2.0 SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This section summarizes the information and analysis presented in the main body of this draft environmental impact report (EIR). Section 15123 of the 2008 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes and 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* State CEQA Guidelines, *this summary presents information on the proposed Glendale Triangle 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 draft EIR is also provided. In addition, this summary addresses areas of controversy associated with the proposed 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 Glendale Triangle project site is located in southern Glendale. The project site is located approximately 1,200 feet east of the boundary between the Cities of Glendale and Los Angeles. Interstate 5 (I-5 the Golden State Freeway), State Route 134 (SR-134) and SR-2 (the Ventura and Glendale Freeways) provide regional access to the project site. From a local perspective, the project site is located in southern Glendale within the San Fernando Road Corridor Redevelopment Project Area, which includes 750 acres, generally extending along the length of the San Fernando Road corridor. The 2.18-acre triangle-shaped project site is bound by San Fernando Road to the west, Los Feliz Road to the north, and Central Avenue to the east.

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The Glendale Triangle project is a proposed mixed-use development consisting of 218 multi-family residential units, 54,000 square feet of commercial floor area, supporting parking facilities, and recreation and open space amenities. The project as proposed consists of two five-story structures, with each structure featuring commercial uses on the ground level with residential uses occupying the four levels above. The project would provide 17,300 square feet of common open space and 15,000 square feet of private open space, for a total of 32,300 square feet of open space. Recreational facilities and common open space would be located on the second floor, podium level. The residential portions of each building would include a lobby, outdoor courtyards, storage rooms, service, trash and recycling rooms, and shared clubhouse with outdoor pool area and fitness facility. Additionally, 707 parking spaces would be provided on the ground floor and within a three-and-a-half-level subterranean parking garage.

Development of the proposed project would require the demolition and removal of three on-site buildings located along the northern and southern portions of the site.

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The following are the Agency project objectives for the Glendale Triangle project.

- Support the objectives of the Redevelopment Plan to eliminate blight and revitalize the San Fernando Road Corridor Redevelopment Area.
- Create a diversity of residential and urban uses to activate and strengthen the vitality of southern 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.
- Utilize architectural design, lighting, and landscape design within the residential component to compliment and enhance the architectural character of the proposed building while also fitting into the existing fabric of the area and give the project site a distinctive and pleasing appearance.
- Increase demand for local retail services.
- Provide employment opportunities for City residents.
- Develop a Transit Oriented Development, thereby reducing the number of vehicles, creating localized employment, revitalizing the local neighborhood and providing a dynamic living environment.

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Aesthetics

Project Impacts

Existing views from the project site include limited long-range views of the Verdugo Mountains. The San Rafael Hills are generally visible to the east down Los Feliz Road and the Santa Monica Mountains are visible to the west down Los Feliz Road. The eight-story Glendale Memorial Hospital building east of the project site currently restrict views east across the property. Similarly, retail structures, located to the west, north and south of the project site, further block views across the project site. Due to the highly developed nature of the area, long distance views of these mountains are mostly limited to the views along major streets as existing buildings block or obstruct the views from other locations on and around the site. Views of the Verdugo Mountains north of the project site are currently available; however, these views are largely obstructed by existing development, and large street trees. Because of the existing pattern and scale of development on and around the project site, no scenic vistas are available. Given that

views from the project site are currently blocked or obstructed, development of the site would not significantly obstruct views further.

The height and the mass of the proposed project would be smaller than the Glendale Memorial Hospital and similar to the height and mass of the associated hospital structures and office buildings located southeast of the project. For example, the proposed mixed use building would be three stories shorter than the eight-story Glendale Memorial Hospital and one-story higher than the shortest associated hospital structure to the southeast. The proposed project would be three to four stories taller when compared to the commercial buildings to the north, west, and south of the site. As the project would be shorter than the eight-story Glendale Memorial Hospital building and taller than existing one and two story commercial structures adjacent to the site; the project would provide a transition in height between the hospital and other surrounding structures. Therefore, the hospital and commercial buildings within the vicinity of the project would be visually compatible in terms of height and massing with the proposed project and the project would reinforce the pattern of existing buildings in the area.

The existing car wash facility on site has been repeatedly remodeled and the original design of the structure is no longer apparent. The central-northeastern portion of the project site is developed with an automotive repair facility that was constructed in the 1960s and the southern portion of the project site is developed with a fast food restaurant, constructed in 1997. The existing structures do not possess any distinguishing architectural design elements or features. Therefore, the change in visual character of the site would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

The project as designed includes architectural features that would enhance the visual character of the project site, including landscaped plazas and/or outdoor seating areas along Los Feliz Road, San Fernando Road and Central Avenue, and articulation of the three corners of the project site. The project would include landscaping at the street level to enhance the pedestrian environment. Parking provided on the ground level would be surrounded by the proposed structures with the remaining parking located below grade, and screened from public view. All supporting infrastructure, such as telecommunications equipment and utility lines, would be placed underground or screened from public view. Finally, signage associated with the retail-commercial component of the project would meet the standards and programs contained in the Municipal Code, and no adverse impact is expected to result. Therefore, project development would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and their surroundings and no significant impact to the visual character of the site and the surrounding area would result.

The proposed structure would consist of light- and medium-colored exterior wall materials balanced with low reflective glass materials. Materials that would be used include masonry veneer, concrete

columns, plaster, metal and infill panel railings, and vertical trellis accents. The street level would use a storefront glazing system, which would create transparency, rather than reflection. Highly polished materials or highly reflective glass that could reflect light and create glare is not proposed. No substantial glare impacts from building materials would result from the proposed project.

Lighting would be established on the site during construction. Lighting used during construction would consist primarily of security lights, although lighting may be used for construction activities occurring during morning or evening hours, particularly in the winter. This lighting would be temporary in nature and would not result in any substantial long-term light or glare impacts.

Development of the proposed project would establish new permanent sources of lighting that would increase the current level of low-intensity light on the site. No uses surrounding the site would be sensitive to light levels. The lighting proposed would be limited to the amount required to safely light driveways, storefront lighting, the sidewalks along San Fernando Road, Los Feliz Road, and Central Avenue, landscape lighting, and public space areas within the project. At the intersection of San Fernando Road and Central Avenue, two vertical planes or "fins" that sandwich a vertical light fixture are proposed where the building comes to a point. The vertical light fixture would serve as accent lighting. 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. Therefore the new on-site lighting would not result in substantial increases in light or glare that would affect any light-sensitive uses on or near the site.

Direct and indirect lighting would be used for signage to be placed on site and/or on building façades. Signage lighting would be focused onto sign surfaces and would generally be of low to medium brightness. All proposed signage and associated lighting would be subject to signage regulations and programs included in the Glendale Municipal Code. Lighting associated with signs would not, therefore, result in substantial light or glare impacts.

Cumulative Impacts

Views of the Verdugo Mountains to the north, San Rafael Hills to the east and Santa Monica Mountains to the west in the project area are currently largely obstructed by surrounding development. Therefore, a potential cumulative impact would not result from the development of the proposed project combined with the closest related project, 435 W. Los Feliz Road project. The related project is also sufficient distance from the proposed project that cumulative light and glare impact would not result. Therefore, the cumulative impact of the project would be less than significant. In addition, the combined

development on the proposed project and 435 W. Los Feliz Road sites would improve the local visual character in the surrounding area.

Air Quality

Project Impacts

The 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) was prepared to accommodate growth, to reduce the high levels of pollutants within the areas under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), to return clean air to the region, and to minimize the impact on the economy. Projects that are considered consistent with the AQMP would not interfere with attainment because this growth is included in the projections utilized in the formulation of the AQMP. The project would add 771 persons, which when added to the existing population of the City of Glendale would result in a total of 207,928 persons. This total is within the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) population estimates and below that estimated in the AQMP. Consequently, the project would be consistent with this component of the AQMP, since it would not result in growth over the projections that were used for future emission estimates.

Another measurement tool in assessing consistency with the AQMP is to determine how a project accommodates the expected increase in population or employment. Generally, if a project is planned in a way that results in the minimization of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) both within the project and the community in which it is located, and consequently the minimization of air pollutant emissions, that aspect of the project is consistent with the AQMP. The proposed project's location within an urban area with both commercial and residential uses would minimize the need for, or the distance of, some motor vehicle trips, thereby reducing motor vehicle emissions from such trips. This type of development is consistent with the goals of the AQMP for reducing motor vehicle emissions. As a result of reduced commutes and other vehicle trips, vehicle miles traveled and resulting air pollutant emissions would be reduced. These measures are consistent with the goals of the AQMP for reducing the impacts associated with new development.

As the agency principally responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in the Basin, the SCAQMD recommends that projects should be evaluated in terms of air pollution control thresholds established by the SCAQMD and published in the *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. Construction emissions were calculated according to the SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, and construction emission factors contained in the URBEMIS2007 Air Quality Impact Model. Project-related construction emissions of all the pollutants would not exceed any of the thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD during project

construction. Therefore, the impacts resulting from construction of the proposed project are considered less than significant.

The SCAQMD recommends that the potential impacts be evaluated on the ambient air concentrations due to construction emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM_{10}) and less than 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$). The nearest sensitive receptor is the Glendale Memorial Hospital, which is located approximately 100 feet east of the construction site boundary. Project-related construction emissions would not exceed the localized significance thresholds for PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, NO_x and CO during project construction. Therefore, the impacts resulting from construction of the proposed project are considered to have a less than significant localized impact.

Project construction would involve the demolition and removal of several existing structures located on the project site. Because some of these structures were constructed during a period when asbestos-containing building materials were not regulated, these structures have the potential to contain building materials containing such hazardous materials. All structures must be stabilized and demolished in accordance with applicable regulations including SCAQMD Rule 1403, Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities. The proposed project would comply with Rule 1403 to ensure that asbestos-containing materials would be removed and disposed of appropriately. With adherence to this applicable regulation, the potential for significant adverse health impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Operational emissions would be generated by both stationary and mobile sources as a result of normal day-to-day activity on the project site after occupancy. Stationary emissions would be generated by the consumption of natural gas for space and water heating devices. Mobile emissions would be generated by the motor vehicles traveling to and from the project site. The analysis of daily operational emissions has been prepared using the data and methodologies identified in the SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* and current motor vehicle emission factors in the URBEMIS2007 Air Quality Impact Model. The net emission increase associated with the proposed project would not exceed the SCAQMD's recommended operational emission thresholds. As a result, the operational impacts associated with the proposed project are considered less than significant.

The project was evaluated to determine if it would cause a CO hotspot utilizing a simplified CALINE4 screening model developed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The simplified model is intended as a screening analysis that identifies a potential CO hotspot. If a hotspot is identified, the complete CALINE4 model is then utilized to determine precisely the CO concentrations predicted at the intersections in question. No significant CO hotspot impacts would occur to sensitive

receptors in the vicinity of these intersections. As a result, no significant project-related impacts would occur relative to future CO concentrations.

During project construction, certain pieces of construction equipment could emit odors associated with exhaust. However, odors emitted from certain pieces of construction equipment would dissipate quickly and be short term in duration. Odors resulting from spray coating applications of paint and related materials during construction would be regulated by SCAQMD Rule 481. This rule imposes equipment and operational restrictions during construction for all spray painting and spray coating operations. Compliance with SCAQMD rules and permit requirements would ensure that no objectionable odors are created during construction. Therefore, impacts from odors during construction would be less than significant. Project-generated refuse would be disposed into appropriate trash collection containers, which would be covered and enclosed as required by the City of Glendale. Trash receptacles within the project area would be required to have lids that enable convenient collection and loading and would be emptied on a regular basis, in compliance with City of Glendale regulations for the collection of solid waste. As a result, impacts from odors would remain less than significant.

The proposed project would not have hazardous materials on site in any appreciable quantity. Development and operation of the project would not result in emissions of toxic air contaminants (TACs) regulated by SCAQMD rules or TACS on federal or state air toxics lists. As a result, impacts from this would remain less than significant. Also, emissions of TACs have not been reported by facilities located within 0.25 mile of the project site since 2002, according to the SCAQMD's Facility Information Detail (FIND) system. Therefore, impacts associated with this facility are considered less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* identifies possible methods to determine the cumulative significance of land use projects. All of the SCAQMD's methods are based on performance standards and emission reduction targets necessary to attain the federal and state air quality standards identified in the AQMP. The *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* identifies possible methods to determine the cumulative significance of land use projects. This draft EIR evaluates the following methods: (1) the SCAQMD method of whether the rate of growth in average daily trips exceeds the rate of growth in population and/or employment and (2) whether or not the project is consistent with the AQMP and, thus, would not jeopardize attainment of state and federal ambient air quality standards in the basin. The ratio of project-to-County Average Daily Trips (ADT) is less than the population ratio for the project. Additionally, the proposed project would generate far fewer non-residential trips compared to the existing land uses. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant cumulative impact with respect to this criterion. In addition, the project would not generate a cumulatively considerable contribution to air pollutant emissions during project

construction and operation. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant cumulative impact with respect to this criterion.

Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32, Nuñez and Pavley), the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, represents the first enforceable statewide program to limit greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from all major industries with penalties for noncompliance. The project would result in direct net GHG emissions of approximately 1,544 metric tons per year (0.0015 million metric tons). Compared to the estimated GHG for all sources in California (423 million metric tons, excluding out-of-state electrical generation), the project would add less than 0.0004 percent to the State of California GHG emissions inventory. Given the above, the project's contribution to global climate would be negligible. No quantitative emission thresholds or similar criteria have been established to evaluate the cumulative impact of a single project on global climate. It is unlikely that a project generating this level of GHG emissions would potentially interfere with the State's programs to meet the goals of AB 32. Therefore, based on this reason, and because the project would comply with established GHG reduction measures, the project is considered to have less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to this GHG emissions.

Cultural Resources

Project Impacts

An historic resources evaluation of the car wash facility was conducted to identify if the structure is an historic resource under national, state, or local standards. The other structures located on the project site were not evaluated as potential historic resources since they were developed in the 1960s and 1990s. The car wash facility was constructed in 1952 and remodeled in 1960. During the remodel, the office area was expanded, a patterned concrete panel was added over the original brick on the office's front façade, and an L-shaped canopy was added along the car wash building. Since the 1960s, a new roof, with deep overhang, thick profile, and slight cant on the front façade, was added to the car wash facility to provide an element of modernism. As such, the car wash facility has been repeatedly remodeled and does not retain the architectural character of the era.

The car wash facility on the site does not meet the criteria for inclusion on the Glendale Register of Historic Resources or for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The local historic criteria are similar to those used to determine potential eligibility to the CRHR or the National Register of Historical Resources (NRHP). Since this building does not meet the threshold for designation as a historic resource, it cannot rise in significance to meet the higher thresholds of the California Register or the NRHP. As the building is not eligible for listing on the CRHR or the NRHP, the impact of the project on historical resources is less than significant.

Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites are not known to exist within the local area. In addition, the project site has been subject to extensive disruption and contains fill materials. Any archaeological resources that may have existed at one time 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. Incorporation of mitigation would reduce impacts to less than significant. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 200-meter (656-foot) radius will 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. Implementation of this standard requirement, which is incorporated as mitigation, would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

The project site has already been subject to extensive disruption due to previous development. Any archaeological or paleontological resources, which may have existed at one time, have likely been previously disturbed. Surface grading or very shallow excavations in the younger Quaternary Alluvium exposed at the project site would most likely not uncover significant vertebrate fossil remains or any superficial paleontological resources. However, deeper excavations that extend into older Quaternary deposits, which exist at unknown depths throughout the project site, may encounter significant fossil vertebrate specimens and significant impact could occur with the implementation of the project. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter (328-foot) radius 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. Any fossils recovered during mitigation should be deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution for the benefit of current and future generations. Implementation of this standard requirement, which is incorporated as mitigation, would reduce potential impacts to a level that is less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts to cultural resources associated with the proposed Glendale Triangle project and the related projects were analyzed in the draft EIR. No cumulative impacts to cultural resources associated with the proposed project and related projects would result, and the incremental effect of the project to these resources would not be cumulatively considerable.

Geology and Soils

Project Impacts

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. 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.

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. All structures shall be designed in accordance with all applicable building codes to ensure safety in the event of an earthquake.

The site is not located within a mapped liquefaction hazard zone. Due to deep groundwater level exceeding 45 feet, relatively high fine contents and intermediate clayey soil layers, potential for liquefaction is low and impacts from liquefaction are less than significant. Since the liquefaction potential at the site is low, earthquake-induced lateral spreading is not considered to be a seismic hazard at the site and impacts would be less than significant.

The topography of the project site and the immediate built environment is relatively flat and, thus, devoid of any distinctive landforms. There are no significant ground slopes in the vicinity of the project site, there are no known landslides near the project site, nor is the project site in the path of any known or potential landslides. Given the relatively flat-lying topography at the project sites, stability problems and the potential for lurching, which is earth movement at right angles to a cliff or steep slope during ground shaking, the potential for impacts from landslides is not significant.

Construction activity associated with 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 potential for significance will end after construction is finished due to covering the site with pavement and landscaping. Further, as part of the 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 project construction. A SWPPP would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure that potential water quality impacts during construction from water erosion would be reduced to less than significant.

Loose sandy soils were encountered on site at shallow depth (within upper 5 feet), which will be removed during grading for subterranean parking levels. Subsurface sandy soils at depths of 25 feet and below are medium dense to very dense. Therefore, the potential for subsidence is low and impacts would be less than significant.

The Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared for the project included design and construction recommendations for the project. Without implementation of the geotechnical recommendation, a potentially significant impact could occur. Therefore, design and construction recommendations provided in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation Report shall be implemented as mitigation, which would reduce impacts to less than significant. Additionally, a SWPPP Permit and adherence to SCAQMD Rule 403—Fugitive Dust will be required, which together would further reduce the potential impacts on geology and soils to less than significant.

Hazards

Project Impacts

In 1979, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), which has regulatory authority, generally prohibited the domestic manufacture of Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) in electromagnets, transformers, and heat-transfer and hydraulic equipment. Southern California Edison-owned transformers are located on the project site in a fenced and locked storage area adjacent to the car wash facility. There is no evidence of spills or releases of PCBs from the transformers. Additionally, three active and at least three abandoned in-ground automotive lifts were identified in the automotive repair building at the project site. Two additional aboveground lifts are also in use in this area. Since these features have likely been refilled with hydraulic fluid in the last 10 years, it is unlikely that the hydraulic reservoirs still store PCB-containing fluid and PCBs are not expected to be contained in these features. Nonetheless, development of the proposed project could result in significant hazardous impacts associated with PCBs. Incorporation of mitigation would reduce impacts to less than significant and would ensure that no significant impact to construction workers on site or surrounding land uses would occur.

Structures constructed or remodeled between 1930 and 1981 have the potential of asbestos-containing materials (ACM). The northern portion of the project site was developed in the 1950s and 1960s, before the ban on ACM; therefore, the likelihood that the project site contains these materials is high. Additionally, possible ACMs were observed in the car wash and automotive repair/tire retail structures located on the northern portion of the project site. As a result of the suspected ACMs in the car wash and automotive repair/tire retail structures, hazardous impacts would be significant. With implementation of standard ACM recommended remediation, impacts would be reduced to less than significant. Standard

ACM remediation would ensure that no significant impact to construction workers on site or surrounding land uses would occur.

The structures on northern portion of the project site were constructed prior to the ban on lead-based paints (LBP) in 1978. The buildings in the northern portion of the project site were developed prior to the generally accepted 1978 lead-based paint determination date. Due to the likely presence of LBP on site, hazardous impacts would be significant. With implementation of standard removal and disposal practices of lead-based paint, recommended mitigation, impacts would be reduced to less than significant. Standard removal and disposal practices of lead-based paint would ensure that no significant impact to construction workers on site or surrounding land uses would occur.

Historical and present uses on the project site have been or are currently listed on environmental databases for hazardous material sites. The California Car Wash, located at 3940 San Fernando Road, is listed in the Historical Underground Storage Tank Registered Database (HIST UST), Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST), and Haznet databases. In 1999, six underground storage tanks (USTs) associated with the former gasoline station were excavated and removed from the northeastern portion of the project site. The City of Glendale issued closure for the LUST case associated with these tanks. An additional former UST location was confirmed to be located in the center of the parking lot of the car wash property. Since no documentation regarding the removal of USTs for the historical site occupants or investigation of chemical storage areas was available, additional assessment was conducted to characterize the site for proposed redevelopment. The additional investigation confirmed a known release of petroleum products from the former USTs, which was removed from the gasoline station located on the car wash property. An isolated area of total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) impacted soil was observed at a depth of 15 below ground surface (bgs). However, no impacts were observed above or below this depth. Nonetheless, significant hazard impacts could occur if impacted soil is not disposed of appropriately during project construction. Incorporation of mitigation regarding disposal of soil would reduce impacts to less than significant. With implementation of mitigation, no significant impact to construction workers on site or surrounding land uses would occur.

San Fernando Valley (Area 4) (also known as the Pollock Wellfield Area), San Fernando Valley (Area 2) (also known as the Crystal Springs Wellfield Area), and Mobil #11-GD4, located at 1324 South Central Avenue are located in the vicinity of the project site and were listed on various government databases for groundwater contamination. Based on the proximity of these properties, significant hazard impacts to the project site could result. Incorporation of mitigation would reduce impacts associated with these facilities to less than significant and would ensure that no significant impact to construction workers on site or surrounding land uses would occur.

Additionally, numerous historical gasoline station and automotive repair facilities were identified within 0.125 and 0.25 mile of the project site. Although based on depth to groundwater and distance from the project site there is no indication that these properties have negatively affected the project site, concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons and related volatile organic compounds (VOCs) may be present as a background condition in groundwater in the area. Based on depth to groundwater, no further assessment of groundwater is recommended at the project site at this time.

Cumulative Impacts

It is possible that a number of the related projects would involve significant renovation or demolition activities, which could subject construction workers or other persons to health and safety risks through exposure to hazardous material. Each related project would be required to adhere to applicable federal, state, and local requirements that regulate worker and public safety. It is anticipated that all hazardous materials delivered and hazardous waste removed from the project site and each related project site would be in accordance with Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Related projects may be located on or near a site included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Development of any of the related projects would be required to comply with applicable laws and regulations pertaining to hazardous wastes, and that risk with identified hazardous material sites would be eliminated or reduced through proper handling, disposal practice, and/or clean up procedures.

The closest related project, located downgradient of the project site, was listed on the Historical (HIST) Auto Stations database. Because of its location and distance, this related project is not expected to adversely impact the project site. Additionally, none of the related projects are directly adjacent to the proposed project site to potentially result in cumulative hazard impacts.

Land Use and Planning

Project Impacts

The project would develop 218 multi-family residential units, 54,000 square feet of commercial floor area, supporting parking facilities, and recreation and open space amenities. Development activity within the project area is subject to land use regulations set forth in the City of Glendale General Plan, the City of Glendale Zoning Ordinance, and San Fernando Road Corridor Redevelopment Project Area.

The project site is designated as Mixed Use by the General Plan and zoned as Commercial/Residential Mixed Use (SFMU) by the Municipal Code. The SFMU zoning classification permits a mix of commercial

and residential uses as well as exclusively commercial, industrial, or residential land uses. Similarly, pursuant to the City's Zoning Ordinance, a mix of commercial and residential uses is permitted within the SFMU Zone subject to the provision that commercial uses are located along the street frontage for lots abutting San Fernando Road, Broadway, and Colorado Street. Therefore, the mix of commercial and residential uses as proposed is permitted under the existing General Plan and Zoning designations. No General Plan Amendment or Zone Change is required.

The project currently includes 707 parking spaces, while the Glendale Municipal Code requires 789 parking spaces for 218 multi-family residential units and the 54,000 square feet of ground floor commercial space, if this space is occupied by 12,000 square feet, or 22 percent, of restaurant uses. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a parking exception to allow for shared parking between the commercial and residential guest uses. Based on a comparison of the project parking supply and peak parking demand, a surplus of eight spaces is anticipated for the proposed project. Therefore, parking provided by the project would accommodate the parking demand associated with the proposed land uses.

The proposed project is designed to comply with the relevant development standards of the San Fernando Road Corridor Redevelopment Plan. The project would not conflict with the implementation of other projects within the 750-acre redevelopment area. The Redevelopment Plan also requires compliance with applicable provisions of the General Plan, and Municipal Code.

With approval of the proposed parking exception and based on the actual demand of 699 parking spaces (please refer to **Section 4.11, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking**), the project would be consistent with the General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, Municipal Code and San Fernando Road Corridor Redevelopment Plan. Therefore, impacts related to land use and planning would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative land use impacts associated with the proposed Glendale Triangle project and related projects were analyzed in the draft EIR. The analysis concluded that no cumulative land use impacts associated with the proposed project and related projects would result, and the incremental effect of the project to these impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Noise

Project Impacts

Traffic noise from the streets adjacent to the site can potentially affect the proposed uses, and traffic from the project can potentially increase noise along streets in the vicinity of the project site that could impact existing use. Traffic generated from the proposed project would not result in a substantial noise increase along roadways in the project area. Therefore, impacts associated with the project increase in roadway noise would be less than significant.

Interior noise levels in the buildings along Los Feliz Road, Central Avenue and San Fernando Road could exceed the City's interior noise standard of 45 A-weighted decibels (dB(A)) for residential uses, resulting in a significant impact. However, mitigation would be incorporated into the project to reduce interior noise levels in the proposed residential units to less than significant.

Siren noise from ambulances associated with the nearby Glendale Memorial Hospital could potentially be deemed annoying or intrusive by future residents of the project. However, since siren noise would be infrequent and short in duration, it would not affect ambient noise levels at the project site over a 24-hour period.

All parking for the proposed project would be located on the ground floor and within in a three-and-a-half-level subterranean parking garage. These subterranean parking levels would not be a source of noise due to being fully enclosed. Therefore, noise impacts associated with parking structure would be less than significant.

Future residents within the project site may experience noise associated with the commercial/retail businesses activities proposed on the ground floor of the project site. Potential noise sources associated with retail uses on site include people talking, music from dining uses, and other noise associated with commercial activity. Typical noise levels in retail-commercial areas are approximately 65 dB(A). However, noise levels due to roadway noise would range from 69 dB(A) to 72 db(A) community noise equivalent level (CNEL). Consequently, roadway noise would be a more prominent noise source and, therefore, noise generated by on-site commercial activities would not result in a significant impact.

Future residents located on the project site may experience noise due to residential activities on the project site. Potential noise sources related to residential uses include people talking, doors slamming, stereos, and domestic animals. These noise sources are not unique and generally contribute to the ambient noise levels experienced in all residential areas. Noise levels for residential areas are typically

between 48 and 52 dB(A) CNEL. Overall, the noise generated by the project's residential uses would not exceed the City's compatibility thresholds and is considered to be less than significant.

Ground vibrations from construction activities very rarely reach the levels that can damage structures, but they can achieve the audible range and be felt in buildings very close to the site. The primary and most intensive vibration source associated with the development of the project would be the use of bulldozers and vibratory rollers, among other equipment during construction. These types of equipment can create intense noise that is disturbing and can result in ground vibrations.

The closest sensitive land use is the Glendale Memorial Hospital, which has buildings situated approximately 130 feet from the project site. The hospital is subject to more stringent vibration criteria than other land uses surrounding the site, which are generally commercial and office uses. The excavation/grading phase of project construction would generate the highest levels of vibration due to the use of a bulldozer and vibratory roller, among other equipment. Based on the methodology described in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Noise and Vibration Assessment Manual, the level of vibration at the hospital would reach 65 VdB during this phase of construction. Since the FTA identifies 65 vibration decibels (VdB(A)) as the maximum acceptable level threshold for a hospital due to the sensitivity of certain types of hospital equipment, the vibration impacts would be temporary, but significant.

Equipment used during the construction phases would generate both steady state and episodic noise that would be heard both on and off the project site. Noise levels generated during construction would primarily affect the hospital and patrons of the commercial and offices uses adjacent to the project site. The US Department of Transportation has compiled data regarding the noise generating characteristics of specific types of construction equipment. Noise levels generated by heavy equipment can range from approximately 73 dB(A) to noise levels in excess of 80 dB(A) when measured at 50 feet.

Construction activities associated with the project would occur at approximately 95 feet from existing commercial and office uses, and approximately 130 from the actual Glendale Memorial Hospital buildings. Equipment estimates used for the analysis for demolition, grading, and building construction noise levels are representative of worse case conditions, since it very unlikely that all the equipment contained on site would operate simultaneously. As presented, potential construction-related noise impacts are considered significant since the noise thresholds of 65 dB(A) for the hospital and 70 dB(A) for surrounding commercial uses would be exceeded.

Besides equipment noise associated with construction activities, construction traffic would generate noise along access routes to the proposed development areas. The major pieces of heavy equipment would be

moved onto the development only one time for each construction activity (i.e., demolition, grading, etc). In addition, daily transportation of construction workers and the hauling of materials both on and off the project site are expected to cause increases in noise levels along project roadways, although noise levels from such trips would be less than peak hour noise levels generated by project trips during project operation. Given that it takes a doubling of average daily trips on roadways to increase noise by 3 dB(A) and that average daily trips from construction activities would not result in a doubling of trip volume, the noise level increases along major arterials in the City of Glendale would be less than 3 dB(A), and potential impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Under the future with project traffic condition, roadway noise level increases would be below 1.0 dB(A) CNEL. Consequently, no cumulatively significant impact would occur with regard to roadway noise. In addition, because the contribution of the project was included in the future with project conditions, the project's impact is also less than significant.

Vibration impacts are localized in nature and decrease with distance. Consequently, in order to achieve a cumulative increase in vibration, more than one source emitting high levels of vibration would need to be in close proximity to the noise receptor. The closest related project, the commercial project at 435 W. Los Feliz Boulevard, is located 540 feet from the project site. This related project would not be located close enough to the project site where significant vibration impacts would occur from concurrent construction. The combined vibration impact of the related projects and the project's contribution would not be cumulatively significant.

The 435 W. Los Feliz Boulevard project by itself could generate noise levels in excess of City standards at adjacent locations. If construction of the proposed project and this related project were to occur simultaneously, there is the potential for combined construction impacts. Therefore, the project contribution to a significant cumulative construction noise impact would be cumulatively considerable. Cumulative construction noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Population and Housing

Project Impacts

The Glendale Triangle project would include 218 multi-family residential units consisting of one and two bedroom units, and 54,000 square feet of commercial space. The proposed project is expected to be built and fully occupied by 2012; therefore, growth projections for year 2015 are used in this analysis. Overall, the increase in population of 654 people that would be associated with the proposed residential units and

the potential indirect increase of 117 people associated with project-related employment opportunities would result in a total population increase of 771 new residents to the City.

When the population, housing and employment increase from the project are added to the 2008 population, housing and employment figures for the Arroyo Verdugo Subregion, the resulting population and housing and employment figures area well within 2015 Arroyo Verdugo Subregional projections.

The 2008 State Department of Finance population estimate for Glendale is 207,157. However, based on the City's projected annual growth rate between 2005 and 2010 as reported by SCAG, a more conservative estimate of the City's 2008 population is 208,989 persons. When the population increase from the project is added to the 2008 City of Glendale population of 208,989, the resulting population is 209,760 residents. In addition, when the project's housing and employment increases are added to SCAG's 2008 housing and employment estimates for the City, the resulting housing and employment figures are 73,673 housing units and 93,795 jobs. All of these demographic increases are within SCAG's 2015 projections of 214,201 residents, 75,461 housing units and 96,495 jobs for the City of Glendale. Therefore, project impacts associated with population, housing and employment growth would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The population growth associated with the proposed project and related projects would result in a total population increase of 10,734 new residents to the City. It should be noted that this analysis conservatively assumes that the proposed project and all of the related projects in the City of Glendale would be built out and fully occupied by 2015. If the proposed project and all of the related projects in the City of Glendale are built out and fully occupied by 2015, the population growth associated with the project and related projects would exceed SCAG's growth projection for the City by 5,522 persons between 2008 and 2015. However, SCAG's long-term projections for the City of Glendale estimate that population will increase to 221,154 persons by 2025 and 227,562 persons by 2035, which marks the end of SCAG's current planning period. Therefore, the population resulting from the project and related projects would be within the long-range population projections for the City. As a result, cumulative population impacts would be less than significant.

Public Services - Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Glendale Triangle project would result in the direct and indirect addition of approximately 771 new residents to the City of Glendale, as indicated in **Section 4.8**, **Population and**

Housing. Impacts associated with these additional residents include an increase in the number of fire department responses, routine fire prevention life/safety inspections, public education activities, and participation in community events. In addition, the new residents generated by the project would reduce the present firefighter-to-population service ratio of 1 to 1,047 by less than 1 percent. The Fire Department has indicated that the proposed project will have a direct impact upon fire protection services. Mitigation, as provided by the Glendale Fire Department, would reduce this impact less than significant. Implementation of the proposed project would also result in a direct increase for plan review and inspections by the Fire Department. However, the Fire Department has indicated that current staffing levels are adequate to accommodate plan review and inspections for of the project.

Funding for the Fire Department in the City of Glendale is derived from various types of tax revenue (e.g., tax increment in the form of property taxes, sales taxes, user taxes, vehicle license fees, deed transfer fees, etc.), which are deposited in the City's general fund or as appropriate into the redevelopment agency funds. The City Council and/or redevelopment agency then allocates the revenue for various public infrastructure improvements and public services that the City provides, including fire protection services. As the Glendale Triangle project is developed, tax revenues from property and sales taxes would be generated and deposited in the City's general fund, redevelopment agency funds, and the state treasury. A portion of these revenues would then be allocated to the City's Fire Department during the City's annual budget process to maintain staffing and equipment levels and facilities within the City of Glendale in numbers adequate to serve project-related increases in service call demands. This, coupled with the mitigation measures, would reduce impacts to fire protection services to less than significant.

The project is located within the response district for Rescue Ambulance (RA) 22, which currently averages about 205 calls per month. The additional residents and employees associated with the project would result in an increase in emergency medical responses. Based on the citywide emergency medical services (EMS) call demand of 0.00616 calls per person per month, the proposed project would generate approximately 60 additional calls per year or about 5 additional calls per month. The City of Glendale has considered a performance workload of 350 responses per month for a paramedic rescue ambulance. With the inclusion of these additional calls for service, RA 22 would be responding to approximately 210 calls per month. Since the number of calls would not be above the current performance workload of 350 per month 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 proposed mitigation, would further reduce impacts to emergency medical services to a less than significant level.

The City of Glendale's minimum fire flow requirement for water mains in the streets surrounding the project site is 6,000 gallons per minute (gpm) at 20 pounds per square inch (psi) of residual pressure.

Water service to the project site is presently provided by existing water lines on and adjacent to the site. City of Glendale policy requires upgrades to water lines serving new development as needed to meet minimum fire flow requirements for new development. With incorporation of mitigation listed below, impacts to fire flow would be reduced to less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts to fire protection and emergency medical services associated with the proposed Glendale Triangle project and related projects were analyzed in the draft EIR. The Glendale Triangle project and related projects together would result in the addition of approximately 10,734 residents. Impacts associated with these additional residents include an increase in fire protection responses, public education activities, participation in community events, and ongoing relations with the homeowners association. In addition, the introduction of the new residents generated by the Glendale Triangle project and related projects would reduce the present firefighter-to-population service ratio of 1 to 1,047 and would also result in an increase in emergency medical responses throughout the City. Due to the amount of development currently proposed in the City of Glendale, the related projects would have a direct cumulative impact upon fire protection and emergency medical services. However, with future funding from the general fund described above and proposed mitigation, this significant cumulative impact would be reduced to less than significant, and the incremental effect of the project to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

No other cumulative impacts to fire protection and emergency medical services associated with the proposed project and related projects, such as plan review or fire flow, would result, and the incremental effect of the project to these impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Public Services - Police Protection

Project Impacts

Implementation of the Glendale Triangle project would result in the addition of approximately 771 new residents to the City of Glendale. The addition of these new residents would slightly increase the number of calls for service and police investigations on the project site.

Funding for the police department in the City of Glendale is derived from various types of tax revenue (e.g., tax increment from property taxes, sales taxes, user taxes, vehicle license fees, deed transfer fees, etc.), which are deposited in the City's general fund, or as appropriate, into redevelopment agency funds. The City Council and/or redevelopment agency then allocates the revenue for various public infrastructure improvements, services and facilities that the City provides, including police services. As

the project is developed, tax revenues from property and sales taxes would be generated and deposited in the City's general fund, redevelopment agency, and the state treasury. A portion of these revenues would then be allocated to the City's police department during the City's annual budget process to maintain staffing and equipment levels within the City of Glendale in numbers adequate to serve project-related increases in service call demands. As funding would be made available to maintain adequate service, impacts would be less than significant.

The police department estimates that the project would generate additional calls for service. According to the police department, these additional calls would not seriously impact Department operations and, therefore, the impact on police protection services is considered less than significant.

The police department considers current response times in the City adequate and has indicated that the Glendale Triangle project would not adversely affect response times in the City. Therefore, the impact of the project on response times is less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts to police protection services associated with the proposed Glendale Triangle project and related projects were analyzed in the draft EIR. The Glendale Triangle project and related projects together would result in the addition of approximately 10,734 residents to the City population. As discussed above, the proposed project would not result in impacts to the Glendale Police Department. However, the addition of 10,734 residents to the City population would result in a cumulative impact to police protection services when considering current department resources. However, with future funding from the general fund and proposed mitigation, cumulative impacts to police protection services in the City would be less than significant, and the incremental effect of the project to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

Public Services - Schools

Project Impacts

The proposed project will include 218 dwelling units, which would generate approximately 32 students grades K–6, 11 students grades 7–8, and 24 students grades 9–12, for a total of 68 students. All schools serving the project site are currently operating under capacity. However, district high schools operated at 15.8 percent over capacity for the 2007–2008 school year. Given the existing lack of high school capacity in the district, implementation of the proposed project would result in a potentially significant impact. However, pursuant to Government Code Section 65995, the payment of school impact fees, as authorized

by Senate Bill 50, will fully mitigate any potential impact of the project on local schools. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on local schools is less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project and related projects could generate approximately 358 students in grades K through 6, 126 students in grades 7 and 8, and 266 students in grades 9 through 12, for a total of 751 students. Due to an existing lack of high school capacity in the district, these additional students would result in a significant impact and the contribution of the proposed project to this impact would be cumulatively considerable. However, according to Government Code Section 65995, the payment of school impact fees, authorized by Senate Bill 50, by each project will fully mitigate the impact of the project and related projects on local schools from cumulative development. Therefore, through payment of these fees, the cumulative impact of the project and related projects would be reduced to a less than significant level, and the project's contribution to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

Recreation

Project Impacts

Implementation of the proposed project would result in an estimated population increase of approximately 654 residents and 162 employees within the City of Glendale.[1] This increase in population would incrementally increase the use of existing neighborhood and community parks in the City. Impacts would be most pronounced at Cerritos Park and Palmer Park, which are the closest facilities to the project site. Even with implementation of all parkland under development, the parkland-to-resident ratio would remain relatively the same. The project would require a total of 4.3 additional acres to meet the ideal park land-to-resident ratio or 6 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, and 0.8 acre to maintain the existing park land-to-resident ratio of 1.12 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents.

Project amenities that would lessen the impacts associated with the project's impact on existing park and recreation facilities include 17,300 square feet of common open space and 15,000 square feet of private open space, for a total of 32,300 square feet of open space. In addition, a 1,800-square-foot fitness center and a 1,600-square-foot clubhouse would be provided adjacent to the main recreational located on the second level.

[1] According to the City of Glendale's Public Facilities Fee Study, workers are weighted as having 45 percent of the impact of a resident on recreational resources.

These amenities will partially serve to reduce demand for public recreation facilities by project residents. However, the public open and park space and private recreation facilities included in the project will not meet the needs of project residents and employees for neighborhood or community parks.

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, the increase in use of neighborhood and community parks in the City that would result from the increase in residents and employees associated with the project is considered significant. As such, the project applicant would be required to pay Development Impact Fees to assist in funding capital improvement projects, upgrades to existing recreational facilities, and acquisition and development of new park and recreation facilities around the project site. The combination of Development Impact fees and tax increment set aside over time is considered a reasonable means to mitigate project impacts on park and recreation land and facilities to less than significant levels. However, the City/Agency could elect to reduce or suspend the tax increment set aside in order to focus on other redevelopment priorities, and timing issues, this funding may not be fully provided, and the project would have a significant and unavoidable impact on park and recreation land and facilities.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts to recreational facilities associated with the proposed Glendale Triangle project and related projects were analyzed in the draft EIR. Implementation of the proposed project and related projects would increase the use of existing recreational facilities in the City. Direct and indirect population growth associated with the proposed project and related projects could result in the addition of 10,734 new residents to Glendale. The addition of 10,734 residents would lower the City's existing parkland to residents ratio of 1.12 acres per 1,000 ratio to approximately 1.08 acres per 1,000 residents.

Given the existing deficiency of parkland in the City, the combined effects of the proposed 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. The combination of Development Impact fees and tax increment set aside over time is considered a reasonable means to mitigate project impacts on park and recreation land and facilities to less than significant levels. However, based on a conservative analysis, which takes into account both the prospect that the City/Agency could elect to reduce or suspend the tax increment set aside in order to focus on other redevelopment priorities, and timing issues, the project and related projects could result in significant and unavoidable impacts on park and recreation land and facilities..

No other cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project and related projects, such as the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, would result, and the incremental effect of the project on these impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Traffic, Circulation and Parking

Project Impacts

The following eight study intersections were selected for analysis in order to determine potential impacts related to the proposed project:

- Seneca Avenue/Los Feliz Boulevard
- San Fernando Road/Chevy Chase Drive
- San Fernando Road/Los Feliz Road
- Central Avenue/Chevy Chase Drive
- Central Avenue/Los Feliz Road
- San Fernando Road/Central Avenue
- Brand Boulevard/Los Feliz Road
- Brand Boulevard-Glendale Boulevard/San Fernando Road

Construction worker vehicles and trucks are forecast to generate 226 vehicle trips per day, 113 inbound, 113 outbound, during the peak construction phases at the site. The inbound construction worker trips are anticipated to occur outside of the AM peak hour; however, the outbound construction worker trips may overlap with the PM peak hour. It is estimated that approximately 113 outbound trips may be generated during the PM peak hour. The anticipated total construction-related trips are 158 fewer than the estimated trips generated by the existing uses to be removed from the site. Therefore, traffic impacts associated with construction activities would be less than significant. Impacts would be further reduced with implementation of project design features.

It is anticipated that delivery trucks/construction equipment would be brought onto the project site and be stored within the perimeter fence of the construction site. However, temporary lane and sidewalk closures may be required along the adjacent public streets to accommodate truck or equipment staging. Flagmen would be used to control traffic movement during the ingress or egress of trucks and heavy equipment from the construction site. A Construction Traffic Control Plan would be developed to minimize potential conflicts between construction activity and through traffic.

To determine the operating conditions of the street system under existing plus project conditions, traffic to be generated by the proposed project was added to the existing year 2008 existing traffic conditions. Application of the City's significance criteria to the year 2008 existing-plus-project scenario indicates that none of the study intersections would be significantly impacted by the proposed project. Therefore, no traffic mitigation measures are required.

A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) was prepared to determine the project's potential impacts on designated monitoring locations on the Congestion Management Program (CMP) highway system. The analysis was prepared in accordance with procedures outlined in the *2004 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County, County of Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority*, July 2004.

There are no CMP intersection monitoring locations in the project vicinity. The proposed project would not add 50 or more trips during the AM or PM peak hours at any CMP monitoring intersections, which is the threshold for conducting further review, as stated in the CMP manual. In addition, the proposed project would not add 150 or more trips (in either direction) during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to the CMP freeway monitoring locations, which is the threshold for conducting further review of freeway monitoring locations, as stated in the CMP manual. Therefore, project impacts would be less than significant and no further review of potential impacts to freeway or intersection monitoring locations that are part of the CMP highway system is required.

Pursuant to the CMP guidelines, the proposed project is forecast to generate demand for 11 daily transit trips over a 24-hour period. Based on the limited increased demand for transit services generated by the project, it is anticipated that the existing transit service in the project area would adequately accommodate the project-generated transit trips. Thus, based on the calculated number of generated transit trips, no project impacts on existing or future transit services in the project area are expected to occur as a result of the proposed project.

The proposed Glendale Triangle Project would use the existing network of regional and local roadways located in the vicinity of the project site. Based on consultation with the City of Glendale Traffic and Transportation Division staff, the following street improvements adjacent to the project site shall be required. A two-foot roadway widening along the property frontages on Los Feliz Road, San Fernando Road, and Central Avenue would be provided. Street dedications will be determined in consultation with the City of Glendale Engineering Division and other City Departments.

The project has a high level of accessibility for emergency vehicles, both from a regional and a site perspective. Central Avenue, San Fernando Road, and Los Feliz Road provide direct routes to the project site for emergency vehicles. Smaller emergency vehicles, such as police cars and ambulances, would be

able to access the subterranean parking structure as necessary. As a result, project impacts on emergency vehicle access would be less than significant.

As for pedestrian safety, the installation of a pedestrian crosswalk is proposed as part of the project on the north leg of Central Avenue at the Laurel Avenue/Central Avenue intersection. Pedestrian crossing warning lights would be installed to alert motorists of pedestrian crossing activity. The crosswalk would extend from the project site to the hospital and provide access to the ground level and residential lobby of the project. All the commercial uses would be accessible from the ground level. Plazas would be created at Los Feliz Road and San Fernando Road to accommodate a waiting area for Metro bus riders and along Central Avenue. Pedestrian access to the second residential lobby and leasing office, which would be located on the ground level within the parking structure, would be via a sidewalk adjacent to the retail-parking driveway. These roadway improvements would be designed to adhere to standard engineering practices and requirements by the City of Glendale Public Works and Fire departments. Given these precautions, the proposed project would not substantially increase traffic hazards associated with the project site.

Direct application of the Code parking rates yields a total Code parking requirement of 789 parking spaces (436 residential spaces, 55 residential guest spaces, 298 commercial spaces) for the proposed project. Thus, the proposed parking supply of 707 spaces does not satisfy the parking requirements pursuant to the Code, with a deficiency of 82 spaces.

During grading and sub-grade construction, parking for construction workers would occur off site. The greatest demand for off-site parking would occur during the sub-grade construction phase. During the peak period of sub-grade construction activities, it is estimated that 88 parking spaces would be required off site. Off-site parking for construction workers will be provided at one or a combination of the following locations: 50 spaces would be provided at 1420 South Central Avenue; 50 spaces would be provided at 2861 Los Feliz Boulevard; and/or 100 spaces would be provided at 3130 North San Fernando Road. As shown, the parking provided at 3130 North San Fernando Road or the combination of parking at 1420 South Central Avenue and 2861 Los Feliz Boulevard would provide sufficient parking to accommodate parking demand from construction workers. Shuttle services will be provided by the project applicant between the off-site parking area/areas and the project site. Additionally, parking by construction workers on adjacent streets will be prohibited and construction workers would be directed to the parking locations mentioned. Once construction of the subterranean garage is complete, construction workers would park on site. Given these conditions, the impact associated with construction parking will be less than significant.

The project proposes to provide parking that is less than the number of parking spaces that would normally be required under Code. However, based on an analysis of the combined parking demands of the proposed residential, guests and commercial uses, the proposed parking supply of 707 spaces would be adequate to accommodate the shared parking demand at the site.

The Code parking ratios do not account for shared parking demand between the project components (i.e., internal capture), as well as the anticipated walk-in patronage from other surrounding commercial buildings to the proposed ground-floor commercial space. The Code parking requirements do not account for the shared parking demands of the residential guests and commercial patrons.

Based on alternative peak parking demand ratios that take the factors listed above into account, a peak parking demand of 699 spaces is forecast for the project site. Based on a comparison of the proposed parking supply, it is concluded that the parking supply of 707 spaces would accommodate the forecast peak parking demand for the proposed project.

There are a number of goals and policies set forth by the City of Glendale General Plan that relate to alternative transportation. As discussed above, pedestrian and transit improvements would be implemented as part of the project. These improvements associated with the project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, and impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative transportation impacts associated with the proposed project and related projects were analyzed in the draft EIR. Cumulative traffic impacts associated with the proposed project and related projects would be less than significant, and the incremental effect of the project to these impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Utilities and Service Systems - Water Service

Project Impacts

Demolition, grading, and construction activities associated with the Glendale Triangle project would require the use of water for dust control and clean-up purposes. The use of water for construction purposes would be short-term in nature and the amount used would be much less than that used during project operation. Therefore, construction activities would not have a significant impact on the existing water system or available water supplies.

New development on the project site would result in an increase in demand for operational uses, including landscape irrigation, maintenance, and other activities on the site. Water demand at buildout would be approximately 47 acre-feet per year. This amount represents a net increase of 43 acre-feet per year (afy), over the 4 afy, used by existing development on the project site.

The City of Glendale has identified an adequate supply of water to meet future City demands under normal conditions. A surplus exists that provides a reasonable buffer of approximately 3,000 to 4,000 afy of water. Future water demand in the City is based on projected development contained in the General Plan. For purposes of this assessment, the demand of the proposed project was assumed not to have been included in this demand projection. However, even with the net addition of 43.31 afy of demand generated by the proposed project, there is ample supply to meet remaining City demand under normal conditions. In addition, it is anticipated that during any three-year drought, the City would have sufficient water supply to meet demand. Similar to normal weather conditions, even with the net addition of 43.31 afy of demand generated by the proposed project, there is sufficient supply to meet City demand under drought conditions.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts to water supply and water treatment facilities associated with the proposed project and related projects were analyzed in the draft EIR. No cumulative impacts to water supply and water treatment facilities associated with the proposed project and related projects would result, and the incremental effect of the project to these impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Utilities and Service Systems - Sewer

Project Impacts

The Glendale Triangle project would, on average, generate 33,520 gallons of sewage per day. This amount of sewage represents a net increase of 30,932 gallons per day over the 2,588 gallons per day generated by the existing uses on the project site.

Sewage generated on the project site would be conveyed to the Hyperion Treatment Plant for treatment. With the Hyperion Treatment Plant currently operating 130 million gallons per day below capacity, the net addition of approximately 30,932 gallons of sewage per day generated by the proposed project would not result in the plant exceeding capacity. Therefore, adequate capacity exists to treat the net sewage increase generated by the project, and the impact of the proposed project on the sewage treatment system is less than significant.

The proposed project would be served by the existing 8-inch lines located in Central Avenue, Los Feliz Boulevard, and San Fernando Road, all of which are located in the Tyburn Flume and would be upgraded as part of the City's Tyburn Wastewater Capacity Improvement Project. Laterals would connect the proposed project to these lines.

The City imposes a sewer capacity increase fee on new developments, based on a computer modeling assessment of Glendale's sewer system's hydraulic capacity. The fee is charged when development of a parcel leads to an increase in the volume of wastewater discharged to the collection system. The City has elected to calculate these fees based on proportional increases in wastewater flow, in order to impose the fee in an equitable manner.

The City will undertake a new hydraulic analysis of the specific drainage basin every five years from the date of the first deposit into the special account. In the event the City receives proposals for new developments not considered in the current hydraulic analysis, intermediate and more frequent hydraulic analyses will be performed to evaluate capacity in the given drainage basin. As part of the City's annual Capital Improvement Program, the Public Works Director will request consideration from the City Council to budget the funds for the balance of the cost of increasing the sewer capacity for any of the drainage basins. The City's Public Works Engineering Division will then be able to design and construct the necessary improvements. As part of the City's Tyburn Wastewater Capital Improvement Project, sewer lines in the vicinity of the project would be upgraded. The project's net sewage increase to the lines in the Tyburn Flume would be mitigated through payment of the sewer capacity increase fee, which would provide the project's proportionate share of the funds for the City to upgrade the system.

Cumulative Impacts

Development of the related projects would place additional demand on the City's sewage conveyance system. Sewage conveyance infrastructure serving the individual related projects may not have adequate capacity to handle additional sewage loads, and such lack of capacity represents a significant impact. It should be noted, planned upgrades to the City's sewage conveyance system include the Tyburn Flume Wastewater Capacity Improvement Project, which would upgrade the sewer lines in Tyburn Street, Gardena Avenue, Central Avenue, Mira Loma Avenue, and San Fernando Road. Additionally, in an effort to alleviate sewer impacts, the City will impose a sewer capacity increase fee on all future developments adding demand for sewer system capacity. The fee will be charged when development of a parcel leads to an increase in the volume of wastewater discharged to the collection system. The City has elected to calculate these fees based on proportional increases in wastewater flow. The collected fees will be deposited into a specially created account to be used to fund capacity improvements of the specific drainage basin. Since the payment of the sewer capacity increase fee is available to reduce the severity of

the impact of the project and related project's on sewer capacity, the cumulative 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

Construction of the proposed project would involve site preparation activities (e.g., demolition and building) that would generate waste materials. Approximately 1,968 tons of demolition material would be generated. The project applicant would be required to take all the construction and demolition debris to a certified mixed debris recycling facility, which recycles a minimum of 50 percent of all waste received, or a recycler must divert all accepted waste from the landfill. The City's Integrated Waste Management Division recommends six certified mixed debris recycling facilities, including American Waste Pendleton Facility in Sun Valley, California Waste Services in Los Angeles, Community Recycling in Sun Valley, Downtown Diversion in Los Angeles, Interior Removal Specialist in South Gate, Justis Waste Recycling at BFI/Falcon Transfer in Wilmington, and Looney Bins in Sun Valley. Construction debris generated on the project site would be disposed of at one of the recommended facilities or at a recycling facility that diverts all construction and demolition waste, in accordance with Chapter 8.58 of the Municipal Code. The one-time disposal of 1,968 tons of demolition debris generated by the project would be served by the certified facilities; therefore, the impact of the project on the certified facilities would be is less than significant.

Project implementation would result in an increase in both residential and commercial development on site. A total of approximately 115.37 tons of solid waste per year is projected to be disposed of into landfills at project buildout. This represents a net increase of 113.13 tons per year when compared with the estimated 2.24 tons per year currently generated on the project site.

All solid waste generated on the project site will be deposited at the Scholl Canyon Landfill, which is owned by the City of Glendale. The annual disposal rate at the Scholl Canyon facility is 460,000 tons per year. Combined with the net increase of 115.37 tons per year in solid waste generated by the proposed project, the annual disposal amount would increase to approximately 460,115 tons per year. With a total annual disposal amount of 460,115 tons, and a remaining 10.3 million ton capacity, the Scholl Canyon facility would meet the needs of the City and the project for approximately 10 years. Because the project would be required to implement a waste-diversion program aimed at reducing the amount of solid waste disposed in the landfill, the amount of solid waste generated would likely be less than the amount estimated. Examples of waste diversion efforts would include recycling programs for cardboard boxes,

paper, aluminum cans, and bottles through the provision of recycling areas within garbage disposal areas.

The Scholl Canyon facility would have sufficient capacity to continue to accommodate the demand for Class III disposal facilities generated by the project site. As such, the increase in solid waste generation associated with the operation of the proposed Glendale Triangle project would not exacerbate landfill capacity shortages in the region to the point of altering the projected timeline of any landfill to reach capacity. Therefore, the impact of the project on permitted landfill capacity is less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Development of related projects would dispose of a projected 8,612 tons of solid waste into landfills every year. Combined with the additional net annual tonnage of solid waste generated by the proposed Glendale Triangle project, the cumulative amount generated by new projects would be approximately 8,725 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 enough to accommodate solid waste disposal needs of the project, and development of all related projects, for at least 10 years, if not longer. The City also utilizes four additional landfills, all of which are currently still accepting materials.

The Scholl Canyon and Puente Hills Landfills are a part of the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (CSDLAC). The CSDLAC provides solid waste management for over half the population in Los Angeles County. CSDLAC's service area covers approximately 800 square miles and encompasses unincorporated County territory, as well as 78 cities, including Glendale. CSDLAC operates a comprehensive solid waste management system, which includes landfills, recycling centers, transfer/materials recovery facilities, and gas-to-energy facilities.

Although there is insufficient permitted disposal capacity within the existing system serving Los Angeles County to provide for its long-term disposal needs, there is additional capacity potentially available within Los Angeles County through the expansion of local landfills, and outside of Los Angeles County through the use of a regional waste-by-rail system and remote landfills. As currently proposed by CSDLAC, this regional system would utilize disposal capacity at the planned Eagle Mountain Landfill (EML) in Riverside County and the Mesquite Regional Landfill (MRL) in Imperial County.

Toward that end, CSDLAC entered into Purchase and Sale Agreements in August 2000 for these two landfills, which are the only two fully permitted rail-haul landfills in California. CSDLAC closed escrow on the MRL in December 2002, and is currently in the planning and development process for that landfill. Due in part to pending federal litigation, CSDLAC has not been able to close escrow on the purchase of the Eagle Mountain Landfill.

CSDLAC intends to utilize a regional waste-by-rail system to transport municipal solid waste approximately 210 miles to MRL via the Union Pacific Railroad main line, which extends from the Metropolitan Los Angeles to Glamis, California. From Glamis, a 4.5-mile dedicated rail spur would be built to the site. Closing escrow on the MRL has allowed work to begin on a comprehensive master plan for the development of the site, including the landfill and rail infrastructure. Work on this project is currently ongoing and is scheduled to be finished in late 2008. Following completion of the master plan, CSDLAC intends to pursue concurrent final design and construction of the facilities necessary to begin operation. The MRL is scheduled to open for receipt of refuse in 2009.

Although 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, in combination with other development, could contribute to insufficient permitted disposal capacity by contributing additional solid waste to regional landfills. Development under the project would also contribute construction debris to regional landfills, increasing the cumulative effect. Therefore, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact would be considered cumulatively considerable, and would be a significant and unavoidable impact.

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 *State 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 *State 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 *State 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 *State CEQA Guidelines*.

Alternative 1 – No Project/No Development Alternative

The No Project Alternative would leave the project site in its present condition. Existing car wash facility, automotive services facility, fast-food restaurant, and associated parking, would remain. This alternative assumes no further development occurs within the project site.

Alternative 2 – Reduced Density Alternative (50% Residential Reduction)

The Reduced Density Alternative considers development of the entire 2.18-acre site with a reduced residential density. This alternative is considered to reduce the significant noise, vibration, and recreation impacts of the proposed project by reducing the amount of development. Under this alternative, all on-site buildings would be demolished and removed. The layout for the land uses proposed under this alternative would be the same as for the proposed project, and would result in the development of 109 apartments and 54,000 square feet of retail-commercial space. The height of the building would be reduced from five stories to three stories, minimizing the number of apartments by 109 dwelling units. Subterranean parking would be reduced from three and one half levels to three levels. Ground floor commercial space would remain at 54,000 square feet.

Alternative 3 – Commercial/Office Alternative

The Commercial/Office Alternative considers development of the entire 2.18-acre site with only commercial and office uses. This alternative was formulated to reduce the significant noise, vibration, and recreation impacts of the proposed project by reducing the amount of development and population generated. Under this alternative, all on-site buildings would be demolished and removed. The layout for the land uses proposed under this alternative would be the similar as for the proposed project, and would result in the development of 108,000 square feet of office space atop 54,000 square feet of retail-commercial space. The height of the building would be reduced from 5 stories to 3 stories. Subterranean parking would be reduced from three and one half levels to three levels. Ground floor commercial space would remain at 54,000 square feet.

Comparison of Alternatives

The analysis contained in **Section 7.0, Alternatives**, of this draft EIR concluded that the No Project/No Development Alternative would avoid the significant impacts identified for the proposed project and would be environmentally superior. While all significant impacts associated with the proposed project

would be avoided under the No Project/No Development alternative, none of the project objectives would be attained because the site would not be redeveloped. According to CEQA if the No Project/No Development Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, "the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives."

Of the remaining alternatives, the Commercial/Office Alternative is considered environmentally superior, as it would result in an incremental reduction of the overall level of impact when compared to the proposed project due to the elimination of the residential units. While the overall impacts of the proposed project could be incrementally reduced by the selection of Alternative 3, the significant and unavoidable short-term noise and groundborne vibration impacts during construction, and recreation impacts would not be eliminated by this alternative. Additionally, the Commercial/Office Alternative would not meet three key project objectives relating to strengthening the vitality of the surrounding area through transit oriented housing opportunities. Additionally, the development density and resulting revenue would not be sufficient to offset the cost of the land and would not be economically feasible for the applicant for this reason.

AREAS OF CONTROVERSY/ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Based on responses to the NOP, the Agency presently is not aware of any areas of controversy or issues to be resolved.