



**PROPOSED
SUBSEQUENT NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Amendment to Fiscal Year 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME Programs to include additional funding for existing Programs and add additional Public Social Services Program

<p>The following Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.</p>	
Project Title/Common Name:	Amendment to FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME Programs to include additional funding for existing Programs and add additional Public Social Services Program for the City of Glendale.
Project Location:	Glendale, Los Angeles County, California: Glendale is located northeast of downtown Los Angeles. It is bounded by the cities of Burbank, Pasadena, La Canada Flintridge and the Los Angeles communities of Tujunga, Eagle Rock and Los Feliz.
Project Description:	Action Plan amendment prepared by the City of Glendale Community Services and Parks Department for the fiscal year 2020-2021 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG), and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing Programs and add additional Public Social Services Program for the City of Glendale.
Project Type:	<input type="checkbox"/> Private Project <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Project
Project Applicant:	Maggie Kavarian, Senior Community Services Supervisor City of Glendale Community Services and Parks Department 141 N. Glendale Avenue, Room 202 Glendale, CA 91206
Findings:	The Director of the Community Development, on September 18, 2020 , 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:	No mitigation measures are required.
Attachments:	Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Erik Krause, Deputy Director of Community Development City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 548-8157 Fax: (818) 240-0392

This page left intentionally blank.



PROPOSED SUBSEQUENT NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Amendment to Fiscal Year 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME to include additional funding for existing Programs and add additional Public Social Services Program

1.	Project Title: Amendment to FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME Programs to include additional funding for existing Programs and add additional Public Social Services Program for the City of Glendale.
2.	Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Glendale Community Development Department Planning Division 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	Contact Person and Phone Number: Dennis Joe, Planner Tel: (818) 937-8157 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	Project Location: Glendale, Los Angeles County, California: Glendale is located northeast of downtown Los Angeles. It is bounded by the cities of Burbank, Pasadena, La Canada Flintridge and the Los Angeles communities of Tujunga, Eagle Rock and Los Feliz.
5.	Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Maggie Kavarian, Senior Community Services Supervisor City of Glendale Community Services and Parks Department 141 N. Glendale Avenue, Room 202 Glendale, CA 91206
6.	General Plan Designation: N/A
7.	Zoning: N/A
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.) Action Plan amendment prepared by the City of Glendale Community Services and Parks Department for the fiscal year 2020-2021 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing Programs and add additional Public Social Services Program for the City of Glendale. See attached Action Plan for full description.
9.	Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The projects are located throughout the City of Glendale, and as such the surrounding uses vary depending on location.
10.	Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement). Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

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

LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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



September 18, 2020

Director of Community Development:

Date:

A. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, 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

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional Public Social Services Programs is not anticipated to have a negative impact on aesthetics. The majority of the projects involve include additional funding for existing community sponsored programs previously reviewed by the approved FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs, and includes an additional public social service program to operate a food bank. The amendment does not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. As such, these programs would not adversely affect scenic vistas, damage scenic resources, degrade the visual character of any sites or create substantial light or glare.

Potential aesthetic impacts could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

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, as updated) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?				X
4. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

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

The City of Glendale does not contain any agricultural resources or lands currently zoned for agricultural uses; instead, Glendale is an urbanized area with a mixture of commercial, residential and industrial uses. Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing Programs and add additional Public Social Services Program would not have a negative impact on agricultural resources largely because there is no “prime farmland,” “unique farmland” or “farmland of statewide importance” that could be converted to non-agricultural use; no existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts; and no farmland that could be converted to non-agricultural use. There is no existing zoning of forest land or timberland in the City of Glendale. No forest land could be converted to non-forest use under the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

C. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied on 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

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing programs and to add an additional program to operate a food bank is not anticipated to have a negative impact on air quality. The majority of the projects involve include additional funding for existing community sponsored programs previously reviewed by the approved FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs, As such, these programs would not adversely affect air quality.

Potential air quality impacts could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or 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

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing programs and to add an additional program to operate a food bank is not anticipated to have a negative impact on biological resources. The majority of the projects involve include additional funding for existing community sponsored programs previously reviewed by the approved FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs, The majority of the projects involve public social service programs that do not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. As such, these programs would not adversely affect biological resources.

Potential impacts on biological resources could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in

subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
3. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing programs and to add an additional program to operate a food bank is not anticipated to have a negative impact on cultural resources. The majority of the projects involve include additional funding for existing community sponsored programs previously reviewed by the approved FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs, The majority of the projects involve public social service programs that do not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. As such, these programs would not adversely affect cultural resources.

Potential impacts on cultural resources could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

F. ENERGY

<i>Would the project:</i>	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

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing Programs and add additional Public Social Services Program is not anticipated to have a negative impact on energy as the majority of the projects involve public social service programs that do not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. As such, these programs would not adversely affect energy consumption or obstruct with state of local energy plans.

Potential impacts on energy could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

G. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Directly or indirectly cause 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 direct or indirect 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

Comments to Sections F(1)(i)(ii)(iii)(iv), (2), (3), (4), (5) and (6):

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing programs and to add an additional program to operate a food bank is not anticipated to have a negative impact geology and soils. The majority of the projects involve include additional funding for existing community sponsored programs previously reviewed by the approved FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs, The majority of the projects involve public social service programs that do not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. As such, these programs would not adversely affect geology and soils.

Potential impacts associated with geology and soils could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

H. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing Programs and add additional Public Social Services Program is not anticipated to have a negative impact associated with greenhouse gases as the majority of the projects involve public social service programs that do not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. As such, these programs would not result in direct or indirect impacts related to the generation of greenhouse gases or conflict with applicable plans.

Potential impacts associated with greenhouse gases could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

I. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing programs and to add an additional program to operate a food bank is not anticipated to have a negative impact on hazards and hazardous materials. The majority of the projects involve include additional funding for existing community sponsored programs previously reviewed by the approved FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs, The majority of the projects involve public social service programs that do not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. As such, these programs would not adversely affect hazards and hazardous materials.

Potential impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

J. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements 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 in flooding on- or off-site;				X
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

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing Programs and add additional Public Social Services Program is not anticipated to have a negative impact associated with hydrology and water quality as the majority of the projects involve public social service programs that do not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. As such, these programs would not adversely affect hydrology and water quality.

Potential impacts associated with hydrology and water quality could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

K. LAND USE AND PLANNING

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community?				X
2. 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

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing programs and to add an additional program to operate a food bank is not anticipated to have a negative impact on land use and planning. The majority of the projects involve include additional funding for existing community sponsored programs previously reviewed by the approved FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs, The majority of the projects involve public social service programs that do not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. The majority of the programs are included in the City's updated Housing Element adopted in January 2014. As such, these programs would not adversely affect land use and planning.

Potential impacts associated with land use and planning could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

L. MINERAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X

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

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing programs and to add an additional program to operate a food bank is not anticipated to have a negative impact on mineral resources. The majority of the projects involve include additional funding for existing community sponsored programs previously reviewed by the approved FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs, The majority of the projects involve public social service programs that do not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. The As such, these programs would not adversely affect mineral resources.

Potential impacts associated with the availability of know mineral resources could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

M. NOISE

<i>Would the project result in:</i>	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
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

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing programs and to add an additional program to operate a food bank is not anticipated to have a negative impact on noise. The majority of the projects involve include additional funding for existing community sponsored programs previously reviewed by the approved FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs, The majority of the projects involve public social service programs that do not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. As such, these programs would not adversely affect noise.

Potential impacts associated with noise could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in

subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

N. POPULATION AND HOUSING

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial unplanned 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

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing programs and to add an additional program to operate a food bank is not anticipated to have a negative impact on population and housing. The majority of the projects involve include additional funding for existing community sponsored programs previously reviewed by the approved FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs, The majority of the projects involve public social service programs that do not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. As such, these programs would not adversely affect population and housing.

Potential impacts associated with population and housing could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

O. PUBLIC SERVICES

<i>Would the project:</i>	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:				
a) Fire protection?				X
b) Police protection?				X
c) Schools?				X
d) Parks?				X
e) Other public facilities?				X

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing programs and to add an additional program to operate a food bank is not anticipated to have a negative impact on public services. The majority of the projects involve include additional funding for existing community sponsored programs previously reviewed by the approved FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs, The majority of the projects involve public social service programs that do not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. As such, these programs would not adversely affect public services.

Potential impacts associated with public services could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

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

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing programs and to add an additional program to operate a food bank is not anticipated to have a negative impact on recreation. The majority of the projects involve include additional funding for existing community sponsored programs previously reviewed by the approved FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs, The majority of the projects involve public social service programs that do not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. As such, these programs would not adversely affect recreational uses. Conversely, the proposed programs included in the action plan would help to relieve existing pressure on the recreational facilities by providing after school programs away from park sites.

Potential impacts on recreational facilities could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Q. TRANSPORTATION

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?				X
2. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?				X
3. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
4. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing programs and to add an additional program to operate a food bank is not anticipated to have a negative impact on transportation. The majority of the projects involve include additional funding for existing community sponsored programs previously reviewed by the approved FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs, The majority of the projects involve public social service programs that do not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. As such, these programs would not adversely affect transportation.

Potential impacts associated with transportation could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

R. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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 that is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in the 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				X

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

Comments to Sections R(1)(i) and (ii):

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing programs and to add an additional program to operate a food bank is not anticipated to have a negative impact on tribal resources. The majority of the projects involve include additional funding for existing community sponsored programs previously reviewed by the approved FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs, The majority of the projects involve public social service programs that do not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. As such, these programs would not adversely affect tribal cultural resources.

Potential impacts associated with tribal cultural resources could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

S. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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 management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing programs and to add an additional program to operate a food bank is not anticipated to have a negative impact on utility and service

systems. The majority of the projects involve include additional funding for existing community sponsored programs previously reviewed by the approved FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs, The majority of the projects involve public social service programs that do not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. As such, these programs would not adversely affect utilities and service systems.

Potential impacts on utilities and service systems could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

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 plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
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

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing programs and to add an additional program to operate a food bank is not anticipated to have a negative impact on wild fire. The majority of the projects involve include additional funding for existing community sponsored programs previously reviewed by the approved FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs, The majority of the projects involve public social service programs that do not propose physical changes to the existing built environment. As such, these programs would not adversely effect on wildfires.

Potential wildfire impacts could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

U. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Does the project have the potential to substantial 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, substantially 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

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

Implementation of the proposed amendment to the action plan for FY 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG and HOME programs additional funding for existing Programs and add additional Public Social Services Program is not anticipated to degrade biological resources or the overall quality of the natural environment; eliminate important historic or prehistoric resources; have environmental effects causing substantial adverse effects on humans; or have cumulatively considerable impacts. As such, these programs are not considered cumulatively considerable.

Potential cumulative impacts could result from capital and neighborhood improvement projects that are also part of the action plan. However, these projects would be evaluated in subsequent project-specific environmental review under CEQA when specific project data becomes available.

13. Earlier Analyses

None

14. Project References Used to Prepare Initial Study Checklist

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

1. Approved Action Plan prepared by the City of Glendale Community Development Department for the fiscal year 2020-2021 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG), and HOME programs.
2. Proposed Action Plan amendment prepared by the City of Glendale Community Development for the fiscal year 2020-2021 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG), and HOME programs to include additional funding for existing programs and add additional public social services program.
3. The City of Glendale’s *General Plan*, “Open Space and Conservation Element,” as amended.

4. California Department of Conservation, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program*, Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2010 (September 2011).
5. California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, *Special Publication 42* (Revised 1997, Supplements 1 and 2 added 1999).
6. South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning* (May 2005).
7. City of Glendale, *General Plan*, "Safety Element" (2003).
8. California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, *State of California General Plan Guidelines* (2017).
9. City of Glendale Municipal Code, as amended.