

INTRODUCTION

This section summarizes the information and analysis presented in the main body of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Section 15123 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines requires an EIR to include a brief summary of the proposed Project and its impacts in language as clear and simple as reasonably practical. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, this summary presents information on the proposed City Center II Mixed-Use Project, the potential environmental effects of this Project, and measures identified to mitigate these effects. A summary of the analysis of alternatives contained in the DEIR is also provided. In addition, this summary addresses areas of controversy associated with the Project, including issues raised by public agencies and the public, known to the City of Glendale. Issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and measures to mitigate the environmental effects of the Project, are also discussed.

PROJECT LOCATION

The City Center Mixed-Use Site is located in the central downtown portion of the City of Glendale, approximately 10 miles north of the City of Los Angeles Civic Center and 5 miles west of the City of Pasadena Civic Center. From a local perspective, the site is located downtown within the Central Glendale Redevelopment Project Area, which has been a focus for the Redevelopment Agency's revitalization and renovation efforts. The approximately 1.3-acre (58,610-square-foot) site is bordered by Wilson Avenue to the north, Brand Boulevard to the east, the existing City Center I project to the south and Orange Street to the west.

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The City Center II Mixed Use Project is a mixed-use residential and hotel high-rise development with associated support spaces, such as parking, amenity rooms, storage rooms, lobby, circulation, and service spaces. In general, the Project would consist of two towers, a 20-story residential tower (west tower) and an 18-story hotel/residential mixed-use tower (east tower). In addition, a retail/café component would be provided on the ground floor of the east tower and would open up to the existing Center City I Plaza. Both towers would contain a helipad landing area for emergency uses. Overall, the Project would consist of 184 residential units, a 172-room hotel, and 4,089 square feet of commercial-retail. The total Project floor area, including mechanical space, open-to-below space, above grade and basement parking space is approximately 544,322 square feet.

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The following are the Agency project objectives for the City Center II Mixed-Use Project:

- Support the objectives of the Redevelopment Plan to eliminate blight and revitalize the Central Glendale Redevelopment Project Area;
- Create a diversity of residential and urban uses to activate and strengthen the vitality of downtown Glendale;
- Provide housing opportunities, pursuant to the Glendale Redevelopment Agency's policy, in an urban setting in close proximity to employment opportunities, public transportation, public facilities, and goods and services;
- Provide a high-quality and functionally integrated housing and retail/commercial development that is distinctive and contributes to the creation of a downtown Glendale residential base;
- Utilize architectural design, lighting, and landscape materials to give the site a distinctive and pleasing appearance;
- Contribute to an attractive and striking skyline in downtown Glendale;
- Focus development of retail and high-density residential uses on a site adjacent to compatible land uses; and
- Provide employment opportunities for City residents.

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Land Use and Planning

Project Impacts

The Land Use Designation Map designates the Project site as “Downtown Specific Plan.” This designation is intended to implement land use and design regulations contained in the Downtown Specific Plan (DSP), adopted in November 2006. The DSP sets forth standards and criteria for development in the downtown area and provides implementing regulations within several distinct districts in conformance with the General Plan. Specifically, the DSP addresses building heights, which were previously unregulated in the downtown area, and establishes appropriate transition zones between office and high-rise development and neighboring lower-scale neighborhood commercial and residential zones. Finally, the DSP provides incentives, in the form of height and density bonuses, to encourage desirable uses and benefits in the downtown area. Desired uses include affordable housing, historic preservation, hotel uses, public open space uses, reuse of existing buildings, signature design,

and sustainable design. The City Center II Project is located in the Broadway Center District of the adopted DSP.

The Zoning Map also designates the Project site as "Downtown Specific Plan" and implements regulations contained in the DSP. Where land use regulations and/or development standards of the Glendale Zoning Code are inconsistent with the DSP, the standards and regulations of the DSP will prevail. Any issue not specifically covered in the DSP will be subject to the regulations in the Zoning Code and/or Municipal Code.

The residential, hotel and retail-commercial uses proposed by City Center II are allowed by the DSP. In addition, the Project would not conflict with the goals, objectives or policies of the Glendale General Plan, the Redevelopment Plan, the DSP or applicable policies contained in regional plans prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative land use impacts associated with the proposed City Center II Project and 51 related projects were analyzed in the EIR. The analysis concluded that no cumulative land use impacts associated with the Project and related projects would result, and the incremental effect of the Project to these impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Population and Housing

Project Impacts

Based on a mix of 67 one-bedroom and 117 two-bedroom units and an average household size of 1.5 persons per one-bedroom unit and 2.5 persons per two-bedroom unit, the residential component of the Project would most likely generate a population of 393 residents.¹ Based on 3.0 employees per 1,000 square feet of commercial space and 0.8 employees for every hotel room, the direct employment growth of the Project would be 150 employees. Applying a 24 percent ratio (which is the percent of existing employee that work and reside in the City of Glendale), the employment positions would result in 36 of these new employees residing in the City of Glendale. If it is conservatively assumed that each of the new employees forms a single household in the City, these households could indirectly add approximately 101 additional residents to the City (36 households x 2.8 persons per household). Overall, the increase in population of 393 people that would be associated with the proposed residential units and

¹ Population generation rates for units were provided by the applicant and represent a more conservative population estimate than if generation rates were used from the Glendale Downtown Specific Plan.

the possible additional increase in population of 101 people associated with employment opportunities provided by the Project would result in a total population increase of 494 new residents to the City.

When the population increase from the Project is added to the 2007 Arroyo-Verdugo Subregional population of 355,623, the resulting population for the year 2010 is approximately 356,234 persons. In addition, when housing and employment estimates associated with Project development are added to 2007 Arroyo-Verdugo Subregional housing and employment figures, the resulting housing and employment figures are 131,134 housing units and 211,054 jobs. All of these demographic increases are well within 2010 Arroyo-Verdugo Subregional projections.

The 2007 State Department of Finance January population estimate for Glendale is 207,157. When the estimated population increase from the Project is added to the January 2007 population estimate for the City of Glendale, the resulting total population for the City is 207,768 residents. In addition, when the Project's housing and employment increases are added to the 2007 SCAG housing and employment projections for the City of Glendale, the resulting housing and employment figures are 73,497 housing units and 87,879 jobs. While the housing and employment estimates are well within SCAG 2010 projections of 74,095 housing units and 90,471 jobs for the City of Glendale, the population figure exceeds the SCAG 2010 population projection of 207,182 persons.

Despite exceeding the SCAG projection, the population increase associated with the Project is not considered substantial, as the increase would amount to less than a 1 percent increase in population growth. In addition, the population growth and related demand on public services associated with the Project have been assessed in Section 4.8, Public Services, of this EIR. In this manner, the projected population increase already has been assessed and the increase in population is not considered substantial. Importantly, the growth associated with City Center II is also accounted for in the Downtown Specific Plan (adopted November 2006). To ensure consistency between the Downtown Specific Plan and the City of Glendale General Plan, the General Plan would be amended to include new population projections as part of the proposed adoption of the Downtown Specific Plan. The City will now submit the new growth projections to SCAG for incorporation into its new population projections, and would result in revisions to the RTP, which is to be updated in 2007. In other words, the demographic projections contained within the RTP are based on a "bottom-up" approach in which local agencies generate the projections that provide the basic framework for SCAG analysis. In this manner, the Project's population projections would be consistent with the City's General Plan, upon which the SCAG population forecast is based. Therefore, after demographic projections are updated, the Project would be even further below future SCAG projections. As a result, project-level impacts associated with population growth would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts to population associated with the City Center II Project and 51 related projects were analyzed in the EIR. The population growth associated with the Project and related projects would exceed 2010 SCAG population projections for the City and this increase is considered a significant cumulative impact.

To ensure consistency between the related projects and the City of Glendale General Plan, the General Plan has been amended to include newly proposed population projections as part of the adoption of the Downtown Specific Plan. The new growth projections will be submitted to SCAG for incorporation into new population projections, and would result in revisions to the RTP, which is to be updated in 2007. In other words, the demographic projections contained in the RTP are based on a “bottom-up” approach in which local agencies generate the projections that provide the basic framework for SCAG analysis. In this manner, the related project and Project’s population projections would eventually be consistent with the City’s General Plan, upon which the SCAG population forecast is based. In the interim, the Project’s contribution to this impact, in conjunction with other related projects, would be cumulatively considerable and would result in a significant and unavoidable impact due to increasing growth over SCAG’s projections.

Aesthetics

Project Impacts

Current scenic views of the Verdugo Mountains to the north across Wilson Avenue, the Santa Monica Mountains to the west across Orange Street, and the San Rafael Hills to the east across Brand Boulevard are either partially or fully obstructed from the Project site. Project development would not obstruct off-site views of scenic vistas from the Project site and residents on the upper floors of the completed Project would have enhanced views. Nearly all views across the site would be blocked by the Project. All views are currently degraded and the development of the site, as proposed, would not significantly degrade views further. Therefore, impacts to scenic vistas associated with the Project are less than significant.

Project development would change the visual character of the Project site. In general, the Project elements would improve the aesthetic character of the site given its architectural design, the use of design elements, and the comprehensive landscape plan. As a result, Project development would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, and no significant impact to the visual character of the site and the surrounding area would result.

Concerning light and glare impacts, no highly polished materials that could reflect light and create glare, or highly reflective glass, are proposed. No substantial glare impacts from building materials that could affect day or nighttime uses in the area would result from the Project. New permanent sources of lighting would be established on the Project site that would increase the level of light on the site from current levels. All outdoor lighting would be directed onto driveways, walkways, and public areas and away from adjacent properties and public rights of way to avoid any light or glare impacts from lighting fixtures included in the Project. The new lighting established would not substantially increase light or glare that would affect any light sensitive uses on or near the site. Additionally, vehicles entering and exiting the proposed parking garage and passenger drop off area and proposed signage would not result in a significant light or glare impact. Overall, light and glare impacts would be less than significant.

Shade and shadow impacts were evaluated using a computer model of the proposed structures to simulate the shadows that would be cast after buildout. Simulations of the summer and winter solstices, June 21 and December 21, respectively, were conducted and showed that shade and shadow impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts to aesthetic resources associated with the City Center II Project and 51 related projects were analyzed in the EIR. Of these related projects, the proposed Orange/Wilson Mixed-Use Project, located west across the street on Orange Street, and the 150-room hotel proposed at the corner of Maryland Avenue and Wilson Avenue, are located within close proximity of the Project site. The Project and nearby related projects would not result in cumulative impacts to scenic vistas because views of surrounding mountains are currently degraded. Cumulative impacts to the visual character of the area would be less than significant because the Project and nearby related projects would improve area aesthetics while being compatible with surrounding uses. Proposed building materials and lighting would not generate a significant light and glare impact. The City Center II buildings would cast shadows on to the Orange/Wilson project, which would include sensitive receptors. This impact is considered significant and unavoidable because feasible mitigation measures do not exist which would reduce the impact to a level of less than significant.

Traffic, Circulation and Parking

Project Impacts

Construction worker vehicles and trucks would generate 490 vehicle trips per day (245 inbound, 245 outbound) during the peak construction phases at the site (i.e., Phase III: Sub-structure Construction and Phase IV: Super-structure Construction and Interior Work). Inbound construction worker trips are

anticipated to occur outside of the AM commuter peak hour; however, it is estimated that approximately 110 outbound construction worker trips may be generated during the PM peak hour. Based on a general distribution of 20 percent to any one particular segment, approximately 22 vehicles are forecast at any study intersections during the PM peak hour. This increase is not anticipated to result in significant impacts based on the City's significance criteria. Additionally, the Project incorporates design features to facilitate flow of construction worker traffic.

To determine the potential impact of City Center II on each study intersection, Project traffic volumes were added to existing traffic conditions. Application of the City's "significance" criteria to the year 2007 existing plus Project scenario indicates that none of the study intersections would be significantly impacted by the Project.

Impacts to the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP) and local transit system were evaluated. Based on Los Angeles CMP methodologies, impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, impacts to policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation and emergency access would be less than significant.

The Project applicant would be required to provide adequate parking facilities during Project construction and the proposed 640 spaces (432 tandem spaces) would exceed the 627 parking spaces (368 condominium resident spaces, 46 residential guest parking spaces, 172 hotel spaces, and 41 commercial spaces) required by the Municipal Code. Therefore, parking impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impact

Related project construction schedules could overlap and result in a significant traffic impact. However, the Project will be required to implement measures to reduce construction-related traffic impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the Project's contribution to the potentially significant traffic impact during related project construction is not cumulatively considerable.

Future traffic conditions prior to Project occupancy were determined by incorporating potential trips associated with known related projects and then applying an ambient growth factor to account for areawide regional growth not included as a related project. The Project's cumulative impact was then determined by adding the Project weekday generation to these conditions. Under future with Project conditions, impacts would be less than significant at all analyzed intersections.

It is possible that traffic impacts created by related projects and cumulative growth could combine to exceed CMP intersection and/or freeway standards and result in a significant impact. However, as the

Project would not result in a significant impact to CMP intersections or freeway segments, the Project contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.

With regard to emergency access, related projects would be required to adhere to standard engineering practices and requirements, and would be subject to planning and design review by the City of Glendale to avoid traffic hazards created by design features and land use incompatibilities, or inadequate emergency access. Therefore, related impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative parking impacts would be less than significant as related projects would provide parking to workers during phases of construction and would be required to provide adequate parking for uses proposed per the Glendale Municipal Code.

A cumulative impact to alternative transportation could occur if related projects resulted in an increase in ridership that exceeds system capacity. As the Project would not result in a significant impact to alternative transportation, the Project's contribution to this potentially significant impact is not cumulatively considerable.

Air Quality

Project Impacts

The Project would not conflict with the 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) because it would not induce population growth over the projections that were used for future emission estimates. Additionally, mixed-use development is consistent with the goals of the AQMP for reducing motor vehicle emissions. Impacts would be less than significant.

Construction emissions were calculated according to the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook and construction emission factors contained in the URBEMIS 2007 Air Quality Impact Model. Air pollutant emissions would not exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD during building construction activities. Impacts would be less than significant.

Localized NO_x, CO, and PM₁₀ impacts to sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity of the Project site during construction activities were estimated using the SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold Methodology. Construction activities would not generate emissions in excess of site-specific localized significance thresholds and impacts would be less than significant.

The analysis of daily operational emissions was prepared using the data and methodologies identified in the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook and current motor vehicle emission factors in the URBEMIS 2002 Air Quality Impact Model. The emissions associated with the Project would not exceed the

SCAQMD's recommended operational emission thresholds. As a result, the operational impacts associated with the Project are considered less than significant.

Concerning CO hotspots, using the CALINE4 screening procedure under worst-case conditions, future CO concentrations at each analyzed intersection would not exceed the state 1-hour and 8-hour standards with Project development. No significant CO hotspot impacts would occur to sensitive receptors in the vicinity of these intersections.

Impacts related to objectionable odors would be less than significant because Project-generated refuse would be disposed into appropriate trash collection containers, which would be covered and enclosed as required by the City.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development (i.e., related projects) would not conflict with the AQMP, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the region is in nonattainment, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, including CO hotspots, or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Noise

Project Impacts

Potential construction-related noise impacts are considered significant due to exceeding the noise threshold of 65 dB(A) for the central business district, as allowed by the Glendale Municipal Code. Mitigation measures are recommended, however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Vehicular noise was modeled based on the distribution of traffic volumes along roadways analyzed in Section 4.4, Traffic, Circulation and Parking, of this EIR. Noise model results indicate that changes in Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) as a result of the Project will range from 0.0 dB(A) to 0.5 dB(A). As increases within this range are not audible, impacts would be less than significant.

Single noise events generated within aboveground parking levels, including those associated with street sweepers, could be an annoyance to on-site residents and may exceed the 65 dB(A) Municipal Code threshold at receptor locations. This is considered a significant impact and a mitigation measure is recommended which would reduce the impact to a level of less than significant.

Groundborne vibration impacts would be less than significant because land uses surrounding the Project consist of commercial and office uses that do not contain sensitive equipment, are not located where persons sleep, and are not considered institutional uses.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative noise impacts associated with the City Center II and 51 related projects were analyzed in the EIR. The combined noise effects generated by the Project and related projects could be cumulatively significant and unavoidable. However, the Project's incremental contribution to these impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Project Impacts

The Project would include the delivery, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, solvents, and other materials. Potential impacts are considered to be less than significant through the implementation of standard state and federal requirements.

A site specific Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) called out two potential areas of concern including a low to moderate risk for contamination due to the presence of a former dry cleaning establishment at 144 North Orange Street and unidentified fill materials placed in the basement areas of former buildings at 131-139 North Brand Boulevard. To address these areas, a Phase II ESA was conducted for both locations. The Phase II ESA indicated that impacts related to the release of hazardous materials into the environment would be less than significant.

The Project site is identified in the ESA to be within the boundary of a National Priority List (NPL or Superfund) Crystal Springs Wellfield Area. However, there is no indication that the Project site has contributed to the regional ground water problem due to groundwater depth of at least 80 feet below the site. Additionally, Phase II testing has determined on-site soils are not impacted by the release of VOCs, TRPH, or priority pollutant metals. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Project development would neither result in a reduction of the number of lanes along disaster response routes in the area, nor result in the placement of an impediment to the flow of traffic such as medians. During the construction activities, the Project would include short-term single lane closures along these routes, which could slow down evacuation along these routes and result in a significant impact. A mitigation measure is recommended which would reduce the impact to a level of less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Although each related project site has potentially unique hazardous materials considerations, it is anticipated that all hazardous materials delivered, and hazardous waste removed, from the Project site and each cumulative project site, would be in accordance with applicable state and federal regulations. With regard to emergency evacuation, related projects are subject to CEQA and would be required to implement measures to mitigate potential impacts. Overall, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Project Impacts

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, in effect at the time of Project construction to the satisfaction of the City of Glendale Public Works Department. Compliance during construction and after buildout would result in a less than significant water quality impact.

Once the Project is developed it would consist of 85 percent impervious surfaces with the remaining areas being in landscaping, and, therefore, its operation would not result in erosion or siltation on or off site. Additionally, the Project would be designed to effectively convey surface water flows to the storm drain system. As sufficient capacity exists to adequately convey projected storm water runoff from the site, the Project would not result in on- or off-site flooding. Impacts related to erosion, site drainage and storm drain system would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Related projects would also be 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, in effect at the time of Project construction to the satisfaction of the City of Glendale Public Works Department. Compliance during Project and related project construction and after buildout would result in a less than significant water quality impact.

The Los Angeles River watershed, within the limits of the City of Glendale, contains predominantly urban uses. As a result, most of the drainage system in the watershed consists of engineered storm channels, and, therefore, is expected to experience little change with development of related projects.

Additionally, as extensive development is not expected in the remaining open spaces, it is unlikely that there will be substantial alteration of drainage systems and watercourses in those areas. Future development in Glendale is not generally expected to take place in previously undeveloped areas, and, therefore, significant expansion of existing storm water drainage facilities or the construction of significant new facilities is not generally anticipated. Cumulative impacts related to erosion, site drainage and storm drain system would be less than significant.

Public Services – Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

Project Impacts

The Glendale Fire Department has indicated that the Project would have a direct impact upon fire protection services. However, through tax revenue generated by the Project and mitigation provided by the Glendale Fire Department, impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

Additional residents and employees associated with the Project would result in an increase in emergency medical responses. The Project is located within the response district for Rescue Ambulance 21, which currently averages over 350 calls per month. With the inclusion of additional calls for service by the Project, RA 21 would be responding to approximately 362 calls per month. Since the number of calls would not be substantially above the recommended workload for a rescue ambulance, the impact of the Project on emergency medical services is less than significant, but the Project's contribution to the cumulative impact is considered significant. Funding from the General Fund described above, coupled with mitigation provided below would reduce impact to emergency medical services to less than significant.

As the fire flow adequacy of water lines serving the Project site is unknown, impacts are considered significant. Recommended mitigation would reduce this impact to a level of less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Due to the amount of development currently proposed in Glendale, the related projects would have a direct cumulative impact upon fire protection services. However, as related projects would be required to implement mitigation measures such as the provision of a mechanical smoke management system and the preparation of an emergency preparedness manual, cumulative impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

Additional residents associated with the Project and related projects would result in an increase in emergency medical responses throughout the City. However, with future funding from the General

Fund and recommended mitigation, this significant cumulative impact would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

Related projects would be required to provide adequate fire flow rates that meet City standards. As such, cumulative fire flow impacts would be less than significant.

Public Services – Police Protection

Project Impacts

The 494 residents generated by the Project would require one additional police officer based on the City's officer to population ratio of 2.0 officers per 1,000 residents. As funding would be made available to maintain adequate service through allocation of tax revenue generated by the Project, impacts would be less than significant.

According to the Glendale Police Department, calls for service generated by the Project could be accommodated and response times would not be adversely affected by Project implementation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The Project and related projects would result in a significant cumulative impact on police protection services when considering current department resources. However, tax revenue generated by the Project and related projects would be allocated to maintain adequate staffing and equipment levels within the City. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Public Services – Schools

Project Impacts

The Project would generate an additional 68 students which would be accommodated by the Glendale Unified School District. All schools serving the Project site are currently operating under capacity. Nonetheless, due to an existing lack of high school capacity in the District, implementation of the Project may indirectly affect the ability of the District to meet the needs of local schools. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65995, the payment of school impact fees, as authorized by Senate Bill 50, will fully mitigate any potential indirect impact of the Project on local schools.

Cumulative Impacts

The Project and related projects would generate 1,224 students which would be accommodated by the Glendale Unified School District. Due to an existing lack of high school capacity in the District, these additional students would result in a significant impact. However, according to Government Code Section 65995, the payment of school impact fees, authorized by Senate Bill 50, by each project would fully mitigate the impact of the Project and related projects on local schools from cumulative development.

Utilities and Service Systems - Water Service

Project Impacts

Project construction would require approximately 1,250 gallons of water per day. After buildout, the Project would demand 28.3 million gallons or 86 .6 acre-feet per year. Existing water entitlements would adequately meet Project demand during construction and after buildout in normal and dry weather conditions. Existing treatment facilities would be adequate to serve the Project and expansion of existing or construction of new facilities would not be required. Therefore, Project impacts to water service would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The Project and related projects would result in a water demand of 1,021 .6 acre-feet per year. Glendale has identified sufficient water supplies to meet additional demand associated with the Project and related projects through General Plan buildout. Additionally, existing treatment facilities would be adequate to serve the Project and related projects and expansion of existing or construction of new facilities would not be required. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Utilities and Service Systems - Sewer

Project Impacts

The Project would generate 52,540 gallons of sewage per day. Sewage generated on the site would be conveyed to either the Los Angeles/Glendale Water Reclamation Plant or the Hyperion Treatment Plant for treatment. If the Reclamation Plant is operating at full capacity, excess sewage from the site would be conveyed to the Hyperion facility for treatment, to which the City has access through the Amalgamated Agreement. With the Hyperion Treatment Plant currently operating 90 million gallons per day below capacity, the addition of approximately 52,540 gallons of sewage per day generated by the Project would not result in the plant exceeding capacity or require new wastewater treatment facilities. Additionally, as

the Los Angeles/Glendale Water Reclamation Plant and the Hyperion Treatment Plant are both subject to permits issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, treatment requirements would not be exceeded. Impacts would be less than significant.

The City has indicated that the 15-inch sewer main in Central Avenue, as well as other lines downstream within the Colorado Flume, may not be able to handle the anticipated net increase in sewer demand. In an effort to mitigate potential sewer impacts, the City will impose a sewer impact fee on future developments, based on a computer modeling assessment of the sewer system's hydraulic capacity. The collected fees, which will be charged for each proposed development, will be deposited into a specially created account used to fund capacity improvements to the specific drainage basin. Since the payment of this fee is available to reduce the severity of the impact of the Project on sewer capacity, the Project's impact on the existing sewage conveyance system would be reduced to less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Development of Project and related projects would add 720,330 gallons per day to the Hyperion Treatment Plant and the City's sewage conveyance system. When the Los Angeles/Glendale Reclamation Plant reaches capacity, the Hyperion Treatment Plant will treat a majority of the waste generated by the Project and related projects. With the Hyperion Treatment Plant currently operating 90 million gallons per day below capacity, the addition of 720,330 gallons of sewage per day generated by the Project and related projects would not result in exceeding the plant's capacity or require new wastewater treatment facilities. Additionally, as the Los Angeles/Glendale Water Reclamation Plant and the Hyperion Treatment Plant are both subject to permits issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, treatment requirements would not be exceeded. Impacts would be less than significant.

Development of the related projects will place additional demand on the City's sewage conveyance system. In an effort to alleviate sewer impacts, the City will impose a capital improvement fee on all future developments adding demand for capacity of the sewer system. Since the payment of the mitigation fee is available to reduce the severity of the impact of the Project and related project's on sewer capacity, the impact of Project and related project's on the existing sewage conveyance system would be reduced to less than significant.

Utilities and Service Systems – Solid Waste

Project Impacts

While Project construction would generate solid waste, the majority of the material would be collected on site in accordance with the City's Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance and sent to commercial facilities located in Los Angeles County. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

A total of approximately 110 tons of solid waste per year is projected to be disposed of into landfills at buildout. All solid waste generated on the Project site would be deposited at the Scholl Canyon Landfill, which is owned by the City. The Scholl Canyon facility would have sufficient capacity to continue to accommodate the demand for Class III disposal facilities generated by the Project site. Additionally, the Project would comply with Assembly Bill 939 and enclose Project trash containers according to City regulations. Impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The Project and related projects would generate 4,252 tons of solid waste per year. The current capacity of the Scholl Canyon and Puente Hills Landfills, which receive over 90 percent of the City's waste, are adequate to accommodate solid waste disposal needs of the Project, and development of all related projects, for at least 15 years, if not longer. The City also uses five additional landfills, all of which are currently still accepting materials. Though the Bradley Landfill is near capacity, if granted their proposed expansion, an additional 4.7 million cubic yards will be made available.

Although the CSDLAC is in the process of increasing the capacity to accommodate future increases in solid waste, these improvements are not yet in place and will not be completed until at least 2009. Further, there is presently insufficient permitted disposal capacity within the existing system serving Los Angeles County. The Project, together with other development, could contribute to insufficient permitted disposal capacity by contributing additional solid waste to regional landfills. Project development would also contribute construction debris to regional landfills, increasing the cumulative effect. Therefore, the Project's contribution to the cumulative impact would be cumulatively considerable. As no feasible mitigation measures exist which would reduce the impact to a level of less than significant, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Recreation

Project Impacts

Based upon the ideal park land-to-resident ratio standard and Project population, the Project would require 3.0 additional acres of new parks. To maintain the existing park land-to-resident ratio, the Project would require 0.7 acres. Project amenities, including 29,103 square feet of amenity space, would lessen the Project's impacts on existing park and recreation facilities. Additionally, a public 0.3-acre mini-park is proposed at the corner of Wilson Avenue and Orange Street. Existing park facilities are currently heavily used due to the deficit in parkland in the City. Even with the provision of common outdoor space and other amenities associated with the Project, the increase in use of neighborhood and community parks in the City that will result from the increase in residents associated with the Project is considered significant and unavoidable.

Cumulative Impacts

Given the existing deficiency of park land in the City, the combined effects of the Project and related projects on existing facilities is considered cumulatively significant because the use of existing parks would increase, thus contributing to an acceleration in the physical deterioration of these facilities. Even with the provision of Project Design Features, the contribution of Project to this impact even with the payment of Development Impact Fees by the Project and related projects, is cumulatively considerable and, therefore, is considered significant and unavoidable.

PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The range of alternatives in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires the EIR to set forth those alternatives necessary to make a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or lessen any significant effects of the Project (Section 15126.6[c]). Of those alternatives, the EIR only need examine in detail the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the Project. When addressing feasibility, the CEQA Guidelines state, "...among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the applicant can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site." The CEQA Guidelines also specify that the alternatives discussion should not be remote or speculative, and need not be presented in the same level of detail as the assessment of the proposed Project.

Therefore, based on the CEQA Guidelines, several factors need to be considered in determining the range of alternatives to be analyzed in an EIR and the level of detail of analysis that should be provided for each

alternative. These factors include: (1) the nature of the significant impacts of the proposed Project; (2) the ability of alternatives to avoid or lessen the impacts associated with the Project; (3) the ability of the alternatives to meet the objectives of the Project; and (4) the feasibility of the alternatives. The following alternatives were examined in this EIR in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines.

Alternative 1 – No Project/No Development Alternative

The No Project Alternative would leave the Project site in its present condition. This alternative assumes no further development occurs within the Project site.

Alternative 2 – 25 Percent Reduced Density

The 25 Percent Reduced Density Alternative considers development of the entire 1.3-acre site at approximately 75 percent of the density of residential, hotel and commercial uses under the Project. This alternative was formulated to reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project by reducing the amount of development. The layout for the land uses proposed under this alternative would be the same as for the Project, and would result in the development of 138 condominiums, 129 hotel rooms, and 3,067 square feet of retail-commercial space. Of the 138 for-sale housing units, 50 would be one-bedroom units and 88 would two bedroom units. The height of the Hotel/Residential tower building would be 14 stories or approximately 167 feet while the height of the Residential tower would be 15 stories or about 178 feet.

AREAS OF CONTROVERSY/ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

The Agency at this point in time is not aware of any areas of controversy or issues to be resolved.