



PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Pacific BMW Dealership Expansion
901 – 919 South Brand Boulevard

<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>	
Project Title/Common Name:	Pacific BMW Dealership Expansion
Project Location:	901 – 919 South Brand Boulevard (Also 112-118 West Garfield Avenue & 119 West Acacia Avenue) Glendale, Los Angeles County
<p>Project Description:</p> <p>The applicant is proposing to construct a new 5-story, 171,140 square-foot above-ground parking structure with rooftop parking on an existing 81,148 square-foot Project site located in the CA (Commercial Auto) Zone. The proposed Project involves the demolition of the existing surface parking lot, an existing 561 square-foot accessory building (relocated to the site in 1964) and removal of existing solar panel structures that will be relocated to the rooftop of the new structure. The new parking structure will feature 450 parking spaces and is proposed for vehicle inventory for the Pacific BMW Car Dealership. The subject property is located in a high-quality transit corridor and under the provisions of Assembly Bill (AB) 2097 is eligible for parking relief in conjunction with the development of the proposed vehicle inventory parking structure.</p> <p>The Project site consists of six lots and is irregularly shaped with frontage on South Brand Boulevard, West Acacia Avenue, and West Garfield Avenue. There are currently three detached commercial buildings on the Project site: a one-story, 18,367 square-foot building originally constructed in 1924 (901 South Brand Boulevard), a one-story 9,192 square-foot building originally constructed in 1964 (915 South Brand Boulevard), and a one-story 561 square-foot accessory building that was relocated to the site in 1964 (919 South Brand Boulevard) that is proposed to be demolished.</p> <p><u>Discretionary Permits:</u></p> <p>Development of the proposed Project will require design approval from the Design Review Board for the new construction.</p>	
Project Type:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private Project <input type="checkbox"/> Public Project
Project Applicant:	Robert Plant 1206 Via La Mesa San Clemente, CA 92672
Findings:	The Director of Community Development, on May 22, 2024 , after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Division, found that the above referenced Project would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be prepared.
Mitigation Measures:	See attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
Attachments:	Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Vista Ezzati, Senior Planner

	City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 937-8180
--	---

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

The following mitigation measure shall apply to the proposed Pacific BMW dealership expansion Project located at 901-919 South Brand Boulevard to reduce identified impacts to less than significant levels.

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

TCR - 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 archaeologist meeting the Secretary of Interior standards, retained by the Project applicant, shall assess the find. Work on the portions of the Project's outside buffer may continue during this assessment period. The Fernandefio Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (FTBMI) shall be contacted regarding any pre-contact and/or post-contact finds and be provided information after the archaeologist makes their initial assessment of the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment.

Monitoring Action: Site inspection

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

Responsibility: Qualified archaeologist retained by the Project applicant

TCR - 2 The Lead Agency and applicant shall, in good faith, consult with the FTBMI on the disposition and treatment of any Tribal Cultural Resource encountered during the Project.

Monitoring Action: Site inspection

Timing: During all site preparation and construction activities

Responsibility: Director of Community Development; Project applicant



INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Pacific BMW Dealership Expansion
901 – 919 South Brand Boulevard

1.	Project Title: Pacific BMW Dealership Expansion
2.	Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Glendale Community Development Department Planning Division 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	Contact Person and Phone Number: Vista Ezzati, Senior Planner Tel: (818) 937-8180
4.	Project Location : 901 – 919 South Brand Boulevard (Also 112-118 West Garfield Avenue & 119 West Acacia Avenue) Glendale, Los Angeles County
5.	Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Robert Plant 1206 Via La Mesa San Clemente, CA 92672 Tel: (949) 280-3411
6.	General Plan Designation: Community Services Commercial
7.	Zoning: CA – Commercial Auto Zone
	<p>Description of the Project: The applicant is proposing to construct a new 5-story, 171,140 square-foot above-ground parking structure with rooftop parking on an existing 81,148 square-foot Project site located in the CA-Commercial Auto Zone. The proposed Project involves the demolition of the existing surface parking lot, an existing 561 square-foot accessory building (relocated to the site in 1964) and removal of existing solar panel structures that will be relocated to the rooftop of the new structure. The new parking structure will feature 450 parking spaces and is proposed for vehicle inventory for the Pacific BMW Car Dealership. The subject property is located in a high-quality transit corridor and under the provisions of Assembly Bill (AB) 2097 is eligible for parking relief in conjunction with the development of the proposed vehicle inventory parking structure.</p> <p>The Project site consists of six lots and is irregularly shaped with frontage on South Brand Boulevard, West Acacia Avenue, and West Garfield Avenue. There are currently three detached commercial buildings on the Project site: a one-story, 18,367 square-foot building originally constructed in 1924 (901 South Brand Boulevard), a one-story 9,192 square-foot building originally constructed in 1964 (915 South Brand Boulevard), and the one-story 561 square-foot accessory building that was relocated to the site in 1964 (919 South Brand Boulevard).</p> <p><u>Discretionary Permits:</u></p> <p>Development of the proposed Project will require design approval from the Design Review Board for the new construction.</p>
9.	Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: <u>North:</u> Vehicle Dealership (Nissan) and Multi-Family Residential Development

<p><u>South:</u> Storage facility, Vehicle Rental (Hertz) and Multi-Family Residential Development</p> <p><u>East:</u> Vehicle Dealership (Chrysler/Dodge/Jeep/Ram)</p> <p><u>West:</u> Multi-family Residential Development</p>
<p>10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).</p> <p>None.</p>

11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

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

LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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



May 22, 2024

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.



5/22/24

Director of Community Development: _____

Date: _____

A. AESTHETICS

<i>Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
3. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X	
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) 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 public accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is located in an urbanized area, on the west side of South Brand Boulevard between West Garfield Avenue and West Acacia Avenue in the CA (Commercial Auto) zone. The CA zone is primarily designed as a district that promotes the maintenance and expansion of vehicle dealerships, although alternative complementary commercial uses are permitted. This site is part of the Pacific BMW Dealership whose main office is located approximately one block north at 800 South Brand Boulevard. The site currently features the Pacific BMW Collision Center and operations on-site include vehicle and auto body repair, vehicle service, as well as some retail sales. The southern portion of the site proposed for the parking structure currently features a surface parking lot with three solar panel structures and a 561 square-foot accessory building (relocated to the site in 1964). Development of the site will result in demolition of the accessory building and the solar panel structures will be removed and relocated to the rooftop of the new above ground parking structure. The new parking structure will be 45'-6" in overall height and is 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 existing dealership building located on the corner (901 South Brand Boulevard, built in 1924) and the existing service garage (915 South Brand Boulevard, built in 1964 and expanded in 1981) will not be altered as part of the project. The site is surrounded by commercial and residential development. The project will be reviewed by the Design Review Board (DRB) with regard to the site planning, mass and scale, architecture, materials, and landscaping to ensure the project's design is compatible with the surrounding built environment. Impacts to visual character are anticipated to be less than significant since the proposed Project complies with objective standards and will be further reviewed for consistency by the DRB.

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 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 downwards 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. 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) 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.

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), 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

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

No Impact. There is no existing zoning of forest land or timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production 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 forest land 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

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

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
2. 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) 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 2022 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which includes a variety of strategies and control measures.

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

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

Population growth associated with the proposed Project is included in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) projects for growth in the City of Glendale. The proposed Project is for vehicle inventory for an existing car dealership where it will replace an existing surface parking lot also used for vehicle inventory, and as a result the proposed Project does not result in population and housing growth that would cause growth in Glendale to exceed the SCAG forecast, because the Project will not result in an increase in school enrollment and is consistent with the General Plan and therefore is included in SCAG’s growth projections. Consequently, implementation of the proposed Project would be consistent with AQMP attainment forecasts. Therefore, 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. The California Air Pollution Control Officer’s Associate (CAPCOA) recommends the use of the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) to calculate and organize emissions data for new development projects. An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Technical Study was prepared for the project by Meridian Consultants, dated June 2022. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0) was used to estimate air quality impacts during the

construction and operation stages of the proposed Project. CalEEMod is a program that relies on project-specific information pertaining to geographic setting utility service provision, construction scheduling and equipment inventory, and operational design features to generate estimates of air pollutant and GHG emissions. Results from the model indicate that the proposed Project would not exceed thresholds for construction, area, or operational impacts. A summary of the results and the Meridian Consultants report is attached. No significant impacts are anticipated. Based on the model run, construction of the proposed Project would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds of significance for construction.

Area sources emissions are generated during the consumption of natural gas for space and water heating devices, by natural gas fireplaces, and during the operation of gasoline-powered landscape maintenance equipment and use of consumer products (e.g., hair spray, deodorants, lighter fluid, air fresheners, automotive products, and household cleaners). Mobile source emissions would be generated by a motor vehicle traveling to and from the Project site.

Area and mobile source emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Module (CalEEMod version 2020.4.0). The Project's land uses were entered into the model to estimate area source emissions. It was assumed that all buildings would combust natural gas, which is a conservative estimate since no uses using natural gas are proposed as part of the proposed Project. Based on the California Emissions Estimator Module (CalEEMod version 2020.4.0) model run, the proposed Project would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds of significance for construction or operations. The project will also be subject to the City's recently adopted reach codes, which pertains to the complete electrification of new construction buildings. This requirement would further reduce emissions in the model run that assumes the use of natural gas. Compliance with these reach codes and the associated improvements would not be required for the existing buildings that are proposed to remain and they can continue operating as-is. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact: The Air Quality and GHG Technical Study prepared by Meridian Consultants evaluated both construction and operational emissions that would be generated by the project and that could affect nearby existing sensitive receptors. As indicated in the model run performed for this Project and indicated in the technical study provided, no construction or operational emissions would exceed SCAQMD thresholds, and therefore, would not expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration. The standards for when a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) is provided in California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) Guidance Document. According to those guidelines, there are two types of projects which may require a health risk assessment to be conducted. The first type of project, known as Type A, or new sources, is a project that can cause an adverse health impact on people already living or working nearby.

Type A project examples (project impacts receptors):

- Combustion related power plants,
- Gasoline dispensing facilities,
- Asphalt batch plants,
- Warehouse distribution centers,
- Quarry operations, and
- Other stationary sources that emit toxic substances.

The second type of project is known as Type B, such as a new residential development project, which will be located in an area that can cause adverse health impacts to those residents. Recently, the California Supreme Court ruled that lead agencies are not required by CEQA to analyze the impact of the existing environmental conditions on a project's future uses, as a Type B project. It is the lead agency's discretion to determine whether a Type B project shall be required to prepare a health risk assessment. The following discussion assumes that a potential health impact is recognized and a health risk assessment may be considered by the lead agency. Because the project is not either a Type A or B

project, an HRA is not required. Further, the above ground parking garage is for vehicle inventory where the majority of the vehicles in the garage would be parked long term and removed periodically for test drives and other vehicle dealership functions. In addition, the use on the project site currently exists as a vehicle dealership and the Project is only proposing an above ground structure to support the dealership in providing more area for vehicle inventory associated with sales. Therefore, impacts associated with exposing sensitive receptors are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activity associated with the proposed Project 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. Therefore, less than significant construction related odor impacts are anticipated to occur from the proposed Project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

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

No Impact. The proposed Project is located in an area that has been 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 heavily urbanized for many years. No riparian habitat and/or other sensitive natural communities are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present on or adjacent to the Project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The Glendale Municipal Code, Chapter 12.44 specifically protects six different native or "indigenous" species of trees that include the Coast Live Oak, Valley Oak, Mesa Oak, Scrub Oak, California Sycamore, and California Bay. No indigenous trees are located on or within 20 feet of the Project site and implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No Mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. The Project site consists of six lots and is irregularly shaped with frontage on South Brand Boulevard, West Acacia Avenue, and West Garfield Avenue. There are currently three detached commercial buildings on the Project site: a one-story, 18,367 square-foot building originally constructed in 1924 (901 South Brand Boulevard), a one-story 9,192 square-foot building originally constructed in 1964 and expanded by 5,000 square feet in 1981 (915 South Brand Boulevard), and a one-story, 561 square-foot building, originally constructed in 1921, that was relocated to the site in 1964 and remodeled and enlarged (919 South Brand Boulevard). There are four solar panel structures that were built in 2015 over the surface parking lot that will be removed and relocated to the roof of the new parking structure. A detached canopy structure that was originally built in 1968 along the West Garfield Avenue frontage and the building addressed at 919 South Brand Boulevard will be demolished as part of the Project. The existing buildings are not currently listed on the Glendale Register of Historic Resources, the California Register of Historic Resources, or the National Register of Historic Places. The existing buildings, with the exception of the building located at 901 South Brand Boulevard, are not identified as eligible for listing at the local, state, or national level.

The building at 901 South Brand Boulevard was identified in the 2019 South Glendale Community Plan Historic Resource Survey as individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation (California Historic Resource Status Code 5S3). This building will remain as part of the Project, and the new above-ground parking structure will be set back a minimum of 5.5 inches from this building. At the northeast corner of the new garage, a notch will be cut out of the structure’s rectangular volume that will create a break between the new and old buildings. For a width of about 19 feet, the garage façade will be setback approximately 16 feet from the property line to maintain visibility of the older building’s clay tile roof and relieve the massing at the street wall.

901 S. Brand was built in 1924 as a showroom and shop building for the Court Motor Company, a dealership for Cadillac automobiles. Court’s original showroom at 228 N. Brand was built in 1922. It either moved or expanded to 234 N. Brand sometime soon after, before moving to its final home at the subject property. In 1927, Court changed ownership and began selling Lincoln Motor Co. products. In

1935 it became a Packard dealership and remained so until the building was vacated after the company stopped producing cars in 1942 to focus on the war effort.

The South Glendale Historic Resources Survey found the building locally significant under Glendale Register of Historic Resources Criterion 1 as an example of commercial development along Brand Boulevard representing a significant and early period of growth in the city. The survey also notes the building's association with the grouping of car dealerships established along Brand Boulevard, starting near the intersection with Colorado Street and then moving southward to larger lots such as the subject site by the mid-1920s. Another identified historic building is located at the south end of the same block. The former Bekins storage building, a seven-story concrete structure at 929 S. Brand, dates to 1929 and was identified in the same survey as eligible for the Glendale Register for its identification with the city's early commercial growth and for the quality of its Art Deco design. A separate parcel is located between this building and the project site.

The Project will be adjacent to the south side of 901 S. Brand but will not affect any of the historic building's character-defining features identified in the survey, which include: simple, one-story massing; brick masonry; clay tile-clad mansard roof at the east façade; bow-truss roof with monitors; large display windows at the showroom portion and steel sash at the shop portion; cast pilasters and architrave at the storefront openings; and the cast cornice below the mansard roof. The proposed garage has four internal levels, along with parking on the roof deck. It will be approximately 22-feet higher than the high point of the historic building's Brand Boulevard façade (which is 23 feet high at the ridge of the mansard roof. Such a height differential is reflective of the street's historic development pattern, which features low-rise, one- and two-story commercial development occasionally adjoined by taller buildings such as the Bekins, Masonic Temple, Security Trust, and Glendale Federal Buildings.

The Project has been designed to relate to both its lower adjoining neighbor and the taller Bekins building at the other end of the block. The garage features a recessed façade and open stairwell at its northeast corner abutting the historic dealership building. This provides massing relief at the dealership's front façade, establishes a break in the street wall between the two buildings, and maintains visibility of the south return of the historic building's mansard roof. The structural expression of the garage's vertical piers and the notched corners of each pier reflect the Bekins design, while the horizontal rhythm of the structural bays is based on the mix of narrower and wider bays seen at the historic dealership building. The east (front), north (street side), and west (rear) facades of the historic building, which are the locations of its character-defining features, will remain completely visible from the street, as will the bow-truss roof and monitors. The garage will largely block the visibility of the dealership's south façade, which was previously altered with stucco cladding over the original brick and three non-original door and window openings - therefore, no character-defining features will be obscured by the new construction.

The Project is assessed under the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation due to its adjacency to the historic building as follows:

1. *A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.*
 - The building will retain its commercial use and also its association with the car dealerships of South Brand Boulevard.
2. *The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The historic appearance and character of the property will be retained and no character defining features will be significantly affected.

3. *Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.*

- No changes are proposed to the building.

4. *Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.*

- Not applicable.

5. *Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.*

- All distinctive features and historic fabric will be retained.

6. *Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*

- Not applicable.

7. *Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.*

- Not applicable.

8. *Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.*

- Not applicable.

9. *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

- The construction of the adjacent garage will not destroy any character-defining materials or features. The new structure will be clearly differentiated from the dealership building but is designed in a manner to complement the context of the block, which features two identified historic buildings. The height (45.5') and massing of the garage will obviously be greater than the adjacent one-story building (23') but this does not make it incompatible in a portion of the city where similar or greater disparities of scale are not uncommon, even at sites with identified or designated historic resources.

10. *New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

- The proposed garage structure will not be physically attached to the historic building and if it were ever demolished, the form, appearance, and historic integrity of the dealership building would remain intact.

The Project is also assessed for its potential effect on the historic integrity of 901 S. Brand using framework of the National Park Service's "7 Aspects of Integrity," as follows:

- The historic building will retain its integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association because the no work is proposed at the historic building.
- The building's setting as a corner property on a major commercial thoroughfare will remain, with its two primary frontages along Brand Boulevard and W. Garfield Street continuing to convey its significance as a 1920s automobile-related commercial property with large display windows facing the street. The presence of the new, taller garage structure will somewhat alter this setting, but it will not erase the clearly legible story this building helps tell about Glendale's commercial development and, in particular, South Brand Boulevard's century-long heritage as one of the region's premier destinations for automobile sales.

Based on this analysis, the building at 901 S. Brand Boulevard will remain eligible for listing in the Glendale Register of Historic Resources if the Project is built as proposed. While the new parking garage will be larger than the historic building, the Project's impact will be limited to a modest change to the historic setting and there will be no adverse change in the building's significance.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites are not known to exist within the Project area. The City's Open Space and Conservation Element indicate that no significant archaeological sites have been identified in this area of Glendale. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with proposed 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 California Public Resource Code PRC21083.2(i) and will require all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius 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 of this State regulatory requirement, 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. 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: No mitigation measures are required.

F. ENERGY

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

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 proposed 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 that for 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 proposed Project would involve consumption of electricity and natural gas; however, these resources are already consumed on the Project site because it is already developed with an existing vehicle dealership, and the Project is to construct a new above-ground parking structure. There would be an incremental increase in the consumption of these resources associated with Project operation but it would not represent unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of resources. The proposed 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). This will include compliance with the newly adopted reach codes pertaining to the complete electrification of new construction buildings and solar panel installation. Sustainable design strategies for the proposed parking structure would include energy-efficient light fixtures and lighting controls, and water-conserving plumbing fixtures. Additionally, the existing solar panel structures that are on-site will be relocated to the roof of the new parking structure. Given the foregoing, the Project's consumption of energy resources would be less than significant, as it would not represent unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of energy resources.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. As described above, the energy efficiency of the new parking structure would, at a minimum, comply with the California Energy Code and the California Building Code which requires new construction projects, such as this, to be fully electric. While not specifically applicable to the proposed Project, Senate Bill 350 sets ambitious 2030 targets for energy efficiency and renewable electricity, increasing California's renewable electricity procurement goal from 33 percent by 2020 to 50 percent by 2030. As described in Section F-1 above, the project would be subject to the City's recently adopted reach codes, which exceed the state's minimum requirements for energy use in construction and design and the existing solar panel structures will be relocated to the roof of the new parking structure. The un-used solar energy produced on-site will be transferred to the City's electrical grid which would assist the City in meeting its renewable energy portfolio. As such, the proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

The tables below show how the project will be compatible with the applicable sections of the Greener Glendale Plan as well as the Regional Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).

Project Consistency with Greener Glendale Plan	
Measure	Applicability
1. Expand applicability of green building standards to residential buildings over 3-stories.	No Conflict. The proposed Project does not include residential development. This measure does not apply. Nonetheless, the Project does include the development of a 5-story above ground parking structure that would be required to comply with the green building standards since they are already included in Glendale's building codes.
2. Exceed California Energy Code requirements by 15 percent.	No Conflict. The proposed parking structure would reduce consumption of electricity and natural gas by exceeding the California Energy Code requirements by 15 % because Glendale's building code already includes 15% above the California code.
3. Reduce baseline water usage by 20 percent.	No Conflict. The proposed parking structure would utilize minimal amounts of water since water-conserving fixtures such as irrigation control, will be installed. Furthermore, all landscaping proposed for the project will be drought tolerant.
4. A radian roof barrier shall be installed.	No Conflict. The proposed Project would include the development of a 5-story above ground parking structure for vehicle storage that is naturally ventilated.
5. Gas fired tankless water heaters shall have an energy factor of at least 0.80.	No Conflict. The proposed Project does not require or include gas-fired storage-type water heaters.
6. Gas-fired storage-tank type water heaters shall have an energy factor of at 0.61.	No Conflict. The proposed Project does not require or include gas-fired storage-type water heaters.
7. Buildings shall be "solar ready".	No Conflict. The proposed Project would include photovoltaic arrays on the roof of the parking structure.
8. At least 20 percent of certain paved areas in residential projects shall be permeable.	No Conflict. The proposed Project does not include residential development. This measure does not apply.
9. Residential gas-fired heating equipment shall be high efficiency units.	No Conflict. The proposed Project does not include residential development. This measure does not apply.
10. Residential air conditioning equipment shall be high-efficiency units.	No Conflict. The proposed Project does not include residential development. This measure does not apply.
11. Natural light ventilation in residential habitable room shall be increased.	No Conflict. The proposed Project does not include residential development. This measure does not apply.
12. New single-family dwellings with floor area greater than 5,000 square feet shall be	No Conflict. The proposed Project does not include residential development and this measure does not apply.

Project Consistency with Greener Glendale Plan

Measure

Applicability

required to meet CALGreen
Tier 1.

CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS 2020–2045 RTP/SCS	
Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis
Goal 1: Encourage regional economic prosperity and global competitiveness	No Conflict. This goal is directed towards SCAG and the City and would not apply to the proposed Project.
Goal 2: Improve mobility, accessibility, reliability, and travel safety for people and goods.	No Conflict. The Project site is located in an urbanized area in the City within one-half mile of a high-quality transit corridor.
Goal 3: Enhance the preservation, security, and resilience of the regional transportation system.	No Conflict. This goal is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.
Goal 4: Increase person and goods movement and travel choices within the transportation system.	No Conflict. This goal is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.
Goal 5: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality.	No Conflict. The proposed project includes the development of a 5-story above ground parking structure for vehicle inventory at an existing vehicle dealership that would create minimal trips. The location of the proposed Project promotes the use of a variety of transportation options, which includes walking, biking and the use of public transportation accessible to both customers and employees.
Goal 6: Support healthy and equitable communities.	No Conflict. The proposed project includes the development of a 5-story above ground parking structure for vehicle inventory at an existing vehicle dealership that would create minimal trips. The location of the proposed Project promotes the use of a variety of transportation options, which includes walking, biking and the use of public transportation accessible to both customers or employees.
Goal 7: Adapt to a changing climate and support an integrated regional development pattern in transportation network.	No Conflict. This goal is directed towards SCAG to support regional development pattern areas.
Goal 8: Leverage new transportation technologies and data-driven solutions that result in more efficient travel.	No Conflict. This goal is directed towards SCAG to leverage the use of new transportation technologies using data-driven solutions.
Goal 9: Encourage development of diverse housing types in areas that are supported by multiple transportation options.	No Conflict. The proposed Project does not include residential development. This measure does not apply.
Goal 10: Promote conservation of natural and agricultural lands and restoration of habitats.	No Conflict. The project is located in an urbanized development area on a site that is developed and is not in the vicinity of any natural or agricultural lands. This measure does not apply.

<p>Guiding Principle 1: Base transportation investments on adopted regional performance indicators and MAP-21/FAST Act regional targets.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This policy is directed towards SCAG in allocating transportation investments rather than individual development projects.</p>
<p>Guiding Principle 2: Place high priority for transportation funding in the region on projects and programs that improve mobility, accessibility, reliability and safety, and that preserve the existing transportation system.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This policy is directed towards SCAG in allocating transportation system funding. This measure does not apply.</p>
<p>Guiding Principle 3: Assure that land use and growth strategies recognize local input, promote sustainable transportation options, and support equitable and adaptable communities.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This policy is directed towards SCAG and the City and does not apply it to individual development projects. This measure does not apply.</p>
<p>Guiding Principle 4: Encourage RTP/SCS investments in strategies that collectively result in reduced non-recurrent congestion and demand for single occupancy vehicle use, by leveraging new transportation technologies and expanding travel choices.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This policy relates to SCAG goals in supporting investments and strategies to reduce congestion and the use of single occupancy vehicles. However, the proposed Project would support the policy as it is located within one-half mile of a high-quality transit corridor and within a Transit Priority Area (TPA) and would support public transportation and other alternative methods of transportation.</p>
<p>Guiding Principle 5: Encourage transportation investments that will result in improved air quality in public health, and reduced greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This policy is directed towards SCAG and governmental agencies to encourage and support transportation investments. This measure does not apply.</p>
<p>Guiding Principle 6: Monitor progress on all aspects of the plan, including the timely implementation of projects, programs, and strategies.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This policy is directed towards SCAG and the City and not does apply to the proposed Project.</p>
<p>Guiding Principle 7: Regionally, transportation investments should reflect best known science regarding climate change vulnerability, in order to design for long term resilience.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This policy is directed towards SCAG and governmental agencies to encourage and support transportation investments. This measure does not apply.</p>

**Core Vision Topic 1:
Sustainable Development**

Through our continuing efforts to better align transportation investments and land use decisions, we strive to improve mobility and reduce greenhouse gases by bringing housing, jobs and transit closer together.

No Conflict. The proposed Project would comply with CALGreen, and would incorporate eco-friendly building materials, systems and high-performance building envelopment. Additionally, the proposed Project would be designed and constructed to incorporate environmentally sustainable design features consistent with the Greener Glendale Plan.

Further, the proposed Project is within walking distance of existing commercial uses within a one half-mile of numerous bus routes.

**Core Vision Topic 2:
System Preservation and Resilience**

“Fix it First” has been a guiding principle for prioritizing transportation funding in the RTP for the last decade. The cost of rebuilding roadways is eight times more than preventative maintenance. Preservation of the transportation system can extend the pavement life in a cost effective manner and can also improve safety.

No Conflict. This core vision topic is directed towards SCAG to ensure the safety and security of the regional transportation system and to guide, encourage, and support transportation investments. This measure does not apply.

**Core Vision Topic 3:
Demand and System Management**

Better managing the existing transportation system through demand management strategies and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) yields significant mobility benefits in a cost-effective manner.

No Conflict. This core vision topic is directed towards public transportation investments and is not directly applicable to individual residential development projects. This measure does not apply.

Core Vision Topic 4: Transit Backbone

Expanding the transit network and fostering development in transit-oriented communities is central to the region’s plan for meeting mobility and sustainability goals while continuing to grow the regional economy.

No Conflict. This core vision topic is directed towards SCAG goals for the region. This measure does not apply.

**Core Vision Topic 5:
Complete Streets**

Creating “complete streets” that are safe and inviting to all roadway users is critical to increasing mobility choices, reducing traffic fatalities and serious injuries and meeting greenhouse gas reduction targets.

No Conflict. This core vision topic is directed toward SCAG and is not specifically applicable to the proposed Project. This measure does not apply.

**Core Vision Topic 6: Goods
Movement**

The efficient movement of goods is critical to a strong economy and improves quality of life in the SCAG region by providing jobs and access to markets through trade. However, increased volumes of goods moving across the transportation system contribute to greater congestion, safety concerns and harmful emissions. It is critical to integrate land use decisions and technological advancements to minimize environmental and health impacts while fostering continued growth in trade and commerce.

No Conflict. This core vision topic is directed toward SCAG and is not specifically applicable to the proposed Project. This measure does not apply.

Sustainable Community Strategy 1: Focus Growth Near Destinations and Mobility Options

Sustainable Community Strategy 1a: Emphasize land use patterns that facilitate multimodal access to work, educational and other destinations.

No Conflict. The proposed Project includes the development of an above ground parking structure for use as vehicle inventory at an existing vehicle dealership that is consistent with the existing land use pattern. The Project site is located within a one half-mile of numerous bus routes that can be utilized by both customers and employees.

Sustainable Community Strategy 1b: Focus on a regional jobs/housing balance to reduce commute times and distances and expand job opportunities near transit and along center-focused main streets

No Conflict. This strategy is directed toward SCAG and is not specifically applicable to the proposed Project. Nonetheless, the proposed Project includes the development of an above ground parking structure for use as vehicle storage at an existing car dealership that is located within a one half-mile of numerous bus routes.

Sustainable Community Strategy 1c: Plan for growth near transit investments and support implementation of first/last mile strategies

No Conflict. This strategy is directed toward SCAG and is not specifically applicable to the proposed Project. This measure does not apply.

<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 1d: Promote the redevelopment of underperforming retail developments and other outmoded nonresidential uses.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed toward SCAG and is not specifically applicable to the proposed Project. Nonetheless, the proposed Project includes the development of an above ground parking structure for use as vehicle inventory at an existing vehicle dealership.</p>
<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 1e: Prioritize infill and redevelopment of underutilized land to accommodate new growth, increase amenities and connectivity in existing neighborhoods.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and the City and does not apply to individual development projects. This measure does not apply.</p>
<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 1f: Encourage design and transportation options that reduce the reliance on number of solo car trips (this could include mixed uses or locating and orienting close to existing destinations).</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project site is located within a one-half mile of a high-quality transit corridor. Additionally, the proposed Project would involve the development of a new 5-story above ground parking garage for use as vehicle inventory at an existing vehicle dealership that would generate few new trips when compared to the existing development on the site. The location of the proposed Project has a variety of transportation options in close proximity such as public transit, walking and biking available to both employees and customers.</p>
<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 1g: Identify ways to “right size” parking requirements and promote alternative parking strategies (e.g. shared parking or smart parking).</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.</p>
<i>Sustainable Community Strategy 2: Promote Diverse Housing Choices</i>	
<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 2a: Preserve and rehabilitate affordable housing and prevent displacement.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.</p>
<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 2b: Identify funding opportunities for new workforce and affordable housing development.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG in identifying funding opportunities for affordable housing development and does not apply to individual development projects.</p>
<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 2c: Create incentives and reduce regulatory barriers for building context sensitive accessory dwelling units to increase housing supply.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.</p>

Sustainable Community Strategy 2d: Provide support to local jurisdictions to streamline and lessen barriers to housing development that supports reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.

Sustainable Community Strategy 3: Leverage Technology Innovations

Sustainable Community Strategy 3a: Promote low emission technologies such as neighborhood electric vehicles, shared rides hailing, car sharing, bike sharing and scooters by providing supportive and safe infrastructure such as dedicated lanes, charging and parking /drop off space.

No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.

Sustainable Community Strategy 3b: Improve access to services through technology such as telework and telemedicine as well as other incentives such as a “mobility wallet”, an app-based system for storing transit and other multi modal payments.

No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.

Sustainable Community Strategy 3c: Identify ways to incorporate “micro-power grids” in communities, for example solar energy, hydrogen fuel cell power storage and power generation.

No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.

Sustainable Community Strategy 4: Support Implementation of Sustainability Policies

Sustainable Community Strategy 4a: Pursue funding opportunities to support local sustainable development implementation projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.

<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 4b: Support statewide legislation that reduces barriers to new construction and that incentivizes development new transit corridors and stations.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.</p>
<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 4c: Support local jurisdictions in the establishment of Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts (EIFDs), Community Revitalization and Investment Authorities (CRIAs), or other tax increment or value capture tools to finance sustainable infrastructure and development projects, including parks and open space.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.</p>
<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 4d: Work with local jurisdictions/communities to identify opportunities and assess barriers to implement sustainability strategies.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.</p>
<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 4e: Enhance partnerships with other planning organizations to promote resources and best practices in the SCAG region.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.</p>
<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 4f: Continue to support long range planning efforts by local jurisdictions.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.</p>
<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 4g: Provide educational opportunities to local decision makers and staff on new tools, best practices and policies relating to implementing the Sustainable Communities Strategy.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.</p>

Sustainable Community Strategy 5: Promote a Green Region

<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 5a: Support development of local climate adaptation and hazard mitigation plans, as well as project implementation that improves community resiliency to climate change and natural hazards.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.</p>
<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 5b: Support local policies for renewable energy production, reduction of urban heat islands and carbon sequestration.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.</p>
<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 5c: Integrate local food production into the regional landscape.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.</p>
<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 5d: Promote more resource efficient development focus on conservation, recycling and reclamation.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.</p>
<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 5e: Preserve, enhance and restore regional wildlife connectivity.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.</p>
<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 5f: Reduce consumption of resource areas, including agricultural land.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.</p>
<p>Sustainable Community Strategy 5g: Identify ways to improve access to public park space.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This strategy is directed towards SCAG and does not apply to individual development projects.</p>

Source: SCAG, Connect SoCal, 2020–2045 RTP/SCS, September 2020.

Notes: Not Applicable—Actions/strategies are those that are not identified for implementation of local jurisdictions. The Project’s consistency with any actions/strategies identified for implementation by the local jurisdictions is assessed above.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

G. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

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 located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The closest active fault is the York Boulevard Fault, located 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. Therefore, impacts from the rupture of a seismic fault are considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

damage to buildings and ensure safety in the event of a moderate or major earthquake. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) Landslides?

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Construction activity associated with the proposed Project development 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 on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Less Than Significant Impact. Subsidence is the process of lowering the elevation of an area of the earth's surface that can be caused by tectonic forces deep within the earth or by consolidation and densification of sediments sometimes due to withdrawal of fluids such as groundwater. 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 fluid 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 in the proposed Project. The 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 geologic 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 above-ground parking structure, and there is no semi-subterranean or subterranean parking levels proposed. There will be approximately 1,750 cubic yards (CY) of grading for the Project for 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. As a result, less than significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

H. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth’s average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns and other elements of the earth’s climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels. Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution from increased formation of ground level ozone and particulate matter, ecosystem changes, increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects. 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.

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

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has prepared the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), which is part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Glendale has an adopted Greener Glendale Plan which meets regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by SCAG and adopted by the ARB. The Greener Glendale Plan uses land use development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, transportation measures and other policies that are determined to be feasible to reduce GHG. As detailed in Response F.2 above, the project will be compatible with the applicable sections of the Greener Glendale Plan as well as the RTP/SCS. The solar panels will generate energy that will be fed into the City's electrical grid, which would assist the City in meeting its renewable energy portfolio, a strategy specified in the Greener Glendale Plan to accomplish Objective E1, to increase the use of renewable energy citywide. As it relates to energy consumption, the relocation of the solar panels to the roof of the new parking structure will be consistent with this objective of the Greener Glendale Plan. Since this proposed Project is consistent with Greener Glendale Strategies to reduce GHGs and the SCS prepared by SCAG, the Project would result in a less than cumulatively considerable impact on GHG emissions.

CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064.7) provide that, when available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make determinations of significance for GHG emissions. Neither the City of Glendale nor the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has adopted specific thresholds of significance for impacts related to GHG emissions or global climate change. The SCAQMD did establish a working group that came up with recommended thresholds, which are utilized in this analysis.

The SCAQMD has released Interim CEQA GHG Significance Thresholds for Stationary Sources, Rules and Plans (December 2008), which includes a GHG emissions threshold of 10,000 metric tons (MT) of CO₂ equivalents (CO₂e) per year to determine the significance of industrial project GHG impacts. This is consistent with the threshold used by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District. A threshold of 3,000 MT CO₂e/year is also suggested for residential and commercial projects. SCAQMD recommends that GHG emissions from construction be amortized over 30 years and added to operational GHG emissions in order to determine the overall project impact.

Please note that CO₂e is the quantity of CO₂ that would cause the same level climate change as a give type and quantity of a GHG emission. This variation of effect between gases is also known as global warming potential (GWP). For example, one unit of methane emissions has the same GWP as 21 units of carbon dioxide. Therefore, one (1) metric ton of methane is equivalent to 21 metric tons of CO₂e. Emissions of multiple types of GHGs are represented collectively in units of CO₂e.

Construction Phase Impacts:

GHG emissions from construction occur as a result of fuel combustion in heavy duty off-road equipment. Construction activities would be temporary in nature. As described above, GHG emissions from construction are supposed to be amortized over a 30-year period and added to operational emissions to

determine significance. An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Technical Study was prepared for the project by Meridian Consultants, dated June 2022, and calculated GHG emissions using CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0. CalEEMod predicts that the project will generate 378 MT of CO₂e construction emissions total. Per SCAQMD methodologies, this total is divided by 30 and added to the operational GHG emissions presented in the operation phase section below.

Operation Related Impacts:

Once construction activities are complete, the only direct source of GHG emissions associated with the project will be from vehicles traveling to and from the site. Indirect emissions are included with direct emissions for the GHG impacts. Total operation phase GHG emissions are generated by project direct and indirect sources are 31.2 MT CO₂e/ year. This is well below the significance threshold of 3,000 MT CO₂e/year selected for the project. Therefore, impacts related to GHG emissions are anticipated to be less than significant.

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 F.2 and H.1 above, the proposed 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
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?				X
6. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
7. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project involves the construction of a parking structure, primarily for Pacific BMW automobile dealership inventory, as well as customer parking. Such uses do not generally involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of significant amounts of hazardous materials. No new hazardous materials will be generated at the site. All businesses within the City of Glendale, as mandated by the California Health and Safety Code Chapter 6.95, are required to file a Hazardous Material Business Plan (HMBP) with the Glendale Fire Department. The HMBP covers the use and storage of all regulated hazardous chemicals and materials to be used and/or stored onsite. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the Project site will require the demolition of one existing commercial building previously used as office, that was originally constructed in 1921 and relocated to the site in 1964 (919 South Brand Boulevard). The proposed Project will also involve the demolition of an existing detached canopy structure originally constructed in 1968. Structures constructed, repaired or remodeled between 1930 and 1981 have the potential of containing Asbestos Containing Building Materials. In addition, buildings constructed prior to 1978 may contain lead-based paints. Testing and removal of lead-based paints is subject to regulations established by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Because of the possibility this structure may contain lead paint or asbestos, the proposed Project would be required to be tested in accordance with applicable rules and regulations and remediated accordingly prior to demolition. The proposed Project would be required to comply with all applicable rules established by the SCAQMD, including Rules 403 and 402, during the construction phase that would prevent dust from migrating beyond the Project site. Compliance with the applicable rules and regulations would ensure that significant impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.

A Report on In-Ground Hydraulic Lift Removal, dated March 2011, was prepared for the property by Golder Associates. The report discussed removed underground storage tanks (USTs) on the property which included one gasoline UST, two waste oil USTs which were removed from the site in 1986. According to the report there is also a possibility of the presence of one 550-gallon gasoline UST installed in 1949 and appears to have been abandoned in place between 1976 and 1982. There was also a Geophysical Evaluation, dated January 27, 2011, prepared for the property by Southwest Geophysics, Inc. that also assessed the presence of buried USTs and/or backfilled excavations associated with UST removal. During the study, a large electromagnetic (EM) anomaly was identified that is large enough to represent a buried vault or UST with two unidentified lines extending toward it. According to the Golder Associates report, investigation activities of the large anomaly included asphalt removal and soil excavation. Based on the investigation, an abandoned single-post in-ground hydraulic lift was uncovered and subsequently removed in accordance with Glendale Fire Department (GFD) requirements. As a result, impacts 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact. Theodore Roosevelt Middle School is located within one-quarter (0.25) mile from the Project site (0.2 miles to the southeast). 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 hazardous materials since the proposed use is a parking structure primarily for vehicle inventory for Pacific BMW dealership.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

- 6) **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 east side of South Brand Boulevard between West Garfield Street and West Acacia Avenue. Neither West Garfield Street nor West Acacia Avenue are identified as a City Disaster Response or County Evacuation Route in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). However, South Brand Boulevard is designated as a City Disaster Response Route in the Safety Element. The proposed Project does not involve any changes to South 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.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

J. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface of groundwater quality?			X	
2. Substantially deplete 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				

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
course of stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			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 Pollution 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 be required to comply with all of 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 proposed 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 proposed Project. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface of groundwater quality since the proposed Project will be required to comply with applicable permitting requirements. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

i) ***Result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?***

Less than Significant Impact. The Project site is situated on a relatively flat lot currently developed with ancillary buildings used by the Pacific BMW automobile dealership. The portion of the site proposed for the new above ground parking structure is currently a surface parking lot fronting South Brand Boulevard. The majority of water that falls on the site is directed to the adjacent streets: West Garfield Street, West Acacia Avenue, and South Brand Boulevard. The existing situation will not change after implementation of the Project. The proposed Project will not alter the course of a stream or river, since no stream or river is located on the site, nor would the Project result in a substantial increase in runoff since the Project site is already developed and the surrounding neighborhood is densely developed. Impacts to drainage patterns would be less than significant.

Furthermore, as part of the proposed Project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the NPDES Permit set forth by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and to prepare and submit a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) to be administered throughout proposed Project construction. The SWPPP would incorporate BMPs to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to less than significant levels. Development of the proposed Project would not require any substantial changes to the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area, nor would it significantly affect the capacity of the existing storm drain system. The SWPPP would incorporate BMPs by requiring controls of pollutant discharges that utilize BAT and BCT to reduce pollutants. In addition, in accordance with Chapter 13.42, Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Control and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan of the Glendale Municipal Code, a SUSMP containing design features and BMPs to reduce post-construction pollutants in stormwater discharges would be required as part of the proposed Project. Consequently, impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) ***Impede or redirect flood flows?***

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. 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 then continues 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 municipal separate storm sewer systems (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 proposed 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

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

1) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The Project site is currently developed with ancillary buildings and surface parking lot used by the Pacific BMW automobile dealership. The proposed Project is the construction of a new five-story above ground parking structure with rooftop parking on an area of the site that currently features a surface parking lot and 561 square-foot office building. The Project site is adjacent to commercial development, a vehicle dealership and multi-family residential development to the north, a storage facility, vehicle rental, and multi-family residential development to the south, a vehicle dealership to the east, and multi-family residential development to the west. 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 proposed Project.

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 for the Project site is CA (Commercial Auto), and the General Plan designation is Community Services Commercial. The proposed Project complies

with the Land Use Element of the General Plan, and the Zoning Code and will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project. California Assembly Bill (AB) 2097 went into effect on January 1, 2022 and adds section 65863.2 to the California Government Code and prohibits local agencies from imposing or enforcing minimum parking requirements for nonresidential uses, such as the proposed expansion of the vehicle dealership that involved development of a new vehicle inventory parking structure. Under AB 2097, the project is eligible for parking relief from minimum parking requirements in the zoning code. The project will require approval from the Design Review Board (DRB) to ensure less than significant impacts to the visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings. As a result, there are no conflicts with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. 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	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
3. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

1) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project involves the construction of a new, five-story parking structure for the purposes of vehicle inventory for the Pacific BMW automobile dealership, demolition of the existing surface parking lot and an existing 561 SF accessory building, and removal of existing solar panel structures that will be relocated to the rooftop of the new structure. The parking structure for vehicle inventory is considered ancillary to the primary use as an automobile dealership and is permitted on the subject property. Surrounding land uses include commercial uses along Brand Boulevard, with adjacent multi-family uses to the west. The existing noise environment in the Project vicinity is dominated by traffic noise from nearby major roadways (South Brand Boulevard to the east, West Chevy Chase to the south, and North Central Avenue to the west), as well as typical residential activities in the surrounding area along the residential streets. The proposed Project involves the construction of a new above-ground parking structure for vehicle inventory, which will have limited activity during normal operating hours. Activities associated with the new parking structure will include the vehicles being taken out for test drives and/or vehicle sales during the dealership’s normal operating hours.

A Noise Study was prepared for the project by Meridian Consultants, dated June 2022 that summarizes the potential for the project to generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels, generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, or expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. The study determined that the project would not generate a significant impact as a result of construction noise and vibration. 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 Pacific BMW 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 70 dB and over noise contour, and the westerly portion is located in the 65-70 dB noise contour. While the new above ground parking structure is not fully enclosed, it is located 40 feet away from the adjacent residential uses and buffered by the dealership’s existing auto body and vehicle repair building located in between the residential uses and the parking structure. Additionally, the parking structure will be used primarily for vehicle inventory, with limited customer parking on the ground floor only during normal operating hours. The Project is not anticipated to generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element because the new vehicle inventory structure is ancillary to the existing vehicle dealership, and activities will include vehicles being taken out for test drives and vehicle sales during the dealership’s normal operating hours. . 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 7:00 PM on Saturday to 7:00 AM on Monday or from 7:00 PM preceding a holiday. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. As indicated in Response M.1 above, the project would not generate a significant impact as a result of construction noise and vibration. Excessive groundborne vibration is typically associated with activities such as blasting used in mining operation, or the use of pile drivers during construction. The proposed Project would be constructed using typical construction techniques. No pile driving for construction would be necessary. Structural support required for the development of the proposed Project would be installed by drilling bore holes, installing steel I beams, and grouting with concrete. Heavy construction equipment (e.g. bulldozer and excavator) would generate a limited amount of groundborne vibration during construction activities at short distances away from the source. The use of equipment would most likely be limited to a few hours spread over several days during demolition/grading activities. Post-construction on-site activities would be limited to mechanical vibration or groundborne noise. As such, temporary groundborne vibration and noise levels associated with the proposed construction 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 the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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)?**

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed 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. The Project could potentially generate one or two additional employees, however, per the applicant, they do not anticipate any significant increases in the number of employees. Additionally, no expansion to the existing service area of a public service provider is required. Therefore, development of the Project site would not induce population growth, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

O. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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?**

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 (0.5 miles south) and can adequately service the site without the need for new or the physical alteration of existing government facilities. The proposed Project will be required to comply with the Uniform Fire Code and to submit plans to the Glendale Fire Department at the time building plans are submitted for approval. Impacts to fire protection facilities and services 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 1.2 miles from the subject property and can adequately service the site without the need for new or the physical alteration of any existing governmental facilities. The site is located in an urban, developed area of the City. Impacts to police protection facilities and services are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c) Schools?

No Impact. Section 65995 of the Government Code provides that school districts can collect a fee on a per-square-foot basis to assist in the construction of commercial structures. Pursuant to Section 65995, the use is exempt from paying school impact fees to the Glendale Unified School District. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d) Parks?

No Impact. The proposed Project would not involve the development or displacement of a park. The Project site is located in the Commercial Auto Zone where an automobile dealership is a permitted use, and the Project site was not planned for use as a park. In accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the Project applicant is exempt from paying the Development Impact Fee to the City since the proposed use of the Project site is an auto dealer as the City has already determined that such uses and facilities do not create any impacts on parks. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e) Other public facilities?

No Impact. The proposed Project is not anticipated to increase the demand for library services. In accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the Project applicant is exempt from paying the Development Impact Fee to the City since the use of the Project site is an auto dealer and the City has already determined that such uses and facilities do not create any impacts on libraries. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

P. RECREATION

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is consistent with the Land Use Element, which designates the Project site for commercial uses. The proposed Project does not include the development of new housing, which would result in new residential population. The potential demand for new parks, or increased maintenance and additional improvements at existing parks, would be minimal due to the nature of the proposed Project. 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 will occur. Therefore, the proposed Project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts associated with the demand of existing park facilities. In accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5820), the Project applicant is exempt from paying the

Development Impact Fee to the City since the proposed use of the Project site is an auto dealer as the City has previously determined that such uses and facilities do not create any impacts on parks. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed above in Response P-1, the proposed Project is not anticipated to create a significant demand on parks facilities that would require the construction or expansion at existing public recreational facilities. In addition, the Project does not include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Q. TRANSPORTATION

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. The City of Glendale General Plan Circulation Element sets forth goals and objectives to provide direction for continuing development throughout the city. This element seeks to preserve and enhance quality of life in the city to allow for commerce to thrive, protect the character of residential neighborhoods and minimize adverse environmental impacts. The project site is irregular in shape with frontage on South Brand Boulevard, West Garfield Avenue and West Acacia Avenue. The Circulation Element identifies South Brand Boulevard as a major arterial street, and West Garfield Avenue and West Acacia Avenue are identified as local streets. Major arterial roadways provide motorists with continuous, efficient routes by utilizing traffic signals, parking limitations and prohibitions, and access to maximize traffic flow and distribute traffic to freeways, other arterials and streets, activity and business centers, and other major traffic generators. Local streets are designed to provide low-volume traffic from residences to arterial streets, such as South Brand Boulevard. The majority of the traffic visiting the project site will continue to utilize South Brand Boulevard to gain access onto the site. The City’s Traffic Engineer reviewed the proposed Project and determined that no significant increase in traffic would occur as a result of the Project because the Project proposes construction of a parking structure for vehicle inventory and the car sales/service floor area will remain the same, and the area of parking garages is not considered for purposes of the trip generation calculation. Per Map 6-2 of the City’s Bicycle Transportation Plan (2012), South Brand Boulevard, West Garfield Avenue and West Acacia Avenue are not identified or proposed bikeways. The City is currently in the process of updating the Bicycle Transportation Plan and the classifications of the streets are proposed to remain unchanged. 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. On September 27, 2013, Senate Bill (SB) 743 was signed into law, which created a process to change the way transportation impacts are analyzed under CEQA. SB 743 required the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to amend the CEQA Guidelines to provide an alternative to level of service (LOS). OPR updated the CEQA Guidelines and now vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is used to measure transportation impacts under CEQA. In October 2020, the City of Glendale adopted the Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines (Glendale TIA Guidelines). Glendale TIA Guidelines were used to analyze the project impact on the City’s transportation system by estimating incremental changes in VMT as well as assessing impacts to pedestrians, bicyclists, transit, hazards, emergency access, and other impacts. The Glendale TIA Guidelines provide several project screening approaches to identify when a project should be expected to cause a less than significant impact related to VMT, such as retail projects, public service buildings, small projects (generates fewer than 145 daily vehicle trips), and local schools. The Glendale TIA Guidelines state that projects located in a high-quality transit area can be presumed to have a less-than-significant transportation impact and do not require a detailed VMT analysis. According to the Glendale TIA Guidelines and City of Glendale’s Online VMT Mapping Tool, the subject property is located in a high-quality transit corridor and screens out from a detailed VMT analysis. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed Project would not result in any changes to the existing roadway network or the locations of existing driveways accessing the Project site. All driveway locations along South Brand Boulevard, West Garfield Avenue, and West Acacia Avenue will remain the same as existing. No 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. Additionally, 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

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural				

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
value to a California Native American tribe, and this is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or		X		
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		X		

1) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and this is:**

i) **Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** Written notice was given to the Fernandeño Tataviam of Band Mission Indians (FTBMI), the Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe, and the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB52 and codified in the Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. A response was received from the FTBMI indicating that the Project area is located within the traditional ancestral territory and encompasses the lineage-villages from which members of the Tribe descent. However, the presence of eligible resources is unknown. Although the Project site has already been developed and disrupted, construction activities associated with the Project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources.

Although the proposed Project involves construction of an above-ground parking structure, as indicated in Response E-3 above, impacts would be potentially significant if human remains were to be encountered during 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). The Project would therefore result in less than significant impacts with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures: Compliance with the following mitigation measures will reduce potentially significant impacts associated with tribal resources on the Project site to less than significant.

TCR - 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 archaeologist meeting the Secretary of Interior standards, retained by the Project applicant, shall assess the find. Work on the portions of the Project’s outside buffer may continue during this assessment period. The Fernandeño Tataviam Band of

Mission Indians (FTBMI) shall be contacted regarding any pre-contact and/or post-contact finds and be provided information after the archaeologist makes their initial assessment of the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment.

TCR - 2 The Lead Agency and applicant shall, in good faith, consult with the FTBMI on the disposition and treatment of any Tribal Cultural Resource encountered during the Project.

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. Written notice was given to the Fernandeño Tataviam of Band Mission Indians (FTBMI), the Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe, and the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB52 and codified in the Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. A response was received from the FTBMI indicating that the Project area is located within the traditional ancestral territory and encompasses the lineage-villages from which members of the Tribe descent. However, the presence of eligible resources is unknown. Although the Project site has already been developed and disrupted, construction activities associated with the proposed Project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources. Features and objects of cultural value, which may have existed at one time (on or beneath the site), have likely been previously disturbed. No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the Project site of surrounding area. 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). The Project would therefore result in less than significant impacts with mitigation incorporated (See Section R-1i above).

Mitigation Measures: Implementation of mitigation measures TCR-1 and TCR-2 noted above would reduce potentially significant impacts associated with tribal resources.

S. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
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, 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			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				
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, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No Impact. No new sources of water supply, such as groundwater, are required to meet the proposed project’s water demand. Water serving the proposed project would be treated by existing extraction and treatment facilities, and no new facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, would be required. No construction or relocation of electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities are required or proposed. 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 in nature. Given the proposed use, a parking structure for the Pacific BMW dealership, water use for the operation of the site is not anticipated to be significant. Therefore, construction activities are not considered to result in a significant impact on the existing water system or available water supplies.

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

Normal Weather Conditions

The City of Glendale has identified an adequate supply of water to meet future City demands under normal conditions. Future water demand in the City is based on projected development contained in the General Plan.

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 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, the City would use less MWD water supplies in the future compared to its current use because of implemented water conservation efforts

(such as, City Best Management Practices, Water-Efficient Landscape Programs and Water-Efficient Indoor Programs). With the City's reduction of dependency on imported water from MWD, GWP has a higher level of reliability in meeting water demands during drought conditions. Even with the implementation of the proposed Project, the GWP would continue to have adequate supply to meet citywide demand under drought conditions.

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 Project site goes to the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP), which the City of Glendale has access to through the Amalgamated Wastewater Agreement between the City of Glendale and the City of Los Angeles. The HTP has a dry-weather design capacity of 450 million gallons per day (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 net 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 products 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 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 an SRA or a very high FHSZ. No impacts would occur related to wildfire hazards due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose Project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. As indicated in Response T-1 above, the Project site is not located within a LRA and is not located near an 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
3. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is a currently developed and located within a densely urbanized area in South Glendale. No biological species or habitat for biological species exists on site or within the Project vicinity. In addition, no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plans apply to the Project site. As such, the proposed Project would not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Furthermore, the proposed Project would not have the potential to eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory, including historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources. Mitigation measures have been added to address potential impacts associated with tribal resources; however, identified impacts would be reduced through mitigation added to the project. 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 significance 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 services, recreation, transportation utilities/service systems, or wildfire. Less than significant impact would occur.

13. Earlier Analyses

The project initially required approval of a Parking Reduction Permit to provide a total of 450 parking stalls where 548 parking spaces are required by code for development of the new vehicle inventory parking structure. An Initial Study was prepared and circulated August 3, 2021, thru August 23, 2021 for a 20-day review period for the project located at 901-919 South Brand Boulevard. During the comment period for the Proposed MND, one letter was received by Richard Drury of Lozeau Drury LLP, representing the organization Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility (SAFER). On September 8, 2021, the Planning Hearing Officer conducted a public hearing for Parking Reduction Permit Case No. PPRP 2004082. For that hearing, staff received a second comment letter on the MND from Mr. Drury, dated September 7, 2021. Following the hearing, the Planning Hearing Officer took the item under submission for a decision to be made at a later date. On December 22, 2021, the Planning Hearing officer adopted the Final MND and approved the parking reduction permit with conditions. The decision letter for the Parking Reduction Permit and the Final MND included responses to the comments made in the September 7, 2021 letter. An appeal was filed on January 6, 2022, by Mr. Drury and scheduled to be heard by the Planning Commission on May 18, 2022. A subsequent letter was submitted by Mr. Drury on the day of the Planning Commission hearing, dated May 18, 2022 and the item was taken off calendar to allow staff time to review the information and respond. The appeal was scheduled to be heard by the Planning Commission on September 21, 2022, however the applicant withdrew the Parking Reduction Permit application prior to the hearing. On January 1, 2023, Assembly Bill (AB) 2097 went into effect which prohibits local jurisdictions from imposing or enforcing minimum parking requirements for development projects within a one-half mile radius of a major transit stop or a high-quality transit corridor. According to the City of Glendale's Online Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT) Mapping Tool, the subject property is located in a high-quality transit corridor and under the provisions of AB 2097 is eligible for parking relief in conjunction with the development of the proposed vehicle inventory parking structure. Accordingly, approval of a Parking Reduction Permit application is no longer required for the project. This document has been revised as needed to address the comments previously made on this project by Lozeau Drury, LLP on behalf of

SAFER, and to include additional information provided by the applicant in response to those comments. Development of the project will require approval from the Design Review Board for the new construction.

14. Project References Used to Prepare Initial Study Checklist

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

1. Environmental Information Form application and materials submitted on September 29, 2020.
2. "Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Technical Study for the Pacific BMW Dealership Expansion", prepared by Meridian Consultants, dated June 2022.
3. "Noise Study for the Pacific BMW Dealership Expansion", prepared by Meridian Consultants, dated June 2022.
4. "Report on In-Ground Hydraulic Lift Removal", prepared by Golder Associates, dated March 2011.
5. "Report on Removal of Two In-Ground Hydraulic Lifts", prepared by Golder Associates, dated March 28, 2011.
6. "Geophysical Evaluation 901 South Brand Boulevard", prepared by Southwest Geophysics, Inc., dated January 27, 2011.
7. "Hydraulic Hoist/Lift Removal (Bays 2&4 Only) & Closure Report", letter prepared by the Glendale Fire Department, dated April 1, 2011.
8. "Hydraulic Hoist/Lift Removal – Closure Report (Bays 1, 23 through 28, and abandoned lift in South parking area)", letter prepared by the Glendale Fire Department, dated April 19, 2011.
9. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Open Space and Conservation Element," January 1993.
10. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Noise Element," May 2007.
11. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Safety Element," August 2003.
12. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Recreation Element," April 1996.
13. The City of Glendale's Municipal Code, as amended.
14. "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.
15. Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq and California Code of Regulations, Title 14 Section 15000 et seq.
16. "CEQA Air Quality Handbook," April, 1993, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
17. "CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook," updated October 2003, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
18. California Emissions Estimator Module (CalEEMod version 2020.4.0) Report.