

**PUBLIC NOTICE
CITY OF GLENDALE**

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN:

The Planning Department, after having conducted an Initial Study, has prepared a Negative Declaration for the following project:

Project Description:

The project involves the establishment of an In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, a Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance and a revision to the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance consistent with the Downtown Mobility Study, approved by City Council in March 2007.

- The proposed In-Lieu Fee Ordinance would allow developers or existing change-of-use tenants within the Downtown Specific Plan area to pay a fee as a means of satisfying parking requirements as stated in the zoning code.
- The proposed Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance would provide a new dedicated account to receive various existing and anticipated fees for the purpose of enhancing mobility downtown within the Downtown Specific Plan area.
- Proposed revisions to the Transportation Demand Management Ordinance would strengthen the City's existing Transportation Demand Management ordinance by defining performance standards, monitoring and implementation of programs for Transportation Management Associations within the City.

Project Location: Glendale Downtown Specific Plan Area

The Downtown Specific Plan is generally bounded to the north just below Glenoaks Boulevard, to the west by Central and Columbus Avenues, to the east along Maryland and Glendale Avenues, and to the south one block south of Colorado Street.

The Proposed Negative Declaration and all documents referenced therein are available for review in the Planning Department office, Room 103 of the Municipal Services Building, 633 East Broadway, Glendale, CA 91206-4386. Information on public hearings or meetings for the proposed project can be obtained from the Planning Department at (818) 548-2140.

Written comments may be submitted to the Planning Department office for a period of twenty (20) days after publication of this notice.

Proposed Negative Declaration Comment Period: January 15, 2009 to February 3, 2009

Date Published: January 15, 2009



CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA
 Planning Department

PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
Parking Management Program and Mobility Plan
Implementation Measures
Downtown Specific Plan Zone

<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:	Parking Management Program and Mobility Plan Implementation Measures - Downtown Specific Plan Zone
Project Location:	Downtown Specific Plan area, which is generally bounded to the north just below Glenoaks Boulevard, to the west by Central and Columbus Avenues, to the east along Maryland and Glendale Avenues, and to the south one block below Colorado Street.
Project Description:	The project involves the establishment of an In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, a Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance and a revision to the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance consistent with the Downtown Mobility Study, approved by City Council in March 2007. In addition, the project evaluates increasing parking exemptions within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone from 2,000 square feet to 5,000 square feet.
Project Type:	<input type="checkbox"/> Private Project <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Project
Project Applicant:	City of Glendale 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386
Findings:	The Director of Planning, on January 15, 2009 , after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Department, found that the above referenced project would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Negative Declaration be prepared.
Mitigation Measures:	No mitigation measures are necessary.
Attachments:	Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Michael Nilsson, Mobility Planner City of Glendale Planning Department 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 548-2140 Fax: (818) 240-0392



CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA
Planning Department

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
 Parking Management Program and Mobility Plan
 Implementation Measures
 Downtown Specific Plan Zone

1.	Project Title: Parking Management Program and Mobility Plan Implementation Measures Downtown Specific Plan Zone
2.	Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Glendale 633 East Broadway, Room 300 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	Contact Person and Phone Number: Michael Nilsson, Mobility Planner Tel: (818) 548-2140 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	Project Location: Downtown Specific Plan area, which is generally bounded to the north just below Glenoaks Boulevard, to the west by Central and Columbus Avenues, to the east along Maryland and Glendale Avenues, and to the south one block below Colorado Street.
5.	Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Michael Nilsson, Mobility Planner City of Glendale, Planning Department 633 E. Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206
6.	General Plan Designation: Downtown Specific Plan
7.	Zoning: Downtown Specific Plan (DSP)
8.	<p>Description of the Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary support or off-site features necessary for its implementation.)</p> <p>The Downtown Mobility Study focuses on transit and pedestrian friendly policies complimenting policies set in the Downtown Specific Plan adopted in November 2006 to direct future growth into Downtown Glendale. Adopted by Council in March 2007, The following are the main policy concepts of the Downtown Mobility Study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street Types: Assign streets according to service priority as primarily autos, pedestrians or transit in order to provide policy guidance on street design and operation. Revise level of service (LOS) criteria based on movement of people versus cars per street type designation. • Street Capacity Enhancements: Limit future road widening within the downtown area to auto priority streets of Central Avenue, Colorado Street and Glendale Avenue. • Transit Service: Update and brand local Beeline buses and routes to create connections between regional and local services, including the incorporation of a downtown circulator (the "Buzz") to connect from the Metrolink Station to the proposed East-West MTA Connector in northern Glendale. • Parking Management: Maximize current parking resources through improved signage and pricing strategies, similar to the parking management program as employed by the City of Pasadena.

- **Transportation Demand Management:** Increase awareness of incentives for alternative transportation programs, enhancing and strengthening the existing TDM ordinance.
- **Funding and Financing:** Create locally-generated financing mechanisms to be channeled into a Downtown Transportation Fund to directly pay for transit and streetscape improvements. Once local financing is well established, seek state and federal funding for large-scale transit improvements.

The Downtown Mobility Study includes an implementation schedule to establish its policy recommendations. Several immediate-term measures have been evaluated in this document for environmental impacts and are described below:

In-Lieu Fee Ordinance – This ordinance will allow developers or existing change-of-use tenants within the DSP the option to pay a fee as a means of satisfying parking requirements as stated in the zoning code. The following research was conducted to determine the appropriate fee structure:

- Review of existing parking requirements and the parking reduction permit process
- Review of jurisdictions with existing In-Lieu Fee policies
- Analysis of the approximate cost to build parking

Based on the results of this research, the following In-Lieu Fee structure is proposed for the DSP zone only:

- Change-of-use - forgo up to 100% of required parking paid as an annual fee of \$600 per space in perpetuity
- New development - forgo up to 50% of required parking paid as a one-time fee of \$24,000 per space paid prior to occupancy

Establishment of a Downtown Mobility Fund – The Downtown Mobility Fund will provide a new dedicated account to receive various existing and anticipated fees for the purpose of enhancing mobility downtown. Funds deposited into this account will be invested in a variety of mobility improvements including parking, congestion relief, transit and streetscape improvements within the DSP zone.

Downtown Mobility Fund sources will consist of:

- Parking meters on Brand Boulevard and proposed in-lieu fees
- New revenue sources specific to the DSP when adopted by Council

Parking lots and structures within the DSP will continue to be placed into the existing parking fund, as no funds will be extracted from the existing parking fund into the Downtown Mobility Fund.

Revised Transportation Demand Management Ordinance – The Mobility Study recommends strengthening the City's existing Transportation Demand Management (TDM) ordinance. From reviewing existing City TDM policies and successful Transportation Management ordinances and organizations, it is recommended the City assume the role of program monitoring and implement TDM strategies within the City. The TDM Ordinance should be revised to include a clarification of the relationship between the existing Glendale TMA and any future TMO's with the City of Glendale and local businesses. The City will define performance standards for TMO's within the City. The City would require:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mandatory participation of new businesses and developments within the downtown area • Annual vehicle ridership surveys for all member companies • A yearly implementation schedule for TDM programs and annual reporting • A minimum of four TMA board meetings per year with a quorum present at all meetings • TMA boards to be composed of representatives with decision-making authority from member companies <p>In addition to the policies mentioned above, a review of existing parking requirements was conducted. To encourage redevelopment of smaller establishments in the Mid-Brand Boulevard District, Staff proposes to increase parking exemptions within the DSP area from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet. Having to provide additional parking or pay an in-lieu fee could be a burden on small businesses within the DSP, a majority of which have no onsite parking. In addition, Therefore, increasing the exemption to 5,000 square feet would encourage redevelopment of small establishments downtown.</p>
<p>9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The ordinances provide a funding and financing mechanism to support transit, streetscape and pedestrian improvements aimed at minimizing congestion and creating parking management policies that are supportive of the Downtown Specific Plan (DSP) and as such will be applied to the Downtown Specific Plan area.</p>
<p>10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement). None.</p>

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

LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

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

Prepared by:

Date:

Approved by:

Date:

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

Director of Planning:

Date:

12. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

A. AESTHETICS

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

Comments to Sections A(1), (2), (3), and (4):

Establishing an In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, a Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance, revising the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance and increasing parking exemptions from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone are not anticipated to have negative

impacts on aesthetics as the following proposed ordinances do not propose any projects, programs or actions that could reasonably be expected to adversely affect scenic vistas, damage scenic resources, degrade the visual character of any sites or create substantial light or glare.

Funds placed into the Downtown Mobility Fund will enable the City to spend revenues generated downtown on transit, streetscape and pedestrian improvements which may include enhanced lighting, street landscaping, crosswalks and signage. The proposed policy would improve aesthetics.

B. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

<i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project. 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. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X

Comments to Sections B(1), (2), and (3):

The proposed ordinances evaluated in this document would not impact any agricultural resources or lands currently zoned for agricultural uses; instead, the Downtown Specific Plan Zone is an urbanized area with a mixture of commercial and residential uses. There are no anticipated impacts from the proposed ordinances to agricultural resources largely because there is no “prime farmland,” “unique farmland” or “farmland of statewide importance” that could be converted to non-agricultural use; no existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts; and no farmland that could be converted to non-agricultural use.

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				X

<i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

Comments to Sections C(1), (2), (3), (4), (5) and (6):

The proposed In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance, revision of the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance and increasing parking exemptions from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone are not anticipated to have a negative impact on Air Quality.

Strengthening the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance will establish policies to control travel behavior through the use of incentives, services and programs such as carpooling, vanpooling, cycling, reduced transit passes, changes in work schedule to offer an alternative to single-occupancy vehicular travel. As currently proposed, the revised Transportation Demand Management Ordinance will require new companies over 25,000 square feet in size or 25 employees or greater, new residential developments over 100 dwelling units, and new mixed use projects greater than 50 dwelling units and 25,000 square feet within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone to join a Transportation Management Association. Funds generated from Transportation Management Association dues may be used for the aforementioned policies aimed at reducing congestion. The ordinance includes requirements for companies in Transportation Management Organization to submit annual vehicle ridership surveys and to adhere to trip reduction requirements to a 1.5 average vehicle ridership (AVR). Average vehicle ridership is a ratio that calculates the total number of employees or residents to the average daily number of vehicles used.

The goals outlined in revising the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance are also consistent with the objectives outlined in Goal 4 of the City of Glendale Air Quality element in that it encourages and promotes the use of public transportation systems, expands existing public transportation systems to reach a greater number of potential users, increases carpooling opportunities, and develops incentives to business to reduce vehicle trips as well as sets up the funding and financing mechanisms to make these programs possible. As a result, revising the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance would improve air quality.

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,				X

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

Comments to Sections D(1), (2), (3), (4), (5) and (6):

Since the proposed ordinances evaluated in this document will be incorporated into an existing built urban environment/mobility infrastructure, negative impacts on biological resources are not anticipated.

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				X

interred outside of formal cemeteries?				

Comments to Sections E(1), (2), (3) and (4):

Establishing an In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, a Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance, revising the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance and increasing parking exemptions from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone are not anticipated to have a negative impact on cultural resources. The proposed ordinances and revision to existing ordinances are not proposing any projects, programs or actions that could reasonably be expected to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource; destroy a unique paleontological or geologic resource; or disturb any human remains.

F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

Comments to Sections F(1)(i)(ii)(iii)(iv), (2), (3), (4) and (5):

Since no building construction or development projects will occur through establishing an In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, a Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance, revising the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance or increasing parking exemptions from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone, implementation of the study is not anticipated to have negative impacts related to soils and geological conditions.

G. 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

Comments to Sections G(1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7) and (8):

Since establishing an In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, a Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance, revising the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance and increasing parking exemptions from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone will not propose any building construction or development projects, implementation of the element is not anticipated to have negative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. Improvements to pedestrian and transit facilities through funds generated through the In-Lieu Fee Ordinance and allocated through

the Downtown Mobility Fund through Transportation Demand Management programs and future capital improvement projects are expected to contribute to further pedestrian safety.

H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

Comments to Sections H(1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9) and (10):

Since the proposed ordinances analyzed in this document do not propose any construction or development projects, implementation of the proposed project is not anticipated to have negative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

I. 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

Comments to Sections I(1), (2) and (3):

Establishment of an In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance, revision of the existing Transportation Demand Management and increasing parking exemptions from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone are not anticipated to have a negative impacts related to land use and planning as it does not propose any projects, programs or actions that could reasonably be expected to physically divide an established community; conflict with applicable land use plans, policies or regulations; or conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Establishment of an In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance, and revision of the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance are immediate term action items set by the implementation plan in the Downtown Mobility Study. Not only will the establishment of an In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance, and revision of the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance help avoid or minimize significantly increased congestion, the growth envisioned by the DSP will create an ideal environment to implement a coordinated multi-modal transportation system with higher use of alternative modes. In addition, implementation of the ordinances mentioned above are expected to improve the functioning of the existing land uses, by improving the existing transit and transportation demand management programs, as well as establishing a parking management system.

Note: Conflicts with the General Plan or other applicable land use plans do not inherently result in a significant effect on the environment within the context of CEQA. As stated in Section 15358(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, "effects analyzed under CEQA must be related to a physical change." Section 15125(d) of the Guidelines states that EIRs shall discuss any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable General Plans in the "Setting" section of the document (not under impacts). Further, Appendix G of the Guidelines (Environmental Checklist Form) makes explicit the focus on environmental policies and plans, asking if the project would "conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation...adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect" (emphasis added). Even a response in the affirmative, however, does not necessarily indicate the project would have a significant effect, unless a physical change would occur. To the extent that physical impacts may result from such conflicts, such physical impacts are analyzed elsewhere in this document. The General Plan contains many policies, which may in some cases address different goals, and thus some policies may compete with each other. The City's approving bodies, in deciding whether to approve the proposed project, must decide whether, on balance, the project is consistent (i.e., in general harmony) with the General Plan.

J. 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

Comments to Sections J(1) and (2):

Establishing an In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, a Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance, revising the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance and increasing parking exemptions from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone are not anticipated to have a negative impact on mineral resources as it does not propose any projects, programs or actions that could reasonably be expected to result in the loss of availability of a known valuable mineral resource or of an important mineral resource recovery site.

K. NOISE

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

Comments to Sections K(1), (2), (3), (4), (5) and (6):

Establishing an In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, a Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance, revising the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance and increasing parking exemptions from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone can potentially reduce auto dependency and increase walking and transit use. To the extent that the programs recommended by the study accomplish that goal it will reduce potential noise that would otherwise be generated by automobiles. Therefore, these ordinances will not expose individuals to additional noise.

L. 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

Comments to Sections L(1), (2) and (3):

Establishing an In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, a Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance, revising the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance and increasing parking exemptions from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone do not propose any projects, programs or actions that could reasonably be expected to induce substantial population growth in the area, or to displace substantial numbers of people or of existing housing units.

M. 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

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Schools?				X
d) Parks?				X
e) Other public facilities?				X

Comments to Sections M(1)(a),(b), (c), (d) and (e):

Establishing an In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, a Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance, revising the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance and increasing parking exemptions from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone are not anticipated to have a negative impact on public services. The element does not propose any projects, programs or actions that could reasonably be expected to result in substantial physical impacts associated with the provision or expansion of public facilities related to fire protection, police protection, schools, parks or other public services.

The aforementioned ordinances will likely improve public services. Funds generated from the In-Lieu Fee to be deposited into the Downtown Mobility Fund can be spent to on improvements such as enhanced lighting, street landscaping, crosswalks, and signage. Implementation of a strengthened Transportation Demand Management Ordinance will decrease the burden of auto-related infrastructure improvements for standard congestion relief practices which includes, but is not limited to, widening roads and building additional parking. It is not expected that these ordinances would result in substantial adverse physical impacts or impacts to any public service performance objectives.

N. 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

Comments to Sections N(1) and (2):

Establishing an In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, a Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance, revising the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance and increasing parking exemptions from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone are not anticipated to have a negative impact related to recreation as it does not propose any projects, programs or actions that could reasonably be expected to substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional recreational facilities, or to require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

O. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				X
2. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard 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. Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X	
7. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

Comments to Sections O(1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6) and (7):

Establishing an In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, a Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance, revising the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance and increasing parking exemptions from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone are not anticipated to have an impact on traffic or transportation as it does not propose any projects, programs or actions that could reasonably be expected to cause a substantial increase in traffic; exceed traffic level-of-service standards; result in a change in air traffic patterns; substantially increase traffic-related hazards, result in inadequate emergency access; or interfere with alternative-transportation modes.

The In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance and revising the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance are components of a larger immediate-term policy set in the Downtown Mobility Study to execute a parking management program in the Downtown Specific Plan Zone. The goal is to maximize the efficiency of available parking and use of existing and future parking inventory. Applicants or existing change-of-use tenants wishing to use the In-Lieu Fee option to forego City parking requirements can satisfy environmental review of their project in regards to parking impacts by paying the in-lieu fee. Money from the In-Lieu Fee will be deposited into the Downtown Mobility Fund which can be used for a variety of transportation demand management, transit, pedestrian and streetscape improvements versus the existing parking fund that requires all funds be spent on the construction, operation and maintenance of parking. All of the aforementioned ordinances are aimed at reducing the demand for parking.

The intent of revising the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance is to decrease the amount of single occupancy vehicular traffic by encouraging alternative modes of transportation, such as carpooling, vanpooling, cycling, walking and incentives to reduce demand such as reduced

transit passes and changes in work schedule. The revised Transportation Demand Management Ordinance will require new companies over 25,000 square feet in size or 25 employees or greater, new residential developments over 100 dwelling units and new mixed use projects greater than 50 dwelling units and 25,000 square feet within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone to join a Transportation Management Association. Funds generated from Transportation Management Association dues may be used for the aforementioned policies aimed at reducing congestion. The revised Transportation Demand Management ordinance includes trip reduction goals set at 1.5 AVR. This ratio is the total number of employees or residents to the average daily number of vehicles used. In addition, the City will define performance standards, monitor and implement TDM programs. This includes requiring member companies of a Transportation Management Association to submit annual vehicle ridership surveys and the establishment of a yearly implementation schedule for TDM programs and annual reporting. The implementation of a revised and strengthened Transportation Demand Ordinance is likely to reduce the volume of traffic, increase level-of-service, and lower demand for parking.

Increasing the exemption of parking requirements within the Downtown Specific Plan area from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet will not result in any significant parking impacts. Businesses less than 5,000 square feet within the Downtown Specific Plan area are predominantly along the Mid-Brand Boulevard corridor which is composed of older structures built without any prescribed parking. Currently, any business undergoing a change-of-use may apply for a parking exception to forego providing required parking as stated in the Glendale Municipal Code. The proposed change itself would not result in significant impact since no physical change is currently proposed. Because a request for a parking exception is a discretionary action requiring approval from the Glendale Redevelopment Agency, they will be subject to separate environmental review once plans are submitted for review.

Establishment of an In-Lieu Fee option for developers to forego parking requirements will not have a significant effect on the availability of parking in the City of Glendale. A peak-hour parking analysis on weekdays and weekends was conducted from 2004 – 2006 within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone. Results of this analysis are shown in Chapter 5 of the Downtown Mobility Study on Pages 5-11 and 5-12 and in the Downtown Mobility Study Appendix 5-A on Page 5A-1. This research confirms that even in peak hour parking conditions capacity is no greater than 53% percent. At the time of the parking survey, parking was tightest in areas that offer the most convenient free parking while fee parking in adjacent public parking lots and structures are often empty.

To ensure that available parking capacity is monitored once the In-Lieu Ordinance is implemented and the parking exception is increased to 5,000 square feet, the City will be responsible for the management of parking supply. The City will develop a method to track in-lieu fee and parking exemptions within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone. In addition, the City will conduct parking audits determined as needed by the Traffic and Transportation Division. The parking audits to be conducted will be similar to those completed for the Downtown Mobility Study to verify that the parking supply is maintained at an adequate level within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone. Once the parking occupancy exceeds 85%, determined in Chapter 5 of the Downtown Mobility Study as the ideal parking capacity threshold, the City could use the funds available in the Downtown Mobility Fund or Parking Fund to construct additional parking, create policies to implement shared-use parking programs with private parking lots within the City, or create additional policies that further limit the demand of parking. As per the In-Lieu Fee ordinance, the City could limit additional In-Lieu fee requests from developers or existing change-of-use tenants in areas of the Downtown Specific Plan Zone where parking occupancy exceeds 85% until such policy direction is determined by the City. With these limits, no significant impacts on the availability of parking are anticipated.

P. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

Comments to Sections P(1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6) and (7):

Establishing an In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, a Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance, revising the existing Transportation Demand Management Ordinance and increasing parking exemptions from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet within the Downtown Specific Plan Zone are not anticipated to have a negative impact on utilities and service systems as it does not propose any projects, programs or actions that could reasonably be expected to exceed wastewater treatment requirements; result in the construction or expansion of water, wastewater-treatment or stormwater-drainage facilities; result in insufficient water supplies or landfill capacity; or violate solid-waste related regulations.

Q. 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				X

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

Comments to Sections Q(1), (2) and (3):

Establishment of an In-Lieu Fee Ordinance, Downtown Mobility Fund Ordinance, revision of the existing Transportation Demand Management and increasing parking exemptions from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet in the Downtown Specific Plan Zone are not anticipated to degrade biological resources or the overall quality of the natural environment in Glendale; to eliminate important historic or prehistoric resources; to have environmental effects causing substantial adverse effects on humans; or to have cumulatively considerable impacts. The ordinances propose improvements and programs intended to reduce auto dependency and increase use of alternative modes, such as walking, transit, and bicycles. In addition, increasing parking exemptions from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet within the Downtown Specific Plan area may have an additional benefit of preserving older buildings, many of which are smaller than 5,000 square feet, along the Mid-Brand Boulevard district.

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. Glendale Downtown Mobility Study, City of Glendale, March 2007
2. Glendale Downtown Specific Plan, City of Glendale, November 2006
3. "Guidelines of the City of Glendale for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended," August 19, 2003, City of Glendale Planning Division.
4. Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq and California Code of Regulations, Title 14 Section 15000 et seq.
5. "CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook," updated October 2003, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
6. The City of Glendale's General Plan, Noise Element, 1978
7. The City of Glendale's General Plan, Air Quality, 1994