

8.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

INTRODUCTION

Section 15128 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines requires an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to briefly describe any possible significant effects that were determined by the City of Glendale Redevelopment Agency not to be significant and were, therefore, not discussed in detail in the EIR. This section addresses the potential environmental effects of the proposed project that have been found not to be significant as a result of the distribution of a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and the responses. The items listed below that were not found to be significant are contained in the environmental checklist form included in Appendix G of the most recent update of the State CEQA Guidelines. Any items not addressed in this section were addressed in **Section 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis**, of this EIR.

AESTHETICS

- **Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

The project site is developed with a vacant commercial building and does not contain any natural scenic resources, such as native trees or rock outcroppings. In addition, the project site is not located within the view corridor of any state scenic highway, as there are no state-designated scenic highways within the City of Glendale.¹ Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway, and no impact will result.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

- **Would the project convert Prime Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban landscape and include industrial, commercial, and residential uses. No Farmland, agricultural land, or related operations are found in the area or on the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would not involve changes that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses because there are no agricultural uses or Farmland in proximity to the project site. Therefore, there would be no conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmlands of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. No impact to agricultural resources would result.

¹ California Department of Transportation. Officially Designated State Scenic Highways. January 2009. <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/cahisys.htm>.

- **Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**

The project site and surrounding area are currently zoned for urban development. Specifically, the project site is currently zoned Downtown Specific Plan, which is intended for urban land uses. Therefore, no conflict with zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act contract would occur and no impact to agricultural resources would result.

- **Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?**

There is no farmland in the vicinity of the project site, as the area is highly urbanized and developed with commercial uses. No farmland would be converted to non-agricultural uses under the proposed project. No impact would occur.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- **Would the project 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

The majority of the local area has been developed or landscaped and supports largely non-native plant communities and species. Therefore, only a limited number of plant species that flourish in urban environments, none of which are considered Rare or Endangered, can be found on the project site. Suitable habitat for sensitive mammal, reptile, amphibian, or fish species does not exist on the Project site or within the surrounding area. No impact would occur.

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

The project site and the surrounding area are completely developed and disturbed. No riparian habitat or sensitive natural community is located in the surrounding area or on the project site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

The project site is neither in proximity to, nor does it contain, wetland habitat or a blue-line stream. Therefore, the proposed project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally

protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. No impact would occur.

- **Would the project 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?**

The local area consists of established, highly urbanized, and developed properties. The project site and the immediate area are almost entirely paved or otherwise developed and do not contain native resident or migratory species or native nursery sites. In addition, there are no wildlife migration corridors in the vicinity of the project site. No impact would occur.

- **Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

The Glendale Municipal Code, Chapter 12. 44 Indigenous Trees, contains guidelines for the protection and removal of indigenous trees. These trees are defined as any Valley oak, California live oak, Scrub Oak, Mesa Oak, California bay, and California sycamore, which measure 6 inches or more in diameter breast height (DBH). No indigenous trees are located on the project site and implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Thus, no impact would occur.

- **Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

The project site and the surrounding area have been developed and heavily affected by past activities. No adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Conservation Plan exists for the project site or immediate area. Consequently, implementation of the Project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan. Thus, no impact would occur.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

- **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5?**

The proposed project is developed with a vacant commercial building built in 1997. This building is not a historical resource as defined by CEQA. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5?**

Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites are not known to exist within the local area. However, the project site has already been subject to extensive disruption and contains fill materials. Any archaeological resources which may have existed at one time on or beneath the site have likely been previously disturbed. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources and result in a significant impact. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius (328 feet) must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, which is incorporated as a project design feature, no impact would occur.

- **Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

Plant and animal fossils are typically found within sedimentary rock deposits. Most of the City of Glendale consists of igneous and metamorphic rock, and the local area is not known to contain paleontological resources. In addition, the project site has already been subject to extensive disruption and development. Any superficial paleontological resources which may have existed at one time on the project site have likely been previously unearthed by past development activities. Nonetheless, there is a possibility that paleontological resources may exist at deep levels and could be unearthed with implementation of the proposed project. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during the proposed project-related subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius (328 feet) must be temporarily suspended or redirected until a paleontologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, which is incorporated as a project design feature, no impact would occur.

- **Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban landscape and include commercial, industrial, and residential uses. No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the project site or surrounding area. Nonetheless, if human remains are encountered during excavation and grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then serve as a

consultant on how to proceed with the remains (i.e., avoid removal or reburial). With implementation of this standard requirement, which is incorporated as a project design feature, no impact would occur.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

- **Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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?**

The project site is not located within an established Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or designated Fault-Rupture Hazard Zone for surface fault rupture hazards.² The Hollywood Fault and the York Boulevard Fault are the closest active fault; the nearest Fault-Rupture Hazard Zone for active faults with evidence of surface rupture is for the York Boulevard Fault, which is located approximately 1.25 miles southeast of the project site. Based on the available geologic data, active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are not known to be located directly beneath or projecting toward the project site. Therefore, the potential for surface rupture as a result of fault plane displacement during the design life of the proposed project is less than significant.

- **Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?**

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 including the International Building Code (IBC) and California Building Code (CBC) 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.

- **Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

Liquefaction is a seismic phenomenon in which loose, saturated, fine-grained granular soils behave similarly to a fluid when subjected to high-intensity ground shaking. Liquefaction occurs as a result of three general conditions: (1) shallow groundwater; (2) low-density, fine, clean sandy soils; and (3) high-intensity ground motion. Studies indicate that saturated, loose and medium dense, near-surface

² City of Glendale, General Plan Safety Element, 2003, Plate P-1.

cohesionless soils exhibit the highest liquefaction potential, while dry, dense, cohesionless soils and cohesive soils exhibit low to negligible liquefaction potential.

The project site is not located within a mapped liquefaction hazard zone.³ Compliance with applicable building codes including the International Building Code (IBC) and California Building Code (CBC) would minimize the exposure of people and the proposed building from the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Therefore, impacts related to liquefaction would be less than significant.

- **Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?**

The project site is currently developed and the topography of the project site and its immediate built environment is relatively flat and, thus, devoid of any distinctive landforms. There are neither known landslides near the project site nor is the project site in the path of any known or potential landslides. Therefore, impacts related to landslides would be less than significant.

- **Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

Construction activity associated with the proposed project development may result in wind and water driven erosion of soils due to grading activities if soil is stockpiled or exposed during construction. However, this impact is considered short-term in nature since the site would be covered with pavement and landscaping upon completion of construction activity. Further, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit set forth by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and prepare and submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be administered throughout proposed project construction. The SWPPP 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 SCAQMD Rule 403—Fugitive Dust, which would further reduce the impact related to soil erosion to less than significant.

- **Would the project 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?**

The project site is not located within a liquefaction zone.⁴ The relatively flat topography of the project site precludes both stability problems and the potential for lurching, which is earth movement at right angles

³ City of Glendale, General Plan Safety Element, 2003, Plate P-1.

⁴ City of Glendale, General Plan Safety Element, 2003, Plate P-1.

to a cliff or steep slope during ground shaking. As previously discussed, the potential for hazards such as landslides and liquefaction is considered low. Liquefaction may also cause lateral spreading. For lateral spreading to occur, the liquefiable zone must be continuous, unconstrained laterally, and free to move along gently sloping ground toward an unconfined area. However, if lateral containment is present for those zones, then no significant risk of lateral spreading will be present. Since the liquefaction potential at the project site is low, earthquake-induced lateral spreading is not considered to be a significant seismic hazard at the site.

Ground surface subsidence generally results from the extraction of fluids or gas from the subsurface that can result in a gradual lowering of the ground level. No regional subsidence as a result of groundwater pumping has been reported in Glendale area.⁵ Therefore, the potential for ground collapse and other adverse effects due to subsidence to occur on the Project site is considered low.

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

- **Would the project 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?**

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

- **Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?**

Septic tanks will not be used in the proposed project. The proposed project would connect to and use the existing sewage conveyance system. Therefore, no impact would occur.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- **Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

⁵ Earth Consultants International, *Technical Background Report to the 2003 Safety Element* (July 2003), 2-20.

The proposed project involves the development of a mixed-use restaurant, restaurant/entertainment, and residential project. The commercial and residential uses proposes do not involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of significant amounts of hazardous materials; however, on-site support service, such as janitorial services, may involve the use of small amounts of hazardous materials. These materials would be stored on project site in small quantities. A variety of state and federal laws govern the generation, treatment, and disposal of hazardous wastes. The City of Glendale Fire Department and Los Angeles County have the authority to inspect on-site uses and to enforce state and federal laws governing the storage, use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes. In addition, Los Angeles County requires that an annual inventory of hazardous materials in use on site, as well as a business emergency plan, be submitted for an annual review, as required by Emergency Planning and Right-to-Know Act (SARA Title III) and Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code. These requirements would be mandated according to state and federal law and are incorporated as proposed project design features. As such, potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

- **Would the project 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?**

The proposed project is currently developed with a vacant commercial building built in 1997. Structures constructed or remodeled between 1930 and 1981, such as the existing on-site structures, have the potential of containing Asbestos Containing Building Materials. In 1976, the U.S. Congress enacted the Toxic Substance Control Act (TSCA), which regulates all industrial chemicals, including Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs). Additionally, the EPA banned lead-containing paints and materials in 1979. Given that the existing building that would be demolished as a part of the proposed project was built in 1997, the proposed project would not 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. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

- **Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?**

Glendale Presbyterian Preschool is located immediately southeast of the project site, however, the proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- **Be located on a site that 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?**

As discussed above, the proposed project is currently developed with a building built in 1997. The project site has no known history of being listed on a hazardous material site and is not currently listed on a list of hazardous materials sites.⁶ As such the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regard to creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

- **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?**

The project site is neither located within an airport land use plan nor is it located within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest public airport or public use airport to the project site is the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport located approximately 7.25 miles to the northwest. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?**

The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- **Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, San Fernando Road, which is approximately five blocks west of the project site, is a County evacuation route, and Brand Boulevard, which is one block west of the project site, is a City disaster response route. These routes are the main thoroughfares to be used by emergency response services during an emergency and, if the situation warrants, the evacuation of an area. Implementation of the proposed project would neither result in a reduction of the number of lanes along these roadways in the Project area nor result in the placement of an impediment to the flow of traffic such as medians. In the event of an emergency, all lanes would be opened to allow for traffic flow to move in one direction and traffic would be controlled by the appropriate agencies, such as the City of Glendale Police Department. During the construction of the proposed project, the construction contractor shall notify the City of Glendale Police and Fire Department of any construction activities (such as movement of equipment and temporary lane closures) that could impede movement along San Fernando Road or Brand Boulevard to allow for these first emergency response teams to reroute traffic to an alternative route, if needed. Implementation of this requirement would be incorporated as a project design feature. Therefore, no impact would occur.

6 State Water Resources Board. GeoTracker. <http://www.geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=200+E.+Broadway%2C+Glendale%2C+CA>. June 2010.

- **Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?**

The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban landscape. The project site is not contained within a fire hazard area as identified in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element. Additionally, landscaping plans do not include plantings of flammable brush, grass, or trees on or adjacent to the site. Consequently, implementation of the propose project would not result in the exposure of people or structures to hazards associated with wildland fires, and no impact would occur.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- **Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?**
- **Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**

Grading activities associated with construction will temporarily increase the amount of suspended solids from surface flows derived from the project site during a concurrent storm event due to sheet erosion of exposed soil. In addition, during excavation and grading, contaminated soils may be exposed and/or disturbed; this could impact surface water quality through contact during storm events. The applicant is required to satisfy all applicable requirements of the NPDES Program and Chapter 13.29, Storm Water and Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Control and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) of the Glendale Municipal Code, at the time of construction of the proposed project to the satisfaction of the City of Glendale Public Works Department. These requirements include preparation of a SWPPP containing structural treatment and source control measures appropriate and applicable to the proposed project. In addition, the proposed project would incorporate a dual sump pump within the subterranean parking and all rooftop and on-site drainage would be captured and conveyed to the street. The SWPPP would incorporate BMPs by requiring controls of pollutant discharges that utilize best available technology economically achievable (BAT) and best conventional pollutant control technology (BCT) to reduce pollutants. Examples of BAT/BCT that may be implemented during site grading and construction of the proposed project could include straw hay bales, straw bale inlet filters, filter barriers, and silt fences. Preparation of the SWPPP is incorporated as a project design feature. Implementation of BMPs would ensure that Los Angeles RWQCB water quality standards are met during construction activities of the proposed project. Therefore, no impact during construction would occur.

Following buildout and operation of the proposed project, the proposed project would increase the intensity of activities on the site and would likely result in an increase in pollutant sources. Common concerns include the potential deposition of pollutants generated by motor vehicle use on roadways and

parking areas adjacent to the project site, and the maintenance and operation of landscaped areas. Stormwater quality is generally affected by the length of time since the last rainfall, rainfall intensity, urban uses of the area, and quantity of transported sediment. Typical urban water quality pollutants usually result from motor vehicle operations, oil and grease residues, fertilizer/pesticide uses, human/animal littering, careless material storage and handling, and poor property management. The majority of pollutant loads are usually washed away during the first flush of the storm occurring after the dry-season period.

These pollutants have the potential to degrade water quality. However, the quality of runoff from the project site would be subject to Section 402(p) of the CWA under the NPDES program. Under the NPDES Municipal Permit No. CAS004001, development projects have responsibilities to ensure that their pollutant loads do not exceed total maximum daily loads for downstream receiving waters.

Development projects are required by the Glendale Municipal Code to submit and then implement a SUSMP containing design features and BMPs appropriate and applicable to the proposed project. The purpose of the SUSMP is to reduce post-construction pollutants in stormwater discharges. Prior to issuance of any grading or building permits, the County must approve the SUSMP. Preparation of the SUSMP is incorporated as a project design feature. Potential water quality impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant through the preparation of the SUSMP and implementation of the BMPs as specified in the NPDES Permit. Therefore, impacts related to water quality and stormwater discharge would be less than significant.

- **Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?**

Currently, the City utilizes water from Glendale Water and Power (GWP), which relies on some local groundwater supplies. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would result in additional development that could indirectly require an increased use of groundwater through the provision of potable water by GWP; however, as discussed in **Section 4.9.1**, the proposed project's water demand is within water projections. Groundwater to be consumed within Glendale would be utilized according to current plans and projections for GWP groundwater supplies. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies. In addition, the groundwater basins are governed by *City of Los Angeles v. City of San Fernando, et al.*, and the Basin Watermaster is vested with the responsibility to monitor and account for any groundwater extraction within the vicinity

of the project site with sustainability as a goal. Further, the proposed project would not extract groundwater on an operational basis.

The project site is currently developed with 100 percent impervious surfaces and, therefore, does not serve as a primary area of groundwater recharge within the San Fernando or Verdugo Basins, which are both located within the City of Glendale. In addition, impervious surfaces would remain with implementation of the proposed project. Consequently, impacts related to groundwater extraction and recharge will be less than significant.

- **Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?**
- **Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?**
- **Would the project 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?**

The project site is served by an existing storm water collection and conveyance system. Since the project site is currently developed with 100 percent impervious surfaces, the quantity of runoff would not change substantially with implementation of the proposed project. All runoff would continue to be conveyed via streets and gutters to storm drain locations around the project site. As a result, the proposed project would not require any substantial changes to the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area, nor would it affect the capacity of the existing storm drain system. Furthermore, as discussed above, 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, Storm Water and Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Control and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan of the Glendale Municipal Code, a SUSMP containing design features and BMPs to reduce post-construction pollutants in storm water discharges would be submitted and implemented as part of the proposed project. Consequently, impacts are considered to be less than significant.

- **Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**
- **Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

According to Federal Emergency Management Agency flood hazard maps, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone; therefore, the proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area or result in structures being constructed that would impede or redirect flood flows.⁷ The proposed project would not be subject to flooding, and, therefore, no impact would occur.

- **Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

There are seven dams located within the City of Glendale.⁸ The nearest dam to the project site is the Diederich Reservoir, located approximately 1.9 miles north of the project site. According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, the proposed project is not located within the inundation zone of this dam or other dams located within the City or elsewhere.⁹ Accordingly, the risk associated with flooding resulting from dam failure is considered less than significant.

- **Would the project be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

The project site is not within a coastal area. Therefore, tsunamis (seismic sea waves) are not considered a significant hazard at the site. In addition, the project site is not located downslope of any large bodies of water that could adversely affect the site in the event of earthquake-induced seiches, which are wave oscillations in an enclosed or semi-enclosed body of water. Therefore, no impact related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow would result from implementation of the proposed project.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

- **Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

The project site and surrounding area have been developed and heavily affected by past activities. The project site and immediate area are not located in an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan area. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan, and no impact would occur.

MINERAL RESOURCES

- **Would the project 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?**

⁷ City of Glendale, General Plan Safety Element, (2003), p. 3-7.

⁸ City of Glendale, General Plan Safety Element, (2003), p. 3-7.

⁹ City of Glendale, General Plan Safety Element, (2003), Plate P-2.

- **Would the project 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?**

The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban landscape and include commercial, industrial, and residential uses. The State Geologist has mapped the Glendale area for aggregate resources. According to Map 4-28 of the City of Glendale General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element, the project site is located within a Mineral Resource Zone-1 (MRZ-1). MRZ-1 is defined as an area where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence. As a result, no impact would occur.

NOISE

- **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?**

The project site is neither located within an airport land use plan nor is it located within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest public airport or public use airport to the Project site is the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport located about 7.25 miles to the northwest. Consequently, no impacts associated with excessive airport noise levels would result.

- **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?**

The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Consequently, no impacts associated with noise would result for residents, employees, patrons of the proposed project.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

- **Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**
- **Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

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.

PUBLIC SERVICES

- **Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools?**

The proposed project would develop studios and lofts ranging in size from 372 square feet to 610 square feet. Given the small size of the proposed studios and lofts it is assumed few if any children would live in the proposed project. However, if the Glendale Unified School District (GUSD) deems it necessary, the project applicant would pay school impact fees to the GUSD based on the current fee schedule for multifamily developments prior to the issuance of building permits. Additionally, with regard to the households that may relocate to the City of Glendale as a result of being employed with the uses of the proposed project, pursuant to Government Code Section 65995, the project applicant shall pay school impact fees to the GUSD based on the current fee schedule for commercial developments prior to the issuance of building permits. Payment of the school impact fees would result in a less than significant impact to school facilities.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- **Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

The project site is not located in the vicinity of an airport. Consequently, the proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns that would result in safety risks. No impact would occur.

- **Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?**

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) and Glendale Beeline provide bus service in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding alternative transportation since no changes to the existing transportation policies, plans, or programs would result from proposed project implementation. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- **Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

Under Section 401 of the CWA, the RWQCB issues NPDES permits to regulate waste discharged to “waters of the nation,” which includes reservoirs, lakes, and their tributary waters. Waste discharges include discharges of storm water and construction of the proposed project discharges. A construction project resulting in the disturbance of more than 1 acre requires a NPDES Permit. Construction projects are also required to prepare a SWPPP. In addition, the proposed project would be required to submit an SUSMP to mitigate urban storm water runoff. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant would be required to satisfy the requirements related to the payment of fees and/or the provisions of adequate wastewater facilities. The proposed project would comply with the waste discharge prohibitions and water quality objectives established by the RWCQB, and as incorporated into the proposed project as a project design feature. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- **Would the project require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

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. Therefore, no impact would occur.