



## PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

New Drugstore with Drive-Thru  
707 N. Pacific Avenue

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

<b>Project Title/Common Name:</b>	New Drugstore with Drive-Thru
<b>Project Location:</b>	707 North Pacific Avenue, Glendale, Los Angeles County
<b>Project Description:</b>	To demolish the existing, vacant restaurant building and to construct a new 12,900 SF (plus 1,661 SF mezzanine) drugstore on a 1.2 acre (51,440 SF) lot, zoned C2 (Height District II). The project includes a drive-thru pharmacy. The proposal will require approval from the Design Review Board and approval of an Administrative Use Permit in order to sell alcoholic beverages.
<b>Project Type:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private Project <input type="checkbox"/> Public Project
<b>Project Applicant:</b>	Steve Shaul for Starpoint Commercial Properties 450 N. Roxbury Drive, Suite 1050 Beverly Hills, CA 90210
<b>Findings:</b>	The Director of Community Development, on September 28, 2015, 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.
<b>Mitigation Measures:</b>	None.
<b>Attachments:</b>	Initial Study Checklist
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Vilia Zemaitaitis, Senior Planner City of Glendale, Community Development Department Planning and Neighborhood Services Division 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386

**Page Left Intentionally Blank**



## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

New Drugstore with Drive-Thru  
707 North Pacific Avenue

1.	<b>Project Title:</b> New Drugstore with Drive-Thru
2.	<b>Lead Agency Name and Address:</b> City of Glendale Community Development Department Planning and Neighborhood Services Division 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	<b>Contact Person and Phone Number:</b> Vilia Zemaitaitis, Senior Planner Tel: (818) 937-8154 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	<b>Project Location:</b> 707 N. Pacific Avenue, Glendale, Los Angeles County
5.	<b>Project Sponsor's Name and Address:</b> Steve Shaul for Starpoint Commercial Properties 450 N. Roxbury Drive, Suite 1050 Beverly Hills, CA 90210 310-247-0550 x109
6.	<b>General Plan Designation:</b> Community Services
7.	<b>Zoning:</b> Community Commercial – C2, Height District II
8.	<b>Description of the Project:</b> To demolish the existing, vacant restaurant building and to construct a new 12,900 SF (plus 1,661 SF mezzanine) drugstore on a 1.2 acre (51,440 SF) lot, zoned C2 (Height District II). The project includes a drive-thru pharmacy. The proposal will require approval from the Design Review Board and approval of an Administrative Use Permit in order to sell alcoholic beverages.
9.	<b>Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:</b> <u>North:</u> C2 (II) and R1 - Burchett Street with low-scale commercial buildings to the north-east and single-family residential uses to the north-west <u>South:</u> State Route 134 Freeway <u>East:</u> C2 (II) - Two-story commercial building <u>West:</u> C2 (II) - Pacific Avenue and then low-scale commercial buildings
10.	<b>Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).</b> 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.

Velia Ymaitatis  
Prepared by:

September 29, 2015  
Date:

[Signature]  
Reviewed by:

9/28/15  
Date:

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

Imelda Fay  
Director of Community Development:

9.28.15  
Date:



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

**No Impact.** Day and night time lighting for the project would not be significantly greater than the previously occupied restaurant development and similar to existing commercial uses along Pacific Avenue. Light standards within the parking lot are required to be shielded from spilling onto adjoining properties, particularly the residences located along Burchett Street north of the subject property. With these requirements in place, and because the surrounding area is already developed with similar commercial uses, no impacts associated with lighting would occur.

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

**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 6626)?				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 6626)?**

**No Impact.** There is 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**

<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
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

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

**No Impact.** The project site is located within the City of Glendale, which is part of the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) and is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD is the agency responsible for preparing the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the Basin. Since 1979, a number of AQMPs have been prepared. The most recent comprehensive plan fully approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) is the 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which includes a variety of strategies and control measures.

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

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

Population growth associated with the proposed project is included in the Southern California Associations of Government (SCAG) projects for growth in the City of Glendale. The proposed project does not result in population and housing growth that would cause growth in Glendale to exceed the SCAG forecast. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with AQMP attainment forecasts. No impact would occur.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The URBEMIS 2007 model (Version 9.2.4) was used to estimate air quality impacts during the construction and operation stages of the project. Results from the model indicate that the proposed project would not exceed thresholds for construction, area, or operational impacts. A summary of the results are attached. No significant impacts are anticipated.

**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 adjacent to the project site. However, as indicated in the model run performed for this project, no construction or operational impacts are anticipated. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration and therefore, 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 from heavy-duty equipment exhaust. However, any detectable odors or heavy-duty equipment exhaust would be associated with initial construction and would be considered temporary and short-term; As construction-related emissions dissipate, the odors associated with these emissions would also decrease, dilute and become unnoticeable. Significant long-term odor impacts are not anticipated to occur from the project since it is a primarily retail use, and the trash receptacle area is located to the rear of the building, near the freeway on-ramp and as far away from adjacent uses as possible. No significant impacts would occur.

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

D. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for decades and the proposal will be replacing an existing building on a major arterial street in generally the same site layout. No wildlife species other than those which can tolerate human activity and/or are typically found in urban environments are known to exist onsite or near the site. These

human-tolerant species are neither sensitive, threatened, nor endangered. Implementation of the project would not result in any impact to species identified as endangered, threatened, sensitive or being of special concern by the California Department of Fish and Game or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. The site does not provide suitable habitat for endangered or rare species given the pattern, type, and level of development in the area. No impacts would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years and surrounded by other commercial developments along Pacific Avenue and residential uses along Burchett Street. No riparian habitat and/or other sensitive natural communities are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present onsite or adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**No Impact.** No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plan has been adopted to include the project site. No impacts 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?***

**No Impact.** The project site was developed in 1978 with a 10,030 SF, one-story restaurant building. The existing development does not meet the criteria for listing on any National, State, or Local Register for Historic Resources, and it is not considered a historic resource under the California Environmental Quality Act. No impacts to a historical resource would occur.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites are not known to exist within the local area. In addition, the project site is currently developed with a commercial building proposed for demolition. Any archaeological resources that may have existed at one time on or beneath the site have likely been previously disturbed. The City's Open Space and Conservation Element indicate that no significant archaeological sites have been identified in this area of Glendale. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant 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?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Plant and animal fossils are typically found within sedimentary rock deposits. Most of the City of Glendale consists of igneous and metamorphic rock, and the local area is not known to contain paleontological resources. 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 must be temporarily suspended or redirected until a paleontologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impacts are anticipated.

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

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

**Less Than Significant 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 significant impacts are anticipated.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- iv) ***Landslides?***

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within a landslide hazard zone area, as indicated by the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). No impacts 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 may result in wind and water driven erosion of soils due to grading activities if soil is stockpiled or exposed during construction. However, this impact is considered short-term in nature since the site would expose small amounts of soil during construction activities and would then be covered upon completion of construction activity. Further, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the Glendale Municipal Code Section 13.42.060 and prepare and administer a plan that effectively provides for a minimum stormwater quality protection throughout project construction. The plan would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to less than significant. In addition, the applicant would be required to adhere to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403—Fugitive Dust, which would further reduce the impact related to soil erosion to less than significant.

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

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

**No Impact.** Subsidence is the process of lowering the elevation of an area of the earth's surface and can be caused by tectonic forces deep within the earth or by consolidation and densification of sediments sometimes due to withdrawal of fluids such as groundwater. The project site is not located in an area of significant subsidence activity and would not include fluid withdrawal or removal. In addition, as indicated in Response F-1 (iii), above, the soil under the project site is not prone to liquefaction. No impacts would occur.

**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. In addition, development of the project will be required to comply with applicable building codes which would minimize structural damage to buildings and ensure safety in the event of a moderate or major earthquake. No significant impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

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

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project site will be connected to the City's sewer system. No septic tanks will be utilized as part of the project. No impacts 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 to reduce GHGs. Therefore, it is determined that the project would result in less than cumulatively considerable impacts associated with GHG emission and no mitigation is required.

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

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

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

**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				X

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project involves the demolition of an existing 1-story, approximately 10,000 SF restaurant and construction of a new 1-story, 12,900 SF (plus 1,661 SF storage mezzanine) retail drug store with drive thru pharmacy. All businesses within the City of Glendale, as mandated by the California Health and Safety Code Chapter 6.95, are required to file a Hazardous Material Business Plan (HMBP) with the Glendale Fire Department. The HMBP covers the use and storage of all regulated hazardous chemicals and materials to be used and/or stored onsite. Hazardous waste pharmaceuticals produced by a business that meets the regulatory definition of a Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator (CESQG - e.g., doctors' offices, pharmacies, and small clinics) are exempt from regulation under the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). A CESQG may dispose of their hazardous waste pharmaceuticals at a Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) Collection program that accepts business waste and pharmaceuticals. The management and disposal of pharmaceutical waste generated by a CESQG may be regulated under the California Medical Waste Management Act. The Medical Waste Management act governs the management of pharmaceutical waste generated by a CESQG that meets the definition of hazardous waste under Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 66261.3. In addition, the pharmacy, if required, must arrange for all medical waste disposal to be provided by a licensed medical waste hauler and must comply with all applicable laws, rules and regulations (including California Health and Safety Code Section 117600 et seq.). Consequently, these laws regulate the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would be required to comply with all applicable rules established by the SCAQMD, including Rule 403 and 402, during the demolition and construction phases of the project that would prevent dust from migrating beyond the project site. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

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

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

**No Impact.** There are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project site. Columbus Elementary School, located at 425 West Milford Street, is approximately 0.4 miles south-east from the project site. No impacts would occur.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**No Impact.** No private airstrips are located in the City of Glendale or in the vicinity of the project site. No impacts 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.** The project site is not located adjacent to or within the vicinity of any response routes identify in the City's Safety Element. The closest response route is Glenoaks Boulevard, two blocks to the north. The new structure will be required to comply with all Glendale Fire Code standards. During construction, the construction contractor shall notify the City of Glendale Police and Fire Departments of construction activities that would impede movement (such as movement of equipment) to allow for these first emergency response teams to reroute traffic to alternative routes, if needed. Further, during construction the applicant would be required to obtain any necessary permits from the City of Glendale Public Works Department for all work occurring within the public right-of-way. Therefore, no impacts to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans 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 is not located near a designated wildland area or within a "Fire Hazard Area". No significant impacts are anticipated.

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

# I. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<b><i>Would the project:</i></b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
4. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
6. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
7. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
8. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
9. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
10. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As part of 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 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, including 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) approved by the City Engineer will also be required to be integrated into the design of the project. Impacts related to water quality are considered to be less than significant with the compliance of all applicable permitting requirements.

**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 a slight 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. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies.

The amount of hardscape proposed on the project site would be similar to current on-site conditions. The proposed project would comply with minimum landscape requirements and, therefore, would not significantly interfere with the recharge of local groundwater or deplete the groundwater supplies relative to existing conditions. Consequently, impacts related to groundwater extraction and recharge 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 currently developed and stormwater runoff is either absorbed into the soil or flows into existing City streets and drains. Construction activity associated with the proposed project may result in wind- and water-driven erosion of soils due to minor grading activities if soil is stockpiled or exposed during construction. However, this impact is considered short term in nature because the site would expose small amounts of soil during construction activities and would then be covered with pavement and landscaping upon completion of the project. Furthermore, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the NPDES Permit set forth by the RWQCB, and to prepare and submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be administered throughout proposed project construction. The SWPPP would incorporate BMPs to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to a less than significant level.

**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.** The proposed project is a one-story retail building and does not include the construction of any housing or dwelling units on site. According to Federal Emergency Management Agency flood hazard maps, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone. No impacts would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** 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.** According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003), the project site is not located within inundation zones from failure of upstream dams. No impacts would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** Tsunamis are large ocean waves generated by sudden water displacement caused by a submarine earthquake, landslide, or volcanic eruption. A review of the County of Los Angeles Flood and Inundation Hazards Map indicates that the site is not within the mapped tsunami inundation boundaries. No impacts would occur.

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

**J. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

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

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

**No Impact.** The project site is already developed with a one-story, 10,030 SF restaurant building that has been vacant for the last two years; this building is to be demolished and replaced with the proposed drugstore. The parking for the project will remain in the same location as for the existing restaurant. The site is surrounded by other existing commercial uses on Pacific Avenue north of the SR-134 Freeway and a two-story commercial office building is located directly adjacent to the west. The neighborhood northwest of the project site consists primarily of single family residences and several multi-unit residential buildings. Fremont Park is located at the end of Burchett Street. The proposed drugstore will not physically divide the established community. No impacts would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** The existing zoning designation on the project site is C2 (Community Commercial) and the General Plan designation is Commercial Services. The proposed use complies with the Land Use Element of the General Plan. The project is designed to be consistent with the zoning code for C2 zones. The C2 zone is intended as a zone to accommodate shopping and convenience services for the community in conformance with the comprehensive general plan of the City. The proposed drugstore with pharmacy drive-thru fulfills the intent of this zone and land use category by providing a shopping and convenience service use for the residential and commercial neighborhood. This project will be reviewed by the Design Review Board per GMC 30.47, to ensure compatibility with surrounding development in terms of size, scale, bulk/mass, roofline orientation, setbacks and site layout. No variances are requested from the C2 development standards and the project complies with the parking chapter provisions, including the number of required parking spaces and dimensions. Approval of an Administrative Use Permit will be required for the off-site sale of alcoholic beverages, as per GMC 30.49. No impacts would occur.

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

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



**No Impact.** The project site and surrounding area have been developed and heavily affected by past activities. There is no habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan in the project site or vicinity. As such, the implementation of the proposed project could not conflict with any such plans. No impacts 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 other land use plan?				X

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

**No Impact.** The project site is completely urbanized and is not within an area that has been identified as containing valuable mineral resources, as indicated in the City's Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993). No impacts would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** As indicated in Response 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	

<i>Would the project:</i>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
4. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			<b>X</b>	
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?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>

**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 existing noise environment in the project vicinity is dominated by traffic noise from nearby State Route 134 (freeway), as well as typical commercial activities in the surrounding area along Pacific Avenue. Surrounding land uses include a commercial office building to the west, residential uses to the northeast, and commercial uses on the east. Long-term operation of the proposed project would have a minimal effect on the noise environment in proximity to the project site.

The City of Glendale Noise Element of the General Plan includes community noise equivalent level (CNEL) noise contours along roadways within the City. As shown in the City's 2003 Noise Element, the project site is located "70 CNEL and over" noise contour area. On-site noise sources typically consist of traffic on the adjacent freeway, traffic to/from the project site, and the operation of on-site, project-related mechanical equipment, such as air conditioning equipment and exhaust fans, in addition to the audio from the drive thru communication system located along the west building elevation, that may generate audible noise levels.

Project compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance would ensure that noise levels from building mechanical equipment would not exceed thresholds of significance. The proposed retail use is not anticipated to generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element. Any noise produced would not be out of the normal range for a retail establishment. Therefore, less than significant noise 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.** The proposed project would be constructed using typical construction techniques. No pile driving for construction would be necessary. Thus, significant vibration impacts from pile installation would not occur.

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

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

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

**No 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 construction activities would be generated by vehicles and equipment involved during various stages of construction operations: 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.

Development of 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 noise impacts will be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

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

**No Impact.** There are no private airstrips located on or within the vicinity of the project site. 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	

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
3. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The project does not include any residential uses and would not result in new population growth in the City. Any indirect growth occurring as a result of employees from the retail drug store project would be inconsequential, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**No Impact.** The subject site is currently developed with a restaurant building that will be replaced with a new retail store with pharmacy drive-thru; as such, no residents would be displaced as a result of the proposed project. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** Please refer to Response M-2 above. No impacts would occur.

#### 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,				



<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire protection?			X	
b) Police protection?			X	
c) Schools?			X	
d) Parks?			X	
e) Other public facilities?				X

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

a) ***Fire protection?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Glendale Fire Department (GFD) provides fire and paramedic services to the project site. The project will require compliance with the Uniform Fire Code, including installation of fire sprinklers, and to submit plans to the Glendale Fire Department at the time building permits are submitted for approval. The overall need for fire protection services is not expected to substantially increase. 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 protection services to the project site. The site is located in an urban, developed area of the City and similar uses exist along Pacific Avenue. The additional day-time population that this project will bring is not anticipated to have a significant impact on Police services. No significant impacts are anticipated.

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

c) ***Schools?***

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

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

d) ***Parks?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not involve the development or displacement of a park. The property is zoned for commercial uses and was not planned for use as

a park. In accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the project applicant will be required to pay the Development Impact Fee to the City based on the current fee schedule for commercial developments prior to the issuance of building permits. Commercial establishments impact parks through the addition of new employees, and such new employees are likely to use parks only sporadically. No significant increase in demand for existing park or recreational facilities is anticipated due to the negligible increase in employees generated by the project. Payment of the park impact fees would mitigate any indirect impacts to a less than significant level.

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

e) ***Other public facilities?***

**No Impact.** The project site currently features a vacant freestanding, one-story restaurant building and development would result in a new 12,900 SF (plus 1,661 SF mezzanine) drugstore that could result in an increase in demand for library services. However, in accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the project applicant will be required to pay the Development Impact Fee to the City based on the current fee schedule for commercial developments prior to the issuance of building permits. Payment of the impact fee would result in a less than significant impact to library facilities.

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

O. **RECREATION**

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project, which would result in a new 12,900 SF retail building, is not expected to generate a substantial increase in demand for existing park or recreational facilities. As discussed in Response N-1d, the project applicant will be required to pay the Development Impact Fee to the City based on the current fee schedule for commercial development prior to the issuance of building permits. Payment of the impact fee would result in a less than significant impact to park and recreational facilities.

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

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

**No 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 public recreational facilities. No 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
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?***

The following section summarizes and incorporates by reference information from the 707 Pacific (Rite Aid) *Traffic Impact Analysis*, prepared by Jano Baghdanian & Associates, dated July 14, 2015 (attached):

### **Less than Significant Impact.**

#### **Trip Impact Analysis**

A total of five intersections were analyzed within the study area for the proposed project: Pacific Avenue & Glenoaks Boulevard, Pacific Avenue & Burchett Street, Pacific Avenue & SR-134 Westbound On/Off-Ramps, Pacific Avenue & SR-134 Eastbound On/Off-Ramps, and Pacific Avenue & Doran Street.

Two of the five analyzed intersections are currently operating at levels of service (LOS) C or better during both the morning and evening peak hours:

- Pacific Avenue & Burchett Street – AM peak hour: LOS C; PM peak hour: LOS C;
- Pacific Avenue & Doran Street – AM peak hour: LOS B; PM peak hour: LOS C;

None of the intersections are currently operating at LOS E or F.

Three of the five intersections are currently operating at LOS D:

- Pacific Avenue & Glenoaks Boulevard – AM peak hour: LOS C; PM peak hour: LOS D;
- Pacific Avenue & SR-134 WB On/Off Ramps – AM peak hour: LOS D; PM peak hour: LOS D;
- Pacific Avenue & SR-134 EB On/Off Ramps – AM peak hour: LOS D; PM peak hour: LOS D.

Utilizing the 2012 ITE Trip Generation Manual (9<sup>th</sup> Edition), the trip generation for the proposed project (pharmacy/drugstore with drive-thru window) would result in approximately 1,441 daily trips of which 50 trips (26 inbound and 24 outbound) occur during the morning peak hour and 144 trips (72 inbound and 72 outbound) occur during the evening peak hour. Taking into account pass-by and walk-in traffic, the trip generation would decrease to approximately 1,005 daily trips of which 36 trips (19 inbound and 17 outbound) occur during the morning peak hour and 70 trips (35 inbound and 35 outbound) occur during the evening peak hour.

In the Existing Plus Project Conditions, both AM and PM peak hour operating conditions would be similar to those for the existing conditions (without the project), except for one intersection. With the project, traffic conditions for the Pacific Avenue & Glenoaks Boulevard intersection would change from LOS C to LOS D in the AM peak hour only (change from existing 0.798 v/c to proposed 0.805 v/c with project, when LOS C refers to 0.701 to 0.800 v/c and LOS D is 0.801 to 0.900 v/c). Traffic generated by the project would not change the intersection levels of service from existing conditions (without the project) for the remaining four intersections, nor would the project cause significant traffic impacts at any of the analysis locations during the weekday AM and PM peak hours for all five intersections.

In the Future (Year 2016) Without Project Traffic Conditions, the same two intersections operate at LOS C or better (same levels as without project), and the same three intersections noted above are projected to operate at LOS D (with an AM peak hour increase of 0.007 v/c for one intersection) and include:

- Pacific Avenue & Glenoaks Boulevard – AM peak hour: LOS D; PM peak hour: LOS D;
- Pacific Avenue & SR-134 WB On/Off Ramps – AM peak hour: LOS D; PM peak hour: LOS D;
- Pacific Avenue & SR-134 EB On/Off Ramps – AM peak hour: LOS D; PM peak hour: LOS D.

Traffic generated by the project would not change the intersection levels of service from Future (Year 2016) Without Project Traffic Conditions, nor would the project cause significant traffic impacts at any of the analysis locations during the AM and PM peak hours.

As noted above, and based on the subject traffic analysis reviewed by the City's Traffic & Transportation staff, the increase in the number of vehicles using the area streets associated with the project is anticipated to result in a less than significant impact.

**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?**



**No 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 impacts would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private air strip. No impacts on air traffic patterns would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** Direct access to the project site and the 61-space parking lot will be provided via two two-way driveways off Burchett Street (same driveway locations as for the existing development). No significant changes are proposed to the existing street system. As part of the proposed project, the applicant will be providing easements for public street use purposes, as specified in the Public Works comments, dated September 16, 2015. The street improvement plans for the area along Burchett Street include the widening of the southerly half of Burchett in order to provide a center turn lane on Burchett Street for westbound traffic and a south-bound right turn lane at the Pacific-Burchett intersection, thereby improving existing traffic flow conditions. No negative impacts would occur.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Other than the roadway improvements described above in Section P-4, no changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the project. Direct access to the property will be taken from Burchett Street, which is designed as a Local Street in the City's Circulation Element. As indicated in Section P-1 above, a traffic control plan will be required for the construction phase of the project. The plan will be reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Division to ensure that emergency access is not impacting during construction. As a result, no significant impacts to emergency access are anticipated.

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

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

**No Impact.** The 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 because no changes to the existing transportation policies, plans, or programs would result from project implementation. The project will provide bicycle racks on-site. 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				X

<i>Would the project:</i>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				
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?				<b>X</b>
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?			<b>X</b>	
4. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			<b>X</b>	
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?				<b>X</b>
6. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			<b>X</b>	
7. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				<b>X</b>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would not result in a significant increase in the amount of runoff since the site is currently developed with an approximately 10,000 SF restaurant, which is to be replaced with a 12,900 SF retail building (building footprint increase of approximately 3,000 SF, and does not include the 1,661 SF mezzanine). The project includes a new loading area behind the building which is currently occupied by landscaping, as well as public right-of-way improvements along Burchett Street. Runoff from the project site would be conveyed via streets and gutters to storm drain locations around the project site. The proposed project slight increase in runoff would not require any substantial changes to the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area, nor would it affect the capacity of the existing storm drain system. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

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

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

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

The proposed project would result in an increase in water demand for operational uses, including landscape irrigation, maintenance and other activities on the site. Based on a generation factor of 0.08 gal/day/sq. ft. for drugstores, the 14,561 SF project would result in a demand of approximately 1,165 gallons per day that equates to 0.0036 acre-feet per year (afy) of water. Although the previous 10,029 SF restaurant is currently vacant, the restaurant use would have generated 1,003 gallons per day (based on the restaurant generation factor of 100 gal/day/1,000 sq.ft.) or 0.0031 acre-feet when in operation. This is only slightly less than the proposed use.

**Normal Weather Conditions**

The City of Glendale has identified an adequate supply of water to meet future City demands under normal conditions. As indicated in the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, a surplus exists that provides a reasonable buffer of approximately 1,500 to 2,500 afy of water. Future water demand in the City is based on projected development contained in the General Plan. For purposes of this assessment, the demand of the proposed project was assumed not to have been included in this demand projection. However, even with the addition of 0.0036 acre-feet per year (afy, or a net increase of 0.0005 afy over the previous restaurant use) of demand generated by the proposed project, there is ample supply to meet remaining City demand under normal conditions.

**Dry Weather Conditions**

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

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

Even with the implementation of the proposed project, the GWP would continue to have adequate supply to meet citywide demand under drought conditions. Even with the addition of 0.0036 acre-feet per year (afy, or a net increase of 0.0005 afy over the previous restaurant use) of demand

generated by the proposed project, there is sufficient supply to meet City demand under drought conditions.

As indicated above, the City would continue to have adequate supply to meet citywide demand under normal and drought conditions with the proposed project. In addition, the proposed project will be required to comply with the phased water conservation measures that include the planting of drought tolerant and California-friendly landscape. The project will also be required to comply with water conservation measures found in the building code. As a result, long-term impacts to water supply during operation of the proposed project under both normal and drought conditions would be less than significant.

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

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

**No Impact.** Sewage from the project site goes to the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP), which the City of Glendale has access to through the Amalgamated Agreement. The HTP has a dry-weather design capacity of 450 million gpd and is currently operating below that capacity, at 362 million gpd. As a result, adequate capacity exists to treat the proposed project-generated effluent. Therefore, the proposed project would not require the expansion or construction of sewage treatment facilities. No significant impact would result with regard to impacts to the available sewage treatment capacity.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in commercial development on site. Both restaurant and retail uses have a solid waste generation rate of 0.006 lbs/1,000 SF/day. The proposed project would generate approximately 0.087 tons (14,561 SF retail x 0.006 lbs./1,000 SF/day) of solid waste per year. The previous restaurant use would have generated approximately 0.060 tons per year (10,029 SF restaurant x 0.006 lbs/1,000 SF/day) when in operation, approximately 0.027 tons per year less than the proposed project.

Solid waste generated on the project site could be deposited at the Scholl Canyon Landfill (owned by the City of Glendale) or at one of the landfills located within the County of Los Angeles. The annual disposal rate at the Scholl Canyon facility is 200,000 tons per year. Combined with the increase of approximately 0.087 tons per year in solid waste generated by the proposed project, the annual disposal amount would increase to approximately 200,027 tons per year. With a total annual disposal amount of 200,027 tons and a remaining capacity of 3.6 million tons, the Scholl Canyon facility would meet the needs of the City and the proposed project for approximately 18 years. Because the proposed project would be required to implement a waste-diversion program aimed at reducing the amount of solid waste disposed in the landfill, the amount of solid waste generated would likely be less than the amount estimated. As a result, no significant impacts are anticipated.

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

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

**No Impact.** The 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 (GMC Chapter 8.58). No impacts would occur.

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



**R. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

<i>Would the project:</i>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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?				<b>X</b>
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)?				<b>X</b>
3. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				<b>X</b>

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

**No Impact.** The project site is a currently developed located within an urbanized area on Pacific Avenue directly north of the 134 Freeway. No biological species or habitat for biological species exists on site or within the project vicinity. In addition, no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plans apply to the project site. As such, the proposed project would not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Furthermore, the proposed project would not have the potential to eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory, including historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant environmental impacts that have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

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

**No Impact.** Cumulative impacts may occur when the proposed project in conjunction with one or more related projects would yield an impact that is greater than what would occur with the development of only the proposed project. With regard to cumulative effects for the issues of agricultural, biological, and mineral resources, the project site is located in an urbanized area and therefore, other developments occurring in the area of the project would largely occur on previously disturbed land and are not anticipated to have an impact. Thus, no cumulative impact to these resources would occur. Impacts related to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and

hazards and hazardous materials are generally confined to a specific site and do not affect off-site areas.

The City's approved and pending projects in the vicinity combined with the proposed project may result in cumulative effects in other environmental issue areas due to the aggregate development within an already urbanized area. However, project-related impacts that require mitigation measures to reduce the level of significance would not result in cumulative impacts when combined with the City's other related projects. Therefore, the proposed project would have not cumulatively considerable effects, and as such, cumulative impacts would not occur.

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

**No Impact.** Based on the analysis presented above, implementation of the aforementioned mitigation measures would reduce environmental impacts such that no substantial adverse effects on humans would occur.

13. **Earlier Analyses**

None

14. **Project References Used to Prepare Initial Study Checklist**

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

1. Environmental Information Form application submitted on September 25, 2015.
2. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Open Space and Conservation Element," as amended.
3. California Department of Conservation, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program*, Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2010 (September 2011).
4. South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning* (May 2005), p. 2-2.
5. City of Glendale, *General Plan*, "Safety Element" (2003), Plate P-3.
6. City of Glendale, *General Plan*, "Safety Element" (2003), Plate P-2.
7. City of Glendale, *General Plan*, "Safety Element" (2003).
8. California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, *State of California General Plan Guidelines* (October 2003).
9. City of Glendale Municipal Code, as amended.
10. CalRecycle, "Waste Characterization: Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates," <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/wastechar/wastegenrates/default.htm>, accessed October 28, 2014.
11. 707 Pacific (Rite Aid) Traffic Impact Analysis, prepared by Jano Baghdanian & Associates, dated July 14, 2015

8/31/2015 8:55:47 AM

Urbemis 2007 Version 9.2.4

## Summary Report for Summer Emissions (Pounds/Day)

File Name: C:\Users\lekrause\AppData\Roaming\Urbemis\Version9a\Projects\Rite Aid 707 N. Pacific.urb924

Project Name: Rite Aid 707 N. Pacific

Project Location: South Coast AQMD

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

## CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10 Dust</u>	<u>PM10 Exhaust</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5 Dust</u>	<u>PM2.5 Exhaust</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>
2016 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)	17.21	21.21	15.65	0.00	6.01	1.07	7.08	1.26	0.98	2.24

## AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	0.22	0.12	1.63	0.00	0.01	0.01

## OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	5.04	7.38	67.26	0.12	19.88	3.86

## SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	5.26	7.50	68.89	0.12	19.89	3.87

8/31/2015 8:55:55 AM

Urbemis 2007 Version 9.2.4

## Summary Report for Winter Emissions (Pounds/Day)

File Name: C:\Users\lekrause\AppData\Roaming\Urbemis\Version9a\Projects\Rite Aid 707 N. Pacific.urb924

Project Name: Rite Aid 707 N. Pacific

Project Location: South Coast AQMD

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

## CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10 Dust</u>	<u>PM10 Exhaust</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5 Dust</u>	<u>PM2.5 Exhaust</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>
2016 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)	17.21	21.21	15.65	0.00	6.01	1.07	7.08	1.26	0.98	2.24

## AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00

## OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	5.72	8.85	63.58	0.10	19.88	3.86

## SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	5.82	8.95	63.66	0.10	19.88	3.86

8/31/2015 8:56:01 AM

Urbemis 2007 Version 9.2.4

## Summary Report for Annual Emissions (Tons/Year)

File Name: C:\Users\lekrause\AppData\Roaming\Urbemis\Version9a\Projects\Rite Aid 707 N. Pacific.urb924

Project Name: Rite Aid 707 N. Pacific

Project Location: South Coast AQMD

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

## CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO<sub>2</sub></u>	<u>PM10 Dust</u>	<u>PM10 Exhaust</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5 Dust</u>	<u>PM2.5 Exhaust</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>
2016 TOTALS (tons/year unmitigated)	0.23	0.55	0.47	0.00	0.04	0.03	0.07	0.01	0.03	0.04

## AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO<sub>2</sub></u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	0.04	0.02	0.29	0.00	0.00	0.00

## OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO<sub>2</sub></u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	0.96	1.44	12.05	0.02	3.63	0.70

## SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO<sub>2</sub></u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	1.00	1.46	12.34	0.02	3.63	0.70