Fernando Road property line. The locations of the proposed additions at each building at the sides and rear will not extend the building foot print for each building closer to the property along San Fernando Road. An approximately five-foot wide landscaped buffer is provided between the reconfigured parking lots, as well as in front of buildings set back approximately five feet from the street front property line.

The building will be constructed with quality materials, such as smooth stucco, corrugated metal siding, brick and aluminum windows with a bronze finish. Review and approval of the Design Review Board along with compliance with the zoning standards and City's Comprehensive Design Guidelines would ensure that the proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. As a result, impacts to visual character and quality of the site are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Day and night time lighting for the project would increase as a result of the proposed project, but would not be significantly greater than any other similar commercial structures permitted in the IMU and C3 zones. Lighting for the project will be similar to existing commercial uses along San Fernando Road. Any external lighting of the property is required to be directed towards the subject property and shielded to prevent light from spilling over onto neighboring properties. With these requirements in place, and because the surrounding area is already developed with commercial buildings, no significant impacts associated with lighting are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

C. AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project is to construct a 6,200 square-foot addition to an existing one-story, 6,087 square-foot, commercial/industrial building; to construct a 2,780 square-foot ground level addition and 4,832 square-foot mezzanine addition within an existing 6,648 square-foot, commercial/industrial building; to demolish 848 square-feet and improve the façade of an existing 52,848 square-foot building; and to construct a 7,789 square-foot addition to an existing one-story, 2,211 square-foot commercial/industrial building.

An approximate total of 1,000 cubic yards of soil will be graded at the Project site that includes 426 CY of cut and 574 CY of fill imported to the project site. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) was used to estimate air quality impacts during the construction and operation stages of the project. Results from the model indicate that the proposed project would not exceed thresholds for construction, area, or operational impacts. A summary of the results are attached. As a result, less than significant impacts will occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact: There are no sensitive receptors located near the Project site. Surrounding the Project property are general commercial businesses (retail, restaurants, auto repair, etc.) to the west (across San Fernando Road) located in the IMU (Industrial/Commercial Mixed Use)

zone, office and retail to the north located within the C3-I (Commercial Service-Height District I) zone, auto repair to the south located in the IMU (Industrial/Commercial Mixed Use) zone, and the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way to the south located in the T (Transportation) zone. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) was used to estimate air quality impacts during the construction and operation stages of the project. Results from the model indicate that the proposed project would not exceed thresholds for construction, area, or operational impacts. As a result, the Project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activity associated with the project may generate detectable odors from equipment exhaust. However, any detectable odors or equipment exhaust would be associated with initial construction and would be considered transitory and/or short-term. Therefore, less than significant construction related odor impacts are anticipated to occur from the project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

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

No Impact. The project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for decades. The Project site is currently developed with a 6,087 square-foot commercial/industrial building (c. 1968), a 6,648 square-foot, commercial/industrial (c. 1972), a 52,848 square-foot commercial/industrial (c. 1953), and a 2,211 square-foot commercial/industrial building (c. 1921). The remainder of the site is paved for surface parking. No wildlife species other than those which can tolerate human activity and/or are typically found in urban environments are known to exist on or near the Project site. These human-tolerant species are neither sensitive, threatened, nor endangered. Implementation of the project would not result in any impact to species identified as endangered, threatened, sensitive or being of special concern by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. In addition, the Project site does not provide suitable habitat for endangered or rare species given the pattern, type, and level of development in the area. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years and surrounded by the Southern Pacific Rail right-of-way, offices, general commercial uses (retail, restaurant, offices) and auto repair to the west, north, east and south, respectively. No riparian habitat and/or other sensitive natural communities are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present on or adjacent to the Project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No Mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

No Impact. The Project site is currently developed with a four commercial buildings (constructed in 1921, 1953, 1968 and 1972,) and surface parking lots. The City's Historic Preservation Planner has determined that the four existing buildings are not eligible for designation at the local, state or national level and are not considered historic resources. No historic resources are located on the project site. As a result, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change to a historical resource.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites are not known to exist within the project area. The City's Open Space and Conservation Element indicate that no significant archaeological sites have been identified in this area of Glendale. Nonetheless, construction activities

associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, compliance to regulations outlined by California Public Resource Code PRC21083.2 (i) will be adhered to, which all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. As a result, less than significant impact would occur.

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

CR–1 In 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 Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians shall be contacted 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. If the Native American cultural resource is determined to be significant, as defined by the consulting Tribe(s), 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 materials encountered during the project.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Plant and animal fossils are typically found within sedimentary rock deposits. Most of the City of Glendale consists of igneous and metamorphic rock, and the local area is not known to contain paleontological resources. Nonetheless, paleontological resources may possibly exist at deep levels and could be unearthed with implementation of the project. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during the project-related subsurface activities, compliance to regulations outlined by California Public Resource Code PRC21083.2 (i) will be adhered to, which all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. As a result, less than significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measure CR-2 identified above would address a potential impact to a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

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

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The Project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of commercial land uses and a railroad right-of-way to the west. No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the Project site or surrounding area. Notice was given to the Fenandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (FTBMI), Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe, and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.31 et seq. Consultation was not requested by either tribe within 30-days of the notice; however, the FTBMI did request that mitigation measures be added based on comments received. 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 diseased 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.

CR–2 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 remains provide to be Native American in origin by the County Coroner, the applicant shall immediately notify the lead agency and all consulting Tribes.

F. ENERGY

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

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

Less than Significant Impact.

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

Operation of the Project would involve consumption of electricity and natural gas; however, these resources are already consumed on the Project site, and an incremental increase in the consumption of these resources associated with Project operation would not represent unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of resources. The Project would be designed to comply with Title 24 Building, Energy and Green Buildings Standards (California Building Code, Title 24, Parts 4, 6, and 11). Sustainable design strategies for the new building would include the use of high performance glazing and a light-colored,

single-ply, thermoplastic roof membrane over a well-insulated roof assembly to reduce heat gain during the summer. Other sustainable features would include energy-efficient light fixtures, lighting controls, and water-conserving plumbing fixtures. The building roof would be solar ready and able to support future installation of a photovoltaic system. Given the foregoing, the Project's consumption of energy resources would be less than significant, as it would not represent unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of energy resources.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Less than Significant Impact. As described above, the new commercial office building's energy efficiency would, at a minimum, comply with the California Energy Code and the California Building Code. While not specifically applicable to the Project, Senate Bill 350 sets ambitious 2030 targets for energy efficiency and renewable electricity, increasing California's renewable electricity procurement goal from 33 percent by 2020 to 50 percent by 2030. As described in Section 2.2.2, the new commercial office building would include a solar-ready roof which could support future installation of a photovoltaic system. As such, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

G. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less than Significant Impact. Earthquake-induced strong ground shaking causes most of the earthquake damage. Damage to structures is usually caused by strong horizontal ground acceleration, which is measured as a percentage of g, the acceleration of gravity. The degree of shaking depends on several factors, including earthquake size; location; depth of the focus; orientation and movement of the seismic waves (source effects); the type of sediments or rocks that the seismic waves travel through (path effects); and the interaction between the structures and the sediments or rocks at a specific site (site effects). Strong ground shaking can also trigger the destructive secondary effects of liquefaction and slope failure (landslides).

According to the City's Safety Element (August 2003), the main faults include the Sierra Madre, the Verdugo and the Raymond faults. Per Plate P-1 of the Safety Element, the subject property is not located within 5,000 linear feet of these faults. The closest fault to the subject site is the Verdugo Fault, which is approximately 6,500 linear feet to the north. A worst-case scenario earthquake (maximum magnitude) for Glendale would involve rupture of the Verdugo fault, given that this fault lies directly below extensively developed portions of the City. Both the Sierra Madre and Raymond faults can also cause earthquakes that have the potential to severely impact the City. Given that the City of Glendale is almost completely built out, the reduction of earthquake losses depends primarily on the prudent retrofitting of existing structures.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The Project site is located in a Liquefaction Hazard Zone by Plate P-1 of the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element. A geotechnical investigation and infiltration study was prepared by R. T. Frankian & Associated (RTF&A, dated August 15, 2019), which field exploration borings were drilled at the subject site to a maximum depth of 51.5 feet. In general, the upper soils at the site consist of sandy silts and silty sands that were

observed to be moist and moderately dense, extending to depths of about 10 feet below the present grade. The upper moderately dense soils were observed to be underlain by alternating layers of clean sands and silty sands that were observed to be dense. The presence of silty clay and sandy silts were observed below a general depth of 30 feet. Groundwater was not encountered in the test borings drilled for the subject investigation.

Based on the results of the study, some of the naturally deposited soils beneath the site may be subject to dry settlement in the event of a large earthquake on a nearby fault that produces the design-level ground motions. To reduce the amount of hydro-consolidation and seismically induced settlement, the geotechnical study recommended that the upper soils be removed and recompacted in areas where construction of new buildings will occur. Removals of approximately 8 feet below the present grade will be required between the two existing buildings in the northern portion of the site where Building AB (6325 San Fernando Road) will be constructed. Removals should extend a lateral distance of at least 6 feet beyond the perimeter of that building. Because Building E (6231 San Fernando Road) will be set back less than 6 feet from the property line along San Fernando Road, it will not be possible to remove and recompact soil along the eastern perimeter. Therefore, the geotechnical study recommended that Building E be supported on drilled, cast-in-place friction piles. Additionally, the geotechnical study recommended that removal and recompaction of soil for Building E extend at least two feet below final soil subgrade elevation to provide support for the proposed concrete slab floor. The bottoms of the areas to be filled should be processed prior to placement of compacted fill. Processing should consist of scarifying the upper six to 12 inches of the exposed soils, adjusting the moisture content of the scarified soil to approximately two percent above optimum moisture content, and compaction of the exposed soil to at least 90 percent of the maximum dry density of the soil. The bottoms of areas to be filled should be observed and approved by a representative of the Geotechnical Engineer of Record prior to fill placement.

The following mitigation measure has been added to reduce the potential for liquefaction and/or seismically induced settlement of the proposed buildings.

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

M –1 The applicant shall comply with all guidelines recommended in the Report of Geotechnical Investigation and Infiltration Study was prepared by RTF&A, dated August 15, 2019.

iv) Landslides?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project site is not located within a landslide hazard zone area, as indicated by the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). Therefore, no impacts associated with landslides would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

construction would be reduced to less than significant. In addition, the applicant would be required to adhere to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403—Fugitive Dust, which would further reduce the impact related to soil erosion to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A geotechnical investigation and infiltration study was prepared by R. T. Frankian & Associated (RTF&A, dated August 15, 2019), which results of the Expansion Index tests indicate that the near surface soils have a "very low" potential for expansion. Accordingly, no special treatment of the soil, relative to expansive soil conditions, is anticipated to be required. Additional tests should be performed at the completion of the recommended grading operations to determine the expansion potential of the soils exposed near final grade in the proposed building areas. In the event that expansive soils are present, recommendations for the construction of foundations and concrete slabs founded on expansive soils would be presented in a report summarizing the results of the grading operations.

The soil subgrade should be thoroughly moistened prior to casting concrete slabs. As previously mentioned in the "Grading" section of RTF&A geotechinical report, if import soils are required for use as compacted fill, the import soils should be relatively non-expansive and similar to the on-site soils. Compliance with the recommendations would ensure that no significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project would connect to and use the existing sewage conveyance system located within San Fernando Road. Septic tanks will not be used in the project. Therefore, no 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 of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

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

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

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

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. GHG as defined under AB 32 includes: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the State agency charged with regulating statewide air quality, adopt rules and regulations that would achieve greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to statewide levels in 1990 by 2020 by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

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

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

Handbook, the Air Quality Management Plan, or the SCAQMD set forth applicable significance thresholds for GHG emissions.

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

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

On March 27, 2012, the City of Glendale's City Council adopted the Greener Glendale Plan for Community Activities to address how the City of Glendale can meet its state mandated reduction targets for GHG emissions. Per this plan, it identifies that energy consumed in buildings accounts for 49% of Glendale's GHG inventory emission. To ensure that new construction is sustainable and improve efficiency of the building stock, the City of Glendale adopted a Green Building Standard (June 7, 2011) with requirements exceeding those in the State of California's mandatory CAL Green Code. The City of Glendale's Building Standard requirements include:

- Projects must exceed California Energy Code requirements by 15%.
- Projects must reduce baseline water usage by 20%.
- Radiant roof barriers shall be installed.
- Gas-fired tankless water heaters shall have an energy factor of at least .80.
- Gas-fired storage-tank type water heaters shall have an energy factor of at least 0.61.
- Buildings shall be "solar ready".
- 20% permeable paving required.
- High-efficiency gas-fired space heating equipment required.
- High-efficiency air conditioning equipment required • Increased natural lighting and ventilation required.
- Increased green building standards for homes larger than 5,000 square feet.

Since this project is required to comply with Greener Glendale Plan to reduce GHGs, 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 of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

I. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project involves the demolition of surface parking lots and the construction of a 6,200 square-foot addition to an existing one-story, 6,087 square-foot commercial/industrial building; the construction of a 2,780 square-foot ground level addition and 4,832 square-foot mezzanine addition within an existing 6,648 square-foot, commercial office; the demolition of 848 square-feet and façade improvement to an existing 52,848 square-foot commercial/industrial building; and the construction of a 7,789 square-foot addition to an existing one-story, 2,211 square-foot commercial/industrial building.

Searches of the Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database and California State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker database indicated no contamination on the project site. The federal government banned consumer use of lead-based paint (LBP) in 1978 and many, but not all, asbestos-containing materials (ACM) were banned in construction products in 1989. As the structures on the project site were constructed between 1921 and 1968, prior to the ban of these materials, it is possible that they contain LBP or ACMs. Due to the age of this building, there is the potential for hazardous building materials such as asbestos-containing material and lead to be present within the structure. As such, demolition of this structure during construction could require removal,

transportation, and disposal of potentially hazardous building materials. However, in the event that suspect asbestos-containing materials, lead-based materials, or other hazardous building materials are found during demolition, such materials would be tested and removed from the site in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations, such as SCAQMD Rule 1403 and state and federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations. Upon compliance with these applicable laws involving safe treatment and disposal of asbestos-containing material, lead-based material, or other hazardous building materials, the transport and disposal of these materials would not be expected to pose a significant risk to the public or environment.

The project would include use of heavy equipment for demolition, grading, excavation, and construction. Fueling and maintenance of such equipment could result in incidental spills of petroleum products and hazardous materials in construction staging areas. However, such incidental spills would likely be minor and would be minimized through implementation of standard best management practices (BMPs) included in a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) mandated Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) during construction. Relevant BMPs would typically include creation of designated fueling and maintenance areas located not in proximity to drainages and equipped with temporary spill containment booms, absorbent pads, and petroleum waste disposal containers. Some hazardous materials use would continue to occur in association with project operations, including natural gas for the emergency generator, fertilizers, cleaning supplies, etc. Use of hazardous materials would be required to meet all applicable regulations related to the transport, use, and storage of such materials.

All businesses within the City of Glendale, as mandated by the California Health and Safety Code Chapter 6.95, are required to file a Hazardous Material Business Plan (HMBP) with the Glendale Fire Department. The HMBP covers the use and storage of all regulated hazardous chemicals and materials to be used and/or stored onsite. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project proposes to construct additions to four existing commercial/industrial buildings that will function as new general offices. The proposed general office land use will involve the incidental use and storage of some hazardous materials, such as natural gas for the emergency generator, fertilizers, cleaning supplies, etc.; however, it is not expected to create a reasonably foreseeable upset or accidental conditions involving the release hazardous materials into the environment.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, which include:

- All hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to Section 25187.5 of the Health and Safety Code.
- All land designated as hazardous waste property or border zone property pursuant to former Article 11 (commencing with Section 25220) of Chapter 6.5 of Division 20 of the Health and Safety Code.
- All information received by the Department of Toxic Substances Control pursuant to Section 25242 of the Health and Safety Code on hazardous waste disposals on public land.

As a result, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The City's Emergency Plan is a planned response to extraordinary emergency situations associated with natural disasters, technological incidents, and national security emergencies. This document is designed to include the City of Glendale as part of the California Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) and National Incident Management System (NIMS), which have been adopted for the purpose of exercising operational management and coordination of emergency operations. The City of Glendale maintains a dedicated Emergency Operations Center (EOC) to manage and coordinate major emergencies or disasters.

The City's EOC serves to keep citizens informed and prepared for an emergency, coordinates resources during an emergency, and provides relief after an emergency. The goal of EOC personnel is to save lives and protect property by developing programs and emergency operational capabilities in the event of a natural or man-made disaster. Planning for and responding to disasters and emergencies requires many different actions, such as evacuations, shelter set-ups or preparations for power outages. All of these activities are coordinated and directed by the EOC. Training for residents and employees within the City continues through the Community Emergency Response Team program (Glendale 2003).

The Office of Emergency Services is tasked with coordinating disaster operations within the City. Glendale General Plan Safety Element Goal 8, Policy 8-1 and Program 8-1.1 is directly related to emergency services, as it requires that emergency response and recovery plans are sufficient to protect public safety and the general welfare in accordance with regional, State, and federal regulations. The City's Emergency Plan is updated annually and City personnel are trained annually in exercises ranging from tabletop discussions to full-scale exercises involving dozens of personnel in the field supported by the activation of the City's EOC. Continued adherence to Goal 8, and related policies and programs, in the Safety Element of the Glendale General Plan would reduce impacts associated with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan by keeping the community prepared for emergency response and recovery from natural and urban disasters, in light of local conditions.

According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, San Fernando Road is a County Evacuation Route, which is a road that in an event of certain types of disasters that require the mobilization (evacuation) of a segment of the population from a hazardous or potentially hazardous area to a safer area. Implementation of the project would neither result in a reduction of the number of lanes along this roadway nor result in the placement of an impediment, such as medians, to the flow of traffic. During construction, the contractor shall notify the City of Glendale Police and Fire Departments of construction activities that would involve the movement of equipment so as to give first emergency response teams the option of rerouting traffic to an alternative route. Further, during construction the applicant would be required to obtain any necessary permits from the City of Glendale Public Works Department for all work occurring within the public right-of-way. Implementation of these requirements would be incorporated as conditions of approval. By complying with these regulations and conditions the Project would not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with the City's adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Consequently, project impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The Project Site is 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. Less than significant 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?			X	
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
4. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
6. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
7. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
8. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
9. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X	
10. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The City currently utilizes water from Glendale Water and Power (GWP), which relies on some local groundwater supplies. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would result in additional development that could indirectly require a slight increased use of groundwater through the provision of potable water by GWP; however, as discussed in Response S-4 below, the proposed project's water demand is within water projections. This Project was routed to GWP for comment and this department did not comment with concerns that the Project will substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies.

The Project site is currently developed with a four commercial buildings (constructed in 1921, 1953, 1968 and 1972,) and surface parking lots. With the exception of the existing commercial/industrial buildings, the surface of the site is mostly paved with an asphalt parking lot with an approximately five-foot wide strip of landscaping along portions of the street front property lines. The amount of hardscape proposed on the Project site would be similar to current on-site conditions. Therefore, the project would not significantly interfere with the recharge of local groundwater or deplete the groundwater supplies relative to existing conditions. Consequently, impacts related to groundwater extraction and recharge would not change compared to existing conditions will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The Project site is currently developed with a four commercial buildings and surface parking lots. Stormwater runoff currently flows into existing City streets and drains. There are no streams or rivers on the Project Site. The surface of the site is mostly paved with an asphalt parking lot with an approximately five-foot wide strip of landscaping along portions of the street front property lines and several minor landscape planters throughout surface parking lot. Overall the landscaping pattern will largely remain the same on the site with a new five-foot wide landscape planter along the perimeter of portions of the Project site along San Fernando Road. The proposed project will modify the existing drainage pattern of the site and would slightly decrease the runoff. All 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, 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 would be required to prepare and submit a SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan) 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.

In addition, in accordance with Chapter 13.42, Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Control and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan of the Glendale Municipal Code, a SUSMP (Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan) containing design features and BMPs to reduce post-construction pollutants in stormwater discharges would be required as part of the project. As a result of

the conditions and measures required by the NPDES permit, SWPPP and SUSMP, impacts on the existing drainage pattern are considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. In addition to stormwater management outlined within Response J-3 above, the proposed project would be required to adhere to Chapter 14.43, Low Impact Development Standards of the Glendale Municipal Code. Primary goals of LID (Low Impact Development) are: i) to lessen the adverse impacts of stormwater runoff from development and urban runoff on natural drainage systems, receiving waters and other water bodies, ii) minimize pollutant loadings from impervious surfaces by requiring development projects to incorporate properly designed, technically appropriate BMPs and other low impact development strategies, and iii) minimize erosion and other hydrologic impacts on natural drainage systems by requiring development projects to incorporate properly designed, technically appropriate hydro-modification control development principles and technologies. Further, as stated above in Section J-3, there are no streams or rivers on the site and the Project will not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in on or off site flooding. As such, impacts will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Please refer to Response J-3 and J-4 above. The Project will not create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planning stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Accordingly, the Project impact on capacity to handle stormwater is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) ***Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?***

Less than Significant Impact. Please refer to Response J-3 above. The Project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Consequently, the Project impact on water quality is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain or other flood hazard area, as shown on the latest FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map. No Project impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The State of California Government Code Section 65302 (g) requires that local governments to assess the potential impact that failure of dams or other water retention structures might have on their community, and publish flood data and a directory of dams showing inundation limits in the Glendale area. According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (Plate P-2), the proposed project is located within the inundation zone of the Western Reservoir within the City. Seven dams located in the Glendale area fall under State jurisdiction. For security purposes, the locations of dams and reservoirs are not included in this document.

Planning for new developments are to consider the impact on flooding potential as well as the impact of flood control structures on the environment, both locally and regionally. Land development planning should consider leaving watercourses natural wherever possible, or developing them as parks, nature trails, golf courses or other types of recreation areas that could withstand inundation. The Project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for decades, and is currently developed with a four commercial buildings (constructed in 1921, 1953, 1968 and 1972,). Between the Western Reservoir and the Project site is developed with variety of residential and commercial uses, the 1920's and 1930's.

The catastrophic release of water from reservoirs and tanks has the potential to impact large areas in the City, including critical facilities located within the inundation zones. Critical facilities (such as, hospitals, schools, fire stations) should not be permitted in floodplains unless they are elevated above the projected inundation depths and/or otherwise protected. Facilities using, storing, or otherwise involved with substantial quantities of onsite hazardous materials should not be permitted within these inundation zones unless all standards of elevation, anchoring, double containment and flood proofing have been satisfied, and the hazardous materials are stored in watertight containers that will not float. The Project proposes to construct additions to the four existing commercial/industrial buildings that will function as new general offices. The proposed general office land use will not serve as a critical facility and will not use or store substantial quantities of onsite hazardous materials. It is anticipated the new general offices will involve the incidental use and storage of some hazardous materials, such as natural gas for the emergency generator, fertilizers, cleaning supplies, etc. As a result, the Project impact on flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

10) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

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

way, offices, general commercial uses (retail, restaurant, offices) and auto repair to the west, north, east and south, respectively. No impacts would occur.

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

1) *Physically divide an established community?*

No Impact. The Project site is generally located mid-block of San Fernando Road, between Sonora Avenue and Grandview Avenue. Surrounding the Project site are general commercial businesses (retail, restaurants, auto repair, etc.) to the west (across San Fernando Road) located in the IMU (Industrial/Commercial Mixed Use) zone, office and retail to the north located within the C3-I (Commercial Service-Height District I) zone, auto repair to the south located in the IMU (Industrial/Commercial Mixed Use) zone, and the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way to the south located in the T (Transportation) zone.

The Project site is currently developed with a four commercial buildings (constructed in 1921, 1953, 1968 and 1972,) and surface parking lots. All of the Project's four buildings will function as general commercial offices, which are permitted uses in the C3 and IMU zones. The Project's design will comply with all development standards. Therefore, the project will not divide an established community. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The zoning designations for the Project site are Commercial Services – C3 Height District I and IMU (Industrial/Commercial Mixed Use) Zones, and the General Plan designations are Community Services and Mixed Use. Commercial Services areas within the City are designated areas to offer a range of commercial services, such as personal services, shopping, offices (medical, real estate, etc.) and retail. Mixed Use areas generally allow for a compatible mix of commercial, industrial and residential land uses, or standalone commercial uses. The proposed use is a permitted use by right by the Zoning Code and complies with the Land Use Element of the General Plan. The project complies with the parking chapter provisions, including the number of required parking spaces and dimensions. After improvements, the site will be developed with a total of 263 parking spaces between all of the Project's

building. The Glendale Municipal Code (by Table 30.32-A of Chapter 30.32.050) requires general offices to provide 2.7 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. Because the proposed use is a permitted by right and the Project complies with Zoning Code development standards, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The City's Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993) does not identify the Project site and immediate area as being located in an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan area. As such, implementation of the project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

L. MINERAL RESOURCES

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

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

No Impact. The City's Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993) does not identify the Project site as within an area containing valuable mineral resources. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

M. NOISE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
2. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
3. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
4. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the Project site to excessive noise levels?				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the Project site to excessive noise levels?				X

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

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project involves the demolition of surface parking lots and the construction of a 6,200 square-foot addition to an existing one-story, 6,087 square-foot commercial/industrial building; the construction of a 2,780 square-foot ground level addition and 4,832 square-foot mezzanine addition within an existing 6,648 square-foot commercial/industrial building; the demolition of 848 square-feet and façade improvement to an existing 52,848 square-foot commercial/industrial building; and the construction of a 7,789 square-foot addition to an existing one-story, 2,211 square-foot commercial/industrial building. Surrounding the project site are the Southern Pacific Rail right-of-way to the west, office to the north, general commercial uses (retail, restaurants and offices) to the west and auto repair shops to the south. The proposed use is a permitted use by right and complies with the Land Use Element of the General Plan. The development of office buildings on this site would not generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?***

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The improvement and change of use to general offices on this site would not generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element. Per Exhibit 2 of the City's Noise Element, the noise contour along San Fernando Road is at a 70 Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). And, per Table 1 – Noise/Land Use Compatibility Table of the City's Noise Element, office buildings are normally acceptable at up to 70 CNEL. The Project site is in the vicinity of urban uses, such as Southern Pacific Rail right-of-way, retail businesses, restaurants, auto repair shops and other general offices. Noise producing post-construction on-site activities would include typical traffic noise from vehicles entering and exiting the site, mechanical equipment operation such as for HVAC systems. These operational uses would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Surrounding the project site are the Southern Pacific Rail right-of-way to the west, office to the north, general commercial uses (retail, restaurants and offices) to the west and auto repair shops to the south.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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 population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
3. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

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

Less than Significant Impact. The project does not include any new residential units and would not result in substantial new population growth in the city. Any indirect growth occurring as a result of employees from the four-story general office project would be inconsequential. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. Please refer to Response N-2 above. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

O. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

a) Fire protection?

Less than Significant Impact. The City of Glendale Fire Department (GFD) provides fire and paramedic services to the Project site. The project will require compliance with the Uniform Fire Code, including installation of fire sprinklers, and to submit plans to the Glendale Fire Department at the time building permits are submitted for approval. Comments received from GFD did not express concern that the project is not expected to significantly increase calls for service or necessitate expansion or construction of a new facility. Less than significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b) Police protection?

Less than Significant Impact. The Glendale Police Department (GPD) provides police protection services to the Project site. The site is located in an urban, developed area of the City and similar uses exist along San Fernando Road. Comments received from GPD indicate the Project is not expected to significantly increase calls for service or necessitate expansion or construction of a new facility. Less than significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c) Schools?

Less than Significant Impact. Section 65995 of the Government Code provides that school districts can collect a fee on a per-square-foot basis to assist in the construction of or additions to schools. Pursuant to Section 65995, the project applicant is required to pay school impact fees to the Glendale

Unified School District based on the current fee schedule prior to the issuance of building permits. Payment of the school impact fees would mitigate any indirect impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d) Parks?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would not involve the development or displacement of a park. The property is zoned for commercial and mixed uses and was not planned for use as a park. In accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the project applicant will be required to pay the Development Impact Fee to the City based on the current fee schedule prior to the issuance of building permits. Payment of the impact fees is full mitigation of any impacts on parks and libraries and therefore the Project 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 employees at the new general offices could increase the demand for library services an incremental amount; however, in accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the project applicant will be required to pay the Development Impact Fee to the City based on the current fee schedule for mixed use developments prior to the issuance of building permits. Payment of the impact fees is full mitigation of any impacts on parks and libraries. The Project would therefore result in less than significant impacts.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

P. RECREATION

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed in Response O-1d, the project applicant will be required to pay the City's Park and Library Development Impact Fee to provide for park and recreation facilities based on the current fee schedule for commercial and residential development prior to the issuance of building permit. Payment of the City's Development Impact Fees for parks and libraries is full mitigation of any impacts on parks 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 discussed above in Response P-1, the project is not anticipated to create a significant demand on parks facilities that would require the construction or expansion at existing public recreational facilities. In addition, the Project does not include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Q. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			X	
2. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
3. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
4. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
5. Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
6. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

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

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is located on San Fernando Road, which is identified as a "Major Arterial" in the City's Circulation Element. The Project includes the demolition of surface parking lots and the construction of a 6,200 square-foot addition to an existing one-story, 6,087 square-foot commercial/industrial building; the construction of a 2,780 square-foot ground level addition and 4,832 square-foot mezzanine addition within an existing 6,648 square-foot, commercial office; the demolition of a 848 square-feet and façade improvement to an existing 52,848 square-foot commercial/industrial building; and the construction of a 7,789 square-foot addition to an existing one-story, 2,211 square-foot commercial/industrial building. 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 8-10 months and will not exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system.

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 was prepared by Linscott Law & Greenspan, Engineers (dated October 7, 2019), which evaluated the Project for potential impacts at seven key intersections and local residential street segments within the vicinity of the Project site. The locations selected for analysis were based on the above criteria, the peak-hour vehicle trip generation associated with the proposed Project, the anticipated distribution of Project vehicular trips, and existing intersection/corridor operations. Manual traffic counts of vehicular turning movements were conducted at each of the study intersections during the weekday morning and afternoon commuter periods to determine the peak hour traffic volumes. The counts were conducted at six of the seven study intersections on Thursday, September 12, 2019. Counts were conducted at the Sonora Avenue / Flower Street intersection on Thursday, September 19, 2019. The manual traffic counts at the study intersections were conducted from 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM to determine the respective peak commuter hours. The Project is expected to generate 46 net new vehicle trips (39 inbound trips and 7 outbound trips) during the AM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, the proposed Project is expected to generate 45 net new vehicle trips (7 inbound trips and 38 outbound trips). Over a 24-hour period, the proposed Project is forecast to generate 387 daily trips ends (approximately 194 inbound trips and 193 outbound trips) during a typical weekday. Overall, the traffic impact study concluded that none of the seven study intersections would be not significantly impacted by the forecasted traffic by the Project. No traffic mitigation measures were recommended or required by the study. As a result, less than significant impacts to will the existing circulation system will occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The ingress and egress for the site have been evaluated by the City's Traffic Division and found to be adequate for emergency access or access to nearby uses. Further, the project does not involve the elimination of a through-route or the narrowing of a roadway. 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 such, implementation of the proposed project would not create new obstructions to emergency access in the Project area. All proposed accesses and drive lanes would be subject to the Fire Department's access standards. The project must also comply with all Building, Fire, and Safety Codes. Project plans would be subject to review and approval by the Public Works Engineering and Traffic Divisions, Community Development Department Building & Safety Division and Fire Department. As a result, less than significant impacts to emergency access will occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

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

R. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Written notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam of Mission Indians, Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe 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, the presence of eligible resources is unknown. Although, the Project site has already been developed and disrupted, construction activities associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources. As a result, mitigation measures have been added to the project reducing potential impacts to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of mitigation measures CR-1and CR-2 would ensure that no significant impacts would occur.

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. Notice was given to the Tribal Cultural Resource, as required by AB52 and codified in Public Resource Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. The Project site and surrounding area have been commercially developed for a number of years. Features and objects of cultural value, which may have existed at one time (on or beneath the site), have likely been previously disturbed. No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the Project site or surrounding area. Impacts would be potentially significant if human remains were to be encountered during excavation and grading activities. State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then serve as a consultant on how to proceed with the remains (i.e. avoid removal or rebury). Mitigation measures have been added to the project (See Section in E-4) to the project that would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of mitigation measures CR-1and CR-2 would ensure that no significant impacts would occur.

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

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

No Impact. Under Section 401 of the CWA (Clean Water Act), the RWQCB (Regional Water Quality Control Boards) issues NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) permits to regulate waste discharged to "waters of the nation," which includes reservoirs, lakes, and their tributary waters. Waste discharges include discharges of stormwater and construction related discharges. A construction project resulting in the disturbance of more than one acre requires a NPDES Permit; this project is over an acre. Construction projects are also required to prepare a SWPPP. In addition, the proposed project

would be required to submit an SUSMP to mitigate urban stormwater runoff. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant would be required to satisfy the requirements related to the payment of fees and/or the provisions of adequate wastewater facilities. The proposed project would comply with the RWCQB-established waste discharge prohibitions and water quality objectives, which will be incorporated into the proposed project as a project design feature. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Runoff from the Project site would be conveyed via streets and gutters to storm drain locations around the Project site. The proposed project slight increase in runoff would not require any substantial changes to the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area, nor would it affect the capacity of the existing storm drain system. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

The proposed project would result in an increase in demand for operational uses, including landscape irrigation, maintenance and other activities on the site. Based on a generation factor of 120 gallons per day/ One Thousand Gross Square Feet (KGSF), the general office project would result in a demand of approximately 10,626 gallons per day that equates to 11.9 acre feet per year (afy) of water (based on Sewage Generation Factors for Residential and Commercial Categories, L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide).

The total water demand in 2020 in the City of Glendale is expected to be 28,182 afy with a total available supply of 39,540 afy, resulting in a surplus of 11,358 afy for that year. The City of Glendale has identified an adequate supply of water to meet future City demands under normal conditions. Future water demand in the City is based on projected development contained in the General Plan. For purposes of this assessment, the demand of the proposed project was assumed not to have been included in this demand projection. However, even with the additional demand of 11.9 afy generated by the proposed project, ample supply exists to meet remaining City demand under normal conditions.

The Project must comply with the provisions of Glendale's Mandatory Water Conservation Ordinance, as well as the 2016 California Green Building Standards (CALGreen) of the Glendale Green Building

Code and the water conserving fixture and fittings requirements per the current California Plumbing Code. All new buildings must utilize higher efficiency plumbing fixtures (low-flush toilets, low-flow showerheads and faucets) and automatic irrigation system controllers based on water or soil moisture, and demonstrate an indoor net reduction in the consumption of potable water.

Normal Weather Conditions

The City of Glendale has identified an adequate supply of water to meet future City demands under normal conditions. As indicated above, a surplus exists that provides a buffer of approximately 11,358 afy of water. Future water demand in the City is based on projected development contained in the General Plan. For purposes of this assessment, the demand of the proposed project was assumed not to have been included in this demand projection. However, even with the addition of 11.9 afy of demand generated by the proposed project, there is ample supply to meet remaining City demand under normal conditions.

Dry Weather Conditions

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

It is anticipated that during any 3-year drought, the City would have sufficient water supply to meet demand. According to the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, the City would use less MWD water supplies in the future compared to its current use because of implemented water conservation efforts (such as, City Best Management Practices, Water-Efficient Landscape Programs and Water-Efficient Indoor Programs). With the City's reduction of dependency on imported water from MWD, GWP has a higher level of reliability in meeting water demands during drought conditions.

Even with the implementation of the proposed project, the GWP would continue to have adequate supply to meet citywide demand under drought conditions. Even with the addition of 11.9 afy of demand generated by the proposed project, there is sufficient supply to meet City demand under drought conditions.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. Sewage from the Project site goes to the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP), which the City of Glendale has access to through the Amalgamated Agreement. 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.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in development on site. According to CalRecycle (Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates for Institutional Sector Generation Rates), the proposed project would generate approximately 96.91 tons (offices at 6 lb./1,000 SF/day) of solid waste per year. The amount of solid waste per year at the project site currently is 74.23 tons (offices at 6 lb./1,000 SF/day).

Solid waste generated on the Project site could be deposited at the Scholl Canyon Landfill (owned by the City of Glendale) or at one of the landfills located within the County of Los Angeles. The annual disposal rate at the Scholl Canyon facility is approximately 200,000 tons per year. Combined with the increase of approximately 96.91 tons per year in solid waste generated by the proposed project, the annual disposal amount would increase to approximately 200,072 tons per year. With a total annual disposal amount of 200,072 tons and a remaining capacity of 3.6 million tons, the Scholl Canyon facility would meet the needs of the City and the proposed project for approximately 18 years. Because the proposed project would be required to implement a waste-diversion program aimed at reducing the amount of solid waste disposed in the landfill, the amount of solid waste generated would likely be less than the amount estimated. As a result, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

T. WILDFIRE

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

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. As indicated in Response T-1 above, Project site is not located within a LRA and is not located near a SRA or a very high FHSZ. No impacts would occur related to wildfire hazards due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

U. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

No Impact. The Project site is a currently developed and located within an urbanized area along San Fernando Road. 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, 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. Approximately three miles southeast of the project, is a separate proposal to demolish existing office building (built 1948) and construct a new 5-story med/gen office/retail building with on-site parking, located at 517 East Broadway. As a result, the incremental effect of the general offices is not cumulatively considerable because the Project is not connected with any past, current or foreseeable future project within immediate area or on the subject property. All environmental issues considered in this Initial Study were found to have either no impact, a less than significant impact or less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. As discussed in Section G (Greenhouse Gas Emissions), the project would not exceed State or regional thresholds for the emission of criteria air pollutants or greenhouse gases. With implementation of mitigation measures for impacts associated with cultural resources and soils, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. With regard to cumulative effects for the issues of agricultural, biological, and mineral resources, the Project site is located in an urbanized area and therefore, other developments occurring in the area of the project would largely occur on previously disturbed land and are not anticipated to have an impact. Thus, no cumulative impact to these resources would occur. Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials are generally confined to a specific site and do not affect off-site areas.

Therefore, the proposed project would have no cumulatively considerable effects, and as such, cumulative impacts would not occur.

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

Less than Significant Impact. As detailed throughout this Initial Study, the proposed project does not exceed any significance thresholds or result in significant impacts in the environmental categories typically associated with indirect or direct effects to human beings, such as aesthetics, agriculture, biological resources, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use, mineral resources, population/housing, public services, recreation, transportation utilities/service systems, or wildfire.

As mentioned in Response E-4 regarding cultural resources, in 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. As specified within mitigation measure CR-1 and CR-2, the applicant shall immediately notify the lead agency and all consulting Tribes in an event that Native American cultural resources are discovered.

As described in Response G-1 (iii) regarding liquefaction, while the Project site is located in a Liquefaction Hazard Zone by Plate P-1 of the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element. To reduce the amount of hydro-consolidation and seismically induced settlement, the geotechnical study recommended that the upper soils be removed and recompacted in areas where construction of new buildings will occur. Removals of approximately 8 feet below the present grade will be required between the 2 existing buildings in the northern portion of the site where Building AB will be constructed. Additionally, the geotechnical study recommended that removal and recompaction of soil for Building E extend at least 2 feet below final soil subgrade elevation to provide support for the proposed concrete floor slab. Mitigation measure M-1 recommends for the applicant shall comply with all guidelines

recommended in the Report of Geotechnical Investigation and Infiltration Study (prepared by RTF&A, dated August 15, 2019) to reduce seismic-related ground failures to a less than significant level.

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. The City of Glendale's *General Plan,* "Noise Element," as amended
3. California Department of Conservation, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program,* Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2010 (September 2011).
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. Traffic Impact Study - 6265 San Fernando Road Office Project (prepared by Linscott Law & Greenspan Engineers, October 7, 2019)
9. California Emissions Estimator Module (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) Report.
10. FHWA, Special Report – Measurement, Prediction, and Mitigation, updated June 2018, accessed December 2018, https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/Environment/noise/construction_noise/special_report/hcn04.cfm
11. City of Glendale, Greener Glendale Plan for Community Activities (March 27, 2012).
12. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Congestion Management Program (2010)
13. City of Glendale, Bicycle Transportation Plan (September 2012)
14. Report of Geotechnical Investigation and Infiltration Study (prepared by R. T. Frankian & Associates, August 15, 2019)
15. August 15, 2019)