



CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

11-Unit Condominium Project
342-344 Myrtle Street

The following Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.	
Project Title/Common Name:	11-Unit Condominium Project
Project Location:	342-344 Myrtle Street, Glendale, Los Angeles County
Project Description:	The proposed project includes the demolition of two single-family homes and the construction of a 3-story, 11 unit multi-family condominium project. Thirty parking spaces would be provided in a single level semi-subterranean garage accessed from Myrtle Street. The project site is located on two adjoining lots totaling 13,750 square feet in size in the R-1250 High Density Residential Zone. (Refer to page 5 for a complete project description.)
Project Type:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private Project <input type="checkbox"/> Public Project
Project Applicant:	Hamlet Zohrabians 3467 Ocean View Blvd. Ste. B Glendale, CA 91208 Phone: (818) 236-3619
Findings:	The Director of the Community Development, on September 17, 2013, after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning and Neighborhood Services Division, found that the above referenced project would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Negative Declaration be prepared.
Mitigation Measures:	No mitigation measures are required.
Attachments:	Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Hassan Haghani, Director of Community Development City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 548-2140; Fax: (818) 240-0392

This page left intentionally blank.



CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

11-Unit Condominium Project
342-344 Myrtle Street

1.	Project Title: 11-Unit Condominium Project
2.	Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Glendale Community Development Department Planning and Neighborhood Services Division 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	Contact Person and Phone Number: Milca L. Toledo, Planner Tel: (818) 937-8181, (818) 548-2115 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	Project Location: 342-344 Myrtle Street, Glendale, Los Angeles County
5.	Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Hamlet Zohrabians 3467 Ocean View Blvd, Ste B Glendale, CA 91208 Phone: (818) 2236-3619
6.	General Plan Designation: High Density Residential
7.	Zoning: R-1250 (High Density Residential) Zone
8.	Description of the Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary support or off-site features necessary for its implementation.) The proposed project includes the demolition of two single-family homes and the construction of a three-story, 11 unit multi-family condominium project. Thirty parking spaces would be provided in a single level semi-subterranean garage accessed from Myrtle Street. The project site is located on two adjoining lots totaling 13,750 square feet in size. Design Review Board approval is required pursuant to Chapter 30.47 Glendale Municipal Code. No Variances are requested.
9.	Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: <u>North:</u> Multi-family Residential <u>South:</u> Multi-family Residential <u>East:</u> Multi-family Residential <u>West:</u> Multi-family Residential
10.	Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement). None

11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural and Forest Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Prepared by:

Date:

Reviewed by:

Date:

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

Director of Community Development:

Date:

Project Description

The proposed project includes the demolition of two single-family homes constructed in 1918 and 1921 and the construction of a three-story, 11 unit multi-family condominium project on two adjoining lots totaling 13,750 square feet in the R-1250 High Density Residential Zone. The project would consist of 10 three-bedroom units ranging in size from 1,468 square feet to 1,520 square feet and one 1,444 square-foot two-bedroom unit. The project site fronts Myrtle Street and is situated between Central Avenue to the east and Columbus Avenue to the west.

Parking

A total of 30 parking spaces would be provided for the project in a semi-subterranean garage. Vehicular access would be provided via one 12-foot wide driveway on Myrtle Street. This driveway would accommodate one-way traffic flow.

Requested Entitlements

The applicant is seeking Design Review Board approval pursuant to the Glendale Municipal Code, Chapter 30.47. No variances are requested.

12. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

A. AESTHETICS

<i>Would the project:</i>	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. The project site is located within a heavily urbanized area of the City with relatively flat topography. No scenic vistas, as identified in the Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993), exist within, or in proximity to, the project site. Therefore, no impacts to scenic vistas would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is not located within the view corridor of any state scenic highway, as there are no state-designated scenic highways within the City of Glendale. Therefore, the proposed project would not damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site fronts the south side of Myrtle Street. It is not anticipated that the proposed project will degrade the existing visual character of the site given the nature and style of the current residential development in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project is appropriate for residential buildings in an urban environment.

The area surrounding the project site includes residential uses in buildings of various sizes. Nearby buildings were constructed during various time periods with a variety of architectural styles. The proposed architectural style will require approval from the Design Review Board, which will review the site planning, architecture, materials and landscaping to ensure compatibility with the surrounding built environment. The proposed project will not degrade the visual character of the

surrounding area. No impacts associated with the existing visual character of the surrounding neighborhood would occur.

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. The property faces Myrtle Street and single-family and multi-family residences in the R-1250 (High Density Residential) Zone. Nighttime lighting for the project would slightly increase as a result of the new construction. The increase in lighting would occur primarily along Myrtle Street. The lighting generated from the proposed building will be similar to that of the multi-family buildings in the immediate area. As such, impacts associated with increased ambient lighting affecting nighttime views in the project area are considered less than significant.

B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

<i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</i>				
	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 agricultural use zones currently exist within the city, nor are any agricultural zones proposed. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

C. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	

<i>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:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The project is located in the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), which recently approved the 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The purpose of the AQMP is to set forth a comprehensive and integrated program that will lead the Basin into compliance with the federal 24-hour PM_{2.5} air quality standard, and to provide an update to the Basin's commitments towards meeting the federal 8-hour ozone standards. Projects that are considered to be consistent with the AQMP do not interfere with attainment and do not contribute to exceeding an existing air quality violation because this growth is included in the projections utilized in the formulation of the AQMP. Therefore, projects, uses, and activities that are consistent with the applicable assumptions used in the development of the AQMP would not jeopardize attainment of the air quality levels identified in the AQMP, even if they exceed the SCAQMD's recommended thresholds.

The project would not increase population figures over those that have been planned for the area and would be consistent with the AQMP forecasts. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the air quality-related regional plans, and should not jeopardize attainment of state and federal ambient air quality standards.

Another measurement tool in determining AQMP consistency is to determine how a project accommodates the expected increase in population and employment. Generally, if a project is planned in such a way that results in the minimization of vehicle miles traveled both within the project and in the community in which it is located, and consequently the minimization of air pollutant emissions, it would be consistent with the AQMP. The project site is located in close proximity to several modes of public transportation, which could accommodate a portion of the project-generated trips. As a result, vehicle miles traveled and, consequently, air pollutant emissions from mobile sources, would be reduced from the proximity to existing transit facilities. No significant impacts are anticipated.

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 URBEMIS2007 Environmental Management Software was used to estimate the emissions associated with construction of the proposed project. URBEMIS2007 is a land use and transportation based computer model designed to estimate regional air emissions from new land use development projects. The model accounts for certain meteorological conditions that characterize specific air basins in California. The model was developed by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and is approved for use by the SCAQMD.

The URBEMIS2007 emission calculations assume the use of standard construction practices, such as compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), to minimize the generation of fugitive dust, which is mandatory for all construction projects. In the URBEMIS2007 model, the emission calculations take into account compliance with Rule 403 by incorporating the measures below. Rule 403 contains other best available control measures to minimize fugitive dust emissions; however, they are not accounted for in the URBEMIS2007 model.

- Watering of exposed surfaces and unpaved roads three times daily, which is estimated to reduce fugitive dust emissions from this source (PM10 and PM2.5) by 61 percent, per guidance from the SCAQMD; and
- Use of soil stabilization measures during equipment loading and unloading, which is estimated to reduce fugitive dust emissions from this source (PM10 and PM2.5) by 69 percent, per guidance from the SCAQMD.

The project's construction information was entered into the model to estimate construction emissions. Based on the model run, construction of the project would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds of significance for construction.

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

Area and mobile source emissions were estimated using URBEMIS2007. The project's land uses were entered into the model to estimate area source emissions. It was assumed that all buildings would combust natural gas. Based on the URBEMIS2007 model run, the project would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds of significance for construction or operations. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As indicated in the air quality model run described above, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. No significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Sensitive residential receptors are located nearby in single and multi-family residential buildings. However, as indicated in the model run performed for this project, no construction or operational impacts are anticipated. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration; impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activity associated with the proposed project may generate detectable odors. However, any detectable odors would be associated with initial

construction and would be considered short-term. Significant long-term odor impacts are not anticipated to occur from the project since it is a residential use. No significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the project:</i>	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 Game 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 Game 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

No Impact. The majority of the local area has been developed or landscaped and supports largely non-native plant communities and species. Therefore, only a limited number of plant species that flourish in urban environments, none of which are considered rare or endangered, can be found on the project site. Suitable habitat for sensitive mammal, reptile, amphibian, or fish species does not exist on the project site or within the surrounding area. No impact 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

No Impact. The project site and the surrounding area are completely developed and disturbed. No riparian habitat or sensitive natural community is located in the surrounding area or on the project site. No impact 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 not in proximity to, nor does it contain, wetland habitat or a blue-line stream. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The local area consists of established, highly urbanized, and developed properties. The project site and the immediate area have been developed and do not contain native resident or migratory species or native nursery sites. In addition, there are no wildlife migration corridors in the vicinity of the project site. No impact 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 proposed project lies within an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years. No protected biological resources are present onsite. In addition, there are no indigenous trees, as defined pursuant to Chapter 12.44 of the Glendale Municipal Code (GMC), located on or within 20 feet of the project site. Implementation of the proposed project will not conflict with any local policy designed to protect biological resources. No impacts would occur. Also, please refer to Responses D-1 through D-4 above.

- 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. The project site and the surrounding area have been developed and heavily affected by past activities. No adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Conservation Plan exists for the project site or immediate area. Consequently, implementation of the project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the project:</i>	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?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would require the demolition of two existing one-story residential buildings constructed in 1918 and 1921. The property located at 344 W. Myrtle Street was identified in the Craftsman Survey with a status code of "6L", indicating that it is not eligible for the Glendale Register of Historic Resources or for listing at the state or national level. The property located at 342 W. Myrtle Street was not included in the survey. However, based on discussion with the historic preservation staff, it was determined that the residence is not considered an historic resource. Both properties are not considered historic resources under the California Environmental Quality Act. As a result, their demolition will not cause any adverse environmental impact to historic resources.

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?***

No Impact. The project site has already been developed and disrupted. Any archaeological resources, which may have existed at one time (on or beneath the site), have likely been previously disturbed. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius (328 feet) must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site has already been subject to disruption and development. Any superficial paleontological resources which may have existed at one time on the project site have likely been previously unearthed by past development activities. Nonetheless, there is a possibility that

paleontological resources may exist at deep levels and could be unearthed with implementation of the proposed project. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during the proposed project-related subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius (328 feet) must be temporarily suspended or redirected until a paleontologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the project site or surrounding area. Nonetheless, if human remains are encountered during excavation and grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then serve as a consultant on how to proceed with the remains (i.e., avoid removal or reburial). With implementation of this standard requirement, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

F. **GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

<i>Would the project:</i>	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	

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. The project site is not within an established Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone for surface fault rupture hazards. Based on the available geologic data, active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are not known to be located directly beneath or projecting toward the project site. Therefore, the potential for surface rupture as a result of fault plane displacement during the design life of the project is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. As identified in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, the project site is not located within a mapped liquefaction hazard zone. Therefore, no impacts related to liquefaction would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

- iv) ***Landslides?***

No Impact. As identified in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, the project site is not located within a mapped landslide hazard zone. Therefore, no impacts related to landslides would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction 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 be covered with pavement and landscaping upon completion of construction activity. Further, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit set forth by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and prepare and submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be administered throughout proposed project construction. The SWPPP would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water driven erosion during construction would be reduced to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

G. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<i>Would the project:</i>	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. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels 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.

It should be noted that an individual project's GHG emissions will generally not result in direct impacts under CEQA, as the climate change issue is global in nature, however an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. This project is consistent with Greener Glendale Strategies UD4-A, UD4-B, and WT5 to reduce GHGs.

The project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts associated with GHG emissions since the project is a 11-unit residential townhouse condominium development and is consistent with the Greener Glendale Plan.

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. In an effort to implement State mandates under AB32 and SB375 that address climate change in local land use planning, local land use jurisdictions are generally preparing GHG emission inventories and reduction plans and incorporating climate change policies into local General Plans to ensure development is guided by a land use plan that reduces GHG emissions. The City of Glendale adopted the Greener Glendale Plan with strategies to reduce GHGs. These strategies will provide direction for individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions and help the City meet its GHG emission reduction targets.

For the reasons discussed above, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

H. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

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

No Impact. The project involves the development of residential uses. Such uses do not generally involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of significant amounts of hazardous materials. No new hazardous materials will be generated at the site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the project site will require demolition of the two single-family houses constructed in 1918 and 1921. Structures constructed, repaired or remodeled between 1930 and 1981 have the potential of containing Asbestos Containing Building Materials. In addition, buildings constructed prior to 1978 may contain lead based paints. Testing and removal of lead-based paints is subject to regulation established by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The proposed project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. As such, the existing structures are required to be tested in accordance with applicable rules and regulations and remediated accordingly prior to demolition. Compliance with the applicable rules and regulations would ensure that significant impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. There is one public school, Columbus Elementary School, located at 425 W. Milford Street, located within one-quarter mile of the project site. However, the project would not emit any new hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials since residential uses are proposed.

The project would be required to comply with all applicable rules established by the SCAQMD, included Rule 403 and 402, during the construction phase of the project that would prevent dust from migrating beyond the project site. Further, all asbestos containing materials and lead based paints would be removed from the existing buildings in conformance with applicable laws, which include the development of a hazardous substance removal plan. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

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 currently listed on a list of hazardous materials sites. In addition, the project site has been developed with residential uses since the late 1900's. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is neither located within an airport land use plan nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest public airport or public use airport to the project site is the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport located approximately seven miles to the northwest. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, Brand Boulevard, which is just east of the project site, is a City disaster response route. This route is a main thoroughfare to be used by emergency response services during an emergency and, if the situation warrants, the evacuation of an area. Implementation of the proposed project would neither result in a reduction of the number of lanes along this road nor result in the placement of an impediment to the flow of traffic. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban landscape. The project site is not within a fire hazard area as identified in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

I. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<i>Would the project:</i>	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	

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. Under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established regulations under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program to control direct storm water discharges. In City of Glendale, the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) administers the NPDES permitting program and is responsible for developing NPDES permitting requirements. The NPDES program regulates industrial pollutant discharges that include construction activities. Implementation of the proposed project will require compliance with all the NPDES requirements including the submittal and certification of plans and details showing both construction and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) that are integrated into the design of the project. The submittal of a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), as approved by the City Engineer, will also be required to be integrated into the design of the project. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste water discharge requirements since the project will be required to comply with applicable permitting requirements. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

- 2) ***Substantially 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. Currently, the City 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 an increased use of groundwater through the provision of potable water by GWP. However, as discussed in Response Q-4 below, the proposed project's water demand is within water projections. Groundwater to be consumed within Glendale would be utilized according to current plans and projections for GWP groundwater supplies. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies. Further, the proposed project would not extract groundwater on an operational basis.

The project site is currently developed and, therefore, does not serve as a primary area of groundwater recharge within the San Fernando or Verdugo Basins, which are both located within the City of Glendale. Consequently, impacts related to groundwater extraction and recharge 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 stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is served by an existing storm water collection and conveyance system. The quantity of runoff would not change substantially with implementation of the proposed project since the project site is currently developed. All runoff would continue to be conveyed via streets, alleys and gutters to storm drain locations around the project site. As a result, the proposed project 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. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. As indicated in Response I-7 above, the project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain or other flood hazard area, as shown on the latest FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map. No 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?**

No Impact. There are seven dams located within the City of Glendale. The nearest dam to the project site is the Diederich Reservoir, located approximately two miles north of the project site. According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, the proposed project is not located within the inundation zone of this dam or other dams located within the City or elsewhere. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

- 10) **Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

J. LAND USE AND PLANNING

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

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

1) ***Physically divide an established community?***

No Impact. The proposed project would be constructed in the R-1250 (High Density Residential) Zone. The proposed residential development is a permitted use in the zone. It will be replacing two existing one-story single-family houses. No established community would be divided as a result of the project. 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 project is consistent with the Land Use Element which designates this area as a High Density residential neighborhood and the R-1250 zoning development standards which implements the Land Use Element. The project is consistent with the goals of the Housing Element which encourages a wide range of high quality housing types to meet the needs of current and future residents. The proposed project is designed to comply with all zoning standards and no variances are being requested. No impact 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 project site and surrounding area have been developed and heavily affected by past activities. The project site and immediate area are not located in an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan area. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

K. **MINERAL RESOURCES**

<i>Would the project:</i>	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				X

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
other land use plan?				

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

No Impact. The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban landscape and include commercial, industrial, and residential uses. The State Geologist has mapped the Glendale area for aggregate resources. According to Map 4-28 of the City of Glendale General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element, the project site is located within a Mineral Resource Zone-1 (MRZ-1). MRZ-1 is defined as an area where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence. As a result, 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 K-1 above, there are no known mineral resources within the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

L. NOISE

<i>Would the project:</i>	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

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 purpose of the Noise Element is to provide a comprehensive planning management tool to provide for the compatibility of land uses. A goal of the Noise Element is to incorporate noise considerations into land use planning decisions to ensure the land use complies with adopted standards. The existing noise environment in the project vicinity is dominated by traffic noise from nearby roadways, as well as nearby residential activities.

The proposed project involves the demolition of two single-family houses and construction of an 11-unit multi-family building, which is a permitted land use on the subject site. The surrounding land uses include single- and multi-family residential uses in a multifamily zone. Long-term operation of the proposed building would have a minimal effect on the noise environment in proximity to the project site. Noise generated by the proposed residential project would result primarily from normal operation of the building's mechanical equipment and project-related traffic and is not anticipated to generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element.

The project site is located in an area where the ambient noise contour ranges from 60 CNEL to 65 CNEL as shown on the map of the 2030 Noise Contours, Exhibit 2 of the City's Noise Element. Table 1 of the Noise Element indicates that residential multi-family projects are "Conditionally Acceptable" in areas where the noise levels are between 60 and 70 CNEL. While this residential use will be more intensive than the current use, it is not anticipated to generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element. Common open space would be partially buffered from roadway noise by the proposed building. No significant impacts are anticipated.

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: Excessive groundborne vibration is typically associated with activities such as blasting used in mining operations, or the use of pile drivers during construction. The project would not require any blasting activities and any earth movement associated with project construction is not anticipated to require pile driving. Structural support required for the development of the project would be installed by drilling bore holes, installing steel I-beams, and grouting with concrete. Therefore, the project is not expected to generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact: As indicated in Response L-1 above, significant noise impacts are not anticipated to result from the long-term operation of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is neither located within an airport land use plan nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest public airport or public use airport to the Project site is the Bob Hope Airport located about seven miles to the northwest. Consequently, no impacts associated with excessive airport noise levels would result.

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 impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

M. POPULATION AND HOUSING

<i>Would the project:</i>	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 proposed 11-unit residential project is consistent with the residential densities prescribed in the Land Use Element, which is intended for high density residential. In addition, as indicated in Section C.1 above, the project would not cause population growth in Glendale to exceed regional SCAG forecasts. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. Development of the project would result in the demolition of two single family residential structures and construction of an 11-unit multi-family building. The new project will result in a net increase of 9-units. Therefore, no substantial numbers of existing housing will be displaced. No impacts would occur.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No further mitigation measures are required.

N. PUBLIC SERVICES

<i>Would the project:</i>	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 overall need for fire protection and paramedic services is not expected to increase significantly as a result of the proposed project as the project site is located in an urbanized area of the city. The project will be required to comply with the applicable Fire Code, including installation of fire sprinklers, and to submit plans to the Glendale Fire Department at the time building permits are submitted to ensure adequate fire flow protection. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b) **Police protection?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The Glendale Police Department (GPD) provides police services to the project site. The overall need for police protection services are not expected to increase significantly as a result of the proposed project as the project site is located in an urbanized area of the city. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c) **Schools?**

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d) **Parks?**

Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion under Sections O.1 and O.2 below.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e) **Other public facilities?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is an already developed infill parcel and can be adequately served by existing public facilities. No significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

O. **RECREATION**

<i>Would the project:</i>	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	

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would develop 11 residential units. The project design provides code required private and common outdoor space which can be used for recreation purposes on the project site including a private patio or balcony for each of the units and common spaces with barbeque, a table with seating and a children's play area. As a result, no significant increase in demand for existing park or recreational facilities is anticipated.

Also, in accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5575), the project applicant will be required to pay a Development Impact Fee to the City for permit issuance. This fee would further alleviate any potential impact associated with recreation.

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, the project is not anticipated to create a significant demand on parks facilities that would require the construction or expansion at existing recreational facilities. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

P. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<i>Would the project:</i>	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	

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project includes the development of an 11-unit multi-family building that would increase in the number of vehicles using the area streets. Based upon trip generation factors published in *Trip Generation*, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 8th Edition, 2008, the project would generate fewer than 50 vehicle trips during both the weekday morning peak hour (typically occurring between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m.) and the weekday evening peak hour (typically occurring between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m.). Because the project's peak-hour trip generation would not exceed the established threshold of 50 vehicle trips, no significant and adverse impacts on the area street system is anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project does not involve changes to the existing street network or to existing emergency response plans. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority and Glendale Beeline provide bus service within the City of Glendale. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding alternative transportation since no changes to the existing transportation policies, plans, or programs are proposed. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Q. **UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X	
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
3. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
4. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
5. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
6. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
7. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) issues National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits to regulate waste discharged to "waters of the nation," which includes reservoirs, lakes and their tributary waters. Waste discharges include discharges of stormwater and

construction project discharges. A construction project resulting in the disturbance of more than one acre requires an NPDES permit and the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). In addition, the project will be required to submit a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) to mitigate urban storm water runoff. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant will be required to satisfy the requirements related to the payment of fees and/or provisions of adequate wastewater facilities. Because the project will comply with the waste discharge prohibitions and water quality objectives established by the RWQCB, impacts are considered to be less than significant.

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 storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

No Impact. The project site is currently developed with two single-family houses, and associated garages. The amount of impervious surfaces is not expected to significantly change with the implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, no 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. Glendale Water and Power provides water service for domestic, irrigation, and fire protection purposes to the City of Glendale. The City has four sources of water to meet existing and projected water demands. These sources consist of water imported from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD), groundwater from the San Fernando Groundwater Basin and the Verdugo Groundwater Basin, and recycled water.

The City of Glendale uses approximately 33,000 acre-feet of water on an annual basis. Of this total, approximately 78 percent is provided by the MWD, 12 percent is pumped from the San Fernando Groundwater Basin, 6 percent is pumped from the Verdugo Groundwater Basin, and the remaining 4 percent is supplied by the City's water reclamation system.

Due to an increasing reliance on local resources, the amount of water the City would purchase from MWD to meet demand is projected to remain stable or slightly increase between the present time and the year 2025. However, MWD water would continue to be the main source of supply for the City. Based on available water supplies, the MWD has indicated that it can meet 100 percent of its member agencies' needs over the next 20 years.

Overall the status of Glendale's water supply is highly reliable. The San Fernando and Verdugo Basins, to which Glendale possesses water rights, are managed under court order by a court-appointed watermaster in order to preserve water levels in these basins, thereby, assuring reliability of those in possession of pumping rights. Glendale is one of the original member agencies of the MWD, and has reliably received water from it over 60 years, and would continue to receive water from MWD into the future. Additionally, Glendale has a sizable source of reclaimed water available

to it, and has recently completed a reclaimed water distribution system. The use of reclaimed water is important, as it frees portable water in Glendale's system to be used to satisfy other water users. These water sources enable the City to meet all its projected demands, including those of the proposed project. Consequently, this impact is considered to 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. See response provided under Section Q-2.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The majority of solid waste generated in the City of Glendale is transported to Scholl Canyon Landfill, which is owned by the City. An ordinance passed by the City of Glendale limits disposal at the landfill to solid wastes generated within the Los Angeles County incorporated Cities of Glendale, La Canada Flintridge, Pasadena, South Pasadena, San Marino, Sierra Madre; the Los Angeles County unincorporated communities known as Altadena, La Crescenta, Montrose; the unincorporated area bordered by the Cities of San Gabriel, Rosemead, Temple City, Arcadia, and Pasadena; the unincorporated area immediately to the north of Arcadia, and Pasadena; and the unincorporated area immediately to the north of the City of San Marino bordered by the City of Pasadena on the west, north and east sides.

Scholl Canyon Landfill has the capacity to accept solid waste until January 2019. Solid waste generation is expected to increase during the construction phase of the project as well as when the future residents move into the residential units. However, the existing solid waste system would be sufficient to accommodate wastes generated during construction. No significant impacts to solid waste facilities are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

R. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<i>Would the project:</i>	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			X	

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is located in a developed urban area. No impacts are anticipated to occur to the quality of the environment, fish or wildlife habitats, fish or wildlife populations, plant or animal communities, or to rare, threatened or endangered plant and animal species as a result of the proposed project. No historical resources, as defined by CEQA, are located on the project site. No significant 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. Development of the proposed project will not substantially increase traffic nor would it result in a substantial increase in population. The project is consistent with the allowable densities in the zoning code and General Plan. Public facilities are available to accommodate the slight increase in area population.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the proposed project would not create direct and indirect adverse effects on humans. Many of the less than significant impacts that were identified are considered short-time effects and no significant impacts are anticipated.

13. Earlier Analyses

None

14. Project References Used to Prepare Initial Study Checklist

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

1. The City of Glendale's General Plan, as amended.
2. The City of Glendale's Municipal Code, as amended.
3. "Guidelines of the City of Glendale for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended," August 19, 2003, City of Glendale Planning Division.
4. Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq and California Code of Regulations, Title 14 Section 15000 et seq.
5. "CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook," updated October 2003, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
6. Air Quality Analysis, Urbemis 2007.