

5.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

INTRODUCTION

Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to briefly describe any possible significant effects that were determined not to be significant and were, therefore, not discussed in detail in the EIR. This section addresses the potential environmental effects that have been found not to be significant as a result of the distribution of a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and the responses. This section includes the environmental questions and issues addressed in the City of Glendale Environmental Checklist Form. Any issues not addressed in this section were addressed in Section 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this EIR.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

Would the project:

- Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

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

- Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

The project site and the surrounding area is currently zoned Central Business District (CBD) and is surrounded by urban uses. Therefore, there would be no conflict with zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act contract. No impact to agricultural resources would result, and no mitigation measures are required.

- Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use?

Refer to the discussion above. No impact to agricultural resources would result, and no mitigation measures are required.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

The majority of the local area has been developed or landscaped and supports largely non-native plant communities and species. Therefore, only a limited number of plant species, which flourish in urban environments, can be found; none are considered Rare or Endangered. Suitable habitat for sensitive mammal, reptile, amphibian, or fish species does not exist on the project site or within the surrounding area, and no species were observed in the vicinity.¹

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

The project site and the surrounding area is completely developed and disturbed. No riparian habitat or sensitive natural community is located in the surrounding area or on the project site. Therefore, no impacts to biological resources would occur with implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation measures are required.

¹ Information regarding existing biological resources was obtained by a site survey performed by Impact Sciences, Inc. on October 16, 2002.

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

The project site is not in proximity to nor does it contain wetland habitat or a blue-line stream. Therefore, project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

- Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

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

- Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?

The City of Glendale has tree ordinance titled the Street Trees and Shrubs Ordinance. The purpose of the City's ordinance is to ensure that public sidewalks and streets are safe and not to preserve trees as biological resources like an oak tree ordinance. Consequently, the project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinance aimed at protecting biological resources.

- Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or State Habitat Conservation Plan?

The project site and the surrounding area have been developed and heavily affected by past activities. No adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Conservation Plan exists for the project site or immediate area. Consequently, implementation of the project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan. No impact to biological resources would result, and no mitigation measures are required.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

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

Septic tanks will not be used in the proposed project. The project would connect to and use the existing sewage conveyance system. No impact would result, and no mitigation measures are required.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

- Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

The project site previously has a functioning school on site. The students from this facility have since been relocated to another location. No other existing or proposed schools are located within a one-quarter mile of the project site. Consequently, no impacts are anticipated.

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

The project site is neither located within an airport land use plan nor is it located within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest public airport or public use airport to the project site is the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport located about 5.5 miles to the northwest. Consequently, no impacts associated with airport safety hazards would result, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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

The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Consequently, no impacts associated with safety hazards would result for people working or residing in the project area, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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

The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban landscape and include retail-commercial uses. The project site is not contained within a fire hazard area as identified in the City of Glendale's Safety Element and it does not have nor do potential landscaping plans include plantings of flammable brush, grass, or trees on or adjacent to the site. Consequently, implementation of the project would not result in the exposure of people or structures to hazards associated with wildland fires. No impact would result, and no mitigation measures are required.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- Create the potential for inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

The project site is not in a coastal area. Therefore, tsunamis (seismic sea waves) are not considered a significant hazard at the site. The site is not located downslope of any large bodies of water that could adversely affect the site in the event of earthquake-induced seiches, which are wave oscillations in an enclosed or semi-enclosed body of water.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

The project site and surrounding area have been developed and heavily affected by past activities. No adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Conservation Plan exists for the project site or immediate area. Consequently, implementation of the project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted Conservation Plan. No impacts to biological resources would result, and no mitigation measures are required.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?

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

- Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

Refer to the response above. No impact to mineral resources would result, and no mitigation measures are required.

NOISE

Would the project result in:

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

The project site is neither located within an airport land use plan nor is it located within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest public airport or public use airport to the project site is the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport located about 5.5 miles to the northwest. Consequently, no impacts associated with airport safety hazards would result, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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

The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Consequently, no impacts associated with noise would result for people working or residing in the project area, and no mitigation measures would be required.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No residential properties currently exist within the project site; therefore, no housing would be displaced by the development of the project. Consequently, no impact associated with the displacement of housing would result, and no mitigation measures would be required.

- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No residential properties currently exist within the project site; therefore, no housing would be displaced by the development of the project. Consequently, no impact associated with the displacement of residential populations necessitating the construction of replacement housing would result, and no mitigation measures would be required.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

- Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

The project site is not located in the vicinity of an airport and does not propose any use that would generate air traffic. Consequently, the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns that would result in safety risks. No impact would result, and no mitigation measures are required.