



**PROPOSED  
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Honda Automobile Dealership Expansion  
1231 - 1265 S. Brand Blvd.

<p>The following Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.</p>	
<b>Project Title/Common Name:</b>	Honda Automobile Dealership
<b>Project Location:</b>	1231-1265 S. Brand Blvd., Glendale, Los Angeles County
<p><b>Project Description:</b>          The site is currently developed with five structures with a combined total of 17,293 SF (vehicle sales, showroom repair, workshops and a carwash). The proposed project involves the demolition four existing one-story commercial structures with a combined total of 14,118 SF (vehicle sales, showroom, repair and storage buildings), maintain an existing 3,175 SF (workshop and car wash) building and construct a new two-story, 54,000 SF automobile dealership building (Honda) with roof top parking and a 1,500 SF service canopy on an approximately 70,718 SF (1.62 acres) site. The existing Honda dealership is located on nine lots at 1235 S. Brand Boulevard (subject site). The project will be constructed in two phases across the entire site. The new building will be two-stories and approximately 45'-10" in height at the top of the parking deck. The first level includes the dealership showroom, sales offices, parts storage and vehicle service. Access to the service reception will be from Magnolia Ave., and vehicle access (entrance and exit) to the dealership will be from Brand Blvd. and Magnolia Ave. The second level will include offices and parts storage. The proposed dealership building requires 235 on-site parking spaces based on code require of 4 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area. The applicant is proposing to provide a total of 90 on-site parking spaces, including 29 surface parking spaces and 61 rooftop parking spaces. The applicant is requesting a parking reduction permit for 145 parking spaces. The proposed project will also require approval of the design (site planning, mass and scale and design and detailing) by the Design Review Board.</p>	
<b>Project Type:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private Project <input type="checkbox"/> Public Project
<b>Project Applicant:</b>	New Century Honda c/o Daniel Lin 1235 S. Brand Blvd. Glendale, CA 91204
<b>Findings:</b>	The Director of Community Development, on <b>October 29, 2021</b> , after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Division, found that the above referenced project, as mitigated, would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be prepared.
<b>Mitigation Measures:</b>	See attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
<b>Attachments:</b>	Initial Study Checklist; Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Milca Toledo, Senior Planner City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 548-2140; Fax: (818) 240-0392

---

### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

The following mitigation measures shall apply to the proposed Honda automobile dealership project, located at 1231-1265 S. Brand Blvd., to reduce identified impacts to less than significant levels.

#### Mitigation Measure:

#### CULTURAL RESOURCES

MM-1 In the event that Native American cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall assess the find. Work on the portions of the project's outside buffer may continue during this assessment period. The Gabrielino Indian Tribe Band of Mission Indians shall be contracted to consult if any such find occurs. The archaeologist shall complete all relevant California State Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 Series forms to document the find and submit this documentation to the applicant, Lead Agency and the FTBMI. If the Native American cultural resource is determined to be significant, as defined by consulting Tribes, a Native American monitor procured by the Gabrielino Indian Tribe Band of Mission Indians shall be present for all ground disturbing activities that occur within the proposed project area.

**Monitoring Action:** Site inspection

**Timing:** During all site preparation and construction activities when resources are discovered.

**Responsibility:** Qualified archaeologist retained by the project applicant.

MM-2 The Lead Agency and applicant shall, in good faith, consult with the Gabrielino Indian Tribe Band of Mission Indians on the disposition and treatment of any artifacts or other cultural materials encountered during the project.

**Monitoring Action:** Site inspection

**Timing:** During all site preparation and construction activities

**Responsibility:** Community Development Department; Project Applicant

**AGREEMENT TO PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES AND MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM**

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

---

Signature of Project Applicant(s)

---

Date:

---

Signature of Project Applicant(s)

---

Date:



## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Honda Automobile Dealership Expansion  
1231-1235 S. Brand Blvd.

1.	<b>Project Title:</b> Honda Automobile Dealership
2.	<b>Lead Agency Name and Address:</b> City of Glendale Community Development Department Planning Division 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	<b>Contact Person and Phone Number:</b> Milca Toledo, Senior Planner Tel: (818) 937-8181 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	<b>Project Location:</b> 1231-1235 S. Brand Blvd., Glendale, Los Angeles County
5.	<b>Project Sponsor's Name and Address:</b> New Century Honda c/o Daniel Lin 1235 S. Brand Blvd. Glendale, CA 91204
6.	<b>General Plan Designation:</b> Community/Services Commercial
7.	<b>Zoning:</b> CA (Commercial Auto) Zone
8.	<b>Description of the Project;</b> <p>The site is currently developed with five structures with a combined total of 17,293 SF (vehicle sales, showroom repair, workshops and a carwash). The proposed project involves the demolition four existing one-story commercial structures with a combined total of 14,118 SF (vehicle sales, showroom, repair and storage buildings), maintain an existing 3,175 SF (workshop and car wash) building and construct a new two-story, 54,000 SF automobile dealership building (Honda) with roof top parking and a 1,500 SF service canopy on an approximately 70,718 SF (1.62 acres) site. The existing Honda dealership is located on nine lots at 1235 S. Brand Boulevard (subject site). The project will be constructed in two phases across the entire site. The new building will be two-stories and approximately 45'-10" in height at the top of the parking deck. The first level includes the dealership showroom, sales offices, parts storage and vehicle service. Access to the service reception will be from Magnolia Ave., and vehicle access (entrance and exit) to the dealership will be from Brand Blvd. and Magnolia Ave. The second level will include offices and parts storage. The proposed dealership building requires 235 on-site parking spaces based on code require of 4 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area. The applicant is proposing to provide a total of 90 on-site parking spaces, including 29 surface parking spaces and 61 rooftop parking spaces. The applicant is requesting a parking reduction permit for 145 parking spaces. The proposed project will also require approval of the design (site planning, mass and scale and design and detailing) by the Design Review Board.</p>
9.	<b>Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:</b> <i>North:</i> Automobile dealership uses <i>South:</i> Automobile dealership uses

East: Automobile dealership uses

West: Multi-family residential uses across the alley

- 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).**  
None

**11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:**

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

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

**LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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




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.

  
 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**

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	

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

**No Impact.** The project site is located in an urbanized commercial area of the city within the Brand Boulevard of Cars on Brand Boulevard in the CA (Commercial Auto) zone, a zone designed specifically for automobile dealership. 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 on a scenic vista would occur.

**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 project site is located in an urbanized commercial area of the city within the Brand Boulevard of Cars on Brand Boulevard in the CA (Commercial Auto) zone, a zone designed specifically for automobile dealership. 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, and the site is already developed with the Honda Dealership. The CA zone permits a maximum building height of 90 feet, though building height is limited to 35 feet within 40 feet of a residential zone boundary.

The project will not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality because the new building will be 45'-10" in height and 34'-10" within 40 feet of existing residential zoned boundary to the west, well under the maximum 90-foot height permitted 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 traveling north on Brand Boulevard would remain. The site is surrounded by commercial and residential development. In accordance with GMC section 30.47.030, the project will be reviewed by the Design Review Board in regard to the site plan, mass and scale, architecture, materials, and landscaping to ensure project's design is compatible with the surrounding built environment. Therefore, less than significant environmental impacts are anticipated.

**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 increase as a result of the proposed project, but would not be significantly greater than the existing on-site conditions. Any external lighting of the property is required to be directed towards the subject property and shielded to prevent light from spilling over onto neighboring properties. The Zoning Code also requires that parking structure rooftop lighting be designed and installed to preclude light trespass onto adjacent properties. Light standards are contained in Section 30.30.040 of the Glendale Municipal Code, which limits lighting to a maximum height of 16 feet. With these requirements in place, and because the surrounding area is already developed with commercial and residential buildings, no significant impacts associated with lighting are anticipated.

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

**B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES**

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



Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**3) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), 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. No impact would occur.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C. **AIR QUALITY**

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 site is located within the City of Glendale, which is part of the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) and is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD is the agency responsible for preparing the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the Basin. Since 1979, a number of AQMPs have been prepared. The most recent comprehensive plan fully approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) is the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which includes a variety of strategies and control measures.

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

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

The project would not increase population figures over those that have been planned for the area or cause growth in Glendale to exceed the SCAG forecast. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with AQMP attainment 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 in the region. No impact would occur with relation to a conflict with, or obstruction of, the implementation of the SCAQMD AQMP.

**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 involves the demolition of four existing structures on-site and the construction of a new vehicle auto dealership. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) was used to estimate air quality impacts during the construction and operation stages of the project. Results from the model indicate that the proposed project would not exceed thresholds for construction, area, or operational impacts. A summary of the results is attached. No significant impacts are anticipated.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Sensitive receptors are defined as schools, hospitals, resident care facilities, daycare centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The proposed project is located in a commercial area, and where residential uses exist across the alley to the west with no known sensitive receptors located nearby. In addition, as indicated in the model run performed for this project, no construction or operational impacts are anticipated. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration and therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

The project would be required to adhere to the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403-Fugitive Dust, which would further reduce the less than significant impact related to construction impacts identified in Response C.2 above and comply with all applicable rules that govern construction related impacts. In addition, as indicated in the air quality model run described above, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration and therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to responses in C.1 & C.3 above. Construction activity associated with the proposed project will be for approximately one year and may temporarily generate detectable odors from equipment exhaust. However, any detectable odors or equipment exhaust would be associated with initial construction and would be considered transitory and/or short-term. The

operation of the proposed project could create odors associated with routine maintenance of vehicles in the service bays. During construction, equipment exhaust would temporarily generate odors. Any construction- and operation-related odor emissions would be temporary and intermittent. Additionally, noxious odors would be confined to the immediate vicinity of the equipment. By the time such emissions reach any sensitive receptor sites, they would be diluted to well below any level of air quality concern. Therefore, impacts associated with operation- and construction-generated odors would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

**D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

<i>Would the project:</i>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>
5. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>

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

**No Impact.** The project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for decades. Natural vegetation does not exist on-site. The site is surrounded by densely developed urban properties and is unsuitable for use as a 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 on or near the project site. These human-tolerant species are neither sensitive, threatened, nor endangered. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impact to species identified as endangered, threatened, sensitive or being of special concern by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. In addition, the project site does not provide suitable habitat for endangered or rare species given the pattern, type, and level of development in the area. No impacts would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project is located in an area that has been 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 as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?***

**No Impact.** The project site is neither in proximity to, nor does it contain, wetland habitat or a blue-line stream. Therefore, the proposed project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. No 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, as the subject lot and the surrounding area are developed with a variety of commercial uses as well as some multi-family residences. 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**

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

1) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?**

**No Impact.** The project site is currently developed with the Honda automobile dealership and the site is paved. The existing buildings, to be demolished as a result of the project, were constructed between 1951 and 1983. The proposed demolition would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. No historic resources have been identified on this site and the property is not within a historic district. 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. No impact to a historical resource would occur.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites are not known to exist within the project area. The City's Open Space and Conservation Element indicate that no significant archaeological sites have been identified in this area of Glendale. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, the proposed project will comply with regulations outlined by the California Public Resource Code PRC21083.2(i) and will require 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. As a result, less than significant impact would occur.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** Notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (FYBMI), Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians and Gabrielino-Tongva on March 10, 2021, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by any of the three tribal governments within 30-days of the notice.

The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of commercial and residential land uses. No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the project site or surrounding area. However, impacts would be potentially significant if human remains were to be encountered during excavation and grading activities. State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then serve as a consultant on how to proceed with the remains (i.e., avoid removal or reburial). With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impact is anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** The following mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to less than significant level.

- MM – 1 If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 60-foot buffer of the find) shall cease and the County coroner shall be contacted. If the human remains prove to be Native American in origin by the County Coroner, the applicant shall immediately notify the lead agency and all consulting Tribes.
- MM – 2 In the event that Native American cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall assess the find. The Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe shall be contracted to consult if any such find occurs. The archaeologist shall complete all relevant California State Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 Series forms to document the find and submit this documentation to the applicant, Lead Agency and the Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe. If the Native American cultural resource is determined to be significant, as defined by consulting Tribes, a Native American monitor procured by the Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe shall be present for all ground disturbing activities that occur within the proposed project area.
- The archaeologist and Tribal monitor will have the authority to request ground disturbing activities cease within the area of a discovery to assess and document potential finds in real time.
  - The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe on the disposition and treatment of any artifacts or other cultural materials encountered during the project.

**F. ENERGY**

<i>Would the project:</i>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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; however, these resources are already consumed on the project site, and an incremental increase in the consumption of these resources associated with the project operation would not represent unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of resources. Furthermore, 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); therefore, the project consumption of energy resources would be less than significant.

**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 new building's energy efficiency would, at a minimum, comply with the California Energy Code and the California Building Code. As such, the project would not conflict with or obstruct state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.



**G. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

<i>Would the project:</i>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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.			<b>X</b>	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			<b>X</b>	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				<b>X</b>
iv) Landslides?				<b>X</b>
2. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			<b>X</b>	
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?			<b>X</b>	
4. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?			<b>X</b>	
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?				<b>X</b>
6. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			<b>X</b>	

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.***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the City’s Safety Element (August 2003), the subject site is not within an established Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The closest active fault is the York Boulevard Fault, located approximately 0.7 miles to the southeast and runs through Forest Lawn Cemetery. Based on the available geologic data contained in the City’s Safety Element, 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. However, the project is not considered a

critical facility and therefore, is not restricted on the site. Therefore, impacts from the rupture of a seismic fault are considered to be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**iv) *Landslides?***

**No Impact.** The project is not located within a landslide hazard zone area, as indicated by the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). Therefore, no impacts 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 will not result in wind and water driven erosion of soils due to grading since the site would expose small amounts of soil during construction activities. Further, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the Glendale Municipal Code Section 13.42.060 to prepare and administer a plan that effectively provides for a minimum stormwater quality protection throughout project construction. The plan would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to less than significant. In addition, the applicant would be required to adhere to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403-Fugitive Dust, which would further reduce impacts related to soil erosion to less than significant.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Subsidence is the process of lowering the elevation on an area of the earth's surface that can be caused by tectonic forces deep within the earth or by consolidation and densification of sediments sometimes due to withdrawal of fluids such as groundwater. According to the City's Safety Element (August 2003), the project site is not located in an area of significant subsidence activity and would not include withdrawal or removal. In addition, as indicated

in Response G-1 (iii) above, the soil under the project site is not prone to liquefaction. Therefore, impacts related to unstable soils are anticipated to be less than significant.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** 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. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

- 6) ***Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?***

**Less than Significant Impact.** Plant and animal fossils are typically found within sedimentary rock deposits. According to the City's Safety Element (2003), 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. The proposed project is to construct a new vehicle dealership, and there is no semi-subterranean or subterranean parking levels proposed. The project proposes to grade 1,065 cubic yards (cut), 1,740 cubic yards (fill), and net (fill) 675 cubic yards associated with the required footings. Nonetheless, there is a possibility that paleontological resources may exist at deep levels and could be unearthed with implementation of the project. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during the project-related subsurface activities, compliance to regulations outlined by California Public Resource Code PRC21083.2(i) will be adhered to, which requires all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius to be temporarily suspended or redirected until a paleontologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impact would occur.

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

**H. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

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

**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 small (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 H.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**

<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

<i>Would the project:</i>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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 site?				<b>X</b>
6. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			<b>X</b>	
7. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				<b>X</b>

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.** Searches of the Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database and California State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker database indicated no contamination on the project site. The federal government banned consumer use of lead-based paint (LBP) in 1978 and many, but not all, asbestos-containing materials (ACM) were banned in construction products in 1989. As the existing building on the project site was constructed prior to the ban of these materials, it is possible that the existing building contains LBP and/or ACMs. In addition, other regulated materials such as fluorescent lights may be present.

The existing structures are required to be tested in accordance with applicable rules and regulations and remediated accordingly prior to demolition. The project would be required to comply with all applicable rules established by the SCAQMD, including Rule 403 and 402, during the construction phase of the project that would prevent dust from migrating beyond the project site. Compliance with the applicable rules and regulations would ensure that no significant impacts would occur.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would include demolition activities prior to new construction. Given the age of the structures on site, LBP and ACMs may be encountered during demolition activities. Project construction would be required to comply with applicable state regulations regarding LBP work practices, including testing and abatement. The removal of ACMs would be subject to the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1403, which governs work practice requirements for asbestos in all renovation and demolition activities. Rule 1403 includes an onsite survey and notification requirements prior to beginning a project, as well as work practice standards and disposal requirements.

Additionally, under California law, fluorescent lamps cannot be disposed of as municipal waste. Fluorescent tubes and bulbs may be managed as universal wastes under Title 22, Chapter 23 of the

California Code of Regulations and are typically recycled. With adherence to applicable regulations, project impacts related to removal of hazardous materials during demolition would be less than significant.

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

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

**No Impact.** There are two existing schools within one-quarter (0.25) mile from the project site. Cerritos Elementary School (0.4 miles to the southeast) and Theodore Roosevelt Middle School (0.6 miles to the northeast) of the project site. The proposed project would comply with all hazardous materials remediation protocols during the demolition and construction phase. The project would not emit any new hazardous emissions or handle any new hazardous materials because the proposed use will continue to be an auto dealership and associated parking structure primarily for vehicle inventory for Honda dealership. No impact 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project site?***

**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 Magnolia Avenue and Cypress Street. Neither Magnolia Avenue nor Cypress Street are identified as a City Disaster Response or County Evacuation Route in the City of Glendale's Safety Element (August 2003). However, South Brand Boulevard adjacent to the site 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. During construction, the applicant would be required to obtain any necessary permits from the City of Glendale Public Works Department for all work occurring within the public right-of-way. Implementation of these requirements would be incorporated as a typical condition of approval. Consequently, project impacts would be less than significant.

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

- 8) ***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**

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

**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 basis?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City currently utilizes water from Glendale Water and Power (GWP), which relies on primarily importing water from the Metropolitan Water District, some local groundwater basins and from the San Fernando Basin. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would result in development that could indirectly require a slight increased use of groundwater through the provision of potable water by GWP; however, as discussed in Response S-2 below, the proposed project's water demand is within water projections. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies.

Per the City's Open Space and Conservation Element, the north and easterly facing slopes of the Verdugo Mountains drain into the Arroyo Verdugo drainage basin and directly feed aquifers and wells reserved exclusively for the City of Glendale. The south-facing slopes of these mountains drain into the Los Angeles River basin which feed aquifers, ground water basins and wells shared by the Cities of Glendale, Burbank and Los Angeles. The largest flood control basin is the Verdugo basin, which is located adjacent to the Oakmont Country Club in the northern portion of the city. Maps 4-21 and 4-22 of the Open Space and Conservation Element show this, as well as the other basins, within the city. Per Maps 4-21 and 4-22, the subject property is not located on or within the watershed or aquifer recharge areas. 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 applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) Permit set forth by the RWQCB (Regional Water Quality Control Board), and to prepare and submit a SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan) to be administered throughout proposed project construction. The SWPPP would incorporate BMPs (Best Management Practices) to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The future development of a new automobile dealership would not change the existing drainage pattern of the site significantly since the lot is currently covered with the existing building and surface parking lot. All subsequent runoff would be conveyed via streets and gutters to storm drain locations around the project site. Development of the proposed project would not require any substantial changes to the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area, nor would it significantly affect the capacity of the existing storm drain system. In addition, in accordance with Chapter 13.42, of the Glendale Municipal Code, a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) containing design

features and BMPs to reduce post-construction pollutants in stormwater discharges would be required as part of the project. Impacts are considered to be less than significant as a result of the conditions and measures required by the NPDES permit, SWPPP and SUSMP.

**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.** Please refer to Response J-3(i) above.

**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(i) above.

With respect to water quality, as described above in Response J-1 and J-5, with implementation of BMPs mandated by the MS4 (municipal separate storm sewer systems) permit, SWQMP, and construction-related NPDES permit, water quality impacts associated with project construction and operation would be less than significant.

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

- iv) ***impede or redirect flood flows?***

**Less than Significant Impact.** According to Plate P-2 by the City's Safety Element, the project site is not located within a Dam Inundation Zone that would be inundated during the failure of an up-gradient water reservoir or dam. Additionally, FEMA Flood Maps do not identify the project site to be located within a 100-year flood zone. The project site is located with flood Zone X with a 0.2-percent annual chance of flooding or a 1-percent annual chance of flooding with an average depth of less than one foot. Therefore, less than significant flood related impacts would occur in association with construction and operation of the project.

**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.** Seiches are typically caused when strong winds and rapid changes in atmospheric pressure push water from one end of a body of water to the other, causing the water to oscillate back and forth for hours or even days. The proposed project site is not located downslope of any large body of water that would produce a seiche. 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?***

***Less Than Significant Impact.*** The project site is not located within a mapped groundwater basin. The project would be required to comply with the Phase 1 MS4 permit requiring runoff to be treated using low impact development (LID) treatment controls, such as bio-treatment facilities and other hydro-modification features, to improve stormwater quality, and NPDES requiring the development and implementation of a SWPPP, which describes BMPs to control erosion and water quality. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact as it would not conflict with a water quality control plan or a sustainable groundwater management plan.

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

K. **LAND USE AND PLANNING**

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

1) ***Physically divide an established community?***

***No Impact.*** The project site is currently developed with the Honda automobile dealership including ancillary buildings and a surface parking lot. The project is the demolition of four existing buildings associated with a dealership and the construction of a new automobile dealership building. The project site is surrounded by one-, two- and three-story commercial and multi-family residential development to the west. The proposed project involves the development of a two-story building, which will include a sales floor, service bays, a car wash and parts and car storage. The site is located on the "Brand Boulevard of Cars" and is zoned CA (Commercial Auto), which encourages automobile dealerships and their associated uses. 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?***

***Less Than Significant 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, as well as the zoning standards contained in the CA zone, with one exception. The applicant is requesting a Parking Reduction Permit to provide a total of 90 on-site parking spaces, including 29 surface parking spaces and 61 rooftop parking spaces where 235 parking spaces are required per code for the development of the new vehicle inventory parking structure. Approval of the requested parking reduction in parking will not be detrimental to the surrounding neighborhood because the proposed project is to construct a new automobile dealership and associated parking structure primarily to be used for vehicle

inventory and additional inventory parking is proposed on the surface parking lot. The basis for the parking reduction permit is that sufficient parking will be provided on-site to meet the parking demand of the new Honda dealership. The proposed project would comply with applicable land use plans, policies and regulations as the Parking Reduction Permit process is part of the existing zoning regulations applicable to the proposed project. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur,

**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
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 1992). 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**

<i>Would the project:</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	

<i>Would the project:</i>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
2. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			<b>X</b>	
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?				<b>X</b>

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 demolition of the existing Honda automobile dealership buildings to allow for the construction of a new two-story building and associated parking structure for the same use. The new building includes a showroom, service bays, and parts and car storage, a service canopy; the existing carwash will remain along the west side of the property. The new building is proposed to be enclosed, which will significantly reduce the operational noise associated with the existing dealership. Surrounding land uses include commercial uses along Brand Boulevard, and multi-family buildings across the alley to the west. Activities associated with the new automobile dealership will be similar to existing – vehicles being taken out for test drives, and/or vehicle sales, vehicle service, and incidental carwash for Honda patrons only. These activities will take place during the dealership’s normal operating hours. Long-term operation of the proposed project would have a minimal effect on the noise environment in proximity to the project site above the existing conditions. As shown in the City’s Noise Element, the existing Honda dealership site is located in an area identified as being in two noise contours. The easterly portion of the project site is located in the 70dB and over noise contour, and the westerly portion is located in the 65-70 dB noise contour. While there are portions of the building that are not fully enclosed, it is located a minimum of 30 feet away from the adjacent residential uses. Also, the parking structure will be used primarily for vehicle inventory and customer parking is proposed in the surface parking lot as well as on the roof of the structure. The project is not anticipated to generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element because the project would be constructed to reduce interior noise to acceptable levels as required by the building code. Construction associated with the project will be required to comply with the City of Glendale Noise Ordinance (GMC Chapter 8.36), which prohibits construction activities between the hours of 7:00 PM on one date and 7:00 AM of the next day or from 7:00pm on Saturday to 7:00 AM on Monday or from 7:00 PM preceding a holiday. No significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measure:** No Mitigation measures are required.

2) **General 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. Thus, significant vibration impacts would not occur.

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

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

- 3) ***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**

<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

- 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)?***

**No Impact.** The proposed project involves the demolition of the existing Honda automobile dealership buildings to allow development of a larger dealership building. The project does not include any residential uses and would not result in new population growth in the City. Any indirect growth occurring as a result of employees relocating to the area would be inconsequential such that impacts would be less than significant, since the construction jobs resulting from the proposed project would be temporary lasting approximately 12 months. Since the project site is located within an urban area and is currently served by existing circulation and utility infrastructure, no major extension of infrastructure is required as part of the proposed project. According to the applicant, during construction, operational personnel will be approximately 75, however, it will increase by approximately 20 additional employees after construction. The project is consistent with the zoning and land use designation and therefore, is not considered growth inducing. No impacts would occur.

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

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

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

**No Impact.** Please refer to Response N-1 above. No impacts would occur.

O. **PUBLIC SERVICES**

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

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 0.3 miles northeast from the project site. In the event that Fire Station No. 22 is not available, other units would be available for dispatch from GFD fire stations or adjacent jurisdictions.

The project will be required to comply with the Uniform Fire Code, including installation of fire sprinklers, and to submit plans to the Glendale Fire Department at the time building plans are submitted for approval. Therefore, compliance with the applicable Fire Code and the Building Code provisions would minimize the project's impact on fire services. The future development of the new

Honda auto dealership will be required to meet all code provisions. As a result, the proposed project would be adequately served by existing fire stations and would not require the provision of any new fire stations or the expansion of existing fire stations. Therefore, the overall need for fire protection services is not expected to substantially increase. 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 1.7 miles northeast from the subject property. The proposed project will intensify the on-site commercial uses as a result of the large dealership building. The site is located in an urban, developed area of the City. The additional commercial activity that this project will bring is anticipated to have less than significant impact to Police services. The project can be adequately served by the existing police protections service and is not anticipated to result in substantial adverse impacts. The overall need for police protection services is not expected to substantially increase as a result of the proposed project, and therefore there will be no need to provide new or physically altered Police facilities to maintain acceptable services ratios, response times or performance objectives. No significant impacts are anticipated.

**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 Pursuant to Section 65995, the project applicant is required to pay school impact fees to the Glendale Unified School District based on the current feet schedule prior to the issuance of building permits. Payment of the school impact fees would mitigate any indirect impacts to a less than significant level.

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

**d) Parks?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not involve the development or displacement of a park. The subject property is zoned CA (Commercial Automobile), 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 commercial nature of the use. In accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the project applicant will be required to pay the Development Impact feet to the city based on the current fee schedule prior to the issuance of building permits. Payment of the impact would result in less than significant impact to park facilities.

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

**e) Other public facilities?**

**No Impact.** The subject site is presently developed with the Honda automobile dealership. The project is the demolition of the existing automobile dealership buildings and the construction of a new Honda automobile dealership building. The lots surrounding this site are developed with similar



commercial facilities and multi-family residential buildings. The project site can be adequately served by existing public facilities. No impacts will occur.

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

**P. RECREATION**

<i>Would the project:</i>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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 automobile uses. The potential demand for new parks, or increased maintenance and additional improvements at existing parks, would be minimal due to the commercial nature of the use. The incremental increase of commercial space 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.

As discussed in Response O-1(d), the project applicant will be required to pay the City’s Park and Library Development Impact Fee to provide for park and recreational facilities based on the current fee schedule for residential development prior to the issuance of building permit. Payment of the impact fees would result in a less than significant impact to park and recreational facilities.

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

- 2) ***Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As indicated in Response P-1 above, the project is not anticipated to significantly 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**

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

**1) Conflict with program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** Construction activities for the proposed project would generate additional traffic as a result of employee vehicle trips and construction trucks transporting equipment and building material during construction period. The increase in day time traffic is not considered substantial since the construction phase is short-term, approximately 18-24 months and will not exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system. No changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the project

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

The proposed project does not conflict with any program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities as increase in the number of vehicles using the area streets resulting from the project is anticipated to create a less than significant impact. The project site will be served by South Brand Boulevard, Magnolia Avenue and West Cypress Street, adjacent to the subject site. South Brand Boulevard is a Major Arterial street and Magnolia Avenue and West Cypress Street are local streets, and are able to accommodate the traffic generated with the addition of the proposed project. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

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

**2) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, (b) contains the criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts. Subjection (1) sets forth the criteria for Land Use Projects. It states that vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a

significant impact. Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area compared to existing conditions should be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact. As discussed above in Response Q-1, the proposed project would not result in any significant increase in traffic on the area roadway network, would not exceed applicable thresholds for VMTs, and therefore will not conflict with and would be consistent with this Guidelines. Less than significant impact would occur.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As discussed in Q-1 above, the proposed project would not result in any significant increase in traffic on the area roadway network. A Construction Traffic Control plan approved by the Glendale Public Works Department will be required prior to construction. The plan is required to identify all traffic control measures, signs and delineators to be implemented by the construction contractor. The plan will also identify contractor information, hours of construction, construction worker parking information, as well as the proposed haul route(s). There would not be any access by the general public to the construction site and the disposal of demolition materials and export of soil/material will not interfere with public streets with implementation of an approved traffic control plan. In addition, the proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing roadway network. No significant impacts would occur.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing street networks or to existing emergency response plans. As indicated in Section Q-1 above, a traffic control plan will be required for the construction phase of the project. The plan will be reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Division to ensure that emergency access is not impacted during construction. As a result, less than significant impacts to emergency access are anticipated.

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

**R. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

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

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

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 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 with Mitigation Incorporated.*** Written notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (FTBMI), Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, and Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by any tribal government within the 30-days of notice.

As indicated in Response E-3 above, impacts would be potentially significant if human remains are encountered during excavation and grading activities. State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then serve as a consultant on how to proceed with the remains (i.e., avoid removal or reburial). Mitigation measure MM-1 and MM-2 identified above (page 2 of this MND) would reduce any potential substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** Refer to mitigation measures MM1 and MM2 above (page 2 of this MND).

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

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** As mentioned previously, no known burial sites are known to exist within the vicinity of the project site and surrounding area. In addition, 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 FTBMI, Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, and Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe 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. With the implementation of mitigation measures MM-1 and MM-2, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

**Mitigation Measures:** Mitigation measure MM-1 and MM-2 identified above (page 2 of this MND) would address a potential substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.

**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

**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.** Under Section 401 of the CWA, the RWQCB issues NPDES permits to regulate waste discharged to "waters of the nation," which includes reservoirs, lakes, and their tributary waters. Waste discharges include discharges of stormwater and construction related discharges. Construction projects are also required to prepare a SWPPP. In addition, the proposed project would be required to submit an SUSMP to mitigate urban stormwater runoff. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant would be required to satisfy the requirements related to the payment of fees and/or the provisions of adequate wastewater facilities. The proposed project would comply with the RWQCB's established waste discharge prohibitions and water quality objectives,

which will be incorporated into the proposed project as a project design feature. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

**2) *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 and therefore, are not considered to result in a significant impact on the existing water system or available water supplies.

Future water demand in the city is based on projected development contained in the General Plan. The total water demand in 2020 in the City of Glendale is expected to be 28,182 acre feet per year (afy) with a total available supply of 39,540 afy.

**Normal Weather Conditions**

The City of Glendale has identified an adequate supply of water to meet future city demands under normal conditions. As indicated in the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, a surplus exists that provides a reasonable buffer of approximately 1,500 to 2,500 afy of water. Future water demand in the city is based on projected development contained in the General Plan. For purposes of this assessment, the demand of the proposed project was assumed to have been included in this demand projection. Therefore, with the demand generated by the proposed project, there will be ample supply to meet remaining city demand under normal conditions.

**Dry Weather Conditions**

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

It is anticipated that during any 3-year drought, the city would have sufficient water supply to meet demand. According to the 2020 Urban Water Management Plan, the city would use less MWD water supplies in the future compared to its current use. With the city's reduction of dependency on imported water from MWD, GWP has a higher level of reliability in meeting water demands during drought conditions. Even with the additional demand generated by the proposed project, there is sufficient supply to meet city demand under drought conditions.

The proposed project will be required to comply with the provisions of Glendale's Mandatory Water Conservation Ordinance, as well as the 2016 California Green Building Standards (CAL Green) of the Glendale Green Building Code and the water conserving fixture and fittings requirements per the current California Plumbing Code. All new buildings must utilize higher efficiency plumbing fixtures (low-flush toilets, low-flow showerheads and faucets) and automatic irrigation system controllers

based on water or soil moisture, and demonstrate an indoor net reduction in the consumption of potable water.

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

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

- 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?***

**No Impact.** Sewage from the City of Glendale is treated by the City of Los Angeles Hyperion System, which includes the Los Angeles/Glendale Water Reclamation Plant (LAGWRP), located outside the Glendale City limits in Los Angeles, and the Hyperion Treatment Plant, located in Playa del Rey. The City of Glendale and the City of Los Angeles jointly own and share operating capacity of LAGWRP. The City of Glendale entered into an amalgamated treatment and disposal agreement (Amalgamated Agreement) with the City of Los Angeles, which eliminates entitlements and reduces limitations on the amount of sewage discharged into the Hyperion system. Any City of Glendale sewage not treated at the LAGWRP is treated at the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP).

The HTP has a dry-weather design capacity of 450 million gpd and is currently operating below that capacity, at 362 million gpd. As a result, adequate capacity exists to treat the proposed project-generated effluent. Therefore, the proposed project would not require the expansion or construction of sewage treatment facilities. No impact would result with regard to impacts to the available sewage treatment capacity.

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

- 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 City of Glendale is closely monitoring SB 1383 compliance dates, and as a result, will be making significant changes to its solid waste program in order to comply with this regulation. The new result of these changes, and compliance with SB 1383, is expected to increase the life of the landfill due to a significant amount of previously disposed organics being diverted to organics process facilities. The City of Glendale's Zero Waste Action Plan (2011) contains zero waste policies to increase its diversion rate from landfills and incinerators from 61% in 2009 to 70% by 2015 of current disposal tonnage of the 262,058 tons per year, and if feasible, 90% by 2025. The year 2025 was selected as a target year because this is approximately when the landfill at Scholl Canyon is scheduled to close. By diverting more materials, the life of the existing landfill could be extended significantly, particularly if the communities that share Scholl Canyon implement similar Zero Waste resource management initiatives. Waste reduction strategies within this plan require new buildings to comply with the 2016 CALGreen Code, as well as promote Green Building Policy that provides incentives for construction materials that are more durable, have a longer lifespan, require no additional finishing on-site, have less frequent maintenance and repair cycles, and give credits for projects made from recycled content. Given the foregoing, the Project

will not generate solid waste in excess of local standards or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. As a result, less than significant impacts would occur.

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

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

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

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

**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

**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 show 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, the project site is not located within a LRA and is not located near a SRA or 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, the 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. The City's Fire Prevention staff reviewed the project and provided general comments in their memo dated May 22, 2021. Impacts 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 would be less than significant.

**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, the 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**

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Does the project have the potential to substantially 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			X	

<i>Would the project:</i>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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)?				
3. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			<b>X</b>	

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

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

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

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As detailed throughout this Initial Study, the proposed project does not exceed any significant thresholds or result in significant impacts in the environmental categories typically associated with indirect or direct effects to human beings, such as aesthetics, agriculture,

biological resources, energy, geology/soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use, mineral resources, population/housing, public service, recreation, transportation utilities/service systems, or wildfire. Less than significant impact would occur.

### 13. Earlier Analyses

None

### 14. Project References Used to Prepare Initial Study Checklist

One or more of the following references were incorporated into the Initial Study by reference, and are available for review in the 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 on March 24, 2021.
2. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Open Space and Conservation Element," January 1993.
3. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Noise Element," May 2007. Open Space and Conservation Element," January 1993.
4. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Safety Element," August 2003.
5. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Recreation Element," April 1996.
6. City of Glendale Municipal Code, as amended.
7. "City of Glendale and Glendale Housing Authority Guidelines for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as Amended, and the State CEQA Guidelines, as Amended," November 1, 2016, City of Glendale Planning Division.
8. Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq and California Code of Regulations, Title 14 Section 15000 et seq.
9. "CEQA Air Quality Handbook," April, 1993, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
10. South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning* (May 2005).
11. California Department of Conservation, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program*, Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2010 (September 2011).
12. California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, *Special Publication 42* (Revised 1997, Supplements 1 and 2 added 1999).
13. California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, *State of California General Plan Guidelines* (2017).
14. City of Glendale, "Green Glendale Plan" (March 27, 2012).
15. City of Glendale, "Zero Waste Action Plan" (2011).
16. California Emissions Estimator Module (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) Report.