PROPOSED
NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Star Ford Dealership Expansion
1101 South Brand Boulevard

The following Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.	
Project Title/Common Name:	Star Ford Expansion
Project Location:	1101 South Brand Boulevard, Glendale, Los Angeles County

Project Description:

The proposed project involves the demolition of the existing surface parking lot located on the northern portion of the subject site to accommodate the construction of a new three-story, approximately 64,000 square-foot parking structure, including service bays at the ground floor and roof top parking, on an approximately 98,700 square-foot site. No changes to the existing dealership building, aside from the construction of ramps between the existing building and the new parking structure, are proposed. The new structure will be three stories and approximately 40 feet in height. Aside from four new service bays proposed to be located on the ground floor, the remainder of the structure will be used for parking vehicles.

Vehicular access to the site will remain as it currently exists with driveways from South Brand Boulevard, West Chevy Chase Drive and Palmer Avenue.

The proposed project will require approval of the design (site planning, mass and scale and design and detailing) by the Design Review Board.

Project Type:	☒ Private Project ☐ Public Project
Project Applicant:	Robert Plant 422 South Pasadena Avenue Pasadena, CA 91105
Findings:	The Director of Community Development, on July 3**, 2019**, 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.
Mitigation Measures:	None required
Attachments:	Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Philip Lanzafame, Director of Community Development City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 548-2140; Fax: (818) 240-0392

This page left intentionally blank.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Star Ford Dealership Expansion
1101 South Brand Boulevard

1.	**Project Title:** Star Ford Dealership Expansion
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:** Roger Kiesel, AICP, Senior Planner Tel: (818) 937-8152 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	**Project Location:** 1101 South Brand Boulevard, Glendale, Los Angeles County
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Robert Plant 422 South Pasadena Avenue Pasadena, CA 91105
6.	**General Plan Designation:** Community/Services Commercial
7.	**Zoning:** CA (Commercial Auto) Zone
8.	**Description of the Project:** (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary support or off-site features necessary for its implementation.) The proposed project involves the demolition of the existing surface parking lot located on the northern portion of the subject site to accommodate the construction of a new three-story, approximately 64,000 square-foot parking structure, including service bays on the ground floor and roof top parking, on an approximately 98,700 square-foot site. No changes to the existing dealership building, aside from the construction of ramps between the existing building and the new parking structure, are proposed. The new structure will be three stories and approximately 40 feet in height. Aside from four new service bays proposed to be located on the ground floor, the remainder of the structure will be used for parking vehicles. Vehicular access to the site will remain as it currently exists with driveways from South Brand Boulevard, West Chevy Chase Drive and Palmer Avenue. The proposed project will require approval of the design (site planning, mass and scale and design and detailing) by the Design Review Board.
9.	**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *North:* Commercial and residential uses *South:* Auto dealership uses *East:* Auto dealership uses *West:* Residential uses
10.	**Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).**

None

11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☐ Geology / Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards / Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology / Water Quality	☐ Land Use / Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population / Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☐ 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.

Kim Knoll — July 3, 2019

Prepared by: Date:

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

Vilia Zyman for — July 3, 2019

Director of Community Development: 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

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
3. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			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 in proximity to 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) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is located on the west side of South Brand Boulevard between West Chevy Chase Drive and Palmer Avenue in the CA (Commercial Auto) zone. The CA zone is primarily designed as a district that promotes the maintenance and expansion of vehicle dealers, although alternative complementary commercial uses are permitted. This zone permits a maximum building height of 90 feet, but building height is limited to 35 feet within 40 feet of a residential zone boundary. The site currently contains the Star Ford automobile dealership. The northern portion of the site (along Chevy Chase Drive) proposed for the parking structure is currently a surface parking lot. The parking structure will be approximately 40 feet in height and is well under

the maximum height permitted in the zone (while the adjacent use is a single-family residence, this residence is also located in the CA zone). According to the Open Space and Conservation Element, the Verdugo Mountains are the most significant physical landmarks in the community because these topographical features flank the central portion of the City. The majority of the views of the Verdugo Mountains are directly in line with Brand Boulevard. Since no portion of the proposed building extends over Brand Boulevard, the majority of the views of the mountains when travelling north on Brand Boulevard would remain.

The existing dealership building will not be altered, aside from the addition of ramps leading to the proposed parking structure. The site is surrounded by commercial and residential development. The project will be reviewed by the Design Review Board with regard to the site planning, mass and scale, architecture, materials, and landscaping to ensure the project's design is compatible with the surrounding built environment. Impacts to visual character are anticipated to be less than significant given the project review process.

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 nighttime lighting for the project would represent a slight increase above the existing on-site conditions. The project includes approximately 16-foot high light standards on the rooftop. The project will be required to comply with the lighting standards contained in Section 30.30.040 of the Glendale Municipal Code. This limits rooftop lighting to a maximum height of 16 feet and stipulates that all lighting be installed to preclude light trespass onto adjacent properties. Compliance with the above-referenced section would reduce any potentially significant impact to a less significant level.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

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

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?				
4. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?***

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

C. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
2. 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?			X	
3. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
4. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

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

No Impact. The project is located in the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), which approved the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The purpose of the AQMP is to set forth a comprehensive and integrated program that will lead the Basin into compliance with the federal 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ air quality standard, and to provide an update to the Basin's commitments towards meeting the federal 8-hour ozone standards. Projects that are considered to be consistent with the AQMP do not interfere with attainment and do not contribute to exceeding an existing air quality violation because this growth is included in the projections utilized in the formulation of the AQMP. Therefore, project uses, and activities that are consistent with the applicable assumptions used in the development of the AQMP would not jeopardize attainment of the air quality levels identified in the AQMP, even if they exceed the SCAQMD's recommended thresholds.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***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?***

Less Than Significant Impact. Emission estimates were done using the California Emissions Estimator Model® (CalEEMod) which is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals to quantify potential criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. The model was developed for the California Air Pollution Officers Association (CAPCOA) in collaboration with the California Air Districts. The model quantifies direct emissions from construction and operation activities (including vehicle use), as well as indirect emissions, such as GHG emissions from energy use, solid waste disposal, vegetation planting and/or removal, and water use.

The proposed project's construction and land use information was entered into the model to estimate both construction and operation emissions. Based on the model run, construction of the project would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds of significance for either construction or operation. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. As indicated in the model run performed for this project, no construction or operational impacts are anticipated. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration and impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?***

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activity associated with the proposed project may generate detectable odors. However, any detectable odors would be associated with initial construction and would be considered short-term. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and 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 (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 proposed project is located in an area that has been urbanized for many years and is currently developed with an automobile dealership. The portion of the site proposed for the parking structure is a surface parking lot. Natural vegetation does not exist on site. Existing trees in the area are limited to street trees. The site is surrounded by densely developed urban properties and is unsuitable for use as wildlife habitat due to its location. No wildlife species other than those which can tolerate human activity and/or are typically found in urban environments are known to exist in the vicinity of the site. These human-tolerant species are neither sensitive, threatened, nor endangered. Implementation of the project would not result in any impact to species identified as endangered, threatened, sensitive or being of special concern by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. The site does not provide suitable habitat for endangered or rare species. 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 highly urbanized for many years. No riparian habitat and/or other sensitive natural communities are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present onsite or adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?***

No Impact. The proposed project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years. No federally protected wetlands are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present onsite or adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project is located in an area that has been urbanized for many years and has been substantially modified by human activity. The area surrounding the subject property has been developed in commercial and residential uses. Implementation of the proposed project will not interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project lies within an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years. No protected biological resources are present onsite, and the surrounding area is developed with a variety of commercial uses as well as some multi-family residences. Similarly, there are no indigenous trees, as defined pursuant to Chapter 12.44 of the Glendale Municipal Code (GMC), located on or within 20 feet of the project site. Implementation of the proposed project will not conflict with any local policy designed to protect biological resources. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?				X
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?			X	
3. 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 is currently developed with the Star Ford automobile dealership, including the surface parking lot that will be demolished to make way for the proposed parking structure. Due to its age and lack of historic context, development on the project site is not listed on the Glendale Register of Historic Resources, nor is it eligible for listing. Additionally, the project site is not listed on the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site has already been developed and disrupted with construction of the current auto dealership building and surface parking lot in 2011 following demolition of the previous Glendale Dodge dealership. Archaeological resources, which may have existed at one time (on or beneath the site), have likely been previously disturbed. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius 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 is anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) 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 rebury). With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

F. ENERGY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				X
2. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				X

1) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less than Significant Impact. Construction of the project would require consumption of nonrenewable energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels (including fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline) for automobiles and construction equipment, and other resources including, but not limited to, lumber, sand, gravel, asphalt, metals, and water. Construction would include energy used by construction equipment and other activities at the project site (e.g., building demolition, excavation, paving), in addition to the energy used to manufacture the equipment, materials, and supplies and transport them to the project site. Energy for maintenance activities would include day-to-day upkeep of equipment and systems, as well as energy embedded in any replacement equipment, materials, and supplies. It is expected that nonrenewable energy resources would be used efficiently during construction and maintenance activities given the financial implications of inefficient use of such resources. Therefore, the amount and rate of consumption of such resources during construction and maintenance activities would not result in the unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of energy resources.

Operation of the project would involve consumption of electricity and natural gas. The project would be designed to comply with Title 24 Building, Energy and Green Buildings Standards (California Building Code, Title 24, Parts 4, 6, and 11). Sustainable design strategies for the proposed parking structure would include energy-efficient light fixtures and lighting controls, and water-conserving plumbing fixtures. Given the foregoing, the project's consumption of energy resources would be less than significant, as it would not represent unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of energy resources.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Less than Significant Impact. As described above, the energy efficiency of the new parking structure would, at a minimum, comply with the California Energy Code and the California Building Code. While not specifically applicable to the project, Senate Bill 350 sets ambitious 2030 targets for energy efficiency and renewable electricity, increasing California's renewable electricity procurement goal from 33 percent by 2020 to 50 percent by 2030. As such, the project would not conflict with or obstruct state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

G. 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 Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), 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
6. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is not within an established Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone for surface fault rupture hazards. Based on the available geologic data, active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are not known to be located directly beneath

or projecting toward the project site. Therefore, the potential for surface rupture as a result of fault plane displacement during the design life of the project is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) ***Landslides?***

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activity associated with the proposed project development may result in wind and water driven erosion of soils due to grading activities if soil is stockpiled or exposed during construction. However, this impact is considered short-term in nature since the site would be covered with the proposed parking structure and some landscaping upon completion of construction activity. Further, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit set forth by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and prepare and submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be administered throughout construction. The SWPPP would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure that impacts from erosion during construction would be reduced to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial risks to life or property?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) 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. The project site has already been subject to disruption and development. Any superficial paleontological resources which may have existed at one time on the project site have likely been previously unearthed by past development activities. Nonetheless, there is a possibility that paleontological resources may exist at deep levels and could be unearthed with implementation of the proposed project. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during the proposed project-related subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius 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 is anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

H. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
impact on the environment?				
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 AB32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. GHG as defined under AB32 includes: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. AB32 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 SB375 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. AB32 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 consequently, 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.

I. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
6. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
7. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				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 project involves the construction of a parking structure with ground-floor service bays for the Star Ford automobile dealership and may involve the use, routine transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. However, compliance with State and local laws regulating the use of such materials will be required and, therefore, project impacts will 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 involves the construction of a parking structure with four ground-floor service bays for the Star Ford automobile dealership. The project will be required to comply with all applicable rules established by the SCAQMD, including Rules 403 and 402, during the construction phase of the project that would prevent dust from migrating beyond the project site.

The project will be required to comply with State and local laws regulating the use of hazardous materials. Compliance with State and local laws will ensure that impacts will remain less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is located within one-quarter mile of Theodore Roosevelt Middle School (222 E Acacia Ave, Glendale, CA 91205). However, as discussed above, compliance with State and local laws regulating the use of hazardous materials will be required. As a result, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is located on the west side of South Brand Boulevard between West Chevy Chase Drive and Palmer Avenue. Neither West Chevy Chase Drive nor Palmer Avenue are identified in the City of Glendale's Safety Element (August 2003) as part of an emergency response or evacuation plan. However, South Brand Boulevard is designated a City Disaster Response Route in the Safety Element. The proposed project does not involve any changes to Brand Boulevard, nor would the project result in the alteration of an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. No changes to the locations of the driveways entering/existing the site from Brand Boulevard are proposed. As such, a less than significant impact to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

7) ***Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?***

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

J. 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 or otherwise substantially degrade surface of groundwater quality?			X	
2. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X	
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			X	
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
in flooding on- or off-site;				
iii) 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; or			X	
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
4. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			X	
5. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X	

1) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface of groundwater quality?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not involve additions to or withdrawals of groundwater. The amount of hardscape proposed on the project site is the same as the current on-site conditions, as the majority of the site is covered. Development of the project would not result in a substantial increase in runoff in the surrounding neighborhood since the area is already densely developed. The proposed project would not significantly interfere with the recharge of local groundwater or deplete the groundwater supplies. No significant impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

Less than Significant Impact.

The project site is situated on a flat lot currently developed with the Star Ford automobile dealership. The portion of the site proposed for the parking structure is currently a surface parking lot fronting Chevy Chase Drive. The majority of water that falls on the site is directed to the adjacent streets of Palmer Avenue, South Brand Boulevard and West Chevy Chase Drive. The existing situation will not change after implementation of the project. The project will not alter the course of a stream or river, since no river or stream is located on the site, nor would the project result in a substantial increase in runoff since the project site is already almost entirely paved. Impacts to drainage patterns would be less than significant.

Furthermore, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the NPDES Permit set forth by the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB), and to prepare and submit a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) to be administered throughout proposed project construction. The SWPPP would incorporate BMPs to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to a less than significant level. 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. 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.

ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not alter the course of a stream or river. Flood hazards due to heavy precipitation can result in inundation of developed areas due to overflow of nearby stream courses or from inadequate local storm drain facilities, if not sized to accommodate large storm events. The City has developed a flood control system that provides protection for its residents. The amount of surface runoff will not change as a result of the project. In addition, no Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)-designated flood zones are located within the project site as indicated in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). Therefore, flooding impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iii) 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; or

Less than Significant Impact. Please refer to Response J-3 above. The amount of on-site impervious surfaces would not increase as a result of the project since the site is already fully developed and mostly paved. Impacts from runoff as a result of the proposed project are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

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.

5) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

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.

K. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community?				X
2. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X

1) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The project site is currently developed with the Star Ford auto dealership. The project is the construction of a new three-story parking structure with rooftop parking and four service bays on the ground floor. The parking structure is proposed on an area of the site that currently has a surface parking lot. The project site is adjacent to commercial development, a surface parking lot and residential development to the north, residential development to the west, and automobile dealerships to the east and south. The proposed project is consistent with the development pattern in the area and the permitted zoning. No established community would be divided as a result of the project. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No Impact. The zoning designation on the project site is CA (Commercial Auto) Zone and the General Plan designation is community/services commercial. The proposed project is consistent

with the Land Use Element of the General Plan. The project complies with the development standards contained in the zoning code. No significant impacts associated with applicable land use plans and policies would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

L. MINERAL RESOURCES

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

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

No Impact. The project site is located in an area that has been completely urbanized for many years and is not within an area that has been identified as containing valuable mineral resources, as indicated in the City's Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993). Therefore, development within the project site would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. As indicated in Response L-1 above, there are no known mineral resources within the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

M. NOISE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
3. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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 area to excessive noise levels?				X

1) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project 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 the construction of a parking structure at the Star Ford dealership. The area of the site on which the parking structure is proposed is currently a surface parking lot. The parking structure would be constructed consistent with the building code and, therefore, short-term construction noise levels are not expected to exceed the standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. Construction associated with the project will be required to comply with the City of Glendale Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 8.36), which prohibits construction activities between the hours of 7:00 PM on one day and 7:00 AM of the next day or from 7:00 PM on Saturday to 7:00 AM on Monday or from 7:00 PM preceding a holiday. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less than Significant Impact. Excessive groundborne vibration is typically associated with activities such as blasting used in mining operations, or the use of pile drivers during construction. The proposed project would be constructed using typical construction techniques. No pile driving for construction would be necessary. Structural support required for the development of the project would be installed by drilling bore holes, installing steel I beams, and grouting with concrete. 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. The western façade of the proposed parking structure is fully enclosed with building walls and fixed windows, aside from access to the alley, and will mask noise generated by operation of the parking structure. Therefore, the project is not expected to generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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 area 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.

N. POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

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

No Impact. The proposed project involves the construction of a parking structure with four ground-floor service bays at the Star Ford dealership. The portion of the site on which the parking structure is proposed is currently a surface parking lot. The proposed project is consistent with the zoning and land use designation of the site and therefore, is not considered growth inducing. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is currently the location of the Star Ford automobile dealership. The site currently does not contain any residential units. No impacts would occur.

O. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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:				

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 nearest fire station is Station No. 22, located at 1201 South Glendale Avenue, which is approximately 0.2 mile from the project site. The project will be required to comply with the Uniform Fire Code and to submit plans to the Glendale Fire Department at the time building plans are submitted for approval. Impacts to fire protection are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Glendale Police Department (GPD) provides police services to the project site. The nearest police facility is located at 131 North Isabel Street, which is about 1.3 miles from the subject property. The proposed project will slightly increase the on-site activity since the proposed parking structure will be located on a portion of the site that is currently a surface parking lot. The site is located in an urban, developed area of the City. The project is anticipated to have less than significant impact to 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 for new commercial buildings or additions to existing buildings to assist in the construction of or additions to schools. Such fee will be collected prior to the issuance of a building permit. Payment of these fees under the provisions of Government Code Section 65995.5 reduces impacts that could occur as a result of the project to less than significant levels.

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 subject property is zoned CA (Commercial Auto), which encourages automobile dealerships and is not planned for use as a park. The proposed project would not result

in a significant contribution to additional need for parks due to the nature of the proposed parking structure use. The proposed project would be subject to the park and library development impact fees. Such fees will be collected prior to the issuance of development permits. Impacts to parks are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e) Other public facilities?

No Impact. The subject site is presently developed with the Star Ford automobile dealership. The parking structure is proposed on a portion of the site currently developed with a surface parking lot. The lots surrounding this site are developed with surface parking lots, low scale commercial and auto dealership uses, and residential uses. The project site can be adequately served by existing public facilities. No impacts will occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

P. RECREATION

	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 project, as proposed, is consistent with the Land Use Element, which designates the project site for commercial uses. The potential demand for new parks, or increased maintenance and additional improvements at existing parks, would be minimal due to the nature of the proposed project, a parking structure with four ground floor service bays for the existing Star Ford auto dealership. The proposed use will not substantially increase the use of the City's community parkland such that any noticeable impact on the community parks within the city will occur.

In addition, pursuant to Section 4.10 of the G.M.C., the applicant will be required to pay the public use facilities development impact fee. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts associated with the demand of existing park 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 indicated in Response P-1 above, the project is not anticipated to increase the demand on existing parks. No significant impacts to recreation resources are anticipated with implementation of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Q. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			X	
2. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
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. South Brand Boulevard, West Chevy Chase Drive and Palmer Avenue are adjacent to the subject site. South Brand Boulevard is a Major Arterial Street, West Chevy Chase Drive is a Minor Arterial Street and Palmer Avenue is a Local Street. Access to the parking garage will be from the former two streets. Vehicular access to the site and driveway locations will not change as a result of the project. As a Major Arterial, South Brand Boulevard has an environmental carrying capacity of 45,000 vehicles per day. This street currently accommodates approximately 32,000 vehicle trips per day. West Chevy Chase Drive has an environmental carrying capacity of 30,000 vehicle trips per day. This street currently accommodates approximately 22,000 vehicle trips per day. Because the volumes on these streets would be less than the aforementioned traffic carrying capacity, the project would not be expected to cause any significant and adverse impacts on either of the streets. Additionally, the purpose of the proposed project is to contain more

inventory cars on the dealership site, thus reducing the number of automobile trips to off-site storage facilities to view or pick up cars.

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 Q-1 above, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any significant increase in traffic on the area roadway network. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing roadway network nor the locations of driveways accessing the site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project is the construction of a parking structure on a portion of the dealership site that is currently a surface parking lot. It does not involve changes to the existing street network or existing emergency response plans. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

R. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project cause a substantial adverse				

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

As indicated in Response E-4 above, 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 rebury).

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Less Than Significant Impact. As mentioned previously, 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.

S. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
2. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X	
3. 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	
4. Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				X
5. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

1) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No Impact. The site is currently developed with the Star Ford automobile dealership and the project is the construction of a parking structure with four ground-floor service bays on a portion of the site currently containing a surface parking lot. The proposed use is consistent with the zoning of the subject site. This slight increase in development intensity is not anticipated to substantially increase the demand for new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the need to expand existing facilities. The project site is presently served by existing facilities. No impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?***

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. Given the proposed use, a parking structure with four ground-floor service bays for the existing Star Ford auto dealership, water use for the operation of the site is not anticipated to be significant. Therefore, construction activities and operation of the project are not considered to result in a significant impact on the existing water system or available water supplies.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As indicated in Response S-2 above, the project involves the construction of a parking structure with ground-floor service bays at an existing automobile dealership. The project is not expected to significantly increase the demand for new storm water drainage facilities or the need to expand existing facilities or the construction of new facilities. In addition, the project use is consistent with the Zoning Code and the General Plan. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The project involves the demolition of an existing surface parking lot and construction of a parking structure with four service bays at the existing Star Ford automobile dealership. The addition of the parking structure is not anticipated to generate significant solid waste over and above what is generated currently at the dealership. A less than significant impact is anticipated.

As a result, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

T. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility area or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, *would the project:*	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
1. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response			X	

If located in or near state responsibility area or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, *would the project:*	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
2. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			X	
3. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel, breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?			X	
4. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?			X	

1) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) maps areas of significant fire hazards based on fuels, terrain, weather, and other relevant factors, pursuant to Public Resources Code 4201-4204 and Government Code 51175-51189. These areas are referred to as Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZs) and are identified for areas where the state has financial responsibility for wildland fire protection (i.e., state responsibility areas, or SRAs), and areas where local governments have financial responsibility for wildland fire protection (i.e., local responsibility areas, or LRAs).

There are three FHSZ mapped for SRAs (moderate, high, and very high), while only lands zoned as very high are identified in LRAs (CAL FIRE 2007). The project site is not located within a LRA and is not located near a SRA or a very high FHSZ. As a result, no impact would occur related to wildfire hazards, including emergency response/evacuation, pollutants and uncontrolled wildfire spread, associated infrastructure, or post-fire effects.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

No Impact. As indicated in Response T-1 above, project site is not located within a LRA and is not located near a SRA or a very high FHSZ. No impacts would occur related to wildfire hazards due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel, breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

No Impact. As indicated in Response T-1 above, project site is not located within a LRA and is not located near a SRA or a very high FHSZ. No impacts would occur related to the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

No Impact. As indicated in Response T-1 above, project site is not located within a LRA and is not located near a SRA or a very high FHSZ. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

U. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is located in a developed and highly urbanized area. No impacts are anticipated to occur to the quality of the environment, fish or wildlife habitats, fish or wildlife populations, plant or animal communities, or to rare, threatened or endangered plant and animal species as a result of the proposed project.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the proposed project will not increase traffic, nor would it result in an increase in population. The use of the proposed project is consistent with the zoning and General Plan for the area. Public facilities are available to accommodate the slight increase in usage due to development of the site.

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

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

13. Earlier Analyses

None

14. Project References Used to Prepare Initial Study Checklist

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

1. Environmental Information Form application and materials submitted October 29, 2018.
2. The City of Glendale's General Plan, Open Space and Conservation Element, January 1993.
3. The City of Glendale's General Plan, Safety Element, August 2003.
4. The City of Glendale's Municipal Code, as amended.
5. "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.
6. Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq and California Code of Regulations, Title 14 Section 15000 et seq.
7. *"CEQA Air Quality Handbook,"* April, 1993, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
8. *"CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook,"* updated October 2003, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
9. The City of Glendale's General Plan, Noise Element, May 2007
10. The City of Glendale's General Plan, Recreation Element, April 1996
11. CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod. 2016.3.1 Star Ford expansion, May 2019