

## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

### **PURPOSE**

*It is the intent of the Executive Summary to provide the reader with a clear and simple description of the proposed project and its potential environmental impacts. Section 15123 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines requires that the summary identify each significant effect, recommended mitigation measure(s), and alternatives that would minimize or avoid potential significant impacts. The summary is also required to identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public and issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant effects. This section focuses on the major areas of the proposed project that are important to decision makers and utilizes non-technical language to promote understanding.*

### **Site Location and Description**

The Verdugo Gardens project site is located in the central downtown portion of the City of Glendale, approximately 10 miles north of the City of Los Angeles Civic Center and 5 miles west of the City of Pasadena Civic Center. From a local perspective, the project site is located downtown within the Central Glendale Redevelopment Project Area, which has been a focus for the Redevelopment Agency's revitalization and renovation efforts. The 1.8-acre project site is surrounded by Central Avenue on the west, Doran Street on the south, a five-story parking garage, and a surface parking lot on the east, and Sanchez Drive to the north.

### **Project Description**

The Verdugo Gardens project is a mixed-use development consisting of 287 for-sale housing units, 3,236 square feet of ground-floor retail/commercial uses, a public open space plaza and park, landscaping, lighting, utilities, subterranean and above-grade parking, which would be screened from public streets with perimeter housing, and associated amenities. The residential units are designed in a variety of layouts and sizes ranging from one to three bedrooms in flat, townhouse, loft, and penthouse configurations. The proposed 24-story structure would obtain a height of approximately 266 feet and would include an amenity deck on the 7<sup>th</sup> floor reaching a height of about 73 feet, and a pool deck on the 21<sup>st</sup> floor reaching a height of approximately 231 feet. Development of the proposed project would require the demolition and removal of two on-site buildings located along the northern and southern portions of the site.

### **Alternatives**

The range of alternatives in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires the EIR to set forth those alternatives necessary to make a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that

would avoid or lessen any significant effects of the project (Section 15126.6[c]). Of those alternatives, the EIR only need examine in detail the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project. When addressing feasibility, the *CEQA Guidelines* state, “among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the applicant can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site.” The *CEQA Guidelines* also specify that the alternatives discussion should not be remote or speculative, and need not be presented in the same level of detail as the assessment of the proposed project.

Therefore, based on the *CEQA Guidelines*, several factors need to be considered in determining the range of alternatives to be analyzed in an EIR and the level of detail of analysis that should be provided for each alternative. These factors include (1) the nature of the significant impacts of the proposed project; (2) the ability of alternatives to avoid or lessen the impacts associated with the project; (3) the ability of the alternatives to meet the objectives of the project; and (4) the feasibility of the alternatives. The following alternatives were examined in this EIR in accordance with the *CEQA Guidelines*.

- No Project/No Development Alternative – The No Project Alternative would leave the project site in its present condition. Existing restaurant and medical office uses, including parking, would remain. This alternative assumes no further development occurs within the project site.
- 25 Percent Reduced Density – The 25 Percent Reduced Density Alternative considers development of the entire 1.8-acre site at approximately 75 percent of the density of residential and commercial uses under the proposed project. This alternative was formulated to lower the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project by reducing the amount of development. Under this alternative, all on-site buildings would be demolished and removed. The layout for the land uses proposed under this alternative would be the same as for the proposed project, and would result in the development of 215 condominiums and 2,156 square feet of retail-commercial space. The height of the building would also be 18 stories, or approximately 200 feet.
- 75 Percent Reduced Density – The 75 Percent Reduced Density Alternative considers development of the entire 1.8-acre site at approximately 25 percent of the density of residential and commercial uses under the proposed project. This alternative was formulated to reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project by reducing the amount of development. Under this alternative, all on-site buildings would be demolished and removed. The layout for the land uses proposed under this alternative would be the same as for the proposed project, and would result in the development of 72 condominiums and 719 square feet of retail-commercial space. The height of the building would be six stories or approximately 67 feet.

## Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

A summary of the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the proposed project, as well as mitigation measures included to avoid or lessen the severity of potentially significant impacts, is provided in **Table 2.0-1, Summary Table of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**, below.

Table 2.0-1  
Summary Table of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>LAND USE PLANNING</b>		
<b>Project Impacts</b>		
<p>The Land Use Designation Map designates the project site as “Downtown Specific Plan.” This designation is intended to implement land use and design regulations contained in the Downtown Specific Plan (DSP), adopted in November 2006. The DSP sets forth standards and criteria for development in the downtown area and provides implementing regulations within several distinct districts in conformance with the General Plan. Specifically, the DSP addresses building heights, which are currently unregulated in the downtown area, and establishes appropriate transition zones between office and high-rise development and neighboring lower-scale neighborhood commercial and residential zones. Finally, the DSP provides incentives, in the form of height and density bonuses, to encourage desirable uses and benefits in the downtown area. Desired uses include affordable housing, historic preservation, hotel uses, public open space uses, reuse of existing buildings, signature design, and sustainable design. The Verdugo Gardens project is located in the Gateway District of the adopted DSP. The residential and retail-commercial uses proposed by Verdugo Gardens are allowed by the DSP. In addition, the project would not conflict with the goals, objectives, or policies of the Glendale General Plan, the Redevelopment Plan, the DSP or applicable policies contained in regional plans prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments. (Refer to pp. 4.1-1 to 4.1-85 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		
<p>Cumulative land use impacts associated with the proposed Verdugo Gardens project and related projects were analyzed in the EIR. The analysis concluded that no cumulative land use impacts associated with the proposed project and related projects would result, and the incremental effect of the project to these impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. (Refer to pp. 4.1-85 and 4.1-86 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>POPULATION AND HOUSING</b>		
<b>Project Impacts</b>	None are required.	Less than significant.
<p>Based on a mix of 121 one-bedroom units, 158 two-bedroom units, and 8 three-bedroom units and an average household size of 1.5 persons per one-bedroom unit, 2.5 person per two-bedroom unit, and 3.5 persons per three-bedroom unit, the residential component of the project would most likely generated approximately 606 residents. Based on a 3.0 employees per 1,000 square feet, the direct employment growth of the project would be 10 employees. Applying a 24 percent ratio (which is the percent of existing employees that work and reside in the City of Glendale), the employment positions would result in 2 new employees residing in the City of Glendale. If it is conservatively assumed that each of the new employees for a single household in the City, these households could indirectly add approximately 7 additional residents to the City. Overall, the increase in population of 606 people that would be associated with the proposed residential units and the possible additional increase in population of 7 people associated with employment opportunities provided by the project would result in a total population increase of 613 new residents to the City.</p>		
<p>When the population increase from the project is added to the 2007 Arroyo Verdugo Subregional population of 355,623, the resulting population for the year 2010 is approximately 356,236 persons. In addition, when housing and employment estimates associated with development of the project are added to 2007 Arroyo Verdugo Subregional housing and employment figures, the resulting housing and employment figures are 131,135 housing units and 211,056 jobs. All of these demographic increases are well within 2010 Arroyo Verdugo Subregional projections. (Refer to pp. 4.2-3 and 4.3-4 of the EIR.)</p>		
<p>When the project's housing and employment increases are added to the 2007 Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) housing and employment projections for the City of Glendale, the resulting housing and employment figures are 73,497 housing units and 87,879 jobs. The housing and employment estimates are well within SCAG 2010 projections of 74,095 housing units and 90,471 jobs for the City of Glendale. (Refer to p. 4.3-4 of the EIR.)</p>	None are required.	Less than significant.

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>POPULATION AND HOUSING (continued)</b>		
<p><b>Project Impacts (continued)</b></p> <p>The 2007 State Department of Finance population estimate for Glendale is 207,157. When the estimated population increases are added to the current population estimate for the City of Glendale, the resulting total population for the City of Glendale is 207,770 residents. The population figure exceeds the SCAG 2010 population projection of 207,182 persons. Despite exceeding the SCAG projection, the population increase associated with the project is not considered substantial, as the increase would amount to less than a 1 percent increase in population growth. In addition, the population growth and related demand on public service associated with the project have been assessed in Section 4.8, Public Services, of this EIR. In this manner, the projected population increase already has been assessed and the increase in population is not considered substantial. Importantly, the growth associated with the Verdugo Gardens project is also accounted for in the Downtown Specific Plan (adopted November 2006). To ensure consistency between the Downtown Specific Plan and the City of Glendale General Plan, the General Plan was amended to include new population projections as part of the proposed adoption of the Downtown Specific Plan. The City will submit the new growth projections to SCAG for incorporation into its new population projections, which would result in revisions to the RTP, which is to be updated in 2007. In other words, the demographic projections contained within the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) are based on a “bottom-up” approach in which local agencies generate the projections that provide the basic framework for SCAG analysis. In this manner, the proposed project’s population projections would be consistent with the City’s General Plan, upon which the SCAG population forecast is based. Therefore, after demographic projections are updated, the project would be even further below future SCAG projections. As a result, impacts associated with population growth would be less than significant. (Refer to p. 4.2-4 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>POPULATION AND HOUSING (continued)</b>		
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		
<p>Cumulative impacts to population associated with the proposed Verdugo Gardens project and related projects were analyzed in the EIR. The population growth associated with the proposed project and related projects would exceed 2010 SCAG population projection for the City and this increase is considered a significant cumulative impact.</p> <p>To ensure consistency between the related projects and the City of Glendale General Plan, the General Plan has been amended to include newly proposed population projections as part of the adoption of the Downtown Specific Plan. The new growth projections will be submitted to SCAG for incorporation into new population projections, and would result in revisions to the RTP, which is to be updated in 2007. In other words, the demographic projections contained in the RTP are based on a “bottom-up” approach in which local agencies generate the projections that provide the basic framework for SCAG analysis. In this manner, the related project and proposed project’s population projections would eventually be consistent with the City’s General Plan, upon which the SCAG population forecast is based. In the interim, the project’s contribution to this impact, in conjunction with other related projects, would be cumulatively considerable and would result in a significant and unavoidable impact due to increasing growth over SCAG’s projections.</p>	<p>None are available.</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>AESTHETICS</b>		
<b>Project Impacts</b>		
<p>Development of the Verdugo Gardens project, as proposed, would block a majority of all views across the site. Views of high-rise office development along Brand Boulevard east across the project sight from Central Avenue would either be blocked or partially blocked. Similarly, the mass of the proposed structure would further limit views across the project site south from Sanchez Drive and north from Doran Street. All of these views, however, are currently degraded, and the development of the site, as proposed, would not significantly degrade these views further. The restaurant, located on the northwestern corner of the project site, currently blocks views west across the project site from Sanchez Drive. Similarly, the medical office building, located along the southern boundary of the project site, presently blocks views north across the project site from Doran Street. (Refer to p. 4.3-11 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>The replacement of the existing buildings and surface parking lots with the proposed project would change the visual character of the project site. In general, the project elements would improve the aesthetic character of the site, given the architectural design of the project; the use of design elements, such as the Sky Gardens; and the comprehensive landscape plan to be implemented. Given the existing urban aesthetic context, development of the proposed Verdugo Gardens would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the proposed project site and its surroundings, and no significant impacts to the visual character of the site and the surrounding area would result. (Refer to pp. 4.3-10 to 4.3-17 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>AESTHETICS (continued)</b>		
<b>Project Impacts (continued)</b>		
<p>Concerning light and glare impacts, the use of highly polished materials or highly reflective glass that could reflect light and create glare, is not proposed. New permanent sources of lighting would be established on the project site with the development of the proposed project that would increase the level of light on the site from current levels. No uses surrounding the site would be sensitive to light, with the exception of the residential uses associated with the project. Residents of the proposed dwelling units would choose to live in the urban environment of downtown Glendale, which includes a higher level of ambient lighting than neighborhoods that are exclusively residential. The lighting proposed would be limited to the amount required to safely light driveways along Central Avenue, and public space areas within the project. 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. Additionally, headlights from vehicles entering or exiting the driveway into the proposed parking garage and proposed signage lighting would not result in a significant light or glare impact. Overall, light and glare impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.3-17 and 4.3-18 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>Shade and shadow impacts were evaluated using a computer model of the proposed structures to simulate the shadows that would be cast after buildout. Simulations of the summer and winter solstices, June 21<sup>st</sup> and December 21<sup>st</sup>, respectively, were conducted and showed that shade and shadow impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.3-19 to 4.3-36 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>AESTHETICS (continued)</b>		
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		
<p>Cumulative impacts to aesthetic resources associated with the Verdugo Gardens Project and related projects were analyzed in the EIR. The project and related projects would not result in cumulative impacts to scenic vistas because views of surrounding mountains are currently degraded and would not be further blocked by these projects. The development of the project site and related projects would improve the visual character between Central Avenue and Brand Avenue and would not impact visual character of Downtown Glendale. Proposed building materials and lighting would not generate a significant light and glare impact. Given the location and angle of sunlight in summer and winter, at no time would shade from the proposed project and related projects impact the same land use and produce shadows between Central Avenue and Brand Boulevard. Therefore the development of the project and nearby related projects would have a less than significant effect on the aesthetic value of their surroundings. (Refer to pp. 4.3-37 and 4.3-38 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<b>TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION AND PARKING</b>		
<b>Project Impacts</b>		
<p>Construction worker vehicles and trucks would generate 432 vehicle trips per day (216 inbound, 216 outbound) during the peak construction phases at the site. Inbound construction worker trips would occur outside of the AM commuter peak; however, it is estimated that approximately 108 outbound construction worker trips may be generated during the PM peak hour. Based on a general distribution of 80 percent on the freeways and 20 percent on local roadways, approximately 40 vehicles are forecast at any study intersection during the PM peak hour. This increase is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts based on the City's significance criteria. Additionally, the project incorporates design features to facilitate flow of construction worker traffic. (Refer to p. 4.4-21 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION AND PARKING (continued)</b>		
<b>Project Impacts (continued)</b>		
<p>To determine the potential impact of Verdugo Gardens on each study intersection, project traffic volumes were added to existing traffic conditions. Application of the City's "significance" criteria for year 2006 existing plus project scenario indicates that none of the study intersections would be significantly impacted by the project. (Refer to pp. 4.4-22 to 4.4-25 of the EIR.)</p> <p>The mainline freeway analysis was prepared in accordance with criteria outlined in the 2004 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County. The maximum increase in the freeway mainline traffic during the weekday AM peak hour is estimated to be 23 vehicles on the westbound SR-134 freeway, west of Central Avenue and 24 vehicles on the eastbound SR-134 freeway, east of Central Avenue. The maximum increase is freeway mainline traffic during weekday PM peak-hour is estimated to be nine vehicles on the eastbound SR-134 Freeway, west of Central Avenue and nine vehicles on the westbound SR-134 Freeway, east of Central Avenue. These increases in overall mainline freeway traffic volumes correspond to a V/C increase ranging from zero to 0.002, or less than 0.5 percent of the total capacity of the freeway segments. No significant project-related mainline freeway impacts are anticipated along SR-134 during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. (Refer to pp. 4.4-22 to 4.4-25 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p> <p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p> <p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>There are no Congestion Management Plan (CMP) intersections monitoring locations in the project vicinity. The proposed project will not add 50 or more trips during the AM or PM peak hours at any CMP monitoring intersections, which is the threshold for preparing a traffic assessment as stated in the CMP manual. Therefore, no further review of potential impacts to intersection monitoring locations that are part of the CMP highway system is required. (Refer to p. 4.4-27 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION AND PARKING (continued)</b>		
<b>Project Impacts (continued)</b>		
<p>There are two CMP freeway monitoring locations in the vicinity of the project. The project will not add 150 or more trips (in either direction) during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to the CMP freeway monitoring locations, which is the threshold for preparing a traffic impact assessment, as stated in the CMP manual. Therefore, no further review of potential impacts to freeway monitoring locations that are part of the CMP highway system is required. (Refer to pp. 4.4-27 and 4.4-28 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>As required by the 2004 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County, a review has been made of the CMP transit service. The project is forecast to generate demand for 17 daily transit trips, 4 AM peak hour Transit Trips, and 1 PM peak hour Transit Trips. Based on the projected limited increased demand for transit services generated by the project, it is anticipated that the existing transit service in the project area will adequately accommodate the project-generated transit trips. Impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.4-28 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>There are a number of goals and policies set forth in the City of Glendale General Plan that relate to alternative transportation. An analysis of the consistency of these applicable goals and policies with the project is provided in Section 4.1, Land Use and Planning, of this EIR. The project does not conflict with applicable General Plan goals and policies related to alternative transportation. Therefore, the project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, and impact would be less than significant. (Refer to p. 4.4-34 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION AND PARKING (continued)</b>		
<b>Project Impacts (continued)</b>		
<p>Construction workers will initially park on site, and as the final stages of construction commence parking will be provided via a combination of on-site areas and off-premises parking facilities within the downtown area. These off-site parking premises will be within walking distance to the project site, and if not a service shuttle will be provided for the construction workers. In regards to buildout of the project, the peak parking demand for the project site is 653 spaces (574 condominium resident spaces, 72 residential guest spaces, and 7 commercial spaces). With the proposed parking supply of 664 spaces, and the parking accommodations for construction workers, the parking supply is sufficient to meet this parking demand requirement and would have a less than significant impact. (Refer to pp. 4.4-30 to 4.4-33 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		
<p>Construction of related projects would result in periods of heavy truck traffic as a result of the delivery of construction materials and the hauling of demolition materials. Although the time frame for construction of these projects is uncertain, as well as the degree to which construction of these projects will overlap and the location at which impacts occur, it is possible that the construction of these related projects and project could affect roadway segments and intersections, which could result in a significant cumulative impact. The project will be required to implement numerous measures to reduce construction-related traffic impacts, including preparation and implementation of a truck haul route plan and construction traffic control plan, and workers would be traveling to the project site during non-peak hours. Therefore, the project's cumulative impacts are less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.4-34 and 4.4-35 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION AND PARKING (continued)</b>		
<b>Cumulative Impacts (continued)</b>		
<p>Related projects are expected to generate 2,859 new vehicle trips during the AM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, the related projects are expected to generate 4,214 new vehicle trips. Over a 24-hour period, the related projects are forecast to generate 50,594 new daily trips. In regards to Year 2010 Pre-Project Conditions, five of the eight study intersections are expected to continue operating at LOS D or better during the AM and PM peak hours with addition of the ambient traffic growth and the traffic due to the related projects. In regards to Year 2010 With Project Conditions, the addition of the project traffic along with the related projects would not increase the V/C ratio by 0.02 or more. Therefore, the project and related projects would not result in significant cumulative impacts and no traffic mitigation measures are required or recommended. (Refer to p. 4.4-35 of the EIR and <b>Topical Response No. 1, Cumulative Projects.</b>)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>The Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program is a cumulative scenario that considers the impact of single projects in the context of cumulative traffic demand on CMP roadways. It is possible that the traffic impacts created by related projects and cumulative growth could combine to exceed CMP standards of significance. However, even if that occurs, the CMP guidelines require that freeway monitoring locations must be examined if the proposed project would add 150 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours or 50 or more trips at CMP intersections during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours. The project would not add 150 or more trips during either AM or PM weekday peak hours at CMP mainline freeway-monitoring locations or 50 or more trips during the AM or PM weekday peak hours at CMP intersections. Therefore, the project does not meet the criteria to be analyzed, and the project's contribution is not cumulatively considerable. (Refer to p. 4.4-38 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION AND PARKING (continued)</b>		
<b>Cumulative Impacts (continued)</b>		
<p>It is anticipated that the related projects and project would be required to adhere to standard engineering practices and requirements, and would be subject to planning and design review by the City to avoid traffic hazards created by design features and land use incompatibilities, or inadequate emergency access. Therefore, the related projects and the incremental effect of the project would not be cumulatively considerable and would result in a less than significant impact. (Refer to p. 4.4-43 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>It is anticipated that the related projects would either accommodate construction workers on site or through other suitable means to reduce impacts to surrounding parking facilities. The project would also accommodate workers on site and provide parking within walking distance of the project site or shuttle construction workers to the project site. Additionally the related projects would be required to provide adequate on-site parking as conditions of development approval. The related projects are a sufficient distance from one another to reduce the potential for on-site parking shortages, and many of the related projects are anticipated to include on-site parking regulated monthly by permits and user fees. The project is anticipated to provide sufficient parking to accommodate the shared parking demand for the retail-commercial and residential uses. Therefore, the related projects and the incremental effect of the project would not be cumulatively considerable and the project's and related project's impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to p. 4.4-43 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>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 the cumulative increases in demand would be distributed among the various bus routes that serve the area. Existing transit service in the project area would accommodate the project. Therefore, the incremental effect of the project would not be cumulatively considerable and the project's cumulative impacts would not be significant. (Refer to p. 4.4-44 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>		
<b>Project Impacts</b>		
<p>The project would not conflict with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) because it would not induce growth over the projections that were used for future emissions estimates. Additionally, the proposed project would include some commercial uses (including a possible restaurant) that would meet the daily needs of residents on the site, minimizing the need to leave during the day. This type of development is consistent with the goals of the AQMP for reducing motor vehicle emissions. Impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.5-18 and 4.5-19 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>Construction emissions were calculated according to the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD's) CEQA <i>Air Quality Handbook</i> and construction emission factors contained in the URBEMS 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. 4.5-19 and 4.5-20 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>Localized oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), and fine particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) impacts to sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity of the project site during construction activities were estimated using the SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold Methodology. Construction activities would not generate emissions of site-specific localized significance thresholds and impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to p. 4.5-19 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>Air Quality (continued)</b>		
<b>Project Impacts (continued)</b>		
<p>The analysis of daily operational emissions was prepared using the data and methodologies identified in the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook and current motor vehicle emission factors in the URBEMIS 2002 Air Quality Impact Model. The emissions associated with the project would not exceed the SCAQMD's recommended operational emission thresholds. As a result, the operational impacts associated with the project are considered less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.5-22 and 4.5-23 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>Concerning CO hotspots, using the CALINE4 screening procedure under worst-case conditions, future CO concentrations at each analyzed intersection would not exceed the state 1-hour and 8-hour standards with project development. No significant CO hotspots would occur to sensitive receptors in the vicinity of these intersections. (Refer to pp. 4.5-25 to 4.5-27 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>The proposed project would develop additional urban uses on the project site, similar to uses already existing on and around the project site, and it does not include uses that would generate significant objectionable odors, although it is quite possible that odors from restaurant operations may be occasionally perceptible. Operation of the proposed project would involve the disposal of refuse, including domestic and food service refuse from residential and retail uses and would be disposed into appropriate trash collection containers, which would be covered and enclosed as required by the City. (Refer to pp. 4.5-27 and 4.5-28 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		
<p>Cumulative development (i.e., related projects) would not conflict with the AQMP, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the region is in nonattainment, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, including CO hotspots, or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.5-28 to 4.5-30 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p><b>NOISE</b></p>		
<p><b>Project Impacts</b></p> <p>Existing plus project modeled noise levels on the project site along Central Avenue north of Pioneer Drive would be approximately 68.1 dB (A) CNEL and along Highway 134 east of Pacific Avenue north of Doran Street, and 77.2 dB (A) CNEL. These noise levels are consistent with the monitored results around the project site of between 69 dB(A) to 75 dB(A) CNEL. In both cases, noise levels would be above the City Municipal Code exterior noise threshold of 65 dB(A) for residential uses, and because the project would develop exterior living areas along Central Avenue and Highway 134, such as patios or exterior useable areas (e.g. the sculpture garden, the community garden, common outdoor areas, balconies, etc.), impacts would be significant. In addition, interior noise levels in the building along these roadways could be above the interior threshold of 55 dB(A) during daytime and 45 dB(A) during the nighttime resulting in significant interior noise level as well. (Refer to pp. 4.6-16 to 4.6-18 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>4.6-1(a) Noise sensitive residential land uses proposed in areas exceeding the exterior 65 dB(A) CNEL (such as those dwelling units facing Central Avenue and Highway 154) shall be designed so that interior noise levels attributable to exterior sources do not exceed 55 dB(A) during the daytime and 45 dB(A) during the nighttime when doors and windows are closed. 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 including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North-facing windows and sliding glass doors along Highway 134 shall be double paned, mounted in low air filtration rate frames, and have a sound transmission coefficient rating of 30 or greater;</li> <li>• Air conditioning units may be provided to allow for windows to remain closed; and</li> <li>• Roof or attic vents facing northward shall be baffled.</li> </ul> <p>4.6-1(b) In order to reduce noise levels in the ground floor garden areas, where adequate space is available on site and as otherwise permitting by code, the applicant shall provide a decorative wall and/or plexi-glass barrier or other means to provide a noise buffer between the Project's ground floor garden areas and vehicle noise sources emanating from the adjacent Central Avenue and from Highway 134.</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable (exterior). Less than significant (interior).</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>Noise (continued)</b>		
<b>Project Impacts (continued)</b>		
<p>Development of the proposed project would introduce an eight-level parking garage on the project site. On-site residential land uses would be the closest sensitive receptors within the project area and would thus represent the worst-case impact associated with parking structure noise from the project. Parking structures can generate <math>L_{eq}</math> noise levels between 49 dB(A) <math>L_{eq}</math> (tire squeals) to 74 dB (A) <math>L_{eq}</math> (car alarms) at 50 feet. Due to high level of traffic noise along streets surrounding the project site, normal daytime parking structure <math>L_{eq}</math> noise would not likely be audible due to the masking of noise by traffic on nearby roadways. However, single noise events could be an annoyance to site residents and may exceed 65 dB(A) Municipal Code threshold at receptor locations. (Refer to pp. 4.6-1 and 4.6-19 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>4.6-2 Sound attenuation measures shall be incorporated into the design to minimize noise leakage from the aboveground parking structure. These measures may include a half-wall on the grade level parking deck, full walls on the sides of the structure that face nearby receptors, and/or noise control louvers on selected structure facades that potentially influence receptor areas. Acoustical analysis shall be performed to demonstrate that the aboveground parking structure does not result in noise levels that exceed City standards at on-site residences. These components shall be incorporated into the plans to be submitted by the applicant to the City of Glendale for review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>Other noise sources that may be associated with the parking structure areas include the use of sweepers in the early morning or late evening hours. Noise levels generated by sweepers are generally higher than parking lot noise associated with automobile activities. The noise from sweepers would not cause an increase in long-term noise of more than 3 dB(A) over the time-weighted CNEL, and would not be significant from that perspective. However, the peak sound levels generated by the sweepers could exceed the single noise even threshold for on-site residences. Depending on the timing of operations, this noise source would result in a significant noise impact during quieter morning and evening periods, and would exceed the Municipal Code 65 dB(A) threshold for exterior uses at receptor locations. (Refer to p. 4.6-19 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>4.6-3 On-site sweeper operations shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

2.0 Executive Summary

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>Noise (continued)</b>		
<b>Project Impacts (continued)</b>		
<p>Regarding on-site retail uses future residents within the project site may experience noise due to human activity within the area from patrons using commercial/retail businesses and the public open on site. Roadway noise would be a more prominent noise source and, therefore, noise generated by human activity would not result in a significant impact. (Refer to p. 4.6-19 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>Regarding residential on-site development, future residents located on the project site, as well as off-site uses, may experience noise due to an increase in human activity within the area. These noise sources are not unique and generally contribute to the ambient noise levels experienced in all residential areas. Overall, the noise generated by the project's residential land uses would not exceed the City's compatibility thresholds and is considered to be less than significant. (Refer to p. 4.6-20 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>Ground vibrations from construction activities very rarely reach the levels that can damage structures, but they can achieve the audible range and be felt in buildings very close to the site. Large bulldozers are capable of producing approximately 77 VdB at 75 feet, the approximate distance to the nearest structure. Land uses surrounding the project site consist of commercial and office uses, and do not contain sensitive equipment, are not located where persons sleep, and are considered institutional uses. Consequently, the project would not result in the exceedance of any of the identifiable thresholds. Vibration impacts are considered less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.6-20 and 4.6-21 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p><b>Noise (continued)</b></p> <p><b>Project Impacts (continued)</b></p> <p>The construction period for the project is anticipated to consist of four phases and last approximately 26 months. Phase I (demolition) would involve the demolition and removal of the existing on-site structures. This phase would include up to 20 demolition haul truck round trips per day and is anticipated to take one month to complete. Phase II (site grading) would involve excavation of existing fill materials and replacement with properly compacted fill materials. Activities on a worst-case day would involve the use of one auger, three loaders, one hydraulic crane, one water truck and would involve approximately 16 truck/trailer combos per day for export and import of soil, and would last two months to complete. Phase III and IV would involve above grade construction and would take approximately 18 to 23 months to complete. Activities would include one crane, four forklifts, one concrete pump, skill saws, power drills, truck-mounted welding rigs, and two electric lifts, and would generate a total of 10 to 20 material delivery trucks per day along with a total of 20 to 40 concrete trucks per day. Noise levels generated by heavy equipment can range from approximately 68 dB(A) to noise levels in excess of 95 dB(A) when measured at 50 feet. Potential construction-related noise impacts are considered significant due to exceeding the noise threshold of 65 dB(A) for central business district as allowed by the Municipal Code. (Refer to pp. 4.6-22 to 4.6-25 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>4.6-4 All construction activity within the City shall be conducted in accordance with Section 8.36.080 of the City of Glendale Municipal Code.</p> <p>4.6-5 The following construction best management practices (BMPs) shall be implemented to reduce construction noise levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Ensure that construction equipment is properly muffled according to industry standards and be in good working condition;</li> <li>• Place noise-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses;</li> <li>• Schedule high noise-producing activities between hours of 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM to minimize disruption on sensitive uses;</li> <li>• Implement noise attenuation measures, which may include, but are not limited to, temporary noise barriers or noise blankets around stationary construction noise sources;</li> <li>• Use electric air compressors and similar power tools rather than diesel equipment;</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>Significant and unavoidable.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>Noise (continued)</b>		
<b>Project Impacts (continued)</b>		
	<p>4.6-5 (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone numbers 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.</li> </ul> <p>4.6-6 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.</p> <p>4.7-7 Heavily loaded trucks used during construction shall be routed away from residential streets.</p>	
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		
<p>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 offices use achieve interior noise levels of 55 dB(A). The cumulative impacts could be significant. 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. The project contribution to noise impacts is not considered to be cumulatively considerable. Cumulative development from related projects would not result in a cumulative impact in terms of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. In addition, the project would not result in a cumulatively significant impact since it is not anticipated there would not be an increase above 1.0 dB(A) CNEL. Therefore, the project contribution and related projects contribution to cumulative noise impacts is not considered to be cumulatively considerable. (Refer to pp. 4.6-26 and 4.6-27 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

2.0 Executive Summary

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>Noise (continued)</b>		
<b>Cumulative Impacts (continued)</b>		
<p>Vibration impacts are localized in nature and decrease with distance. Consequently, in order to achieve a cumulative increase in vibration, more than one source emitting high levels of vibration would need to be in close proximity to the noise receptor. None of the related projects would be located close enough to the project site where significant vibration impacts would occur from concurrent construction activities. The combined vibration effect of the related projects and the project's contribution would not be cumulatively significant. (Refer to p. 4.6-28 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>Noise impacts are localized in nature and decrease with distance. Consequently, in order to achieve a cumulative increase in noise, more than one source emitting high levels of noise would need to be located in close proximity to the noise receptor. The combined noise effect of related projects and the project's contribution could be cumulatively significant. (Refer to p. 4.6-28 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.6-3 to 4.6-7.</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p><b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b></p>		
<p><b>Project Impacts</b></p>		
<p>The office building at 610 North Central Avenue does not appear eligible for inclusion on the City of Glendale Register. While the building displays influences of mid-century modernism, these design elements are derivative of the International Modern style that preceded it in the region. The structure at 610 North Central Avenue was not a product of an important architect or designer. The structure does not exemplify or reflect any significant interest or value as part of the heritage of the City. No historic event occurred in the building. The building located at 610 North Central is not one of the best remaining architectural types, as this is not a rare type of building- it is an unremarkable building. There is nothing unique about the location of this building, nor does it contain any singular physical characteristic representing an established or familiar visual feature in its neighborhood. The building on the site is not a source or repository of archeological interest. The building is located on a traditional commercial parcel and is not part of a natural setting that contributes to the well being of the people of the City.</p> <p>The properties on North Central do not possess any significant aesthetic features. The buildings are not identified with any historically significant persons or events. The buildings are not good examples of the mid-century Modern Style as found throughout the City. None of the buildings' designs represents the work of any notable builder, designer, or architect. The buildings are not in a unique location. The buildings do not possess any significant design or workmanship that represents a high level of achievement. They do not represent any distinctive planning or landscaping elements or methods. The buildings located on the corners of the intersection of Central and Doran were not designed to relate to each other, and none of the buildings conveys a sense of historic and architectural cohesiveness. Finally, the buildings have not been designated as a historic district at any level and would not qualify for designation. The impact of the project on historical resources is less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.7-22 to 4.7-32 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES (continued)</b>		
<b>Project Impacts (continued)</b>		
<p>Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites are not known to exist within the local area. In addition, the project site already has been subject to extensive disruption and contains fill materials. Any archaeological resources that may have existed at one time have likely been previously disturbed. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources, which would in turn result in a significant impact. (Refer to p. 4.7-32 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>4.7-1 In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth disturbing work within a 200-meter 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 measures may include as little as recording the resource with the California Archaeological Inventory database or as much as excavation, recordation, and preservation of the sites that have outstanding cultural or historic significance.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>Plant and animal fossils are typically found within sedimentary rock deposits. Most of the City of Glendale consists of igneous and metamorphic rock. The local area is not known to contain paleontological resources. In addition, the project site has already been subject to extensive disruption and is extensively developed. Any superficial paleontological resources that may have existed at one time have likely been previously unearthed by past development activities. Nonetheless, there is a possibility that paleontological resources may exist at deep levels and a significant impact could occur with implementation of the project. (Refer to pp. 4.7-32 and 4.7-33 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>4.7-2 In the event that paleontologist resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within 100-meter 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 measures may include as little as recording the resource with the California Inventory database or as much as excavation, recordation, and preservation of the sites that have outstanding paleontological significance.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban landscape and include retail-commercial uses. No known traditional sites exist within the project area or surrounding area, nor have any resources been identified. Nonetheless, there is a possibility that human remains could be unearthed and a significant impact could occur with implementation of the project. (Refer to p. 4.7-33 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>4.7-3 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 NACH 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, reburial).</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES (continued)</b>		
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		
<p>There are no known historical properties located on the project site. In addition, none of the related projects would involve impacts to identified historic resources. Therefore, no cumulative impacts on historic resources will result. (Refer to pp. 4.7-34 and 4.7-35 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>Development of the related projects in the City would also require grading and excavation that could potentially affect archaeological, paleontological, or human remains. The cumulative effect of these projects would contribute to the loss of subsurface cultural resources, if these resources were not protected upon discovery. CEQA requirements for protecting archaeological and paleontological resources or human remains are applicable to development are applicable to development in the City of Glendale, as are local cultural resource protection ordinances. Because subsurface cultural resources are protected upon discovery, as required by law, impacts to those resources would be less than significant. (Refer to p. 4.7-35 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES – FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES</b>		
<b>Project Impacts</b>		
<p>The Glendale Fire Department has indicated that the project would have a direct impact upon fire protection and emergency medical services. However, through tax revenue generated by the project and mitigation provided by the Glendale Fire Department, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. (Refer to 4.8.1-6 to 4.8.1-9 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>4.8-1 Building design shall use naturally ventilated smoke-proof enclosures.</p> <p>4.8-2 The project applicant shall conduct a fire flow test prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy to determine whether the existing water system would be capable of providing a minimum fire flow of 6,000 gallons per minute (gpm) at 20 pounds per square inch (psi) residual. In the event that fire flows are not adequate, the project applicant shall undertake and complete required improvements to meet the minimum fire flow requirement. These improvements may include but are not limited to increasing water system pipelines serving the project site, providing booster pumps, or other means that are acceptable to the City of Glendale Fire Department.</p> <p>4.8-3 As needed, the project applicant shall be responsible for providing a new city standard fire hydrant 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 (2-1/2 x 4 x 4) and shall be installed in accordance with Glendale Fire Department standards.</p> <p>4.8-4 A smoke management system (SMS) shall be provided for the structure.</p> <p>4.8-5 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.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES – FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES (continued)</b>		
<b>Project Impacts (continued)</b>	<p>4.8-6 The following items shall be submitted within 180 days of the issuance of the first building permit and approved prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project applicant shall provide an emergency manual prepared specifically for project occupants that addresses 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 California Code of Regulations Title 19 and be submitted to the Glendale Fire Department for review and approval prior to the issuance of the first occupancy permit.</li> <li>To assist in occupant emergency training, a video and other training materials shall be developed specifically for the project's occupants, and regularly scheduled training, in accordance with Title 19, shall be contracted. Building management, in accordance with Title 19, shall keep records of occupant training and emergency drills.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	Less than significant.

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES – FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES (continued)</b>		
<b>Project Impacts (continued)</b>	<p>48-7 A package of signage and graphics 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provisions for additional performance-based facilities to aid occupant egress, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Painting of all stairwells with building standard paint or “warm/friendly” color (not industrial-type color);</li> <li>– Shoulder-height graphics in stairwells;</li> <li>– Graphic “safety quips” at every third floor intermediate stairwell landing;</li> <li>– 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.</li> </ul> </li> <li>– Other performance-based measures to enhance cognitive recognition of egress facilities.</li> <li>• Custom-made signage for all fire-sprinkler control valves, all fire-alarm control panels, junction boxes, terminal cabinets, smoke control panels, all other panels in the fire control room, on fire department connections, fuel control valves for the emergency generator, all motor control centers, fans, switches, panels, motors, etc., serving the smoke management system, fire pumps, pump controllers, water tank, etc.</li> <li>• Signage in all service and ancillary rooms in the building, identifying the room.</li> </ul>	Less than significant.

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES – FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES (continued)</b>		
<b>Project Impacts (continued)</b>	<p>4.8-7 (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supplementary “STAIR” signs in the parking garage, which shall be visible from drive aisles at a distance of 300 feet.</li> <li>• Signage identifying the locations of fire hose valves and fire extinguishers in the parking garage shall be provided and visible from drive aisles.</li> <li>• Custom-made signage shall be provided specifically for responding firefighters containing operating instructions for the fire alarm system, fire sprinkler/standpipe system, smoke control system, other equipment in the fire control room, fire pump room, etc.</li> <li>• All code-required signage, including, but not limited to stairwell identification signage and Title 19 evacuation signs.</li> <li>• Signage on exterior doors shall identify where they lead;</li> <li>• Address numbers for placement on the building, on the directory in lobby, and on each unit.</li> </ul> <p>4.8-8 Building specifications for the fire protection systems shall include a narrative description detailing the design intent, shall be specifically tailored to this project, and shall include only criteria that are either in excess of, or not addressed in, the applicable design and installation standards. Specifications shall not duplicate applicable design and installation standards.</p> <p>4.8-9 All fire stopping for the project shall be consolidated under the responsibility of a single fire-stopping specialty contractor.</p> <p>4.8-10 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, and establish a standardized fire-stopping systems that allow for tenant improvement and future utility improvements.</p>	Less than significant.

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES – FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES (continued)</b>		
<b>Project Impacts (continued)</b>		
	<p>4.8-11 To assist in the timely and efficient response by emergency response vehicles, applicant shall remit payment to the City to implement traffic preemption systems for intersections the Glendale Fire Department shall so designate prior to issuance of any building permits.</p> <p>4.8-12 If barbecues are permitted, the following limitations shall be incorporated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Common area barbecues, if provided, shall be identified on plans for location review and approval. Barbecues shall only be natural gas fired.</li> <li>• Individual dwelling unit barbecues, if provided or permitted, shall be natural gas fired only. Covenants, conditions, and restrictions for the project shall prohibit the use of propane or solid-fuel barbecues (or prohibit all barbecues).</li> </ul> <p>4.8-13 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 building occupancy.</p> <p>4.8-14 Fire rated assemblies, such as corridor walls, occupancy separation walls, and others, shall not be utilized for utilities. Utilities may be installed in a furred-out wall or partition constructed over a fire-rated wall or partition.</p>	Less than significant.

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES – FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES (continued)</b>		
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		
<p>Due to the amount of development currently proposed in Glendale, the related projects would have a direct cumulative impact upon fire protection services. However, as related projects would be required to implement mitigation measures such as the provision of a mechanical smoke management system and the preparation of an emergency preparedness manual, cumulative impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant. Additional residents associated with the project and related projects would result in an increase in emergency medical responses throughout the City. However, with future funding from the General Fund and recommended mitigation, this significant cumulative impact would be reduced to a level of less than significant. Related projects would be required to provide adequate fire flow rates that meet City standards. As such, cumulative fire flow impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.8.1-9 to 4.8.1-10 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>4.8-15 The City of Glendale shall monitor the number of calls for emergency medical service received on an annual basis and request additional City of Glendale General funds to add additional required personnel and/or equipment as needed to provide adequate service.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES – POLICE PROTECTION</b>		
<b>Project Impacts</b>		
<p>The 613 new residents generated by the project would require 1.2 additional police officers based on the City's officer to population ratio of 2.0 officers per 1,000 residents. As funding would be made available to maintain adequate service through allocation of tax revenue generated by the project, impacts would be less than significant. According to the Glendale Police Department, calls for service generated by the project could be accommodated and response times would not be adversely affected by project implementation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to 4.8.2-4 and 4.8.2-5 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES – POLICE PROTECTION (continued)</b>		
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		
<p>The proposed project and related projects would result in the addition of approximately 9,304 residents and about 4,909 employees. The proposed project would not result in impacts to the Glendale Police Department. However, the addition of additional residents and employees as a result of the proposed project and related projects would result in a cumulative impact on police protection services when considering department resources. However, impacts to police services in the City would be less than significant and the incremental effect of the project to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable. (Refer to p. 4.8.2-6 of the EIR, and <b>Topical Response No. 1, Cumulative Projects.</b>)</p>	<p>4.8-16 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.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES – SCHOOLS</b>		
<b>Project Impacts</b>		
<p>The project would generate an additional 89 students, which would be accommodated by the Glendale Unified School District. All schools serving the project site are currently operating under capacity. Nonetheless, due to an existing lack of high school capacity in the District, implementation of the project may indirectly affect the ability of the District to meet the needs of local schools. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65995, the payment of school impact fees, as authorized by Senate Bill 50, will fully mitigate any potential indirect impact of the project on local schools. (Refer to p. 4.8.3-6 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>4.8-17 Pursuant to Education Code Section 17620 and Government Code Section 65995 et. seq., the project applicant shall pay all legally required school fees set by Glendale Unified School District at the time of building permit issuance.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES – SCHOOLS (continued)</b>		
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		
<p>The project and related projects would generate 1,030 students that would accommodate by the Glendale Unified School District. Due to an existing lack of high school capacity in the District, these additional students would result in a significant impact. However, according to Government Code Section 65995, the payment of school impact fees, authorized by Senate Bill 50, by each project would fully mitigate the impact of the project and related projects on local schools from cumulative development. (Refer to p. 4.8.3-7 of the EIR and <b>Topical Response No. 1, Cumulative Projects.</b>)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.8-17 would apply to cumulative projects.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<b>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – WATER SERVICE</b>		
<b>Project Impacts</b>		
<p>After buildout, the project generate a water demand 59.0 acre-feet per year. Existing water entitlements would adequately meet project demand during construction and after buildout in normal and dry weather conditions. Existing treatment facilities would be adequate to serve the project and expansion of existing or construction of new facilities would not be required. Therefore, project impacts to water service would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.9.1-1 to 4.9.1-14 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		
<p>The project and related projects would result in a water demand of approximately 862.2 acre-feet per year. The City of Glendale has identified sufficient water supplies to meet additional demand associated with the project and related projects through General Plan buildout. Additionally, existing treatment facilities would be adequate to serve the project and related projects and expansion of existing or construction of new facilities would not be required. As such, impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.9.1-14 to 4.9.1-15 of the EIR, and <b>Topical Response No. 1, Cumulative Projects.</b>)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – SEWER</b>		
<b>Project Impacts</b>		
<p>The project would generate 39,558 gallons of sewage per day. Sewage generated on the site would be conveyed to the Los Angeles/Glendale Water Reclamation for treatment. If the Reclamation Plant were operating at full capacity, excess sewage from the site would be conveyed to the Hyperion facility for treatment, to which the City has access through the Amalgamated Agreement. The proposed project would not result in the plant exceeding capacity. The proposed project would be served by the existing 8-inch line located in Central Avenue and the existing 15-inch line located in Doran Street. Laterals would connect the proposed project to this line. The 8-inch line does not have capacity to handle the net increase in sewage generated from the project site and it is unknown if the 15-inch line has adequate capacity. As a result, the sewer capacity within the project area is not anticipated to be adequate to serve the proposed uses and will result in a significant impact. (Refer to 4.9.2-4 to 4.9.2-6 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>4.9-1 The project applicant shall pay a sewer impact fee for improvements and upgrades to the Salem/San Fernando Flume area to alleviate sewer impacts. The fee as estimated under the City's methodology would be \$96,498. These collected fees will be deposited by the City of Glendale into a specially created account to be used to fund capacity improvements to the Salem/San Fernando Flume drainage basin.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>When the Los Angeles/Glendale Water Reclamation facility reaches capacity, the Hyperion Treatment Plant would treat any excess waste generated by the project, which the City of Glendale has access to through the amalgamated agreement. With the Hyperion Treatment Plant currently operating 110 million gallons per day below capacity, adequate capacity exists to treat project-generated effluent. Therefore, the project would not require the expansion or construction of sewage treatment facilities, the construction which could cause significant environmental effects. In regards to the sewage collection system, replacement of existing lines in the immediate vicinity of the project site is required. The replacement of these lines could result in short-term service interruptions to service area users. However, temporary replacement lines would be built and operational before abandonment of existing lines begins to ensure service to existing uses is not interrupted. Therefore, the impact associated with the replacement of existing lines in the immediate vicinity of the project is less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.9.2-6 and 4.9.2-7 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – SEWER (continued)</b>		
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		
<p>Development of related projects will add 573,825 gallons per day to the Hyperion Treatment Plant and the City's sewage conveyance system. Combined with the net increase of 39,558 gallons generated by the project, the cumulative amount demanded by the project and related projects would generate an overall sewage demand of 613,383 gallons per day. The project and related projects would not exceed the treatment capacity. However, development of the related projects combined with the project would place additional demand on the City's sewage conveyance system. Sewage conveyance infrastructure serving the individual related projects may not have adequate capacity to handle additional sewage loads, and would represent a significant impact. (Refer to pp. 4.9.2-8 to 4.9.2-10 of the EIR, and <b>Topical Response No. 1, Cumulative Projects.</b>)</p>	<p>4.9-2 Each project shall contribute sewer impact 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 impact 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.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>When the Los Angeles/Glendale Water 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 110 million gallons a day below capacity, adequate capacity exists to treat effluent generated by cumulative development. Additionally, development of the related projects and project may also require relocation of existing sewer lines. Although these relocations could result in short term service interruptions, and a potential significant impact, the City of Glendale will require capacity upgrades to the sewer conveyance system prior to occupancy to avoid overloading the system on a project-by-project basis. Therefore the project and related projects would have a less than significant impact in regards to requiring the expansion and construction of sewage treatment facilities, and infrastructure. (Refer to p. 4.9.2-10 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – SOLID WASTE</b>		
<b>Project Impacts</b>		
<p>While project construction would generate solid waste, the majority of the material would be collected on site in accordance with the City's Construction Debris Recycling Ordinance and sent to commercial facilities located in Los Angeles County. As such, impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.9.3-8 to 4.9.3-9 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>A total of approximately 112 tons of solid waste per year is projected to be disposed of into landfills at buildout. All solid waste generated on the project site would be deposited at the Scholl Canyon Landfill, which is owned by the City. The Scholl Canyon facility would have sufficient capacity to continue to accommodate the demand for Class III disposal facilities generated by the project site. Additionally, the project would comply with Assembly Bill 939 and enclose project trash containers according to City regulations. Impacts would be less than significant. (Refer to pp. 4.9.3-9 and 4.9.3-10 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – SOLID WASTE (continued)</b>		
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		
<p>The project and related projects would generate 3,759 tons of solid waste per year. The current capacity of the Scholl Canyon and Puente Hills Landfills, which receive over 90 percent of the City's waste are adequate to accommodate solid waste disposal needs of the project, and development of all related projects, for at least 15 years, if not longer. The City also uses five additional landfills, all of which are currently still accepting materials. Though the Bradley Landfill is near capacity, if granted their proposed expansion, an additional 4.7 million cubic yards will be made available.</p> <p>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, these improvements are not yet in place and will not be completed until at least 2009. Further, there is presently insufficient permitted disposal capacity within the existing system serving Los Angeles County. The project, together with other development, could contribute to insufficient permitted disposal capacity by contributing additional solid waste to regional landfills. Project development would also contribute debris to regional landfills, increasing the cumulative effect. Therefore, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact would be cumulatively considerable. As no feasible mitigation measures exist which could reduce the impact to a level of less than significant, the impact would be significant and unavoidable. (Refer to pp. 4.9.3-11 to 4.9.3-13 of the EIR, and <b>Topical Response No. 1, Cumulative Projects.</b>)</p>	<p>None are available.</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable.</p>
<p>As with the proposed project, related projects would be required to implement waste diversion programs in an effort to help the City meet its goal of reducing the amount of solid waste generated by generated by 50 percent. In addition, related projects are also required to comply with applicable municipal codes. As a result, the cumulative of the proposed project and related projects regarding compliance with applicable state and local solid waste statutes and regulations is less than significant. (Refer to p. 4.9.3-13 of the EIR.)</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>RECREATION</b>		
<b>Project Impacts</b>		
<p>Based upon the ideal park land-to-resident ratio standard and project population, the project would require 3.6 additional acres of new parks. To maintain existing park land-to-resident ratio, the project would require 0.8 acre. Project amenities, including 46,222 square feet of common outdoor space, would lessen the project's impacts on existing park and recreation facilities. Even with the provision of common outdoor space and other amenities, the increase in residents associated with the project would result in significant park and recreation impacts.</p>	<p>Please refer to <b>Topical Response No. 2, Park and Recreation</b>. As summarized, the combination of Development Impact fees and tax increment set aside over time is considered a reasonable means to mitigate project impacts on park and recreation land and facilities to less than significant levels; however, based on a conservative analysis, which takes into account both the prospect that the City/Agency could elect to reduce or suspend the tax increment set aside in order to focus on other redevelopment priorities, and timing issues, the conclusion that this project would create significant and unavoidable impacts on park and recreation land and facilities remains unchanged.</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable.</p>
<p>The project would provide residents with several amenities, including public and private open space, a fitness center, outdoor pool/spa, and barbecue area. These recreation facilities are incorporated into the design of the project and will be constructed concurrently with the project. The short-term impacts associated with the construction of these facilities are addressed in Sections 4.4, Traffic, Circulation and Parking; 4.5 Air Quality; and 4.6, Noise. Construction of these recreational facilities will not result in significant impacts, but it will contribute to the overall construction impacts.</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		
<p>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.</p>	<p>Please refer to <b>Topical Response No. 2, Park and Recreation</b>. As summarized, the combination of Development Impact fees and/or tax increment set aside over time is considered a reasonable means to mitigate project and cumulative 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 conclusion that this project and cumulative development would create significant and unavoidable impacts on park and recreation land and facilities remains unchanged.</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable.</p>

Project Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>RECREATION (continued)</b>		
<b>Cumulative Impacts (continued)</b>		
<p>The project includes 8,627 square feet of public open space, 37,595 square feet of common space and 12,117 square feet of private space. This space will be incorporated into the project and will be constructed concurrently with the project. While the proposed project as a whole is expected to result in a number of significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the construction on-site recreational amenities, which is attributed to construction activities, this construction activity is not anticipated to result in a significant impact when considered in conjunction with the construction of future park and recreational facilities elsewhere in the City of Glendale. Consequently, the incremental effect of the project would not be cumulatively considerable and cumulative impacts associated with the project would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

## Project Alternatives

The range of alternative 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 on 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 basic objectives of the project. When addressing feasibility, the *CEQA Guidelines* state, “.... among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the applicant can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site.” The *CEQA Guidelines* also specify that the alternative discussion should not be remote or speculative, and need not be presented in the same level of detail as the assessment of the proposed project.

Therefore, based on the *CEQA Guidelines*, several factors need to be considered in determining the range of alternatives to be analyzed in an EIR and the level of detail of analysis that should be provided for each alternative. These factors include: (1) the nature of the significant impacts of the proposed project; (2) the ability of alternatives to avoid or lessen the impacts associated with the project; (3) the ability of the alternatives to meet the objectives of the project; and (4) the feasibility of the alternatives. The following alternatives were examined in this EIR in accordance with the *CEQA Guidelines*.

### Alternative 1 – No Project/No Development Alternative

The No Project /No Development Alternative is required to be evaluated by Section 15126(2)(4) of the *CEQA Guidelines*. As required by the *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. Existing restaurant and medical office uses, including parking, would remain. None of the impacts associated with construction and operational activities would occur if the No Project/No Development Alternative were selected. No short-term noise impacts would occur during construction and any long-term population, noise, solid waste and recreation impacts would not occur during project operation. In addition, this alternative would not develop the site to eliminate existing blighted conditions within the downtown area.

### **Alternative 2 – 25 Percent Reduced Density**

The 25 Percent Reduced Density Alternative considers development of the entire 1.8-acre site at approximately 75 percent of the density of residential and commercial uses under the proposed project. This alternative was formulated to reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project by reducing the amount of development. Under this alternative, all on-site buildings would be demolished and removed. The layout for the land uses proposed under this alternative would be the same as for the proposed project, and would result in the development of 215 condominiums and 2,156 square feet of retail-commercial space. Of the 215 for-sale housing units, 91 would be one-bedroom units, 117 would two bedroom units, and 7 would be three bedroom units. The height of the building would also be 18 stories or approximately 200 feet.

### **Alternative 3 – 75 Percent Reduced Density**

The 75 Percent Reduced Density Alternative considers development of the entire 1.8-acre site at approximately 25 percent of the density of residential and commercial uses under the proposed project. This alternative was formulated to reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project by reducing the amount of development. Under this alternative, all on-site buildings would be demolished and removed. The layout for the land uses proposed under this alternative would be the same as for the proposed project, and would result in the development of 72 condominiums and 719 square feet of retail-commercial space. Of the 72 for-sale housing units, 31 would be one-bedroom units, 39 would two bedroom units, and two would be three bedroom units. The height of the building would also be six stories or approximately 67 feet.

### **Environmentally Superior Alternative**

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires an EIR to identify an environmentally superior alternative. Of the alternatives considered in this section, the No Project/No Development Alternative is environmentally superior to the other alternatives and the project as proposed, because the significant and unavoidable short-term noise, long-term noise and recreation, and cumulative short-term noise, solid waste and recreation impacts would be avoided. According to CEQA if the No Project/No Development Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, “the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.”

Alternative 3 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 reduction of residential units and retail-commercial space. 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. In addition, this alternative would not accomplish many of the project objectives.

## **AREAS OF CONTROVERSY/ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED**

The Agency received several comments on the Draft EIR, which are responded to in **Section 3.0** of this Final EIR. The primary issues were related to parks and recreation, aesthetics, shade and shadow, and cumulative projects.