



**PROPOSED
NEGATIVE DECLARATION**
New Residential Congregate Living/ Medical Facility
1809 Verdugo Boulevard

<p>The following Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.</p>	
Project Title/Common Name:	New Residential Congregate Living/ Medical Facility
Project Location:	1809 Verdugo Boulevard, Glendale, Los Angeles County
Project Description:	<p>To construct a new, three-story, 79-bed, 35,000 square-foot, residential congregate living/ medical facility with a 34 space, semi-subterranean garage, and a new 36,783 square-foot, three-level (one level subterranean and two levels above grade), 105 space parking garage on a 64,495 square-foot site consisting of three lots. The site is currently developed with a 35,981 square-foot, three-story, medical office building with 36 parking spaces at the first level of the building (constructed in 1984), located in the C2-I Zone. The existing medical office building and the 36 parking spaces within the building will remain. As proposed, the development will involve a total export of 14,106 cubic yards of soil. The proposed residential congregate living/ medical facility will require approval from the Design Review Board.</p>
Project Type:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private Project <input type="checkbox"/> Public Project
Project Applicant:	Stuart Ahn 3833 El Moreno Street Glendale, CA 91208
Findings:	<p>The Director of the Community Development, on October 15, 2018, after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Division, found that the above referenced project would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Negative Declaration be prepared.</p>
Mitigation Measures:	No mitigation measures are required.
Attachments:	Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Dennis Joe, Planner City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 548-8157; Fax: (818) 240-0392

This page left intentionally blank.



INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Chevy Chase Country Club
3067 East Chevy Chase Drive

1.	Project Title: New Residential Congregate Living/ Medical Facility
2.	Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Glendale Community Development Department Planning Division 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	Contact Person and Phone Number: Dennis Joe, Planner Tel: (818) 937-8157 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	Project Location: 1809 Verdugo Boulevard, Glendale, Los Angeles County
5.	Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Staurt Ahn 3833 El Moreno Street Glendale, CA 91208 Tel: (213) 820-0000
6.	General Plan Designation: Commercial – Community Services
7.	Zoning: C2 (Community Commercial) Zone, Height District I
8.	Description of the Project: To construct a new, three-story, 79-bed, 35,000 square-foot, residential congregate living, medical facility with a 34 space, semi-subterranean garage, and a new 36,783 square-foot, three-level (one level subterranean and two levels above grade), 105 space, parking garage on a 64,495 square-foot site consisting of three lots. The site is currently developed with a 35,981 square-foot, three-story, medical office building with 36 parking spaces at the first level of the building (constructed in 1984), located in the C2-I Zone. The existing medical office building and the 36 parking spaces within the building will remain. As proposed, the development will involve a total export of 14,106 cubic yards of soil. The proposed residential congregate living, medical facility will require approval from the Design Review Board.
9.	Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: <u>North:</u> California Department of Transportation / State Route 2 (SR2)/I-210 Freeway Interchange <u>South:</u> C3 Commercial Service Zone, Height District III & PPD Precise Plan of Development / USC Verdugo Hills Hospital <u>East:</u> City of La Canada Flintridge / Single-Family Residential <u>West:</u> City of La Canada Flintridge (across the State Route 2 (SR2)/I-210 Freeway Interchange) / Commercial
10.	Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement). None.

11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

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

LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Dennis Joe, Planner
Prepared by:

10/11/18
Date:

[Signature]
Reviewed by:

10/11/18
Date:

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

[Signature]
Director of Community Development:

10/11/18
Date:

A. AESTHETICS

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site consists of three parcels, approximately 64,495 square-feet, and located at the northwest corner of Verdugo Boulevard and La Tour Way. Surrounding the Project site are the State Route 2 (SR2)/Interstate 210 (I-210) freeway interchange to the north and west, City of La Canada Flintridge (single-family residences) to the east and across La Tour Way, City of La Canada Flintridge (commercial) further west beyond the State Route 2 (SR2)/Interstate 210 (I-210) freeway interchange, and the USC Verdugo Hills Hospital located within the C3 Commercial Service, Height District III & PPD (Precise Plan of Development) Zone. The subject site is currently developed with a three-story, 35,981 square-foot, medical office building. With the exception of the existing medical office building, the surface of the site is mostly paved with an asphalt parking lot with an approximately five-foot wide strip of landscaping along the street front property lines. There are no protected indigenous trees species on or within twenty feet of the site.

The Project proposes to demolish the at-grade surface parking lots surrounding the existing medical office building to construct a new, three-story, 79-bed, 35,000 square-foot, residential congregate living, medical facility with a 34 space semi-subterranean garage at the western most portions of the site. The project also includes the construction of a new 36,783 square-foot, three-level, parking garage (one level subterranean and two levels above grade) at the northeastern portion of property. A total of 14,106 cubic yards of soil will be graded and exported offsite. The three-story residential congregate living, medical facility will be set back approximately five-feet and ten-feet away with landscaping from the southern property line along Verdugo Boulevard and the western interior property line adjacent to the SR2/I-210 Interchange, respectively. The proposed three-level parking structure located behind the existing three-story medical office building and at the northeast portions of the site will be setback approximately nine-feet from the eastern property line along La Tour Way and approximately one-foot

away from the northern property line abutting the SR2/I-210 interchange. The appearance of the parking structure will be softened as viewed from the single-family residences to the east with layered landscaped five-foot wide buffer area and garden screen wall.

The proposed three-story, residential congregate living, medical facility is designed in a modern style, with a variety of geometric patterns, framing elements, and thoughtful articulation providing architectural interest. The building will be constructed with quality materials, such as smooth stucco and metal panels, and will contrast in color, pattern and placement to complement the contemporary design of the new residential congregate living building. Review and approval of the Design Review Board along with compliance with the zoning standards and City's Comprehensive Design Guidelines would ensure that no significant impacts would occur to the surrounding area. As a result, impacts to visual character and quality of the site are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Day and night time lighting for the project would increase as a result of the proposed Project, but would not be significantly greater than any other similar commercial structure permitted in the C2 zone. Lighting for the proposed building will be similar to existing commercial uses along Verdugo Boulevard. Any external lighting of the property is required to be directed towards the subject property and shielded to prevent light from spilling over onto neighboring properties. With these requirements in place, and because the surrounding area is already developed with commercial and residential buildings, no significant impacts associated with lighting are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

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

<p><i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project, and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</i></p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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?</p>				X

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

C. AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

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

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

Population growth associated with the Project is included in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) projects for growth in the City of Glendale. The Project does not result in

population and housing growth that would cause growth in Glendale to exceed the SCAG forecast, because the Project is consistent with the General Plan and therefore is included in SCAG's growth projections. Consequently, implementation of the Project would be consistent with AQMP attainment forecasts and with applicable air quality plans. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project is to construct a new, three-story, 79-bed, 35,000 square-foot, residential congregate living, medical facility with a 34 space semi-subterranean garage, and to construct a new 36,783 square-foot, three-level, parking garage on a 64,495 square-foot site consisting of three lots and developed with an existing 35,981 square-foot, three-story, medical office building (constructed in 1984), located in the C2-I Zone. A total of 14,106 cubic yards of soil will be graded and exported offsite. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) was used to estimate air quality impacts during the construction and operation stages of the project. Results from the model indicate that the proposed project would not exceed thresholds for construction, area, or operational impacts. A summary of the results are attached. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact: Sensitive receptors located near the Project site include single-family dwellings located immediately west and east. The applicant would be required to adhere to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403 - Fugitive Dust, which would further reduce the less than significant impact related to construction-related impacts identified in Response C-2 above. As a result, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration or create emissions that exceed known thresholds. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

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

No Impact. The project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for decades. The subject site is currently developed with a three-story, 35,981 square-foot medical office building with asphalt parking lots. No wildlife species other than those which can tolerate human activity and/or are typically found in urban environments are known to exist on or near the project site. These human-tolerant species are neither sensitive, threatened, nor endangered. Implementation of the project would not result in any impact to species identified as endangered, threatened, sensitive or being of special concern by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. In addition, the project site does not provide suitable habitat for endangered or rare species given the pattern, type, and level of development in the area. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years and surrounded by the USC Verdugo Hills Hospital to the south, the SR2/1-210 interchange to the west

and north, other commercial uses beyond the SR2/I-210 interchange to the west, and single-family dwellings to the east. No riparian habitat and/or other sensitive natural communities are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present on or adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No Mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

No Impact. The project site currently features an existing three-story, 35,981 square-foot, medical office building (constructed in 1984) with an asphalt surface parking lot. No historic resources are located on the project site. As a result, the project does not cause a substantial adverse change to a historical resource.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Plant and animal fossils are typically found within sedimentary rock deposits. Most of the City of Glendale consists of igneous and metamorphic rock, and the local area is not known to contain paleontological resources. Nonetheless, paleontological resources may possibly exist at deep levels and could be unearthed with implementation of the project. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during the project-related subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until a paleontologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been

appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of commercial and residential land uses. No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the project site or surrounding area. However, impacts would be potentially significant if human remains were to be encountered during excavation and grading activities. State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then serve as a consultant on how to proceed with the remains (i.e., avoid removal or reburial). 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 Safety Element (August 2003), the subject site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Based on the available geologic data, active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are not known to be located directly beneath or projecting toward the project site. Therefore, impacts from the rupture of a seismic fault are considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

- iv) **Landslides?**

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Construction activity associated with the proposed project development may result in wind and water driven erosion of soils due to grading activities if soil is stockpiled or exposed during construction. However, this impact is considered short-term in nature since the site would expose small amounts of soil during construction activities. Further, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the Glendale Municipal Code Section 13.42.060 to prepare and administer a plan that effectively provides for a minimum stormwater quality protection throughout project construction. The plan would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to less than significant. In addition, the applicant would be required to adhere to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403—Fugitive Dust, which would further reduce the impact related to soil erosion to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Subsidence is the process of lowering the elevation of an area of the earth's surface that can be caused by tectonic forces deep within the earth or by consolidation and densification of sediments sometimes due to withdrawal of fluids such as groundwater. The project site is not located in an area of significant subsidence activity and would not include fluid withdrawal or removal. In addition, as indicated in Response F-1 (iii), above, the soil under the project site is not prone to liquefaction. Therefore, impacts related to unstable soils are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. Septic tanks will not be used in the project. The project would not 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Since this Project is consistent with Greener Glendale Strategies to reduce GHGs and the SCS prepared by SCAG, this project would result in a less than cumulatively considerable impact on GHG emissions and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

H. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project involves the demolition of surface parking lots and the construction of a new a three-story, 79-bed, 35,000 square-foot, residential congregate living, medical facility with a 34 space, semi-subterranean garage, and construction of a new 36,783 square-

foot, three-level (one level subterranean and two levels above grade), 105 space, parking garage. All businesses within the City of Glendale, as mandated by the California Health and Safety Code Chapter 6.95, are required to file a Hazardous Material Business Plan (HMBP) with the Glendale Fire Department. The HMBP covers the use and storage of all regulated hazardous chemicals and materials to be used and/or stored onsite. The proposed residential congregate living, medical facility and parking structures will not involve the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, Verdugo Boulevard is a City Disaster Response Route is identified as a road that can best move emergency services and supplies to where they are needed the most immediately following a major

disaster. Implementation of the project would neither result in a reduction of the number of lanes along this roadway nor result in the placement of an impediment, such as medians, to the flow of traffic. During construction, the contractor shall notify the City of Glendale Police and Fire Departments of construction activities that would impede movement (such as movement of equipment) 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 typical condition of approval. Consequently, project impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is not located in or near a designated wildland area. No impact 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

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
10. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The City currently utilizes water from Glendale Water and Power (GWP), which relies on some local groundwater supplies. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would result in additional development that could indirectly require a slight increased use of groundwater through the provision of potable water by GWP; however, as discussed in Response R-4 below, the proposed project's water demand is within water projections. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies.

The amount of hardscape proposed on the project site would not be similar to current on-site conditions, so the result would not be significant. The proposed project would comply with minimum landscape requirements and, therefore, would not significantly interfere with the recharge of local groundwater or deplete the groundwater supplies relative to existing conditions. Consequently, impacts related to groundwater extraction and recharge will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is currently developed 35,981 square-foot, three-story, medical office building and surface parking lot. Stormwater runoff currently flows into existing City streets and drains. Construction activity associated with the proposed project development may result in wind- and water-driven erosion of soils due to minor grading activities if soil is stockpiled or exposed during construction. However, this impact is considered short term in nature because the site would expose small amounts of soil during construction activities and would then be covered with building, pavement and landscaping upon completion of the project. Furthermore, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the NPDES Permit set forth by the RWQCB, and to prepare and submit a SWPPP to be administered throughout proposed project construction. The

SWPPP would incorporate BMPs to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The proposed project will modify the existing drainage pattern of the site and would slightly decrease the runoff, given the limited amount of existing landscaped area. All subsequent runoff would be conveyed via streets and gutters to storm drain locations around the project site. Development of the proposed project would not require any substantial changes to the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area, nor would it significantly affect the capacity of the existing storm drain system. Furthermore, as discussed above, the SWPPP would incorporate BMPs by requiring controls of pollutant discharges that utilize BAT and BCT to reduce pollutants. In addition, in accordance with Chapter 13.42, Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Control and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan of the Glendale Municipal Code, a SUSMP containing design features and BMPs to reduce post-construction pollutants in stormwater discharges would be required as part of the project. Consequently, impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, the proposed project is not located within the inundation zone of a reservoir or dam located within the City or elsewhere. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

10) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

J. LAND USE AND PLANNING

<i>Would the project:</i>	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 proposed project is located on a corner lot in the C2-I (Height District I) zone. Residential congregate living, medical facilities are a permitted use in the C2 zone and the project complies with all of the development standards for the C2-I zone. Therefore, the project will not divide an established community. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The existing zoning designation on the project site is Community Commercial – C2 Height District I and the General Plan designation is Commercial Services. The proposed project complies the Land Use Element of the General Plan the zoning standards in the C2 Height District I Zone. The project complies with the parking chapter provisions, including the number of required parking spaces and dimensions. The project will be reviewed by the Design Review Board per GMC 30.47, to ensure compatibility with surrounding environment. No impacts would occur

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Project site and immediate area are not located in an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan area. As such, implementation of the Project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

K. MINERAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

L. NOISE

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

<i>Would the project:</i>	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 proposed project involves construction of a new residential congregate living, medical facility and a three-level parking structure. These are permitted uses on the subject property, which is zoned C2. Surrounding the site are the SR2/ I-210 freeway interchange to the north and west, City of La Canada Flintridge (single-family residences) to the east and across La Tour Way, City of La Canada Flintridge (commercial) further west beyond the SR2/ I-210 freeway interchange, and the USC Verdugo Hills Hospital to the south. The development of a residential congregate living, medical facility and a three-level parking structure on this site would not generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

M. POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would not result in substantial new population growth in the City because the medical facility will generate 79 residents with care needs, which is within the Southern

California Association of Governments (SCAG) growth projects for Glendale (would not exceed the growth projections outlined in the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 RTP/SCS) adopted by SCAG). Additionally, any indirect growth occurring as a result of employees from the residential congregate living, medical facility project would be inconsequential, so impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

N. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

a) **Fire protection?**

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b) **Police protection?**

Less than Significant Impact. The Glendale Police Department (GPD) provides police protection services to the project site. The site is located in an urban, developed area of the City and similar uses exist along Verdugo Boulevard. The additional population that this project will bring is not anticipated to have a significant impact on Police services.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c) **Schools?**

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d) **Parks?**

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not involve the development or displacement of a park. The property is zoned for commercial and mixed uses and was not planned for use as a park. In accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the project applicant will be required to pay the Development Impact Fee to the City based on the current fee schedule prior to the issuance of building permits. Payment of the impact fees would result in less than significant impact to park facilities.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e) **Other public facilities?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The project is to construct a new, three-story, 79-bed, 33,334 square-foot, residential congregate living, medical facility on a site developed with an existing 35,981 square-foot, three-story, medical office building (constructed in 1984). The additional occupants and employees at the new residential congregate living, medical facility could increase the demand for library services an incremental amount; however, in accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the project applicant will be required to pay the Development Impact Fee to

the City based on the current fee schedule for mixed use developments prior to the issuance of building permits. Payment of the impact fees would result in less than significant impact to library facilities.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

O. RECREATION

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project, which would result in a new 79-bed, 35,000 square-foot, residential congregate living, medical facility and a three-level parking garage is not expected to generate a substantial increase in demand for existing park or recreational facilities. As discussed in Response N-1d, the project applicant will be required to pay the City's Park and Library Development Impact Fee to provide for park and recreation facilities based on the current fee schedule for commercial and residential development prior to the issuance of building permit. Payment of the 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. As discussed above, the project is not anticipated to create a significant demand on parks facilities that would require the construction or expansion at existing public recreational facilities. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

P. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			X	

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
3. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
4. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
5. Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
6. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

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

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project includes the development of a 79-bed, residential congregate living, medical facility that would increase the number of vehicles using the area streets. A traffic analysis (prepared by Jano Baghdanian & Associates, September 17, 2017) was prepared to evaluate the trip generation for the project. Based upon the estimated project trip generation (trip generation rates are based upon Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual 9th Edition), the project is expected to result in 14 new AM Peak , 23 PM Peak , and 216 Daily Trips. Because the net change in trips generated by the project is less than 50 trips in both the AM and PM peak periods no significant traffic impacts are anticipated.

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. With the implementation of the approved plan, construction traffic impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less than Significant impact. No changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the project. Direct access to the property will be taken from Verdugo Boulevard, which is a designed as a Community Collector in the City's Circulation Element. As indicated in Section P-1 above, a traffic control plan will be required for the construction phase of the project. The plan will be reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Division to ensure that emergency access is not impacted during construction, nor is the County's Evacuation Routed impact. As a result, less than significant impacts to emergency access are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. Verdugo Boulevard is not serviced by any transportation programs. 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 impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Q. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the project.</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant impact	No Impact
1. Would the project 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>Would the project:</i>	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. Written notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam of Mission Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by either tribe within the 30-days of notice. In addition, 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 With Mitigation Incorporated.

As mentioned previously, no known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the Project site and surrounding area. Therefore, 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. Written notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam of Mission Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by either tribe within the 30-days of notice. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

R. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

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

No Impact. Under Section 401 of the CWA, 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 one acre requires a NPDES Permit; this project is under an acre. Construction projects are also required to prepare a SWPPP. In addition, the proposed project would be required to submit an SUSMP to mitigate urban stormwater runoff. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant would be required to satisfy the requirements related to the payment of fees and/or the provisions of adequate wastewater facilities. The proposed project would comply with the RWQCB-established waste discharge prohibitions and water quality objectives, which will be incorporated into the proposed project as a project design feature. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

The proposed project would result in an increase in demand for operational uses, including landscape irrigation, maintenance and other activities on the site. Based on a generation factor of 75 gpd/bed/day, the 79-bed, residential congregate living, medical facility, project would result in a demand of approximately 5,925 gallons per day that equates to 6.64 acre feet per year (afy) of water (based on Sewage Generation Factors for Residential and Commercial Categories, L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide).

The total water demand in 2020 in the City of Glendale is expected to be 28,182 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. 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 6.64 afy generated by the proposed project, ample supply exists to meet remaining City demand under normal conditions.

The new 79-bed, three-story residential congregate living, medical facility and three-level parking structure project must comply with the provisions of Glendale's Mandatory Water Conservation Ordinance, as well as the 2016 California Green Building Standards (CALGreen) of the Glendale Green Building Code and the water conserving fixture and fittings requirements per the current California Plumbing Code. All new buildings must utilize higher efficiency plumbing fixtures (low-flush toilets, low-flow showerheads and faucets) and automatic irrigation system controllers based on water or soil moisture, and demonstrate an indoor net reduction in the consumption of potable water.

Normal Weather Conditions

The City of Glendale has identified an adequate supply of water to meet future City demands under normal conditions. As indicated in the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, a surplus exists that provides a reasonable buffer of approximately 1,500 to 2,500 afy of water. Future water demand in the City is based on projected development contained in the General Plan. For purposes of this assessment, the demand of the proposed project was assumed not to have been included in this demand projection. However, even with the addition of 6.64 afy of demand generated by the proposed project, there is ample supply to meet remaining City demand under normal conditions.

Dry Weather Conditions

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

supply during drought conditions. These contracts would define the MWD's obligation to provide "firm" water supply to the City.

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

Even with the implementation of the proposed project, the GWP would continue to have adequate supply to meet citywide demand under drought conditions. Even with the addition of 6.64 afy of demand generated by the proposed project, there is sufficient supply to meet City demand under drought conditions.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in development on site. According to CalRecycle (Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates for Institutional Sector Generation Rates), the proposed project would generate approximately 72.09 tons (nursing/retirement home at 5 lb/person/day) of solid waste per year.

Solid waste generated on the project site could be deposited at the Scholl Canyon Landfill (owned by the City of Glendale) or at one of the landfills located within the County of Los Angeles. The annual disposal rate at the Scholl Canyon facility is 200,000 tons per year. Combined with the increase of approximately 72.09 tons per year in solid waste generated by the proposed project, the annual disposal amount would increase to approximately 200,072 tons per year. With a total annual disposal amount of 200,072 tons and a remaining capacity of 3.6 million tons, the Scholl Canyon facility would meet the needs of the City and the proposed project for approximately 18 years. Because the proposed project would be required to implement a waste-diversion program aimed at reducing the amount of solid waste disposed in the landfill, the amount of solid waste generated would likely be less than the amount estimated. As a result, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

S. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

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

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

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

Therefore, the proposed project would have not cumulatively considerable effects, and as such, cumulative impacts would not occur.

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

Less than Significant Impact. This Project is to construct a new, three-story, 79-bed, 35,000 square-foot, residential congregate living/ medical facility. As mentioned in Response P-1, the Project will increase the number of vehicles using the area streets. However, based upon the traffic analysis, net change in trips generated by the project is less than 50 trips in both the AM and PM peak periods and no significant traffic impacts are anticipated. The duration for construction will be approximately 15 months and will be temporary. As discussed in Response N-1d, the project applicant will be required to pay the City's Park and Library Development Impact Fee to provide for park and recreation facilities based on the current fee schedule prior to the issuance of building permit. Last, the overall number of employment opportunities resulting from this development will not lead to a significant number of new workers moving to the area. Therefore, the Project is not considered growth inducing and will not directly or indirectly lead to increased population that would generate additional calls for fire, paramedic or police services.

Development of the proposed Project would not create direct and indirect adverse effects on humans. Less than significant impact would occur.

13. Earlier Analyses

None.

14. Project References Used to Prepare Initial Study Checklist

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

1. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Open Space and Conservation Element," as amended.
2. California Department of Conservation, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program*, Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2010 (September 2011).
3. South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning* (May 2005).
4. City of Glendale, *General Plan*, "Safety Element" (2003).

5. California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State of California General Plan Guidelines (October 2003).
6. City of Glendale Municipal Code, as amended.
7. 1809 Verdugo Boulevard Assisted Living Project Traffic Analysis Memorandum (prepared by Jano Baghdanian & Associates, September 17, 2017)
8. California Emissions Estimator Module (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) Report.

