2.0 EXECUTIVE 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 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines *requires an EIR to include a brief summary of the proposed project and its impacts in language as clear and simple as reasonably practical. In accordance with the* 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.*

PROJECT LOCATION

The Glendale Triangle Project (the 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 triangular 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 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. A majority of 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. 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 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

Table 2.0-1, Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures, included herein, summarizes the Project-level and cumulative impacts associated with the proposed Project, mitigation measures identified to reduce the severity of Project impacts, and levels of significance after implementation of mitigation measures.

Table 2.0-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
AESTHETICS		
Project Impacts		
Scenic Vistas: Existing scenic vistas from the portion of Glendale where the Project site is located are limited to the long-range views of the Verdugo Mountains to the north, Santa Monica Mountains to the west and San Rafael Hills to the east. 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. Given that views from the Project site are currently blocked or obstructed, development of the site would not significantly obstruct views further. Therefore, development of the proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista and impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.1-12 and 4.1-13 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
AESTHETICS (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Scenic Resources: The Project site is currently developed and does not contain any natural scenic resources, such as native trees or rock outcroppings. In addition, the Project site is not located within the view corridor of any state scenic highway, as there are no state-designated scenic highways within the City of Glendale. Therefore, the proposed Project would not significantly damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway, and no impact will result. (Refer to p. 4.1-13 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
AESTHETICS (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Visual Character: As the Project would be shorter than the adjacent eight-story Glendale Memorial Hospital building and taller than the adjacent existing one and two story commercial structures; 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 Project would comply with the San Fernando Road Redevelopment Project Area Plan and must undergo a two-stage design review process through the Glendale Redevelopment Agency to verify compliance with the Agency's Design Review Guidelines. As such, Project development would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the Project site and their surroundings. (Refer to pp. 4.1-11 through 4.1-14 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
AESTHETICS (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Light and Glare: The proposed structure would consist of light- and medium-colored exterior wall materials balanced with low reflective glass materials. Highly polished materials or highly reflective glass that could reflect light and create glare are not proposed Development of the proposed Project would establish new permanent sources of lighting that would increase the current low-intensity level of light on the site. 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. All proposed signage and associated lighting would be subject to signage regulations and programs included in the Glendale Municipal Code. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in substantial light or glare impacts. (Refer to pp. 4.1-14 and 4.1-15 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
AESTHETICS (continued)		
Cumulative Impacts		
The proposed Project and nearby related projects would not result in cumulative impacts to scenic vistas because views of surrounding mountains are largely obstructed by existing development. Cumulative impacts to the visual character of the area would be less than significant because the Project and nearby related projects would improve the local visual character while being compatible with surrounding uses. In addition, lighting plans and proposed building materials for the proposed Project and related projects within the Redevelopment Project Area would be reviewed by the Glendale Redevelopment Agency during Design Review. (Refer to pp. 4.1-15 through 4.1-17 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
AIR QUALITY		
Project Impacts		
Air Quality Plan: The Project would not conflict with the 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) because it would not induce population growth over the projections that were used for future emission estimates. Additionally, the development is consistent with the goals of the AQMP for reducing motor vehicle emissions. Impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.2-40 through 4.2-41 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
AIR QUALITY (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Construction emissions: Construction emissions were calculated according to the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD's) *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* and construction emission factors contained in the URBEMIS 2007 Air Quality Impact Model. Air pollutant emissions would not exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD during building construction activities. Impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.2-41 through 4.2-43 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Localized Construction emissions: Localized oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), and respirable and fine particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) impacts to sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity of the Project site during construction activities were estimated using the SCAQMD thresholds of significance. Construction activities would not generate emissions in excess of site-specific localized significance thresholds and impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.2-43 through 4.2-44 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
AIR QUALITY (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Operational Emissions: The analysis of daily operational emissions was prepared using the data and methodologies identified in the SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* and current motor vehicle emission factors in the URBEMIS 2007 Air Quality Impact Model. The emissions associated with the Project would not exceed the SCAQMD's recommended operational emission thresholds. As a result, the operational impacts associated with the Project are considered less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.2-45 through 4.2-46 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
CO Concentrations: Future CO concentrations were analyzed and each study area intersection using the CALINE4 screening procedure under worst-case conditions. Future CO concentrations at each analyzed intersection would not exceed the state 1-hour and 8-hour standards with Project development. No significant CO concentration impacts would occur to sensitive receptors in the vicinity of these intersections. (Refer to pp. 4.2-46 through 4.2-48 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
AIR QUALITY (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Objectionable Odors: 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. 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. Additionally, operational impacts related to objectionable odors would be less than significant because project-generated refuse would be disposed into appropriate trash collection containers, which would be covered and enclosed as required by the City. (Refer to pp. 4.2-48 through 4.2-49 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
AIR QUALITY (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Toxic Air Emissions: Project construction would involve demolition and removal of existing structures from the Project site, some of which were constructed before asbestos-containing building materials were regulated. All structures would be stabilized and demolished in accordance with applicable regulations including SCAQMD Rule 1403, Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities. On-site Project operations would not involve hazardous materials in any appreciable quantity or result in emissions of toxic air contaminants (TACs) regulated by SCAQMD rules or TACS on federal or state air toxics lists. 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 hazardous materials, toxic air emissions and TACs are considered less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.2-49 through 4.2-51 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Cumulative Impacts		
The Project would not generate a cumulatively considerable contribution to air pollutant emissions during construction and operation. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the AQMP and would have a less than significant cumulative impact on air quality. (Refer to pp. 4.2-52 and 4.2-53 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
AIR QUALITY (continued)		
Cumulative Impacts (continued)		
Assembly Bill 32, 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. SB 375 has been signed into law as an implementing program for AB 32; however, CARB is not expected to develop regional GHG emission thresholds for California's 18 Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) until 2010. 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 this Project's GHG emissions would interfere with the State's programs to meet the goals of AB 32 and the strategies that are expected to be developed under SB 375. The goals of SB 375 are to generally reduce vehicle miles traveled, reduce GHG emissions, reduce fossil fuel consumption, conserve wildlife habitat, and provide housing choices. Given that the proposed Project is a mixed-use residential/commercial urban in-fill project located near mass transit connections and employment centers, the Project is consistent with the goals of SB 375. Therefore, 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.	Project characteristics and measures that would comply with GHG reduction measures include, but are not limited to, energy and water efficiency standards, and low-carbon fuel standards. (Table 4.2-16 and Table 4.2-17, in Section 4.2 of the Draft EIR).	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
CULTURAL RESOURCES		
Project Impacts		
Historic Resource: The Glendale Register of Historic Resources requires that proposed historic resources meet at least one of seven criteria. The existing on-site buildings do not meet any of the criteria for inclusion on the Glendale Register. Additionally, existing on-site buildings do not quality for listing on the National or California Register. As the existing buildings on site are not historic resources as defined in Section 15064.5 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.3-10 through 4.3-12 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Archaeological Resources: 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. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with Project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during Project subsurface activities, appropriate mitigation would be required before work in the area could proceed, in order to reduce any potential impacts to less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.3-12 through 4.3-14 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	4.3-1 In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during Project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 200-meter (656-foot) radius shall 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. The appropriate mitigation measures may include recording the resource with the California Archaeological Inventory database or excavation, recordation, and preservation of the sites that have outstanding cultural or historic significance.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures		Significance After Mitigation
CULTURAL RESOURCES (continued)			
Project Impacts (continued)			
Paleontological Resources: Deposits of older quaternary alluvium exist on the Project site at unknown depths, which could contain paleontological resources. The Project site has already been subject to extensive disruption due to previous development. However, deeper excavations that extend into older quaternary deposits may encounter significant fossil vertebrate specimens. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during Project subsurface activities, appropriate mitigation would be required before work in the area could proceed, in order to reduce any potential impacts to less than significant. (Refer to p. 4.3-15 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	4.3-2	In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during Project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within 100-meter (328-foot) radius shall 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. The appropriate mitigation measures may include recording the resource with the California Inventory database or excavation, recordation, and preservation of the sites that have outstanding paleontological significance.	Less than Significant
Disturbance of Human Remains: The Project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban landscape and include retail-commercial and medical uses. No known traditional sites exist within the Project area or surrounding area, nor have any resources been identified. Nonetheless, if encountered during excavation and grading activities, any discovery of such resources would be treated in accordance with state and federal guidelines for disclosure, recovery, and preservation, as appropriate. Implementation of this standard requirement would reduce potential impacts to a level that is less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.3-15 through 4.3-16 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	4.3-3	If human remains are unearthed, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then serve as consultant on how to proceed with the remains (i.e., avoid, rebury).	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
CULTURAL RESOURCES (continued)		
Cumulative Impacts		
One related project is located within the immediate vicinity of the Project site, a commercial and office project proposed at 435 W. Los Feliz Road. The site at 435 W. Los Feliz Road does not contain historic resources. In addition, none of the other related projects would involve impacts to identified historic resources. Therefore, no cumulative impacts to historic resources would result. Development of the related projects in the City would also require grading and excavation that could potentially affect archaeological, paleontological, or human remains. CEQA requirements for protecting archaeological and paleontological resources or human remains are applicable to development in the City of Glendale, as are local cultural resource protection ordinances. In addition, the Project includes several mitigation measures that would reduce the Project's impact to cultural resources to less than significant. Because subsurface cultural resources are protected upon discovery as required by law, impacts to those resources would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.3-16 through 4.3-17 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
GEOLOGY AND SOILS		
Project Impacts		
Earthquake Faults: 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. Therefore, the potential for surface rupture as a result of fault plane displacement during the design life of the Project is less than significant. (Refer to p. 4.4-5 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Seismic Ground Shaking: The Project site could be subject to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake originating along one of the faults listed as active or potentially active in the Southern California area. This hazard could pose a risk to public safety and property by exposing people, property, or infrastructure to potentially adverse effects including strong seismic ground shaking. Design of the proposed structures would be required to comply with all applicable building codes to ensure safety in the event of an earthquake. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.4-5 through 4.4-6 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
GEOLOGY AND SOILS (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Seismic-Related Ground Failure: Liquefaction is a seismic phenomenon in which loose, saturated, fine-grained granular soils behave similarly to a fluid when subjected to high-intensity ground shaking. 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. (Refer to p. 4.4-6 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Landslides: 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 site in the path of any known or potential landslides. Therefore, the potential for impacts from landslides is not significant. (Refer to p. 4.4-7 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
GEOLOGY AND SOILS (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Soil Erosion: Project construction 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 complete. Further, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit, and prepare and submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be used throughout Project construction. In addition, the applicant would adhere to SCAQMD Rule 403—Fugitive Dust, which together would further reduce potential impacts on geology and soils to less than significant. (Refer to p. 4.4-7 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Unstable Geological Unit: While Project development would not result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared for the Project included design and construction recommendations. Implementation of these geotechnical recommendations would reduce impacts to less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.4-8 through 4.4-9 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	4.4-1 Geotechnical recommendations 4.1 through 4.14 contained in Section 4.0, Recommendations, of the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared for the proposed Project by Leighton and Associates, Inc., dated September 24, 2007, shall be implemented during Project construction.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
GEOLOGY AND SOILS (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Expansive Soil: Limited laboratory test of one composite bulk sample taken from depths of 25 to 30 feet below ground surface indicate very low expansion potential per CBC, 2001. Based on exploration performed by Leighton and Associates, Inc and laboratory test results, subsurface soils within upper 30 feet are anticipated to be very low to low expansive. Therefore, impacts associated with expansive soil would be less than significant. (Refer to p. 4.4-9 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Soil Support of Septic tanks: Septic tanks would not be used in the proposed Project. The Project would connect to and use the City's existing sewage conveyance system. No impact would result. (Refer to p. 4.4-10 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	No impact.
Cumulative Impacts		
The Project and each related project would be required to be consistent with recommendations contained in each project's geotechnical study and designed in accordance with the CBC. The closest related project is located approximately 500 feet to the west of the site. Therefore, the related projects would not create cumulative impacts on soils and geology. With implementation of a SWPPP, as required by the NPDES permit, cumulative erosion within the watershed would not exceed natural levels, and significant cumulative impacts related to erosion would not occur. (Refer to p. 4.4-11 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		
Project Impacts		
Release of Hazardous Materials: Materials within the existing buildings on the Project site may contain asbestos, lead, and PCBs. Through standard surveys, testing and removal of such materials, these impacts would be effectively mitigated. (Refer to pp. 4.5-10 through 4.5-11 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	4.5-1 Removal of the automotive lifts shall be supervised to ensure release of hydraulic fluid does not occur, which could be encountered during site excavation in the automotive repair building area. Hydraulic fluids used in automotive lifts shall be collected and properly disposed of in accordance with all applicable standards from the City of Glendale Fire Department. 4.5-2 The structures on the northern portion of the Project site shall be surveyed and sampled for asbestos-containing building materials by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor. If asbestos-containing building materials are determined to be present in the structures, all asbestos-containing materials shall be removed under acceptable engineering methods and work practices by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor prior to demolition. These practices include, but are not limited to, containment of the area by plastic, negative air filtration, wet removal techniques and personal respiratory protection and decontamination. The process shall be designed and monitored by a California Certified Asbestos Consultant.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Release of Hazardous Materials: (continued)	4.5-3 The asbestos removal process shall comply with all applicable National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) and South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1403, which require specific notification and training procedures for removing asbestos-containing materials before demolition and renovation when such activities involve more than 100 square feet (Rule 1403) or 160 square feet (NESHAP) of surface area of asbestos-containing materials. These rules apply to friable and nonfriable materials that may become friable during demolition and renovation activities. Additionally, the requirements of Section 1529, Title 8, California Code of Regulations pertinent to asbestos-containing construction materials, as it applies to asbestos exposure in construction work, shall be complied with prior to and during demolition activities. 4.5-4 The construction contractor shall comply with all applicable federal, state, and local lead based paint (LBP) regulations during demolition activities. Should the selected solid waste disposal facility or recycling facility require that suspected LBP debris be analyzed using toxicity characteristics leaching procedure (TCLP), the actual building materials designated for that facility shall be analyzed at that time.	

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Hazardous Material Sites: 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 on the Project site at 3940 San Fernando Road, is listed on environmental databases for hazardous material sites. Based on the Project site assessment and closure documentation, limited affected soil remains in place beneath the former underground storage tank (UST) area. Special disposal considerations would be required for the impacted soil being excavated from the Project site as part of Project development. With implementation of mitigation, hazard impacts associated with soil excavation would be less than significant. Petroleum products from the former USTs, which was removed from the former gasoline station located on the car wash property, impacted an isolated area of soil. No impacts were observed above or below the isolated area. With implementation of mitigation, hazard impacts to construction workers on site or surrounding land uses would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.5-13 through 4.5-15 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	4.5-5 Prior to grading, a soil management plan shall be prepared and implemented to address the handling of soil that may contain low residual concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons. Profile sampling shall be conducted on excavated soils as part of the soil management plan. The excavated soil shall be disposed of at an appropriate permitted disposal facility based on profile sampling. The Project applicant shall coordinate and submit the soil management plan to the City of Glendale Fire Department prior to construction activities.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Hazardous Material Sites: The following areas in the vicinity of the Project site were listed on various government databases for groundwater contamination: San Fernando Valley (Area 4) located in the San Fernando Valley Pollock Wellfield area of Los Angeles County; and San Fernando Valley (Area 2) located in the San Fernando Valley Crystal Springs Wellfield Area of Los Angeles County. Mobil #11-GD4, located at 1324 South Central Avenue, is northeast of the Project site, and is listed on several environmental databases. Therefore, the aforementioned facilities could result in significant hazard impacts to the Project site. With implementation of mitigation, no significant impacts to construction workers or future occupants on site or surrounding land uses would occur.	4.5-6 As part of Project design, a sub-slab vapor barrier shall be installed beneath the structure to ensure that potentially impacted groundwater is not a concern for future occupants of the site.	
Cumulative Impacts		
Although each related project site has potentially unique hazardous materials considerations, the proposed Project and 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. In addition, the closest related project is located approximately 500 feet to the west of the proposed Project site at 435 W. Los Feliz Road. None of the related projects are located close enough to the proposed Project site to create cumulative hazard impacts. As a result, cumulative impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.5-16 through 4.5-17 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (continued)		
Cumulative Impacts (continued)		
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. Additionally, the closest related project, 500 feet west of the proposed Project at 435 W. Los Feliz Road, is located downgradient of the Project site and was listed on the HIST Auto Stations database. Because of its location and distance, this related project is not expected to adversely impact the Project site. Accordingly, cumulative impacts to the public or environment associated with development on or near listed contaminated sites would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.5-16 through 4.5-17 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
LAND USE AND PLANNING		
Project Impacts		
Land Use Plan, Policy, and Regulation: The mix of commercial and residential uses as proposed is permitted under the existing general plan and zoning designations and would comply with the San Fernando Road Corridor Redevelopment Plan. With approval of a proposed parking exception and based on the actual demand of 699 parking spaces, 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. (Refer to pp. 4.6-6 through 4.6-8 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Cumulative Impacts		
All identified Citywide related projects would be reviewed for consistency with adopted land use plans and policies by the City of Glendale. For this reason, related projects are anticipated to be consistent with applicable general plan and zoning requirements, or be subject to an allowable exception, and further, would be subject to CEQA, mitigation requirements, and design review. The closest related project, at 435 W. Los Feliz Road, is located within the San Fernando Road Redevelopment Project Area and is proposing commercial/retail uses, which are consistent with land use and zoning designations. Therefore, cumulative impacts to land use would not be cumulatively considerable, as the proposed Project and closest related project would not conflict with any applicable local or regional land use plans. Therefore, the Project's cumulative impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.6-8 through 4.6-9 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
NOISE		
Project Impacts		
<u>Permanent Noise Increase – Vehicle Noise:</u> An increase in community noise equivalent level (CNEL) of 3 A-weighted decibels (dB(A)) represents the point at which only the most sensitive individuals notice a change in noise levels. Roadway noise levels would not increase as a result of Project traffic. Since the Project would not increase roadway noise levels by 3 dB(A) or greater, impacts would be less than significant. Interior noise levels in the proposed buildings along Los Feliz Road, Central Avenue and San Fernando Road could exceed the interior threshold of 45 dB(A), resulting in a significant impact. (Refer to pp. 4.7-16 through 4.7-18 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	4.7-1 Noise sensitive residential land uses proposed in areas exceeding the exterior 65 dB(A) CNEL (such as those dwelling units facing Los Feliz Road, San Fernando Road and Central Avenue) shall be designed so that average interior noise levels attributable to exterior sources do not exceed 45 dB(A) when doors and windows are closed. In addition, an interior noise level of 45 dB(A) CNEL shall not be exceeded. An acoustical analysis of the noise insulation effectiveness of proposed construction shall be required and documented during permit review, showing that the building materials and construction specifications are adequate to meet the interior noise standard. Examples of building materials and construction specifications which may be used to meet the interior noise standard include the following: • Windows and sliding glass doors with exposure to San Fernando Road, Los Feliz Road or Central Avenue shall be doubled paned, mounted in low air filtration rate frames, and have a sound transmission coefficient rating of 30 or greater; and • Air conditioning units shall be provided to allow for windows to remain closed.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
NOISE (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Permanent Noise Increase – Parking Structures: Parking provided on the ground level for the Project would be surrounded by the proposed structures with the remaining parking located below grade. These parking levels would not be a source of noise due to a fully enclosed design. Therefore, noise impacts associated with parking structure would be less than significant. (Refer to p. 4.7-18 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Permanent Noise Increase – On Site Retail Uses: 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. 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) 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. (Refer to p. 4.7-19 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Permanent Noise Increase – On Site Residential Uses: 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. 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 interior noise threshold and is considered to be less than significant. (Refer to p. 4.7-19 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
NOISE (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Groundborne Vibration: The closest sensitive land use is the Glendale Memorial Hospital, which has buildings situated approximately 130 feet east of the Project site. 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. However, these pieces of equipment would not operate continuously during the workday and it is unlikely the types of equipment would operate simultaneously. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) identifies 65 vibration decibels (VdB) as the recommended maximum acceptable vibration level for hospitals, which is a more conservative standard compared to the FTA recommended maximum acceptable level for other land uses surrounding the site. Based on the methodology described in the FTA Noise and Vibration Assessment Manual, the level of vibration at the hospital would reach 65 VdB during this phase of construction. Therefore, vibration impacts, while temporary in nature, would be significant periodically during the excavation/grading phase of Project construction. (Refer to pp. 4.7-19 through 4.7-20 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce vibration impacts.	Significant and unavoidable

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
NOISE (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Temporary Noise Increase: 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. Construction activities associated with the Project would occur at approximately 95 feet from existing commercial and office uses, and approximately 130 feet from the actual Glendale Memorial Hospital buildings, which are the closest receptors. Noise levels generated during each construction phase would range from 76 dB(A) to 78 dB(A) when measured at 100 feet. Equipment estimates used for the analysis for demolition, grading, and building construction noise levels are representative of worst case conditions, since it very unlikely that all the equipment contained on site would operate simultaneously. Exterior construction-related noise impacts are considered significant since the exterior noise thresholds of 65 dB(A) for the hospital and 70 dB(A) for surrounding commercial uses would be exceeded periodically during the construction process. (Refer to pp. 4.7-21 through 4.7-24 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	4.7-2 All construction activity within the City shall be conducted in accordance with Section 8.36.080, Construction on buildings, structures, and Projects, of the City of Glendale Municipal Code. 4.7-3 The following construction best management practices (BMPs) shall be implemented to reduce construction noise levels: • Two weeks prior to the commencement of construction, notification must be provided to surrounding land uses within 1,000 feet of a Project site disclosing the construction schedule, including the various types of activities that would be occurring throughout the duration of the construction period;	Significant and unavoidable

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
NOISE (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Temporary Noise Increase: Construction traffic would generate noise along access routes to the proposed development areas. However, average daily trips associated with construction activities would not result in a doubling of trip volume along Project roadways. Given that it takes a doubling of average daily trips on roadways to increase noise by 3 dB(A), the noise level increases associated with construction vehicle trips along major arterials in the City of Glendale would be less than 3 dB(A), and potential impacts would be less than significant.	• Ensure that construction equipment is properly muffled according to industry standards and be in good working condition; • Place noise-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses, where feasible; • Schedule high noise-producing activities between the hours of 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM to minimize disruption on sensitive uses; • Implement noise attenuation measures to the extent feasible, which may include, but are not limited to, temporary noise barriers or noise blankets around stationary construction noise sources;	

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
NOISE (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Temporary Noise Increase: (Continued)	• Use electric air compressors and similar power tools rather than diesel equipment, where feasible; • Construction-related equipment, including heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment, shall be turned off when not in use for more than 30 minutes; and • Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the job superintendent shall be clearly posted at all construction entrances to allow for surrounding owners and residents to contact the job superintendent. If the City or the job superintendent receives a complaint, the superintendent shall investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action taken to the reporting party. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed Project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit. 4.7-4 Construction staging areas along with the operation of earthmoving equipment within the Project area shall be located as far away from vibration- and noise-sensitive sites as possible. 4.7-5 Heavily loaded trucks used during construction shall be routed away from residential streets.	

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
NOISE (continued)		
Cumulative Impacts		
Cumulative development would be subject to California Noise Insulation and City of Glendale standards, which require that new hotels, apartment houses, and dwellings achieve an interior noise level of 45 dB(A), and that commercial and office uses achieve interior noise levels of 55 dB(A). In addition, the Project impacts would be less than significant, as all residential and commercial development under the Project would be designed to comply with these standards would achieve compliance. The Project contribution to cumulative noise impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. The addition of traffic from related projects and the proposed Project to existing traffic conditions would not result in a significant cumulative impact with regard to roadway noise. (Refer to pp. 4.7-26 through 4.7-27 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Vibration impacts are localized in nature and decrease with distance. The closest related project, the commercial project at 435 W. Los Feliz Road, is located 540 feet from the Project site. This related project would not be located close enough to the site where significant vibration impacts would occur from concurrent construction. The combined vibration impact of the related projects and the proposed Project would not be cumulatively significant. (Refer to pp. 4.7-27 through 4.7-28 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
NOISE (continued)		
Cumulative Impacts (continued)		
With regard to temporary cumulative increases in noise, more than one source emitting high levels of noise would need to be in close proximity to the noise receptor. The commercial project at 435 W. Los Feliz Road, is located in close enough proximity to the Project site to result in cumulative noise impacts during construction. If construction of the proposed Project and this related project were to occur simultaneously and all the equipment contained on Project site would operate simultaneously, there is the potential for combined construction impacts. Therefore, the Project contribution to a significant cumulative construction noise impact would be cumulatively considerable. (Refer to p. 4.7-28 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.7-2 to 4.7-5 would reduce construction noise levels generated by the Project.	Significant and unavoidable

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
POPULATION AND HOUSING		
Project Impacts		
Population Growth: The Project would generate approximately 654 residents and 162 employees. The employment positions would indirectly generate approximately 117 people additional residents in the City of Glendale. Overall, the Project would result in a total population increase of 771 new residents to the City. The population, housing, and employment increase as a result of the Project are within the South Coast Association of Governments (SCAG's) 2015 projections for residents, housing units and jobs for the City of Glendale. Therefore, Project impacts associated with population, housing, and employment growth would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.8-3 through 4.9-4 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
POPULATION AND HOUSING (continued)		
Cumulative Impacts		
If the Project and all of the related projects considered in the cumulative impact analysis were built and fully occupied by 2015, the City's population could increase by approximately 10,734 residents. When the cumulative population increase is added to the 2008 City of Glendale population, cumulative growth would exceed SCAG's growth projection for the City for the year 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. (Refer to pp. 4.8-3 through 4.8-6 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
PUBLIC SERVICES – FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES		
Project Impacts		
Fire Protection Services: The Glendale Fire Department has indicated that current staffing levels are adequate to accommodate plan review and inspections for the Project. As a result, impacts to the Fire Prevention Bureau would be less than significant. The Glendale Fire Department has indicated that the Project would have a direct impact upon fire protection and emergency medical services. However, funding from the general fund, coupled with mitigation, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, 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, impacts to fire flow would be reduced to less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.9.1-5 to 4.9.1-7 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	4.9-1 Building design shall consider the use of naturally ventilated smoke-proof enclosures. 4.9-2 Fire hydrants on streets fronting the Project site shall be provided at a spacing not to exceed 300 feet on center. 4.9-3 As needed, the Project applicant shall be responsible for providing new City standard fire hydrants in the vicinity of the Project site. The exact location of the new hydrant shall be determined by the Glendale Fire Department. The fire hydrant shall have three outlets (2.5 x 4 x 4) and shall be installed in accordance with Glendale Fire Department standards and provided prior to occupancy. 4.9-4 All areas of the building shall be accessible by an approved gurney access path from all points of Fire Department access, to the satisfaction of the Glendale Fire Department. All elevators shall also accommodate gurneys.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
PUBLIC SERVICES – FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
	4.9-5 The following items shall be submitted within 180 days of building permit issuance, and approved prior to issuance of any occupancy of the building: • The owner shall provide an emergency manual prepared specifically for this Project's occupants, to address proper emergency procedures in the event of fire, earthquake, natural and catastrophic disaster, power outage, medical emergency, bomb threat, violence, etc. The manual shall comply with requirements of Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&R) Title 19 and submitted to the Glendale Fire Department for review and approval prior to the issuance of the first occupancy permit. • To assist in occupant emergency training, a video and other training materials shall be developed specifically for this building's occupants, and regularly schedule training in accordance with Title 19 shall be contracted. The building management in accordance with Title 19 shall keep records of occupant training and emergency drills. • A brochure shall be developed and be made available to all persons entering the building from any public entrance and to all occupants in the building.	

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
PUBLIC SERVICES – FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
	4.9-6 A package of signage and graphics shall be provided for the following. Package shall be submitted within 180 days of building permit issuance, and be approved and installed prior to building occupancy: The package shall consist of the following: • Provisions for additional performance-based facilities to aid occupant egress, including: – Painting of all stairwells with building standard paint or a warm/friendly color (not industrial type color); – Shoulder-height graphics in stairwells; – In each stairwell, at all transitions, and from the third floor, provide a graphic indicator so occupants will know what to expect at each change in direction and at the stairway terminators. – Other performance-based measures to enhance occupants' cognitive recognition of egress facilities. • Custom-made signage for all fire sprinkler control valves, fire alarm control panels, junction boxes, terminal cabinets, smoke control panel, on the fire department connections (FDCs), all motor control centers, fans, switches, panels, motors, etc. • All service and ancillary rooms in the building shall have signage identifying the room.	

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
PUBLIC SERVICES – FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
	• In the parking garage, supplementary "Stair" signs shall be provided so as to be visible from drive aisles from 300 feet. • In the parking garage, signage to identify locations of fire hose valves and fire extinguishers shall be provided so as to be visible from drive aisles. • Custom-made signage specifically for responding firefighters containing operating instructions for the fire alarm system, fire sprinkler, etc. • All code-required signage, including but not limited to: stairwell identification signage; Title 19 evacuation signs. • Signage on exterior doors to identify where they lead; • Address numbers on the building, directory(ies) in lobby(ies), and each units identification.	

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
PUBLIC SERVICES – FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
	4.9-7 The Project's fire protection system shall include a narrative description detailing the design intent; shall be specifically tailored to this Project; and shall include only criteria that is either in excess of, or not addressed, in the applicable design and installation standards. Specifications shall not duplicate applicable design and installation standards. 4.9-8 All fire stopping for the Project shall be consolidated under the responsibility of a single fire stopping specialty contractor. 4.9-9 Utilities in the building, such as electrical, telephone, data, cable, etc., shall be designed and installed in such a way as to minimize deterioration of the fire stopping over the life of the building, and establish a standardized fire-stopping systems that allow for tenant improvement and future utility improvements.	

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
PUBLIC SERVICES – FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
	4.9-10 To assist in the timely and efficient response by emergency response vehicles, applicant shall remit payment to the City to implement traffic preemption systems at intersections designated by the Glendale Fire Department prior to issuance of any building permit. 4.9-11 The Project applicant shall be responsible for coordinating the compilation of the test and maintenance book for all building fire and life safety systems to accommodate future and routine maintenance and testing. The book shall include the design intent and all codes (with the editions stipulated) and required test results to maintain compliance with the design intent and codes in effect at the time. The book shall be completed prior to occupancy of the buildings. 4.9-12 Fire-rated assemblies, such as corridor walls, occupancy separation walls, and others, shall not be utilized for utility services. Utilities may be installed in a furred-out wall or partition constructed over a fire-rated wall or partition in order to ensure the integrity of the fire rated assembly over the life of the building.	

Project Impacts		Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
PUBLIC SERVICES – FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES (continued)			
Cumulative Impacts			
Due to the amount of development currently proposed in Glendale, the related projects would have a direct cumulative impact upon fire protection services. However, related projects would be required to implement mitigation measures such as the provision of a mechanical smoke management system and the preparation of an emergency preparedness manual, which would reduce cumulative impacts to less than significant. Additionally, cumulative development proposed in Glendale would result in an increase in emergency medical responses throughout the City. However, with future funding from the General Fund and recommended mitigation, this significant cumulative impact would be reduced to a level of less than significant. Related projects would also be required to provide adequate fire flow rates that meet City standards. As such, cumulative fire flow impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.9.1-10 through 4.9.1-11 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	4.9-14	The City of Glendale shall monitor the number of calls for emergency medical service responded to by the City's rescue ambulance for increases in demand, and based on a request by the Glendale Fire Department, subject to any required authorization, add an additional rescue ambulance and personnel as needed to provide adequate service.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
PUBLIC SERVICES – POLICE PROTECTION		
Project Impacts		
Police Protection Services: Project residents would slightly increase the number of calls for service and police investigations on the Project site. The City of Glendale Police Department has indicated that the increased demand on police services is not considered substantial and that the Project would not adversely affect response times in the City. Further, funding for the Glendale Police Department is derived from various types of tax revenue, which are deposited in the City's General Fund. Impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.9.2-3 through 4.9.2-5 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Cumulative Impacts		
The Project and related projects would result in a significant cumulative impact on police protection services when considering current department resources. However, tax revenue generated by the Project and related projects would be allocated to maintain adequate staffing and equipment levels within the City. As such, impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to p. 4.9.2-5 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	4.9-15 The Glendale Police Department shall monitor the number of calls for service received on an annual basis and request additional City of Glendale general funds to add additional required police personnel and/or equipment as needed to provide adequate service.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
PUBLIC SERVICES – SCHOOLS		
Project Impacts		
School Capacity: The Project would generate a total of approximately 68 students based on the student generation ratios utilized by the GUSD. All schools serving the Project site are currently operating under capacity. Nonetheless, due to an existing lack of high school capacity in the district, implementation of the proposed Project may indirectly affect the ability of the district to meet the needs of local schools. However, pursuant to Government Code Section 65995, the payment of school impact fees, as authorized by Senate Bill 50, will mitigate any potential impact of the Project on local schools to less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.9.3-3 and 4.9.3-4 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	4.9-16 As authorized by SB 50, the Project applicant shall pay school impact fees to the GUSD prior to the issuance of building permits. The current fee schedule for residential and commercial/industrial development is $2.97 per square foot and $0.47 per square foot, respectively.	Less than Significant
Cumulative Impacts		
Combined, the proposed Project and related projects could generate a total of approximately 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 mitigate the impact of the Project and related projects on local schools to a less than significant level. (Refer to pp. 4.9.3-4 and 4.9.3-5 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	Mitigation Measure 4.9-16 would apply to related projects.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures		Significance After Mitigation
RECREATION			
Project Impacts			
Use of Recreational Facilities: While proposed Project amenities would meet some of the recreational needs of Project residents, employees and the Glendale population, existing park facilities are currently heavily used due to the deficit in parkland in the City. As such, the nominal increase in use of neighborhood and community parks in the City that would occur as result of the Project is considered a significant impact. The City of Glendale Development Impact Fee Ordinance requires a Citywide developer fee for parks, recreation, and library facilities. The Glendale City Council and Redevelopment Agency also adopted resolutions requiring 75 percent of the tax increment revenues generated by new residential projects in both the Central Glendale and San Fernando Corridor Redevelopment Project Areas be set aside in a designated fund to supplement Development Impact Fees collected. The combination of the fees and tax increment set aside over time would mitigate Project impacts on park and recreation facilities to less than significant levels. However, based on a conservative analysis, accounting for the prospect that the City/Agency could elect to reduce or suspend the amount of tax increment set aside for parks, and timing issues, this funding may not be fully provided, and the Project contribution to a significant cumulative park and recreation impact would be cumulatively considerable. (Refer to pp. 4.10-8 through 4.10-11 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	4.10-1	In accordance with the requirements of the City of Glendale Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 5575 and Resolution No. 07-164), the Project applicant shall either pay the Development Impact Fee to the City and/or develop public park or recreation land, which shall, pursuant to the Quimby Act, include a playing field, on the Project site using equivalent funding or greater. The current fee schedule is $3,185 per dwelling unit for multi-family residential and $1.25 per square foot for commercial.	Significant and Unavoidable

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
RECREATION (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Construction of Recreational Facilities: Proposed recreational amenities are incorporated into Project design and would be constructed concurrently with the Project. The short-term impacts associated with the construction of these facilities are addressed in Sections 4.2, Air Quality; 4.7, Noise, and 4.11, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking of the Draft EIR. Construction of these recreational facilities would not result in significant impacts, but would contribute to the overall construction impacts. (Refer to p. 4.10-11 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Cumulative Impacts		
Given the existing deficiency of park land in the City, the combined effects of the Project and related projects on existing facilities is considered cumulatively significant because the use of existing parks would increase, thus contributing to an acceleration in the physical deterioration of these facilities. The Project's contribution of to this impact even with the payment of Development Impact Fees, is cumulatively considerable. (Refer to pp. 4.10-12 and 4.10-13 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	The combination of Development Impact fees and tax increment set aside over time will 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.	Significant and Unavoidable

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
RECREATION (continued)		
Cumulative Impacts (continued)		
The City is devoting additional resources to the acquisition and development of parks within residential areas throughout the City. It is reasonable to expect that all of these facilities will undergo CEQA review and that project-specific impacts associated with the development of each will be mitigated to the extent feasible. As a result, cumulative impacts associated with construction of future parks are expected to be less than significant. While the proposed Project as a whole is expected to result in significant impacts associated with the construction, which includes construction of on-site recreational amenities, this construction activity is not anticipated to result in a significant impact when considered in conjunction with the construction of future parks and recreational facilities elsewhere in the City of Glendale.	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING		
Project Impacts		
Construction-Related Traffic: Project development would result in construction-related traffic in the Project vicinity. In general, the majority of the construction workers are expected to arrive at the Project site during off-peak hours thereby avoiding the AM commuter peak period. It is anticipated that delivery trucks/construction equipment would be brought onto and stored within the construction site. Flagmen would be used to control traffic movement of trucks and heavy equipment from the construction site. A Construction Traffic Control Plan and Project design features would be implemented to minimize potential conflicts between construction activity and through traffic. The anticipated peak construction-related trips are 158 fewer than the estimated trips generated by the existing uses to be removed from the site. Therefore, the construction impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.11-18 through 4.11-20 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Operation-Related Traffic: Project impacts to eight intersections were analyzed. The AM peak-hour operations at seven intersections, and that the PM peak-hour operations at four intersections are forecast to improve with implementation of the Project due to credit of existing uses at the Project site trips at these intersections. 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. (Refer to p. 4.11-20 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Congestion Management Program: Impacts to the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP) and local transit system were evaluated. The proposed Project would not exceed the threshold for preparing a traffic impact assessment at CMP monitoring intersections or freeway monitoring locations. Based on CMP methodologies, impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.11-27 through 4.11-29 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Traffic Hazards: Street improvements such as a 2-foot roadway widening along the property frontages on Los Feliz Road, San Fernando Road, and Central Avenue and street dedications would be provided by the Project and determined in consultation with the City of Glendale Engineering Division and other City Departments. A driveway along San Fernando Road and a driveway along Central Avenue would provide access to the Project site. Both Project driveways would be 24 feet in width, would accommodate left- and right-turn ingress and egress turning movements from the site and would be stop sign controlled. Curbs along the property frontages on Central Avenue, San Fernando Road, and Los Feliz Road would be painted appropriately to designate loading areas. Given these precautions, the proposed Project would not substantially increase traffic hazards associated with the Project site.	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Emergency Access: 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. (Refer to pp. 4.11-30 through 4.11-32 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Construction Parking Capacity: During grading and sub-grade construction, parking for construction workers would occur off site. 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 during grading and sub-grade construction. Shuttle services will be provided by the Project applicant between the off-site parking area/areas and the Project site. 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. (Refer to p. 4.11-32 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Operation Parking Capacity: Direct application of the Glendale Municipal Code parking rates yields a total Code parking requirement of 789 parking spaces. The proposed parking supply of 707 spaces does not satisfy Code parking requirements, with a deficiency of 82 spaces. However, the shared parking demand for the site is projected to be 699 spaces. Therefore, the proposed parking supply of 707 spaces is expected to adequately accommodate the shared parking demand, with a parking surplus of 8 spaces. As such, impacts to parking would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.11-33 through 4.11-36 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING (continued)		
Project Impacts (continued)		
Alternative Transportation: There are a number of goals and policies set forth in the City of Glendale General Plan that relate to alternative transportation. Project implementation would include proposed pedestrian and transit improvements such as installation of a pedestrian crosswalk with warning lights along Central Avenue and pedestrian plazas. The pedestrian and transit improvements would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. As such, and impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to p. 4.11-37 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Cumulative Impacts		
It is anticipated that cumulative construction traffic from related projects would result in periods of heavy truck traffic due to delivery of construction materials and the hauling of demolition materials. The closest related project to the proposed Project site is located approximately 500 feet to the northwest at 435 W. Los Feliz Road. If the related project was approved and construction of the related project overlaps with construction of the proposed Project, a significant cumulative impact could result. However, the Project will be required to implement numerous measures to reduce construction-related traffic impacts, as indicated above. The Project's contribution to construction-related traffic is not cumulatively considerable and the Project's cumulative impacts are less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.11-37 through 4.11-38 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING (continued)		
Cumulative Impacts (continued)		
Based on application of the City's significance criteria to the year 2012 with Project traffic condition, none of the eight study intersections would be significantly impacted by traffic generated by the proposed Project. Additionally, a supplemental analysis was prepared for the Seneca Avenue/Los Feliz Boulevard intersection located within the City of Los Angeles based on the City of Los Angeles traffic study guidelines. The analysis determined that the City of Los Angeles study intersection would not be significantly impacted by the proposed Project, and the Project's incremental effect, accordingly, would not be cumulatively considerable. (Refer to pp. 4.11-38 through 4.11-45 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
It is possible that traffic impacts created by related projects and cumulative growth could combine to exceed CMP intersection and/or freeway standards and result in a significant impact. However, the proposed Project would not exceed the threshold for preparing a traffic impact assessment at CMP monitoring intersections or freeway monitoring locations. The Project does not meet the criteria to be analyzed and the Project contribution is not cumulatively considerable. This impact is considered to be less than significant. (Refer to p. 4.11-45 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING (continued)		
Cumulative Impacts (continued)		
The proposed Project and related projects would be required to adhere to standard engineering practices and requirements, and would be subject to planning and design review by the City of Glendale to avoid roadway hazards or inadequate emergency access. In addition, none of the related projects are located directly adjacent to the proposed Project to result in cumulative traffic hazards due to design features or inadequate emergency access. The incremental effect of the Project would not be cumulatively considerable and the Project's cumulative impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to p. 4.11-46 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
In accordance with City of Glendale requirements, related projects would either accommodate construction workers on site or through other suitable means to reduce impacts to surrounding parking facilities. For these reasons, impacts to parking capacity due to cumulative construction activity associated with the related projects would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.11-46 through 4.11-48 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis) Under the City of Glendale Municipal Code, the related projects would be required to provide adequate on-site parking as conditions of development approval, and thus it is unlikely that the related projects would have a significant cumulative effect on parking demand in the area. The Project is anticipated to provide sufficient parking to accommodate the shared parking demand for the retail-commercial and residential uses. The incremental effect of the Project on parking capacity would not be cumulatively considerable and the Project's cumulative impacts would be less than significant.	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING (continued)		
Cumulative Impacts (continued)		
It is anticipated that related projects would result in an increased demand for alternative transportation, although due to the locations of various related projects, it is expected that cumulative increases in demand would be distributed among the various bus routes that serve the area. It is also possible that ridership demand on a particular bus route associated with related projects could be significant when compared to existing conditions and result in a cumulative impact. However, Project impacts on alternative transportation were considered to be less than significant since it was concluded that existing transit service in the Project area would be able to accommodate the Project and the Project would not conflict with alternative transportation plans or polices. Therefore, the incremental effect of the Project would not be cumulatively considerable and the Project's cumulative impacts would not be significant.	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – WATER SERVICE		
Project Impacts		
Water Supply and Treatment Facilities: Water for construction would be used for dust control and cleanup purposes and would be short-term in nature. The amount of water during construction would be much less than water consumption during Project operation. Therefore, construction activities are not considered to result in a significant impact on the existing water system or available water supplies. The Project water demand would be 47 acre-feet per year. With Project implementation, the City would continue to have adequate supply to meet Citywide demand under normal and drought conditions. As a result, long-term impacts to water supply during operation of the Project under both normal and drought conditions would be less than significant. Existing treatment facilities would also be adequate to serve the Project and expansion of existing or construction of new facilities would not be required. (Refer to pp. 4.12.1-17 through 4.12.1-20 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – WATER SERVICE (continued)		
Cumulative Impacts		
The Project and related projects would result in a water demand of 861.31 acre-feet per year. Glendale has identified sufficient water supplies to meet additional demand associated with the Project and related projects through General Plan buildout. MWD issued a Water Supply Alert in June 2008 for its six-county service area, urging local jurisdictions to adopt and implement water conservation ordinances and to increase efforts and programs to conserve water. In response to the MWD Water Supply Alert, the City has implemented voluntary water conservation measures as contained in Section 13.36.070 of the Municipal Code, which include urging its residents to reduce water consumption by 10 percent, and Section 13.36.060, No Water Waste Policy. Additionally, existing treatment facilities would be adequate to serve the Project and related projects and expansion of existing or construction of new facilities would not be required As such, cumulative impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.12.1-21 through 4.12.1-22 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – SEWER		
Project Impacts		
Wastewater Treatment Facilities: The Project would generate 33,520 gallons of sewage per day. When the Los Angeles/Glendale Reclamation Plant reaches capacity, the Hyperion Treatment Plant will treat a majority of the waste generated by the Project and related projects. With the Hyperion Treatment Plant currently operating 130 million gallons per day below capacity, adequate capacity exists to treat the 33,520 gallons of sewage per day generated by the Project. Project-generated effluent would not result in the plant exceeding capacity or require new wastewater treatment facilities. Impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.12.2-4 through 4.12.2-6 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant
Wastewater Treatment Capacity: In order to provide the capacity needed to accommodate additional development, the City imposes a sewer impact fee on future developments. 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. (Refer to pp. 4.12.2-7 through 4.12.2-8 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	4.12-1 The Project applicant shall pay a sewer capacity increase fee for the Project's net sewage increase to the lines in the Tyburn Flume area to alleviate sewer impacts. The fee as estimated under the City's methodology would be $124,814. These collected fees shall be deposited by the City of Glendale into a specially created account to be used to fund capacity improvements to the Tyburn Flume drainage basin.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – SEWER (continued)		
Cumulative Impacts		
Project and related projects development would add 398,972 gallons per day to the Hyperion Treatment Plant and the City's sewage conveyance system. The Hyperion Treatment Plant has adequate capacity to treat the 398,972 gallons of sewage generated per day by cumulative development and no new wastewater treatment facilities would be required. Additionally, development of the related projects may also require relocation/upgrades of existing sewer lines. The City would require capacity upgrades to the sewer conveyance system prior to occupancy and require that temporary sewer lines be installed and operational prior to construction. The inclusion of these requirements would reduce the related project impact to less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.12.2-8 through 4.12.2-10 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – SEWER (continued)		
Cumulative Impacts (continued)		
Development of the related projects would place additional demand on the City's sewage conveyance system, which may not have adequate capacity to handle additional sewage loads. In an effort to alleviate sewer impacts, the City will impose a sewer capacity increase fee on all future developments that lead to an increase in the volume of wastewater discharged to the collection system. The collected fees will be used to fund capacity improvements of the specific drainage basin. 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, as part of its annual Capital Improvement Program. 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 on the existing sewage conveyance system would be reduced to less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.12.2-8 through 4.12.2-10 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	4.12-2 Each project shall contribute sewer capacity increase fees for improvements and upgrades to alleviate sewer impacts within the specific drainage basin where the particular cumulative project is located. Fees would be determined based on the City's sewer capacity increase fee methodology. These collected fees would be deposited into a specially created account to be used to fund capacity improvements of the specific drainage basin.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – SOLID WASTE		
Project Impacts		
Landfill Capacity: 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 one-time disposal of 1,968 tons of demolition debris generated by the Project would be served by the certified facilities. A total of approximately 115 tons of solid waste per year is projected to be disposed of into landfills at buildout of the Project. All solid waste generated on the Project site would be deposited at the Scholl Canyon Landfill, which is owned by the City. The Scholl Canyon facility would have sufficient capacity to accommodate solid waste disposal needs of by the Project. Solid waste impacts during construction and operation of the Project would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.12.3-7 through 4.12.3-9 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	No mitigation measures are recommended.	Less than Significant

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – SOLID WASTE (continued)		
Cumulative Impacts		
The Project and related projects would generate 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 to accommodate solid waste disposal needs of the Project, and all related projects, for at least 10 years, if not longer. The City also uses four additional landfills, all of which are currently still accepting materials. There is insufficient permitted disposal capacity within the existing system serving Los Angeles County to provide for its long-term disposal needs. Although the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (CSDLAC) is in the process of increasing the capacity to accommodate future increases in solid waste volumes, these improvements are not yet in place and will not be completed until at least 2009. As such, the Project, in combination with other development, could contribute to insufficient permitted disposal capacity by contributing additional solid waste to regional landfills. Project development would also contribute construction debris to regional landfills, increasing the cumulative effect. Therefore, the Project's contribution to the cumulative impact would be cumulatively considerable. (Refer to pp. 4.12.3-10 through 4.12.3-12 of the Draft EIR for entire analysis)	None are available.	Significant and unavoidable

PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The range of alternatives in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires the EIR to set forth those alternatives necessary to make a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or lessen any significant effects of the Project (Section 15126.6(c)). Of those alternatives, the EIR only need examine in detail the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the Project. When addressing feasibility, the *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/No Development Alternative is required to be evaluated by Section 15126(2)(4) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. As required by the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the analysis must examine the impacts which might occur if the site is left in its present condition, as well as what may reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the Project site would not be developed with additional uses, and would remain in its current state. The 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 Percent 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 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 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 five stories to three 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.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires an EIR to identify an environmentally superior alternative among those evaluated in an EIR. Of the alternatives considered in this section, the No Project/No Development Alternative is environmentally superior to the other alternatives, because this alternative would avoid the significant and unavoidable noise, groundborne vibration, and recreation impacts identified for the proposed project. According to *State CEQA Guidelines* 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.

Alternative 3 – 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 impacts associated with the project would not be eliminated by this alternative. Additionally, the Commercial/Office Alternative would not meet key project objectives. 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

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