PROPOSED
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
New 286-Unit Multi-Family Residential Project
223-241 N. Jackson Street

The following Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.	
Project Title/Common Name:	New 286-Unit Multi-Family Residential Project
Project Location:	223-241 N. Jackson Street, Glendale, Los Angeles County
Project Description:	The proposed GUSD Apartments ("Development Project") involves the demolition of the existing GUSD Headquarters office and associated buildings, two modular buildings, a multi-family residential building and surface parking lots. The new development involves constructing a five-story (with mezzanine), 286-unit residential development wrapped around a multi-level parking structure with 394 parking spaces located on an 113,289 square-foot lot (2.60 acres). The proposed Development Project site would require a Zone Change, General Plan and DSP (map) Amendments for the 14 lots fronting Wilson Avenue, Jackson and Kenwood Streets. All lots are currently zoned R-1250 with a General Plan designation of High Density Residential. The project applicant is proposing to change the zoning to DSP/East Broadway District and to change the General Plan designation to DSP. The proposed Development Agreement is to utilize the public open space incentive for additional height/stories and floor area ratio. Additionally, the Planning Division staff is requesting the Planning Commission recommend the City Council initiate a General Plan Amendment, a Zoning Map and Downtown Specific Plan Map amendments to amend the General Plan Designation and Zoning of a lot (APN 5642-017-005) located immediately north of and adjacent to the Project Site. The lot is located at the southwest corner of E. California Avenue and Jackson Street (247 N. Jackson Street). The lot is currently zoned R-1250 with a General Plan designation of High Density Residential. This lot contains an existing multi-unit residential apartment building, a use that is consistent with the recommended General Plan and Zone Change to DSP/East Broadway District and to change General Plan designation to DSP. The applicant is requesting to vacate the easterly portion of Alley 220, northerly of Wilson Avenue, and easterly of Jackson Street at 223-241 N. Jackson Street. Following recommendations from the Planning Commission on the approval of the requested General Plan, Zoning Map and Downtown Specific Plan map amendments, the Development Project applicant will be seeking City Council approval of design review, standards variances for on-and above-ground parking and number of stories and approval of a development agreement.

Project Type:	☒ Private Project ☐ Public Project
Project Applicant:	CP VI Jackson Street, LLC c/o Will Cipes / Carmel Partners 429 Santa Monica Blvd. Santa Monica, CA 90404
Findings:	The Director of Community Development, on **November 16, 2017**, after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Division, found that the above referenced project would not have a significant effect on the environment, with the addition of mitigation measures and instructed that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be prepared.
Mitigation Measures:	See attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Attachments:	Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Phil Lanzafame, Director of Community Development City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 548-2140 Fax: (818) 240-0392

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

The following mitigation measure shall apply to the proposed multi-family residential project located at 223-241 N. Jackson Street to reduce identified impacts to less than significant levels.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

BIO-1. The applicant shall complete an indigenous tree permit application to relocate the existing oak tree, the complete application shall include a letter from the selected contractor with an overview of the transplanting procedures and a general timeline for when the tree will be prepared and moved. The applicant shall guarantee the survival of the transplanted oak tree for five years after relocation.

Monitoring Action:	Obtain indigenous tree permit
Timing:	Prior to issuance of development permits
Responsibility:	Director of Public Works

BIO-2. Should the transplanted oak tree die within five years of initial planting; the developer shall replace the oak tree with nine, 24-inch box oak trees. If there are space restrictions on the property, which prevent the planting of all nine oak trees, the developer shall pay into the City's Urban Forestry Fund the cost of the 24-inch box replacement oak trees not planted onsite subject to the fees at that time. The developer shall plant at a minimum, one of the replacement oak trees on the subject property preferably in the location of the failed tree. The replacement tree planted on the property must be one of the following species: Coast Live Oak (Quercus agrifolia), Valley Oak (Quercus lobata), or Englemann Oak (Quercus englemanni). The replacement tree(s) planted on the property will also be guaranteed for five years after planting.

Monitoring Action:	Compliance with Indigenous Tree Protect Measures
Timing:	Prior to issuance of development permits. During any construction related activities, including but not limited to demolition, site preparation, grading, or building construction.
Responsibility:	Director of Public Works

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

TRA-1. The applicant shall install a traffic signal at the intersection of California Avenue and Jackson Street to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.

Monitoring Action:	Installation of traffic signal
Timing:	Prior to issuance of development permits (plan check). Prior to final approval of development permits (site inspection).
Responsibility:	Director of Public Works

Agreement to Proposed Mitigation Measures and Mitigation Monitoring Program

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

Dated: _____ _____

Signature(s) of the Project Applicant(s)

Dated: _____ _____

1.	**Project Title:** New 286-Unit Multi-Family Residential Project
2.	**Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Glendale Community Development Department Planning Division 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	**Contact Person and Phone Number:** Milca Toledo, Senior Planner Tel: (818) 937-8181 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	**Project Location:** 223-241 N. Jackson Street, Glendale, Los Angeles County, CA 91206
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** CP VI Jackson Street, LLC C/o Will Cipes / Carmel Partners Glendale, CA 91208
6.	**General Plan Designation:** High Density Residential
7.	**Zoning:** R-1250 (High Density Residential) Zone
8.	**Description of the Project:** The proposed GUSD Apartments ("Development Project") involves the demolition of the existing GUSD Headquarters office and associated buildings, two modular buildings, a multi-family residential building and surface parking lots. The new development involves constructing a five-story (with mezzanine), 286-unit residential development wrapped around a multi-level parking structure with 394 parking spaces located on an 113,289 square-foot lot (2.60 acres). The proposed Development Project site would require a Zone Change, General Plan and DSP (map) Amendments for the 14 lots fronting Wilson Avenue, Jackson and Kenwood Streets. All lots are currently zoned R-1250 with a General Plan designation of High Density Residential. The project applicant is proposing to change the zoning to DSP/East Broadway District and to change the General Plan designation to DSP. The proposed Development Agreement is to utilize the public open space incentive for additional height/stories and floor area ratio. Additionally, the Planning Division staff is requesting the Planning Commission recommend the City Council initiate a General Plan Amendment, a Zoning Map and Downtown Specific Plan Map amendments to amend the General Plan Designation and Zoning of a lot (APN 5642-017-005) located immediately north of and adjacent to the Project Site. The lot is located at the southwest corner of E. California Avenue and Jackson Street (247 N. Jackson Street). The lot is currently zoned R-1250 with a General Plan designation of High Density Residential. This lot contains an existing multi-unit residential apartment building, a use that is consistent with the recommended General Plan and Zone Change to DSP/East Broadway District and to change General Plan designation to DSP. The applicant is requesting to vacate the easterly portion of Alley 220, northerly of Wilson Avenue, and easterly of Jackson Street at 223-241 N. Jackson Street.

	Following recommendations from the Planning Commission on the approval of the requested General Plan, Zoning Map and Downtown Specific Plan map amendments, the Development Project applicant will be seeking City Council approval of design review, standards variances for on-and above-ground parking and number of stories and approval of a development agreement.
9.	**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *North:* Public high school (Daily High School) and multi-family residential uses *South:* Commercial uses (Bakery and Offices) *East:* Commercial (Offices) and multi-family residential uses *West:* Multi-family residential uses
10.	**Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).** None

11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

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

LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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

Prepared by: _____ Date: 11-16-17

Reviewed by: _____ Date: 11-16-17

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

Director of Community Development: _____ Date: 11/16/17

12. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

A. AESTHETICS

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

Senate Bill (SB) 743 states that a project's aesthetic impacts shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment if the project is a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project; and if the project is located on an infill site within a transit priority area (TPA). A TPA is defined as an area within one-half mile of major transit stop which includes an intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.

The Project site is well served with regional and local public transit as well as commuter and passenger rail services. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) and the City of Glendale Bee Line provide access to and from the project vicinity. The MTA operates within the Project area primarily along Brand Boulevard and Glendale Avenue while the Bee Line operates along Brand Boulevard, Wilson Avenue, and Broadway. Because the proposed Project is a residential project proposed on an infill site located within a TPA, any aesthetic impacts, including but not limited to (1) adverse effects on scenic vistas, (2) damage to scenic resources, (3) degradation of existing visual character and (4) light and/or glare, are less than significant as a matter of law. Notwithstanding the mandate imposed by SB 743, the following analysis of the aesthetic effects of the project is provided for informational purposes only.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan identifies the San Gabriel Mountains and the Verdugo Mountains as visual and scenic resources. Views of the Verdugo and San Gabriel Mountains are available along Brand Boulevard and Central Avenue, but these views are currently confined to looking down the streets themselves by existing buildings. The Project site is located within a highly developed urban area in the City. The Project site is currently developed with the GUSD Headquarters building and a 9-unit apartment building.

The existing 4-story GUSD administrative building on the northern section of the project site currently obscures views of San Gabriel Mountains to the north and east, and Verdugo Mountains to the west. Looking across the surface parking lot on the southern portion of the Project site, development along Jackson Street fully obstructs views from the east, while distant high-rise buildings and adjacent development severely limit views from the west and south.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. There are no State-designated scenic highways within the City of Glendale. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is currently developed with the GUSD Headquarters building and a 9-unit apartment building. The project site is currently surrounded by commercial buildings and multi-family residential buildings to the east, a school and multi-family residential developments to the north and west, and a church and commercial uses to the south. These surrounding uses range from 1 to 5 stories in height.

The Project includes a request to expand the boundary of the DSP to add the Project Site to the East Broadway District. The permitted height limit within the East Broadway District is 4 stories and 65 feet and maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 2.5. Projects within the East Broadway District may use any combination of the incentives identified in the DSP to increase the permitted height to 5 stories and 80 feet with a maximum FAR of 2.75. The proposed Project is requesting to use the open space incentive to allow a building with an average height of 62 feet, and a maximum height of 88 feet, and an FAR of 2.63. In order to qualify for the height and density bonus under the open space incentive, the project would be required to provide one square foot of publicly accessible open space for every 10 square feet of floor area over the by right FAR of 2.5. The proposed Project would provide 8,497 square feet of publicly accessible open space that meets the requirement to qualify the open space incentive under the DSP.

The Project incorporates landscaping features throughout the Project site, including several ground-level courtyards for use as common areas by residents, and a total of 8,497 square feet of publicly accessible open space in a plaza located on the corner of E. Wilson Avenue and N. Jackson Street, a courtyard along N. Jackson Street, and a courtyard along E. Wilson Avenue.

The proposed project will be reviewed by the City Council in regard to the site planning, mass and scale, architecture, materials, and landscaping to ensure the project's design is consistent with City's goals, policies, and design guidelines. The project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site, and impacts to the visual character of the site and the surrounding area would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The site is currently developed with the GUSD Headquarters building and a 9-unit apartment building. The Project area contains a mix of residential and commercial uses. Institutional uses include the Allan F. Daily Continuation High School immediately to the west of the Project site. Thus, new light sources associated with the Project will not

significantly increase the existing ambient lighting in the area. All lighting associated with the proposed Project would be subject to lighting regulations, including those set forth in the Glendale Comprehensive Design Guidelines. The lighting would not create substantial light and glare impacts based on the location and orientation of the proposed lighting fixtures. The proposed building materials consist of non-reflective, textured surfaces and non-reflective glazed glass on the building exterior, and these materials would not create daytime glare. As such, impacts associated with increase ambient lighting affecting nighttime views in the project area are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

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

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

No Impact. There is no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of Statewide importance within or adjacent to the proposed Project site and no agricultural activities take place on the project site. No agricultural use zones currently exist within the City, nor are any agricultural zones proposed within the City. No impacts would occur with the implementation of the Project.

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 in an urbanized area. Neither the Project site or any of the surrounding area currently zoned agricultural use, nor do any such uses exist within the City of Glendale. No Williamson Act contracts are in effect for the Project site or surrounding vicinity. No conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts would result. No impacts would occur with the implementation of the Project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. There is no existing zoning of forestland or timberland in the City of Glendale. No impacts would occur with the implementation of the Project.

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. No forestland exists within the City of Glendale; therefore, no forestland 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. No farmland or forestland exists near or on the proposed Project site. No farmland would be converted to nonagricultural use, and no forestland would be converted to non-forest use under the proposed Project. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

C. AIR QUALITY

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) adopted an updated air quality management plan (AQMP) in March 2017.[6] The 2016 AQMP was prepared to comply with the federal and State Clean Air Acts and amendments; accommodate growth; reduce the high levels of pollutants in the South Coast Air Basin ("Basin"); meet federal and State air quality standards; and minimize the fiscal impact of pollution control measures on the local economy. It builds on approaches in the previous AQMP to achieve attainment of the federal ozone air quality standard. These planning efforts have substantially decreased exposure to unhealthy levels of pollutants, even while substantial population growth has occurred within the Basin.

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) adopted the 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 RTP/SCS). Projects that are consistent with the projections of population forecasts are considered consistent with the AQMP. Population within the City of Glendale in 2012 and 2040 was forecasted to be 193,200 and 214,000, respectively. The Project would generate approximately 827 residences, yielding less than 1 percent of the anticipated increase in population. The Project would be consistent with the planned land uses and population growth for the City and would not conflict with the AQMP. Consequently, impacts would be less than significant.

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 proposed Project would include the demolition of the existing GUSD Headquarters building and the 9-unit apartment building for construction of a new 5-story multi-family residential building containing 286 units with a multi-level parking garage. Construction emissions were estimated according to the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook and construction emission factors contained in the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). The emission calculations assume the use of standard construction practices, such as compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 Fugitive Dust, which requires all unpaved demolition and construction areas to be wetted at least three times a day during excavation and construction to minimize the generation of fugitive dust.

The estimated maximum daily emissions during Project construction are presented in **Table 1, Maximum Construction Emissions.** The analysis assumes that operation of all construction equipment for a given activity would occur simultaneously and continuously over the day. This would not actually occur, given that most equipment would operate only a fraction of each workday; moreover, many of the activities would not overlap on a daily basis. Therefore, **Table 1** represents a conservative scenario for construction activities. As shown in **Table 1**, emissions associated with construction would not exceed the applicable maximum daily SCAQMD thresholds for criteria pollutants. Thus, the proposed Project would result in less than significant construction emission impacts.

Table 1 Maximum Construction Emissions						
	ROG	NOx	CO	SOx	PM10	PM2.5
Source	pounds/day					
Maximum	50.4	44.3	47.9	0.1	6.2	2.7
SCAQMD Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

*Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas output sheets are provided in **Appendix A**.*

Localized Significance Threshold (LST) Emissions

The SCAQMD devised the Localized Significance Threshold (LST) methodology to assess the potential air quality impacts that would result in the near vicinity of the Project. This methodology considers emissions generated from on-site sources and excludes emissions from off-site vehicular traffic. The SCAQMD provides mass rate lookup tables as a screening tool to determine the likelihood of localized impacts from Project construction and operation. The lookup tables provide values for 1-, 2-, and 5-acre sites based on the geographic location of the Project and the proximity of sensitive receptors (i.e., schools, residences, hospitals, etc.). The Project is in the western San Gabriel Valley, Source Receptor Area (SRA) 8. The estimated area of disturbance is approximately 2.6 acres with sensitive receptors within 25 meters of the Project boundary for purposes of applying the SCAQMD mass rate emission threshold. The result of the LST analysis is provided in **Table 2, Construction Analysis**. As shown in **Table 2**, maximum daily on-site emissions during Project construction and operation would not exceed LSTS within SRA 8 for NOx, CO, PM10, and PM2.5. Localized air quality impacts from the Project would be less than significant.

Table 2 LST Analysis				
	NOx	CO	PM10	PM2.5
Source	pounds/day			
Construction				
Maximum	32.9	20.2	3.6	2.4
SCAQMD LST (SRA 8)	108	958	7	4
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Operational				
Area/Energy emissions	1.1	24.3	0.2	0.2
Existing	0.2	0.9	<0.1	<0.1
Net Total	0.9	23.4	0.2	0.2
SCAQMD LST (SRA 8)	108	958	2	1
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

*Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas output sheets are provided in **Appendix A**.*

Operational Emissions

Operational emissions would be generated by both stationary and mobile sources from normal day-to-day activities associated with the Project. Stationary emissions would be generated by the consumption of natural gas for space- and water-heating equipment. Mobile emissions would be generated by motor vehicles traveling to and from the Project site. The analysis of daily operational emissions has been prepared using the data and methodologies identified in the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook and current motor vehicle emission factors in the CalEEMod model. The results presented in **Table 3, Maximum Operational Emissions**, are compared to the SCAQMD established operational significance thresholds. As shown in **Table 3** below, the emissions associated with the proposed Project would not exceed the SCAQMD recommended operational emission thresholds. The majority of emissions associated with Project operation are attributed to anticipated vehicular traffic traveling to and from the Project. As shown in **Table 3** below, the overall operational impacts associated with the Project would be less than significant based on the applicable SCAQMD thresholds.

Table 3
Maximum Operational Emissions

Source	ROG	NOx	CO	SOx	PM10	PM2.5
	pounds/day					
Area	7.5	0.3	23.9	<0.1	0.1	0.1
Energy	0.1	0.8	0.3	<0.1	0.1	0.1
Mobile	2.7	12.7	32.7	0.1	9.2	2.5
Total	10.3	13.8	56.9	0.1	9.4	2.7
Existing	3.6	10.0	29.5	0.1	5.8	1.6
Net Total	6.7	3.8	27.4	0.1	3.6	1.1
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

*Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas output sheets are provided in **Appendix A**.*

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact could occur if the Project would add a considerable cumulative contribution to Federal or State nonattainment pollutants. The Basin is currently in State nonattainment for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5. In regard to determining the significance of the Project contribution, the SCAQMD neither recommends quantified analyses of construction and/or operational emissions from multiple development projects nor provides methodologies or thresholds of significance to be used to assess the cumulative emissions generated by multiple cumulative projects. Instead, the SCAQMD recommends that a project's potential contribution to cumulative impacts be assessed utilizing the same significance criteria as those for project-specific impacts. Furthermore, SCAQMD states that "projects that do not exceed the project-specific thresholds are generally not considered to be cumulatively significant." Therefore, if a project generates less than significant construction or operational emissions, then the project would not generate a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment. As shown in **Tables 1** through **3**, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed Project would not exceed the SCAQMD recommended

operational emission thresholds and 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. As shown in **Tables 1 through 3**, no construction or operational impacts are anticipated. Therefore, the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration. Impacts would be considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. According to the SCAQMD, "while almost any source may emit objectionable odors, some land uses will be more likely to produce odors…because of their operation." Land uses that are more likely to produce odors include agriculture, chemical plants, composting operations, dairies, fiberglass molding, landfills, refineries, rendering plants, rail yards, and wastewater treatment plants. The proposed Project includes a residential development and would not contain any active manufacturing activities. No impacts due to odors would occur with implementation of the proposed Project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and 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		

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				**X**

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

No Impact. The Project site and the surrounding area are completely developed and disturbed. The Project site is currently developed with the GUSD Headquarters building and a 9-unit apartment building and does not contain any native vegetation or habitat areas. The majority of the surrounding area has also been developed and landscaped with largely non-native plants. Only a limited number of plant species common in urban environments, none of which are considered rare or endangered, are found near the Project site. Suitable habitats for sensitive mammal, reptile, amphibian, or fish species do not exist on the Project site or within the surrounding area. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Project site is currently developed with the GUSD Headquarters building and a 9-unit apartment building. The surrounding area is completely developed and disturbed with commercial and residential uses. No riparian habitat or sensitive natural community is located in the surrounding area or on the Project site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Project site and surrounding area is neither near nor does it contain wetland habitat or a blue-line stream. Therefore, the proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. No impact would occur.

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

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

No Impact. The Project site and the surrounding area are currently developed and does not contain native resident or migratory species or native nursery sites. The Project area is surrounded by urban and commercial uses on all sides, including the Ventura Freeway (SR 134) to the north and the Golden State Freeway (I-5) to the west, which act as a barrier to potential wildlife movement. In addition, there are no wildlife migration corridors in the vicinity of the Project site. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The Glendale Municipal Code, Chapter 12.44 Indigenous Trees, contains guidelines for the protection and removal of indigenous trees. These trees are defined as any Valley Oak, California Live Oak, Scrub Oak, Mesa Oak, California Bay and California Sycamore, which measure 6 inches or more in diameter breast height (DBH). Furthermore, the Glendale Municipal Code, Chapter 12.40 City Street Trees, contains guidelines for the preservation and protection of city street trees.

Currently one oak tree exists on the northeast portion of the Project site. The proposed Project would relocate the oak tree to the future courtyard and would be relocated approximately 5 feet from its current location. The Project would comply with the Glendale Municipal Code, Chapter 12.44 Indigenous Trees, which requires obtaining an Indigenous Tree Permit for relocation of the oak tree. Furthermore, the tree would be relocated in accordance with the City's regulations. Implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures are proposed to reduce impacts to less than significant level.

BIO-1 The applicant shall complete an indigenous tree permit application to relocate the existing oak tree, the complete application shall include a letter from the selected contractor with an overview of the transplanting procedures and a general timeline for when the tree will be prepared and moved. The applicant shall guarantee the survival of the transplanted oak tree for five years after relocation.

BIO-2 Should the transplanted oak tree die within five years of initial planting; the developer shall replace the oak tree with nine, 24-inch box oak trees. If there are space restrictions on the property, which prevent the planting of all nine oak trees, the developer shall pay into the City's Urban Forestry Fund the cost of the 24-inch box replacement oak trees not planted onsite subject to the fees at that time. The developer shall plant at a minimum, one of the replacement oak trees on the subject property preferably in the location of the failed tree. The replacement tree planted on the property must be one of the following species: Coast Live Oak (Quercus agrifolia), Valley Oak (Quercus lobata), or Englemann Oak (Quercus englemanni). The replacement tree(s) planted on the property will also be guaranteed for five years after planting.

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

No Impact. No adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or similar plan applies to this portion of the City of Glendale. Consequently, implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(1) states that "substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired." The GUSD Headquarters building is housed in a 2-story, former storage warehouse constructed in 1938 and a four-story office building constructed in 1971. A narrow, 2-story communicating passage connects the two buildings. The 9-unit apartment building located north of the GUSD Headquarters was built in 1960. Development of the project would result in the demolition of all existing buildings onsite.

A historic resources assessment of the Project site was completed by Historic Resources Group in November 2017. Neither the 1938 warehouse building, the 1971 office building, nor 1960 apartment building are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or for designation as a Glendale Historic Resource. Neither is an excellent example of architectural style or property type and neither was found to have important historic associations. As such, the property is not considered a historic resource under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The block containing the Project site was previously the site of the Wilson Avenue Public School. A 1925 Sanborn Map shows the main school building and several free-standing classroom buildings clustered at the southern portion of the block facing Wilson Avenue. The Wilson Avenue School building was eventually converted to administrative offices for the school district. Based on available records, the school building was most likely converted to administrative offices in the 1930s. The two-story concrete warehouse building appears to have been constructed in 1938 at the northeast corner of the block. No building permits for the original construction of this building were located for this investigation. A 1938 building permit for truck storage at the same location, however, includes the notation "These truck stalls are an addition to concrete school warehouse now nearing completion." The 1938 permit for truck stalls states that the architect was Erwood Eiden. Because Eiden is the architect for the truck stalls, it is very likely he was also the architect for the warehouse. This suggests that the concrete warehouse was under construction in 1938.

The former school building was further remodeled in 1952 when the parapet and bell tower were removed and the walls were re-surfaced. Plans for a new Administration Building were prepared by

architects Jones and Walton and approved in November 1970. The plans included the demolition of the existing administration building (former Wilson Avenue School building), and construction of a new four-story office building with a two-story passage way connecting the new office building to the 1938 warehouse building. The 1938 warehouse building was converted to a two-story media center with rooms for a TV studio, sound studio, art room, and library. Windows were replaced as part of the warehouse remodel windows and select window openings were filled with gunite.

The 1938 warehouse building is set back slightly from the sidewalk with narrow planted areas and a low brick screen wall. It was designed in a stripped-down Moderne style. The 1971 office building is set further back from the sidewalk with a wide planted area and trees. It was designed in a late iteration of the Mid-century Modern style. It is four stories in height and has a rectangular plan with a flat roof and mechanical penthouse. The primary (south) and secondary (north) façades are symmetrically composed and are articulated into six bays each by exposed columns and floor slabs. Between the columns are bands of aluminum-framed windows above brick-veneered spandrel panels. The windows are shaded by continuous projecting canopies at each floor level. On the south façade the canopies are fitted with continuous, louvered metal brise-soleils. The building's east and west façades are windowless and are articulated with the exposed edges of the floor slabs and brick infill.

The 1938 warehouse exhibits the basic massing, decorative cornice and pilasters characteristic of an architectural style often referred to as PWA Moderne, but this very modest building would not be considered a distinctive or exemplary example of the style or type. All of the original windows and doors have been replaced and many window opening have been filled, compromising the building's historic integrity.

The 1971 administration building is a typical example of a public agency building constructed in the 1960s and early 70s. The building's simple rectangular mass is given visual interest through the exposed columns and floor slabs, and applied details such as the brick-veneered spandrel panels, projecting canopies, and louvered metal brise-soleils. Though well executed, the 1971 administration building is not a distinctive or exemplary example of an architectural style or building type.

Research conducted indicates the architect of the 1938 building was a local working architect not considered a master or noted for exemplary accomplishment. The architects of the 1971 building, Jones & Walton, were prolific local architects both independently and in partnership, but the 1971 administration building is not an excellent example of their work and several other buildings they designed exist throughout the region. The architect of the apartment building was also not determined to be notable.

The apartment building at 241 N. Jackson Street is designed in a Mid-Century Modern style and is set back from the sidewalk behind a narrow strip of lawn. It is of wood-frame construction and is two stories in height, with a rectangular plan and a sloping shed roof. The parcel originally contained a one-story, wood-frame, single-family home and detached garage. Both were demolished in 1959 to allow development of the existing apartment building. Permits indicate the owner and contractor and engineer, but so not identify an architect for the building.

241 Jackson is an example of a "Stucco Box" apartment building, a building type that proliferated throughout Southern California during the 1950s and 60s in response to the booming population growth and changing zoning requirements characteristic of Southern California in the years after World War II. The Stucco Box was wholly utilitarian and functional, manufactured from inexpensive materials using the simplest construction methods possible. The more expressive examples display low-cost design elements – such as color, texture, and applied ornamentation, such as geometric decorative metal fixtures in the form of a disc, starburst or diamond, were often affixed asymmetrically to the building's primary façade. This element gave rise to the term "dingbat" to describe buildings of this style.

The apartment building at 241 N. Jackson does not represent a specific development pattern or trend important to the history of Glendale or the larger region. Research and evaluation of the building did not discover any associations of this apartment building with the lives of persons or

groups important to local, state or national history. This building also does not does not exhibit the expressive decorative features that would distinguish the building as an excellent example of property type or style. Apart from some vertical board siding and a "dingbat" decorative light feature, design expression at 241 N. Jackson Street is minimal and perfunctory. The building is not an excellent example of design, type or style and is not associated with any important architects or designers.

A cultural resource literature review and records search of the California Historic Resource Information System (CHRIS) and a review of the Sacred Lands File (SLF) by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was completed with negative results on October 23, 2017. Furthermore, no other historical buildings within proximity to the Project site meet eligibility criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historic Resources, and Glendale Register of Historic Resources. Therefore, no significant impacts to a historic resource would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites are not known to exist within the local area. In addition, the Project site has already been subject to development and on-site improvements. Any archaeological resources that may have existed at one time on or beneath the site have likely been previously disturbed. Furthermore, a Sacred Lands File Search did not reveal any known tribal cultural resources on the Project site. Nonetheless, construction of the Project would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources in portions of the site that have not been previously disturbed. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during grading and excavation activities, all earth-disturbing work would be temporarily suspended or redirected until a qualified archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the resources, in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. The designated archaeologist would consult with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) with regard to the identification of any cultural resources present on the Project site. After the resources have been addressed appropriately, 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. In addition, the Project site has already been subject to extensive disruption and development. Any superficial paleontological resources that may have existed at one time on the Project site have likely been previously unearthed by past development activities. Nonetheless, paleontological resources may possibly exist at deep levels and could be unearthed with implementation of the proposed Project. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during Project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work would be temporarily suspended or redirected until a qualified paleontologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the resources, in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. After the resources have been addressed appropriately, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impact would occur.

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. A Sacred Lands File Search did not reveal any known tribal cultural resources on the Project site. However, impacts would be potentially significant 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 Native American descendants, who will then serve as consultants on how to proceed with the remains (i.e., avoid removal or rebury). With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the City's General Plan Safety Element, the Project site is not located within an established Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or designated Fault-Rupture Hazard Zone for surface fault rupture hazards. Based on the available geologic data, active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are not known to be located directly beneath or projecting toward the Project site. Therefore, the potential for surface rupture as a result of fault plane displacement is less than significant.

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

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less Than Significant Impact. Liquefaction is a seismic phenomenon in which loose, saturated, fine-grained granular soils behave similarly to a fluid when subjected to high-intensity ground shaking. Liquefaction occurs as a result of three general conditions: (1) shallow groundwater; (2) low-density, fine, clean sandy soils; and (3) high-intensity ground motion. Studies indicate that saturated, loose and medium dense, near-surface cohesionless soils exhibit the highest liquefaction potential, while dry, dense, cohesionless soils and cohesive soils exhibit low to negligible liquefaction potential. Liquefaction tends to occur within the upper 50 feet of the ground surface. As identified in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, the Project site is not located within a mapped liquefaction hazard zone. Thus, potential impacts related to liquefaction are considered unlikely. However, compliance with applicable building codes would minimize hazards from liquefaction and other seismically related ground failures. Impacts related to liquefaction would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) Landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact. The topography of the Project site and the surrounding area is relatively flat and, thus, devoid of any distinctive landforms. No known landslides have occurred near the Project site, nor is the Project site in the path of any known or potential landslides. Therefore, impacts related to landslides would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activities associated with the proposed project development may result in wind- and water-driven erosion of soils due to grading activities if soil is stockpiled or exposed during construction. However, this impact is considered short-term in nature because the site would expose small amounts of soil only during construction activities, and would then be covered with pavement and landscaping upon completion of construction. The applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit set forth by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The proposed Project would be subject to the requirements under Section 13.42.060 of the Glendale Municipal Code to prepare and submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that would be administered throughout proposed project construction. The SWPPP would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water driven erosion during construction would be reduced to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is not located within a liquefaction zone. The relatively flat topography of the Project site precludes both stability problems and the potential for lurching, which is earth movement at right angles to a cliff or steep slope during ground shaking. As previously discussed, the potential for hazards such as landslides and liquefaction is considered low. Liquefaction may also cause lateral spreading. For lateral spreading to occur, the liquefiable zone must be continuous, unconstrained laterally, and free to move along gently sloping ground toward an unconfined area. However, if lateral containment is present for those zones, then no significant risk of lateral spreading will be present. Given that the liquefaction potential at the Project site is low, earthquake-induced lateral spreading is not considered to be a significant seismic hazard at the site.

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

To minimize damage due to geologic hazards, design, and construction, the proposed Project would be required to comply with applicable building codes. Compliance with these standards would minimize impacts related to exposure to hazards including landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, and collapse. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The natural soils underlying the Project site are alluvium fan sediments. Such soils are typically in the low to moderately low range for shrink-swell (e.g., expansion). To minimize damage due to geologic hazards, design and construction of the proposed project would comply with applicable building codes. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soil would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

G. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Presently SCAG is reevaluating GHG reduction targets for compliance with SB32 and no new targets have been identified at this time. Glendale will reevaluate the Greener Glendale Plan when new SCAG regional targets are finalized. Given the lack of a formally adopted threshold applicable to this Project, the significance of the Project is evaluated based on the SCAQMD's proposed screening level of 3,000 MTCO2e per year.

The annual GHG emissions associated with the operation of the Project site are provided in **Table 4** below, **Estimated Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** As shown in **Table 4** below, the net GHG emissions associated with the Project would result in 1,909.5 MTCO2e per year, which is below the SCAQMD-recommended screening level threshold of 3,000 MTCO2e per year.

Table 4
Estimated Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GHG Emissions Source	Emissions (Metric Tons CO_2e/year)
Construction (30-year amortized)	59.1
Operational (Mobile) Sources	1,853.9
Area Sources	5.0
Energy	1,236.6
Waste	66.9
Water	182.7
Annual Total	3,404.2
Existing	*1,494.7*
Net Total	**1,909.5**

*Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas output sheets are provided in **Appendix A**.*

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 and the SCS prepared by SCAG. Therefore, it is

determined that the Project would result in less than cumulatively considerable impacts associated with GHG emissions.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) suggests making significance determinations on a case-by-case basis when no significance thresholds have been formally adopted by a lead agency. Although GHG emissions are quantified and shown in **Table 4**, CARB, SCAQMD, and the City of Glendale have yet to adopt project-level significance thresholds for GHG emissions that would be applicable to the Project. Assessing the significance of a project's contribution to cumulative global climate change involves: (1) evaluating the project's sources of GHG emissions; and (2) considering project consistency with applicable emission reduction strategies and goals, such as those set forth by the lead agency or other regional state agency.

As mentioned previously, the Project would generate approximately 744 residences, yielding less than 1 percent of the anticipated increase in population. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the planned land uses and population growth for the City and would not conflict with the AQMP.

The City 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. The Greener Glendale Plan is the City's Climate Action Plan which includes program implementation to reduce GHG emissions and achieve greater sustainability. The Project would be designed for sustainable performance in excess of existing Title 24 building standards. The design would include improvements that reduce GHG emissions for energy, water, and waste, consistent with goals and policies identified in the Greener Glendale Plan. The Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

H. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	

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

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

No Impact. The proposed Project would include the construction of a 286-unit multi-family residential development. The proposed residential uses would not involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of significant amounts of hazardous materials, but may involve the use of small amounts of cleaning products and related materials that may be categorized as hazardous. The limited use of various pesticides and fertilizers may also be used for landscape maintenance. These materials would be used and stored on the Project site in accordance with applicable federal, State, and local regulations. Additionally, the City of Glendale Fire Department and Los Angeles County have the authority to perform inspections and enforce state and federal laws governing the storage, use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes. As such, the proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), which included a survey of the Project site, was prepared in July 2017 **(Appendix C)**. The Phase I ESA concluded that there are no recognized environmental conditions (RECs), controlled recognized environmental conditions (CRECs), or historical recognized environmental conditions (HRECs) connected with the project site.

According to the Phase I Report, a historical 550-gallon Underground Storage Tank (UST) was reported as abandoned on-site in Glendale Fire Department Records obtained during a 2015 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment conducted by Andersen Environmental (Andersen). Andersen conducted a Geophysical and Limited Soil Sampling assessment in August 2015, which revealed the

potential presence of an existing UST in the parking lot to the south-southwest of the administrative buildings. Soil sampling in the area of the detected object, as well as in two other locations of reported subsurface anomalies/disturbances did not reveal evidence of a release of petroleum hydrocarbons. Based on the results of the August 2015 soil sampling, which did not reveal evidence of a release and present location of the suspected UST in a paved parking/drive area, the UST does not appear to represent a significant environmental concern at this time. However, the suspected UST would be confirmed by excavation and removed in accordance with all applicable regulatory guidelines.

The existing buildings on the Project site will be demolished. Structures constructed, repaired, or remodeled between 1930 and 1981 have the potential of containing Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM). Overall, suspect ACMs and painted surfaces were observed in good condition and do not appear to pose a health and safety concern to the occupants of the subject property at this time. The buildings are managed under an Asbestos Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Plan and asbestos was removed from the buildings during prior renovations. However, any asbestos or lead-based paint found would be properly removed and abated as required by State law, specifically Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), the California Health and Safety Code, including the Hazardous Waste Control Law.

Hazardous material impacts typically occur in a local or site–specific context. Although other foreseeable developments within the area will likely increase the potential to disturb existing contamination, the handling of hazardous materials would be required to adhere to applicable federal, State, and local requirements that regulate work and public safety. Therefore, impacts of the proposed project would not have the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Allan F. Daily High School is located immediately west of the Project site. The Project would not include a use that would handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. As discussed in **Section C, Air Quality**, construction of the project would release small quantities of toxic air contaminants for a short period of time, but the magnitude of emissions is not sufficient to create substantial concentrations of hazardous pollutants and the emissions are below applicable SCAQMD thresholds. A UST is suspected to be on the Project site but does not appear to represent a significant environmental concern at this time. The Project would confirm the suspected UST by excavation and if found, removal in accordance with all applicable regulatory guidelines. Impacts would be less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. A Phase I ESA was conducted in accordance with ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 and United States Environmental Protection Agency standards. A hazardous materials database search was completed as part of the ESA. Search results show that the Project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites. The Phase I ESA determined that there are no RECs, CRECs, or HRECs on the Project site. As such, impacts would be less than significant as the site is not on any list of hazardous material sites.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Project area is located approximately 9 miles southeast of the Hollywood Burbank Airport. The airport flight path and airport noise contours do not extend to the Project area. Therefore, the Project site is located outside of any airport land use plan or any runway landing/take-off flight paths for these local airports. No other public or public use airstrips are located within the vicinity of the Project site and no airport related safety impacts would exist. Consequently, no impacts would occur with the implementation of the proposed Project.

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

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

No Impact. The Project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The nearest airport is the Hollywood Burbank Airport, which is located approximately 9 miles northwest of the proposed Project area and is a public use airport. A total of six helipads currently operate within the City of Glendale; however, all helipad operations are subject to all FAA regulations, and operations do not occur often enough to represent a significant hazard to residents, visitors, employees, or construction workers in the Project area. Consequently, no impacts would occur with the implementation of the proposed Project.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, Brand Avenue, located approximately 0.2 miles west of the Project site and Glendale Avenue, located approximately 0.2 miles east of the Project site, are designated City Disaster Response Routes. Colorado Boulevard, which is located approximately 0.3 miles south of the Project site, is a designated County Evacuation Route. These routes are main thoroughfares to be used by emergency response services during an emergency and, if the situation warrants, the evacuation of an area. Implementation of the Project would neither result in a reduction of the number of lanes along this roadway in the Project area nor result in the placement of an impediment to the flow of traffic such as medians. In the event of an emergency, all lanes would be opened to allow for traffic flow to move in one direction, and traffic would be controlled by the appropriate agencies, such as the City of Glendale Police Department.

During construction, the construction contractor is required to notify the City of Glendale Police and Fire Departments of construction activities that would impede movement (such as movement of equipment and temporary lane closures) along adjacent streets to allow for these first emergency response teams to reroute traffic to an alternative route, 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. Implementation of these requirements would be incorporated as a typical condition of approval. Consequently, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element does not identify the Project area to be located within a City-designated Fire Hazard Zone. Therefore, risk of increased fire hazards in

areas where flammable brush, grass, or trees from future development within the Project area is not identified as significant. Consequently, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

I. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Grading activities associated with construction may temporarily increase the amount of suspended solids from surface water flows from the Project site during a concurrent storm event due to sheet erosion of exposed soil. The applicant is required to satisfy all applicable requirements of Chapter 13.29, Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention

Control and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) of the Glendale Municipal Code, at the time of construction to the satisfaction of the City of Glendale Public Works Department. These requirements include preparation of a SWPPP containing structural treatment and source control measures appropriate and applicable to the proposed Project. The SWPPP will incorporate best management practices (BMPs) by requiring controls of pollutant discharges that utilize best available technology (BAT) and best conventional pollutant control technology (BCT) to reduce pollutants. Examples of BAT/BCT that may be implemented during site grading and construction of the proposed Project could include straw hay bales, straw bale inlet filters, filter barriers, and silt fences. Preparation of the SWPPP would be incorporated as a condition of approval. Implementation of BMPs such as fences, sand bag barriers, and/or stabilization of the construction entrance/exit would ensure that Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) water quality standards are met during construction activities of the proposed Project. Therefore, no significant impact during construction would occur.

The Project site is currently developed and consists of mostly impervious surfaces. Development of the proposed apartment project will result in a minimal change in the amount of impervious surfaces and drainage characteristics of the site. The proposed Project would increase the intensity of activities on the site and would likely result in an increase in typical urban pollutants generated by motor vehicle use on roadways and parking areas adjacent to the Project site, and the maintenance and operation of landscaped areas. Stormwater quality is generally affected by the length of time since the last rainfall, rainfall intensity, urban uses of the area and quantity of transported sediment. Typical urban water quality pollutants usually result from motor vehicle operations; oil and grease residues; fertilizer/pesticide uses; human/animal littering; careless material storage; and poor handling and property management. The majority of pollutant loads are usually washed away during the first flush of the storm occurring after the dry-season period.

These pollutants have the potential to degrade water quality. However, the quality of runoff from the Project site would be subject to Section 401 of the CWA under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). 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 surface water runoff from a Project. The new project will include drainage features to clean runoff as required by the applicable NPDES permit. 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. The Project site does not serve as a primary area of groundwater recharge within the San Fernando or Verdugo Basin, which are both located within the City of Glendale. As mentioned previously, construction of the proposed Project will result in minimal change to the amount of impervious surface and drainage characteristics of the site. As such, the proposed Project would not significantly interfere with the recharge of local groundwater or deplete the groundwater supplies. Impacts related to groundwater extraction and recharge will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is served by an existing storm water collection and conveyance system. All runoff with implementation of the project would continue to be conveyed via streets and gutters to storm drain locations around the Project site. As a result, the proposed Project would not require any substantial changes to the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area, nor would it affect the capacity of the existing storm drain system. The Project will not alter the course of a stream or river, since no river or stream is located on the site nor would the project result in a substantial increase in runoff. Consequently, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would not alter the course of a stream or river. Flood hazards due to heavy precipitation can result in inundation of developed areas due to overflow of nearby stream courses or from inadequate local storm drain facilities, if not sized to accommodate large storm events. However, the City has developed a flood control system that provides protection for its residents. In addition, no Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)-designated flood zones are located within the Project site. Therefore, flooding impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Please refer to Response I-3 above. As mentioned above, construction of the proposed Project would result in minimal change to the amount of impervious surfaces and drainage characteristics that currently exist on the site. Impacts from runoff as a result of the proposed Project are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact .The Project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain or other flood hazard area, as shown on the latest FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, and would not place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows(U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Map No. 06037C1345F, September 2008). 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, the proposed Project is not located within an inundation zone. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

10) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

J. LAND USE AND PLANNING

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

1) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The Project site is currently developed with the GUSD Headquarters building and a 9-unit apartment building, both of which would be demolished with implementation of the Project. The Project site is surrounded by other lots zoned R-1250 (High Density Residential) and developed with residential, commercial, and institutional uses. The proposed Project residential uses are consistent with the development pattern in the surrounding area and therefore, would not divide any established communities. 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The current General Plan designation is High Density Residential and site is currently zoned R-1250 (High Density Residential). The proposed Project involves development of a multi-family apartment building containing 286 units.

The Project includes a requesting expanding the boundary of the DSP to add the Project site to the DSP East Broadway District. The Downtown Specific Plan (DSP) was adopted by the City Council in November 2006 to implement the City's General Plan in Downtown Glendale. The DSP is consistent with regional growth policies adopted by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and with the City's General Plan. The DSP implements policies in the Land Use Element of the General Plan including reinforcing Glendale's image and community identity within the greater Los Angeles area metropolitan complex; creating an urban environment which provide for residential diversity and opportunity; supporting the creation of medium and high density housing in areas best suited from the standpoint of accessibility, current development, community organization, transportation, and circulation facilities and economic feasibility; and providing opportunities for a diversity of housing styles for all economic segments of the community.

The DSP also implements a key policy in the Circulation Element of the General Plan to reduce trips by encouraging housing around and in commercial centers as well as policies in the Housing Element including providing a variety of residential development opportunities in the City through the zoning of sufficient land with densities ranging from very low density/open space to high-density development as designated on the Land Use Plan Map; allowing higher density residential development in close proximity to public transportation, services and recreation facilities; and encouraging the development of residential units in Downtown.

The DSP is an urban design oriented plan that defines the land use regulations, physical standards, and design guidelines for development in Downtown Glendale. The primary goals and purposes of the DSP include providing a framework to guide responsible growth and development in Downtown; defining incentives for development of a wide range of downtown housing types; preserving and enhancing the distinctive character of Glendale's downtown buildings, streets and views; and concentrating growth in Downtown, a transit-rich entertainment, employment and cultural center, in order to relieve development pressure on existing residential neighborhoods in the City.

The DSP defines 11 districts defined based on the existing development pattern within each district. The DSP preserves and enhances the characteristics which provide each district its unique character, while improving the attractiveness and livability of the Downtown area. The Design and Development Standards and Guidelines build upon the existing characteristics and promote new development that contributes to the desired uses, scale, image, and pedestrian-friendliness of Downtown.

The East Broadway District as defined in the DSP includes the area located immediately south of the Project Site and Wilson Avenue between Louise and Isabel Streets. This District incorporates the areas first zoned for mixed-use by the City in 2003 and a mix of civic and cultural uses. The DSP builds upon the mixed-use, moderate density character of this district by allowing new mixed-use projects, including housing over retail uses along East Broadway. Multiple residential dwelling unit projects are a permitted use in the East Broadway District.

The land use policies in the DSP allow for complementary land use options to encourage healthy urban districts with opportunities for interaction between uses which enhance the attractiveness and convenience of the primary downtown land uses, such as offices and residential uses, and for public benefits by providing incentives for projects incorporating certain uses defined in the DSP, such as public open space.

To accomplish pedestrian-oriented objectives of the DSP, certain streets have use restrictions at the ground floor. The East Broadway District, where landscaped setbacks from the sidewalk are required. Ground floor uses may be retail, services, office, live/work and/or residential. Jackson and Kenwood Streets in the East Broadway District are identified as Residential Streets, which landscaped setbacks required from the sidewalk.

The permitted height limit within the East Broadway District is 4 stories and 65 feet and maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 2.5. Projects within the East Broadway District may use any combination of the incentives identified in the DSP to increase the permitted height to 5 stories and 80 feet with a maximum FAR of 2.75. The proposed Project is requesting to use the open space incentive to allow a building with an average height of 62 feet, and a maximum height of 88 feet, and an FAR of 2.63. In order to qualify for the height and density bonus under the open space incentive, the project would be required to provide one square foot of publicly accessible open space for every 10 square feet of floor area over the by right FAR of 2.5. The proposed Project would provide 8,497 square feet of publicly accessible open space that meets the requirement to qualify the open space incentive under the DSP.

The proposed Project would include up to 394 parking spaces, which includes 29 guest spaces, 8 handicap spaces, and 2 van space. In addition, 15 short term and 72 long-term bicycle parking spaces would be installed. The Project would meet the minimum parking requirements identified in the Glendale Municipal Code Chapter 30.32.050 for multi-family residential uses in the DSP.

The proposed amendment to the DSP to add the Project site to the East Broadway District would be consistent with the policies of the DSP supporting residential diversity in Downtown, and the development of medium and high-density housing in areas best suited based on community organization and other characteristics to implement policies in the General Plan Land Use, Circulation, and Housing Elements. Between Maryland Avenue and N. Isabel Street, Wilson Avenue contains a mix of uses including multi-family residential, retail commercial, commercial office, and institutional uses. The Allen F. Daily High School is located west of the Project Site and multi-family residential uses are located north and northeast of the site. Development of multi-family housing on the Project Site would be compatible with the existing land use pattern in this portion of Downtown. The proposed Project would not exceed the growth projections outlined in the 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 RTP/SCS) adopted by SCAG. For these reasons, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Project site and surrounding area have been developed and heavily affected by past activities. The Project site and immediate area are not located in an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan area. The proposed Project is currently located in the proposed South Glendale Community Plan area and upon approval would be located within the DSP, which is also not within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan area. Consequently, implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

K. MINERAL RESOURCES

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

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

No Impact. The Project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban environment and include residential and commercial uses. The Project site is located within Mineral Resource Zone-3 (MRZ-3), as defined in the City of Glendale General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element. MRZ-3 is defined as an area where adequate information is not available to determine whether valuable mineral resources are deposited. However, the project site has been developed for several decades with school, office and residential uses, which have precluded its use for mineral extraction. As a result, 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 mentioned previously, the Project is located within MRZ-3 and there are no mineral resources within the Project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

L. NOISE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			**X**	
2. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			**X**	
3. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			**X**	
4. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			**X**	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?				X

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The existing noise environment in the Project vicinity is dominated by traffic noise from nearby roadways and noise from nearby residential commercial uses. To identify the existing ambient noise levels within the Project site, noise measurements were taken at six different locations around the project site with a Larson Davis Model 831 sound level meter, which conforms to industry standards set forth in the American National Standard Institute S1.4-1983 (R2001)—Specification for Sound Level Meter. As shown in **Table 5, Ambient Noise Measurements**. Noise levels within the Project vicinity ranged from a low of 56.2 dB(A) at Site 1 to a high of 65.2 dB(A) at Site 4.

Construction

The City of Glendale does not have regulations that establish maximum construction noise levels. However, Section 8.36.290(k) provides an exemption from the Noise Ordinance for any activity, operation, or noise that cannot be brought into compliance (with the Noise Ordinance) because it is technically infeasible to do so. “Technical infeasibility” for the purposes of this analysis means that noise limitations cannot be complied with despite the use of mufflers, shields, sound barriers, and/or any other noise reduction devices or techniques during the operation of the equipment.

Construction noise impacts would be temporary and would not occur during nighttime hours. In accordance with Noise Ordinance in Section 8.36.080, construction would be prohibited from 7:00 PM to 7:00 AM every night and from 7:00 PM on Saturday to 7:00 AM on Monday. Construction would not be taking place on Sundays and certain holidays. Furthermore, the Project would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) in order to minimize offsite sound propagation during construction. For these reasons, the temporary construction impacts that would result from the proposed Project would be less than significant.

Operation

The proposed Project would have a minimal effect on the noise environment in proximity to the Project site. Noise generated by the proposed Project would result primarily from visitors, off-site traffic, and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment. However, the proposed Project’s mechanical equipment would need to comply with the City’s Noise Ordinance, which establishes maximum permitted noise levels from mechanical equipment. Project compliance with the City’s Noise Ordinance would ensure that noise levels from building mechanical equipment would not exceed thresholds of significance.

According to the City’s Noise Element, the Project is located within the 70 CNEL and over noise contour. The Project would be constructed to reduce interior noise to acceptable levels. While the proposed building will produce a more intensive use than the existing condition, it is not anticipated to generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element. Implementation of the

Project, a residential development, would not exacerbate the noise levels in this area. Therefore, noise impacts from mechanical equipment would be less than significant.

Table 5
Ambient Noise Measurements

Site No.	Location	Leq (15-minute)
1	Northeast portion of the site along N. Jackson Street	61.4
2	Northwest portion of the site along alleyway south of E. California Avenue	56.2
3	West of the Project site along N. Kenwood Street, between E. California Avenue and E. Wilson Avenue	60.0
4	East of the Project site along N. Jackson Street, between E. California Avenue and E. Wilson Avenue	60.8
5	South of the Project site, across E. Wilson Avenue	65.2

*Source: Noise Data sheets are provided in **Appendix D**.*

Furthermore, the Traffic Impact Analysis **(Appendix E)** determined that the Project would result in 20 fewer AM peak-hour trips, 20 additional PM peak-hour trips, and a total of 812 new trips when compared to existing uses. While long-term operation of the Project would contribute to existing ambient noise levels, this increase would be less than significant based on the proposed uses of the Project.

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. According to Sections 8.36.210 and 8.36.020 of the Glendale Noise Ordinance, operating or permitting the operation of any device creating a vibration that is above the vibration perception threshold of 0.01 inch per second root mean square (RMS) at or beyond the property boundary of the source if on private property, or at 150 feet from the source if on a public space or public right-of-way, shall be a violation.

The proposed Project would be constructed using typical construction techniques and would minimize the use of pile driving for construction, thus reducing significant vibration impacts from pile installation. 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 grading and excavation activities. As such, ground-borne vibration and noise levels associated with the proposed Project would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Project site is located approximately nine miles southeast of the Hollywood Burbank Airport. The airport flight path and airport noise contours do not extend to the Project area. Therefore, the Project site is located outside of any airport land use plan or any runway landing/take-off flight paths for these local airports. No other public or public use airstrips are located within the vicinity of the Project Site and no airport related noise impacts would exist. Consequently, no impacts would occur with the implementation of the proposed Project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Consequently, no impacts associated with noise would result from the proposed Project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

M. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				~~X~~
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?

No Impact. A significant impact may occur if a Project would locate new development, such as homes, businesses, or infrastructure, with the effect of substantially inducing growth in the proposed area that would otherwise not have occurred as rapidly or in as great a magnitude. The proposed project involves the development of a multi-family apartment building containing 286 units, in conjunction with removal of the existing GUSD Headquarters building and a 9-unit apartment complex which houses 13 people. The proposed project is expected to generate 744 residents based on 2.6 persons per household resulting in 731 additional residents to the project site above existing conditions. However, the day time population generated from the existing GUSD administration building would no longer be at the site. As mentioned above, the Project would yield to less than 1 percent of the anticipated increase in population within the City and would not exceed the growth projections outlined in the 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 RTP/SCS) adopted by SCAG.

The Project site is zoned R-1250 with a General Plan Land Use Designation of High Density Residential. Furthermore, the Project site is surrounded by other multi-family residences. The Project would be consistent with the adopted zoning and land use designation of the area, and, therefore, is not considered growth inducing. As such, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed Project involves the development of a multi-family apartment building containing 286 units, in conjunction with the removal of the existing GUSD Headquarters building and a nine-unit apartment building which house 13 people. The Project would not displace a substantial amount of existing housing units rather it would add 277 new units to the City's housing stock. As such, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No further mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed Project involves the development of a multi-family apartment building containing 286 units, in conjunction with the removal of the existing GUSD Headquarters building and a nine-unit apartment building which currently houses 13 people. The proposed Project would remove the 9 existing apartment units to develop the 286 units proposed, resulting in a net increase of 277 units. Given that the proposed project would increase the amount of housing available, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No further mitigation measures are required.

N. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Glendale Fire Department (GFD) provides comprehensive emergency services for the City of Glendale, including fire, rescue, and emergency medical (paramedic) services, as well as fire prevention and code enforcement functions. The Project site is located between two fire stations, Fire Station No. 21, is located at 421 Oak Street, approximately 0.65 miles southwest of the Project site, and Fire Station No. 25, located at 353 N. Chevy Chase Drive, approximately 0.75 miles northeast of the Project site. Fire Station No. 21 is equipped with three engine companies, a fire truck, two battalion units, two rescue units, a brush unit, a basic life support ambulance, and a water tender. Fire Station No. 25 is equipped with an engine company, reserve engine company, and a basic life support ambulance. In the event that any of the units of Fire Station Nos. 21 or 25 are not available, other units would be available for dispatch from other GFD fire stations or adjacent jurisdictions.

The proposed Project would add approximately 731 more residents to the City of Glendale. This increase would not substantially affect provision of fire protection given that the Project Site is located in a highly urbanized area and close to existing fire stations. Furthermore, compliance with the applicable Fire Code and the Building Code provisions determines a Project's impact on fire services. The Project will be required to meet all code provisions. As a result, the Project would be adequately served by existing fire stations and would not require the provision of any new fire stations or the expansion of existing fire stations, including No. 21 or No. 25 Therefore, the proposed Project is not anticipated to result in substantial adverse impacts. The overall need for fire protection services is not expected to substantially increase. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Glendale Police Department (GPD) provides police protection services to the Project site from its station at 131 North Isabel Street, approximately 475 feet to the southeast. The proposed Project would introduce approximately 731 new residents to the City of Glendale. This increase would not substantially affect provision of police protection given the proximity of the Project Site to existing police protection services. The Project would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. The overall need for police protection services would not increase substantially as a result of Project implementation. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c) Schools?

Less Than Significant Impact. Section 65995 of the Government Code provides that school districts can collect a fee on a per square foot basis for new residential units or additions to existing units to assist in the construction of or additions to schools. Payment of these fees would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d) Parks?

No Impact. The proposed Project would add approximately 731 new residents to the City. In accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the Project applicant will be required to pay the City's Public Use Facilities Development Impact Fee to provide funding for park and recreation facilities. The Project would not involve the development or displacement of a park. In addition, the Project would provide open space amenities on site, with 46,250 total square-feet of private and common open space and 8,497 total square-feet of publicly accessible open space. Payment of the impact fee would result in a less than significant impact to park facilities. As such, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e) Other public facilities?

No Impact. The proposed Project would not create a significant increase in demand for library services. In accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the Project applicant will be required to pay the City's Public Use Facilities Development Impact Fee. Payment of the impact fee would result in a less than significant impact to library facilities. As such, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

O. RECREATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			**X**	

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would add approximately 731 new residents. These future residents of the Project would utilize recreation and park facilities in the surrounding area as well as the proposed private and public open space amenities that would be included on the Project site. The Project applicant will be required to pay the City's Parks and Library Development Impact Fee to provide funding for park and recreation facilities. 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would include private amenities such as an indoor recreational facility and open space amenities such as the 8,497 square feet of publicly accessible open space located on the corner of E. Wilson Avenue and N. Jackson Street, a courtyard along N. Jackson Street, and a courtyard along E. Wilson Avenue. As discussed above, the Project is not anticipated to create a significant demand on parks facilities that would by itself result in the construction of a new park. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

P. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?		**X**		
2. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			**X**	

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

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

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Construction

Given that a majority of the construction-related traffic generated to and from the Project site would occur before and after the morning and evening peak commute hours respectively, it is expected that traffic impacts from construction activity would be less than significant.

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

Operational

Traffic Impact Analysis—Public Street Network

The Project site is bound by Kenwood Street on the west, Jackson Street on the east, and Wilson Avenue on the south. As shown in Table 6, Project Trip Generation, when compared to the existing uses, the proposed project would generate 812 trips per day, with a reduction in 20 morning (AM) peak-hour and an increase of 20 evening (PM) peak-hour trips. The State-mandated Congestion Management Plan (CMP) Traffic Impact Analysis guidelines require that intersection-monitoring locations be examined if the proposed project would add 50 or more trips during either the weekday AM or PM peak hours. As shown in Table 6, the Project would not add 50 or more trips during either the weekday AM or PM peak hours.

Table 6
Project Trip Generation

Land Use	Size	AM Peak-Hour Volumes				PM Peak-Hour Volumes				Daily Trips	
		Rate	In	Out	Total	Rate	In	Out	Total	Rate	Total
Proposed											
Multi-family Residential	300 units[1]	0.36	28	80	108	0.44	81	51	132	5.44	1632
Existing											
School District Office	52.5 tsf	2.36	-94	-30	-124	2.04	-18	-89	-107	14.37	-754
Low-Rise Apartments	9 du	0.46	-1	-3	-4	0.56	-3	-2	-5	7.32	-66
Total Trip Generation			**-67**	**47**	**-20**	**—**	**60**	**-40**	**20**	**—**	**812**

Source: Jano Baghdanian & Associates, Traffic Impact Analysis, October 30, 2017
[1] Traffic Impact Study assumed worst-case scenario of 300 units. The Project will include 286 units.

Traffic Impact Analysis—Stop-Controlled Intersections

The intersection of California Avenue and Jackson Street currently operates at a level-of-service (LOS) E during the evening (PM) peak hour and is expected to decrease to LOS F by project completion without the addition of Project traffic. The intersection of California Avenue and Jackson Street is expected to have an increase in intersection delay of 3.3 seconds during the PM peak hour upon completion year, exceeding City's threshold for significance. In addition, this intersection would operate at LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS F during the PM peak hour without the Project. A traffic signal warrant analysis was conducted to determine if a traffic signal would be justified and improve traffic operations at this intersection. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure TRA-1**, signalization of this intersection would reduce the intersection delay below the City's threshold of significance and mitigate the impact of the Project. The intersection would operate at LOS A during the AM peak hour and LOS B during the PM peak hour after this traffic signal is installed.

The intersection of California Avenue and Louise Street currently operates at a level-of-service (LOS) D during the evening (PM) peak hour and is expected to decrease to LOS E by project completion without the addition of Project traffic. A traffic signal warrant analysis was conducted to verify the existing need for signalization. The analysis shows that the existing all-way stop-controlled intersection of California Avenue and Louise Street will not exceed the City's threshold for significance of 3.0 seconds in intersection as a result of the Project.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measure is proposed to reduce impacts to less than significant level.

TRA-1 The applicant shall install a traffic signal at the intersection of California Avenue and Jackson Street to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.

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

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed above in Response P-1, the proposed Project is not anticipated to result in any significant increase in traffic on the area roadway network. As such, impacts related to conflicting with a congestion management program would be less than significant.

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 area is located approximately 6.5 miles southeast of the Hollywood Burbank Airport. The airport flight path and airport noise contours do not extend to the Project area. Therefore, the Project site is located outside of any airport land use plan or any runway landing/take-off flight paths for these local airports. No other public or public use airstrips are located within the vicinity of the Project site and no airport related safety impacts would exist. Consequently, the proposed Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns that would result in safety risks. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Driveway access to the proposed Project would be provided from Jackson Street. All on-site driveways would be designed to adhere to the standard engineering practices and recommendations by the City of Glendale Public Works and Fire Departments. No new hazards or design features would be introduced that would alter the logistical configuration of traffic entering and existing the Project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Q. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and this is:				

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or			X	
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.			X	

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site has been developed with residential resources since the early 1920s. As mentioned previously, neither the 1938 warehouse building, the 1971 office building, or the 1960 apartment building are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Place, the California Register of Historical Resources, or for designated as a Glendale Historic Resource. Furthermore, the records search and review of the SLF by the NAHC was completed resulting in negative results for historic resources.

No known tribal resource is located on the Project site. In the event that resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work must be temporarily suspended or redirected until NAHC 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 is anticipated.

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. As mentioned previously, the Project site has been disturbed and excavated in the past and is currently developed with the GUSD Headquarters building and a 9-unit apartment building. No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the Project site and surrounding area. The SLF did not reveal any known tribal cultural resources on the Project site. Thus, the potential for impact on known human remains or a resource determined to be significant by a California Native American tribe is low. No resources have been identified on the Project site pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. No

significant impact to tribal cultural resource is anticipated. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

R. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

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

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. A construction project resulting in the disturbance of more than 1 acre requires a NPDES permit. Construction projects are also required to prepare a SWPPP. In addition, the proposed Project would be required to submit an SUSMP to mitigate urban stormwater runoff. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Project applicant would be required to satisfy the requirements related to the payment of fees and/or the provisions of adequate wastewater facilities. The proposed Project would comply with the waste discharge prohibitions and water quality objectives established by the RWQCB. These prohibitions and objectives would be incorporated into the proposed Project as a Project design feature. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. Majority of the City's water comes from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD). Groundwater extracted from the Verdugo and San Fernando Basins are treated at facilities within the

City; however, the amount of water treated is restricted to the City's right to extract. The City's current water treatment facilities, the Glendale Water Treatment Plan and Verdugo Park Water Treatment Plan, have enough capacity to treat the City's current groundwater rights. In an effort to lessen its reliance upon MWD water, the City is actively exploring constructing new facilities to extract additional water from the Verdugo Basin because it is currently not being utilized to its full potential. Therefore, no new sources of water supply, such as groundwater, are required to meet the proposed Project's water demand. No new facilities or expansion of existing facilities would be required. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Project site is currently developed with the GUSD Headquarters building and a 9-unit apartment building and surface parking lot, thus consisting of mostly impervious surfaces. Construction of the proposed Project would result in minimal change to the amount of impervious surfaces and drainage characteristics of the site and is not expected to substantially increase the generation of wastewater on the Project site. The Project can be adequately served by existing drainage facilities and construction of new offsite drainage facilities or expansion would not be required. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Grading and 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 develop 286 multifamily residential units including 48 studio apartments, 168 one-bedroom apartments, and 70 two-bedroom apartments. The Project would increase demand by approximately 28,475 gallons per day, or 32 af per year over existing uses(Based on Sewage Generation Factors for Residential and Commercial Categories). The total water demand in 2020 in the City of Glendale is expected to be 28,182 acre-feet (af) with a total available supply of 39,540 af, resulting in a surplus of 11,358 af for that year. The City of Glendale has identified an adequate supply of water to meet future City demands under normal conditions. The total water demand in 2020 is expected to be 28,182 acre-feet (af) with a total available supply of 39,540 af. Future water demand in the City is based on projected development contained in the General Plan. For purposes of this assessment, the demand of the proposed Project was assumed not to have been included in this demand projection. However, even with the additional demand of 32 afy generated by the proposed Project, ample supply exists to meet remaining City demand under normal conditions.

It is anticipated that during any 3-year drought, the City would have sufficient water supply to meet demand. According to the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, the City continues to find ways to conserve water and develop new water strategies in order to rely less on MWD water supplies in the future compared to its current use. With the City's reduction of dependency on imported water from MWD, Glendale Water and Power has a higher level of reliability in meeting water demands during drought conditions.

Landscaping for the Project will require the use of drought tolerant plantings. In addition, the current building code requires the use of low flow plumbing fixtures and fittings that will be much more efficient than that of the existing GUSD Headquarters building and 9-unit apartment complex. Consequently, impacts would be considered 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Sewage from the Project site goes to the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP), where the City of Glendale has access to through the Amalgamated Agreement. The HTP has a total capacity of approximately 450 million gallons per day (mgd) and handles a current demand of approximately 275 mgd on a dry weather day (Glendale Water and Power, *Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan* (April 2016)). The Project would increase wastewater generated by approximately 25,311 gallons per day (Based on Sewage Generation Factors for Residential and Commercial Categories) (gpd) over existing uses. Given that the HTP is currently operating 175 million gpd below capacity, the addition of approximately 25,311 gpd of sewage generated by the proposed Project would not result in the plant's exceeding 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 of 277 multi-family residential units on the site. Solid waste generated on the Project site would be deposited at the Scholl Canyon Landfill, which is owned by the City of Glendale, or one of the landfills located within the County of Los Angeles. The Integrated Waste Diversion of the Public Works Department would review the proposed Project with respect to waste generation and disposal. Combined with the increase in solid waste generated by the proposed Project, the Scholl Canyon facility would accommodate the annual disposal amount. Also, the city has implemented a waste-diversion program aimed at reducing the amount of solid waste disposed in the landfill. Examples of waste diversion efforts would include recycling programs for cardboard boxes, paper, aluminum cans, and bottles through the provision of recycling containers.

The Scholl Canyon facility would have sufficient capacity to continue to accommodate the demand for Class III disposal facilities generated by the Project site. As such, the increase in solid waste generation associated with the operation of the Project would not exacerbate landfill capacity shortages in the region to the point of altering the projected timeline of any landfill to reach capacity. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would comply with AB 939, known as the California Integrated Waste Management Act, which requires 50 percent diversion of cities and counties solid waste from landfills by 2000; AB 341, which establishes a State policy goal that no less than 75 percent of solid waste generated be source reduced, recycled, or composted by 2020; and the City's Construction and Demolition Debris Diversion Program section of the Municipal Code, which states that demolition, construction, and remodeling shall divert 50 percent of waste tonnage from area landfills. Consistent with code requirements, the Project would provide a recycling area to reduce the amount of solid waste sent to the landfill.

In addition, the Project would comply with federal, State, and local statues and regulations. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

S. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located within an urbanized area and is currently developed with the GUSD Headquarters building and a nine-unit apartment building. No native vegetation or habitat exists on the 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Related projects in the area include multifamily and mixed-use residential, commercial, and institutional land uses.

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 on agricultural, biological, and mineral resources, the Project site is located in an urbanized area; therefore, other developments occurring in the area

of the project would largely occur on previously disturbed land. 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.

In addition, cumulative impacts have been considered where appropriate in the preceding topical analyses. For example, the evaluation of air quality impacts considered the Proposed Project's cumulative contribution to federal or State nonattainment pollutants within the Basin and the evaluation of traffic impacts considered the cumulative effect of other proposed projects in the immediate vicinity. All related projects would be required to comply with regulatory measures related to public services and utilities, ensuring adequate capacity and levels of service. Through the analyses, no significant cumulative impacts were identified for the proposed Project. Impacts would be less than significant.

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, no substantial adverse effects on humans would occur. Development of the proposed Project would not create direct and indirect adverse impacts on humans. No impacts 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. City of Glendale, General Plan, as amended City of Glendale General Plan, Open Space and Conservation Element, January 1993.
2. California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Mapping System, http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/index.htm, accessed October 2017.
3. California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2012, January 2015.
4. South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Final Localized Threshold Methodology*, July 2008. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/localized-significance-thresholds/final-lst-methodology-document.pdf?sfvrsn=2
5. California Air Resources Board (CARB), "Area Designation Maps/State and National," http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm.
6. South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), *White Paper on Potential Control Strategies to Address Cumulative Impacts from Air Pollution* (2003), Appendix A.
7. South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning*, May 2005, 2-2.
8. United States Environmental Protection Agency. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act: How Wetlands are Defined and Identified. https://www.epa.gov/cwa-404/section-404-clean-water-act-how-wetlands-are-defined-and-identified. Accessed October 2017.
9. PaleoWest Archeology. Cultural Resource Inventory for the Glendale Unified School District Site Apartment Project in Glendale, Los Angeles County, California. October 26, 2017.

10. GeoPentech. Geotechnical Review, Proposed Development at 223-241 N. Jackson St. July 26, 2017.

11. City of Glendale, *General Plan,* "Safety Element" (2003).

12. U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Map No. 06037C1345F, September 2008.

13. City of Glendale, *General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element,* Map 4-28 Aggregate Resources.

14. http://www.glendaleca.gov/government/departments/fire-department/administration/fire-stations#21

15. Glendale Water and Power, *Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan* (April 2016).

16. City of Los Angeles, DPW, LA Sanitation, "Treatment Plants: Hyperion Treatment Plant," https://www.lacitysan.org/san/faces/home/portal/s-lsh-wwd/s-lsh-wwd-cw/s-lsh-wwd-cw-p/s-lsh-wwd-cw-p-hwrp?_adf.ctrl-state=vdg99hfoc_1598&_afrLoop=25854090868988861#!. Accessed October 2017.