HOUSING AUTHORITY
of the County of Los Angeles
Administrative Office
2 Coral Circle • Monterey Park, CA 91755
323.890.7001 • TTY: 323.838.7449 • www.lacdc.org

Gloria Molina
Yvonne Brathwaite Burke
Zev Yaroslavsky
Don Knabe
Michael D. Antonovich
Commissioners

Carlos Jackson
Executive Director

July 3, 2007

Honorable Board of Commissioners
Housing Authority of the
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Commissioners:

APPROVAL OF ALLOCATION OF CITY OF INDUSTRY REDEVELOPMENT HOUSING SET-ASIDE FUNDS AND APPROVAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION (1, 2, 4, 5)
(3 Vote)

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Acting as the responsible agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), certify that the Community Development Commission has considered the attached Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) including any public comments, for the Metro Loma Project, prepared by the City of Glendale, as lead agency, and find that the mitigation measures identified in the IS/MND are adequate to avoid or reduce potential impacts below significant levels.

2. Find that the projects listed in the Environmental Documentation section of this Board letter are exempt from the provisions of CEQA, as described herein, because these projects do not have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment.

3. Approve loans to developers using City of Industry Redevelopment Housing Set-Aside Funds (Industry Funds) in a total amount of up to $24,572,460 for the development of 16 affordable multifamily rental, senior rental, and special needs housing developments, identified in Attachment A, which have been selected through a Notice Of Funding Availability (NOFA) jointly issued by the Housing Authority and the Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles (Commission) on January 2, 2007.

4. Approve administration by the Housing Authority of one affordable special needs housing development, identified in Attachment A as one of the 16 projects, which is also being concurrently recommended to the Board of Commissioners of the Commission to receive HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) funds.

5. Authorize the Executive Director to negotiate Loan Agreements with the recommended developers, for the purposes described above, to execute the Loan Agreements and all related documents, including documents to subordinate the loans to permitted construction and permanent financing and any intergovernmental, interagency, or inter-creditor agreements necessary for the implementation of each development, following approval as to form by County Counsel.

6. Authorize the Executive Director to execute amendments to the Loan Agreements and any related document, as may be necessary for the implementation of each development, following approval as to form by County Counsel.

PURPOSE /JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

The purpose of this action is to approve the allocation of Industry Funds to 16 developments that will provide affordable multifamily, senior, and special needs rental housing in incorporated and unincorporated areas within a 15-mile radius of the City of Industry. The purpose is also to approve environmental documentation for these developments.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING:

There is no impact on the County general fund.

The Housing Authority is recommending loans to developers in a total amount up to $24,572,460 to construct 16 developments. Funds for these loans will be incorporated into the Housing Authority's budget on an as-needed basis in the current and upcoming fiscal years.

Final loan amounts will be determined following completion of negotiations with the developers and arrangements with other involved lenders. Each loan will be evidenced by a promissory note and secured by a deed of trust, with the term of affordability enforced by a recorded Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions document.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS:

Industry Funds consist of tax increment funds collected by the City of Industry's Redevelopment Agency that have been transferred to the Housing Authority to administer for the development of low- and moderate-income housing. On June 2, 1998, your Board adopted an Allocation and Distribution Plan for the disbursement of Industry Funds in incorporated and unincorporated areas within a 15-mile radius of the City of Industry. Nine previous Request For Proposals processes have awarded a total of an estimated $127,308,420 in Industry Funds to 150 developments, created 5,172 units of affordable and special needs housing, and leveraged over $902,645,721 in external funds.

A Notice Of Funding Availability (NOFA) was jointly issued by the Housing Authority and the Commission on January 2, 2007, making available approximately $21,000,000 of Industry Funds and $21,000,000 of County HOME funds for the development of affordable rental housing. As of April 8, 2007, thirty-three proposals were received for Industry funds, seven of which also applied for HOME funds. Review and evaluation has been completed for all of the initial applications under the NOFA process. Industry Funds will be allocated to eighteen developments, four of which will also be receiving HOME funds. Environmental clearances and funding recommendations for sixteen projects listed in Attachment A are being presented to your Board at this time. Funding recommendations for the two remaining HOME projects will be presented to your Board at a later date, after environmental reviews are completed.

It was previously necessary to execute separate loan agreements for HOME funds and Industry funds. However, on December 20, 2005, your Board and the Board of Commissioners for the Commission jointly authorized the Housing Authority to administer HOME funds on behalf of the Commission for projects receiving both Industry and HOME funds, where the amount of Industry funds exceeds the amount of HOME funds. Your Boards also jointly authorized the Commission to administer Industry Funds on behalf of Housing Authority for projects receiving both Industry and HOME funds, where the amount of HOME funds exceeds the amount of Industry funds.

One project is also being concurrently recommended to the Board of Commissioners for the Commission to receive HOME funds in an amount less than the amount of Industry Funds for that project. The Housing Authority will enter into a Loan Agreement for HOME and Industry funds for the project and will administer all funds in the project. The Commission will monitor the project for adherence to HOME regulations and requirements.

A second project is also being concurrently recommended to the Board of Commissioners for the Commission to receive HOME funds in an amount greater than the amount of Industry Funds for that project. The Commission will enter into a Loan Agreement for HOME and Industry funds for the project and will administer all funds in the project. The Housing Authority will monitor the project for adherence to Industry regulations and requirements.

The current funding recommendations will provide Industry Funds to the developers through Loan Agreements with the Housing Authority or Commission, to be executed by the Executive Director, following completion of negotiations and approval as to form by County Counsel. All Loan Agreements will incorporate affordability restrictions and provisions requiring developers to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws.

The Loan Agreements will set aside a minimum of 20 percent of each development's rental units at rates affordable to low-income households earning less than 50 percent of the median income for the Los Angeles-Long Beach Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), adjusted for family size, as established by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). For special needs housing, a minimum of 35 percent of the units will be reserved for households with incomes below 50 percent of median income. The loan agreements will require that the affordable housing units be set-aside for a period of 55 years.

This letter has been reviewed by County Counsel. Attachment A hereto is a complete list of developments recommended for funding at this time.

NOTICE OF FUNDING AVAILABILITY AND SELECTION PROCESS:

The Housing Authority and the Commission issued a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) in accordance with the Industry Allocation and Distribution Plan previously adopted by your Board, as amended. On December 22, 2006, advertising for the NOFA began in local newspapers. The NOFA was released on January 2, 2007, and subsequent informational workshops were held to provide prospective applicants with technical assistance.

Proposals were accepted between February 2 and April 8, 2007. The total demand exceeded available funding. Therefore, no further applications will be accepted until additional funding becomes available.

Non-Special Needs Housing Developments

TYPE	DEMAND	ALLOCATION
Multifamily	$35,171,400 19 Proposals	$19,331,800 9 Developments
Seniors	$17,446,769 4 Proposals	$13,869,769 2 Developments
TOTAL	$52,618,169 23 Proposals	$33,201,569 11 Developments

Special Needs Housing

TYPE	DEMAND	ALLOCATION
Developmental Disabilities	$6,398,319 1 Proposal	$6,398,319 1 Development
Transition Age Youth	$5,862,424 4 Proposals	$2,909,427 2 Developments
Mental Illness	$1,957,000 1 Proposal	$1,957,002 1 Development
Homeless	$6,021,236 4 Proposals	$3,962,455 3 Developments
TOTAL	$20,238,979 10 Proposals	$15,227,201 7 Developments

Each recommended proposal has undergone a review by technical consultants. In addition, in order to verify expertise and service linkages submitted by applicants, proposals for special needs housing were reviewed by a Task Force established by the Executive Director. The Task Force was comprised of persons with experience in serving the targeted special needs populations. Following this process, the proposals were forwarded to the Housing Authority/Commission's Loan Committee which provided independent review of the Task Force's scoring and also heard the appeals.

The NOFA included a process for applicants to appeal individual scores for procedural or technical errors. Applicants were notified of the scoring results and given ten days to appeal. Eleven appeals were filed. The appeals were presented to the Loan Committee, and have been heard and administratively adjudicated. Five of the six appeals in the non-special needs housing category received additional points and received funding recommendations. Four of the five appeals in the special needs

category received additional points; however all five received funding recommendations.

The recommended funding awards are based on threshold criteria and proposals scoring a minimum of 70% of available points are eligible for funding. Awards are made on a first-come first-served basis until all currently available funding is exhausted. The remaining proposals are placed on a waiting list in the order they were received, to hold for future funding availability. The recommended awards are being made in accordance with the County's current Housing and Community Development Plan (HCDP) and the planning documents of other affected jurisdictions. The Executive Director may enter into memoranda of understanding and other agreements with other jurisdictions, if necessary for development of the proposed projects.

Qualified applicants not recommended for funding from the current allocation have been placed on a waiting list for funding under the NOFA once additional funds become available. Placement on the waiting list does not guarantee funding.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:

The proposed projects identified in Attachment A have been reviewed by the Community Development Commission pursuant to the requirements of CEQA. The Metro Loma project required preparation of an IS/MND by the City of Glendale.

As a responsible agency, and in accordance with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines, the Community Development Commission reviewed the IS/MND prepared by the City of Glendale for the Metro Loma project and determined that the project will not have significant adverse impact on the environment. The Board of Commissioners' consideration of the IS/MND, and filing of the Notice of Determination, satisfies the State CEQA Guidelines as stated in Article 7, Section 15096.

Environmental Assessments were prepared for the Mason Court, Seasons at Compton, Coteau III, Casa Dominguez and Slauson Station Apartments projects pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). These documents describe the proposed projects, evaluate the potential environmental effects, and describe the mitigation measures necessary to avoid potentially significant environmental effects from the projects. Based on the conclusions and findings of the Environmental Assessments, Findings of No Significant Impact were approved by the Community Development Commission on the following dates:

Mason Court – July 12, 2004
Seasons at Compton – September 27, 2004
Coteau III – January 3, 2000
Slauson Station – August 2, 2005
Casa Dominguez – May 11, 2004

Following the required public and agency comment period, HUD issued a Release of Funds for these projects on:

Mason Court – August 25, 2004
Seasons at Compton – November 25, 2004
Coteau III – January 3, 2000
Slauson Station – August 23, 2005
Casa Dominguez – May 30, 2004

Consistent with the provisions of the CEQA Guidelines, Article 14, Section 15221, notice was provided to the public that Environmental Assessments, used in place of an Initial Study, would be used to satisfy CEQA requirements for the Mason Court, Seasons at Compton, Casa Dominguez and Slauson Station projects. The Environmental Assessment/Mitigated Negative Declarations were circulated for public review as required by state and local law, and the Environmental Assessment/Mitigated Negative Declarations, in conjunction with the Mitigation and Monitoring Plans, meet the requirements of CEQA for these projects. CEQA Board approval for these projects took place on the following dates:

Mason Court – September 14, 2004
Seasons at Compton – November 9, 2004
Casa Dominguez – August 15, 2006
Slauson Station – May 2, 2006

The remaining projects, as listed below, are exempt from the requirements of CEQA in accordance with California Public Resources Code Chapter 4.5, Article 6, Section 21159.24:

DEVELOPMENT	NUMBER OF UNITS	DEVELOPMENT TYPE
Alexandria House	16	New Construction
James M. Wood SRO	52	New Construction
McCoy Plaza	63	New Construction
Coteau III	6	New Construction
Progress Place 1 & 2	8	New Construction
Manitou Vistas	48	New Construction
MacArthur Park Metro	90	New Construction
Clinton Family	36	New Construction
Sichel Family	37	New Construction
115 & 137 N Soto St	36	Rehabilitation and New Construction
TELACU Esperanza	70	New Construction

IMPACT ON CURRENT PROGRAM:

The recommended allocation of Industry Funds totaling up to $24,572,460 for the projects listed on Attachment A will leverage more than $212,000,000 in additional external resources, over seven times the amount of Industry Funds being recommended for allocation at this time. The requested actions will increase the supply of affordable special needs and non-special needs housing in the County.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLOS JACKSON
Executive Director

Attachments: 2
CJ:CBB

ATTACHMENT A

PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR INDUSTRY AND HOME FUNDS

NON-SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

Applicant	Project Name	Address	Uninc.	Dist.	Type	Total Units	Industry Assist Units	HOME Assist Units	Industry Funds Recommended	HOME Funds Recommended	Local and Other Sources	Total Development Cost
Investiment, Inc. (ADI) / Housing Alternatives, Inc.	Manitou Vistas	3414-3430 E Manitou Ave, Los Angeles 90031	No	1	Family	48	37	0	$2,014,000	$0	$20,938,515	$22,952,515
SADI (ADI & Squier Properties) / Housing Alternatives	Metro Loma	328 Mira Loma Ave, Glendale 91204	No	5	Family	44	33	0	$1,497,000	$0	$17,888,449	$19,385,449
McCormack Baron Salazar / Los Angeles Hsg Partnership / Polis Builderes	MacArthur Park Metro Apts	1901 W 7th St, Los Angeles 90057	No	1	Family	90	45	0	$1,459,000	$0	$38,361,500	$39,820,500
Beyond Shelter HDC / River Bank Dev Co	Slauson Station Apts	1707-1717 E 61st St, Los Angeles 90001	Yes	1	Family	30	22	22	$919,100	$0	$9,937,138	$11,556,238
Meta Hsg Corp / Clinton 2114 LLC / Western Community Housing, Inc.	Clinton Family Apts	2114-2126 Clinton St, Los Angeles 90026	No	1	Family	36	35	0	$975,000	$0	$13,304,628	$14,279,628
Meta Hsg Corp/Sichel 1805 LLC / Western Community Housing, Inc.	Sichel Family Apts	1805 Sichel St, Los Angeles 90031	No	1	Family	37	36	0	$975,000	$0	$13,546,041	$14,521,041
ELA Community Corp	115 & 137 N Soto St	115 & 137 N Soto St, Los Angeles 90033	No	1	Family	36	36	0	$1,050,700	$0	$12,366,821	$13,417,521
L A Community Design Center	Casa Dominguez	15729 S Atlantic Ave, Compton 90221 (part of site in city of Compton)	Yes	2	Family / Transitional Age Youth	70	70	0	$2,900,000	$0	$30,956,975	$33,856,975
TELACU	TELACU Esperanza	1550 S San Antonio Av, Pomona 91766	No	1	Senior	70	70	0	$1,901,933	$0	$9,600,000	$11,501,933
TOTAL						**461**	**384**	**0**	**$13,691,733**	**$0**	**$166,900,067**	**$181,291,800**

SPECIAL NEEDS DEVELOPMENTS

Applicant	Project Name	Address	Uninc.	Dist.	Type	Total Units	Industry Assist Units	HOME Assist Units	Industry Request	HOME Request	Other Sources	Total Development Cost
Beyond Shelter Housing Dev. Corporation	Mason Court Apts	2129 E El Segundo Blvd, Compton 90222	Yes	2	Homeless	12	12	0	$724,638	$0	$3,602,188	$4,326,826
Hollywood Housing Dev. Corporation	Alexandria House Apts	510 S Alexandria Ave, Los Angeles 90020	No	2	Homeless	16	7	0	$737,817	$0	$5,460,605	$6,198,422
Single Room Occupancy Housing Corporation	James M Wood SRO Apts	408 # 5th St & 506 S San Julian St, Los Angeles 90014	No	1	Mental Illness	52	31	0	$1,957,000	$0	$12,281,109	$14,238,109
WLCAC/AF Evans	McCoy Plaza A	9315 Firth Blvd, Los Angeles 90002	No	2	Homeless	63	26	0	$2,500,000	$0	$22,924,920	$25,424,920
Los Angeles County HDC	Coteau III	13965 Coteau Dr, Whittier 90604	Yes	4	Transition Age Youth	6	6	6	$961,272	$948,155	$0	$1,909,427
Linc Housing/Linc Community Dev Corp	Seasons at Compton	Corner of Alondra Blvd & Frailey Ave., Compton 90221	Yes/ Part	2	Dev. Disable	84	42	34	$3,000,000	$3,398,319	$17,902,422	$24,300,741
Jovenes, Inc.	Progress Place 1 & 2	407-409 1/2 & 411-413 Progress Place, Los Angeles 90033	No	1	Transition Age Youth	8	8	0	$1,000,000	$0	$1,348,694	$2,348,694
TOTAL						**241**	**132**	**40**	**$10,880,727**	**$4,346,474**	**$63,519,938**	**$78,747,139**

ATTACHMENT B

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS
I

FEB 0 2 2007

PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
EIF NO. 2006-011
Mira Loma Affordable Family Apartment Development
328 Mira Loma Avenue

The following Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.	
Project Title/Common Name:	Mira Loma Affordable Family Apartment Development
Project Location:	328 Mira Loma Avenue; located on the east side of Mira Loma Avenue between San Fernando Road and Gardena Avenue.
Project Description:	The applicant proposes to construct a new four-story, 44-unit affordable family apartment development with 106 subterranean parking spaces (including 13 tandem spaces) on a 33,292 square foot site. The project will include residential units, a recreation/community room, laundry rooms, a leasing office, an interior landscaped courtyard and recreation park. The park will include a sports court, picnic tables, tot lot, trellis element and landscaping. The 44 residential units will include 14 three-bedroom units (1,165 square foot average), 2 two-bedroom, two-bath units (971 square foot average), 27 two-bedroom, one-bath units (827 square foot average) and 1 one-bedroom, one-bath unit (666 square foot average). All units will have their main entrances off the proposed central courtyard. Both pedestrian and vehicular access to the site will be from Mira Loma Avenue. The site currently contains a storage yard and surface parking lot. The project will require approval of a parking exception from the Glendale Redevelopment Agency to allow project construction without the required number of parking spaces. (Tandem parking spaces are not counted in terms of providing required parking.) Design Review Board approval for design of the site and building and for neighborhood compatibility is also required.
Project Type:	X Private Project Public Project
Project Applicant:	SADI LLC. 5939 Monterey Road, Los Angeles, CA 90042
Findings:	The Director of Planning, on May 10, 2006, after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Department, found that the above referenced project would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be prepared.
Mitigation Measures:	See attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Attachments:	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; Initial Study Checklist No. 2006-11.
Contact Person:	Elaine Wilkerson, Director of Planning City of Glendale Planning Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 548-2140 Fax: (818) 240-039

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
EIF NO. PEIF 200-011
Mira Loma Affordable Family Apartment Development
328 Mira Loma Avenue

1.	**Project Title:** Mira Loma Affordable Family Apartment Development
2.	**Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Glendale Redevelopment Agency 633 East Broadway, Room 201 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	**Contact Person and Phone Number:** Roger Kiesel, Senior Planner Tel: (818) 548-2140 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	**Project Location:** 328 Mira Loma Avenue, Glendale, Los Angeles County
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** SADI LLC.; 5939 Monterey Road, Los Angeles, CA 90042
6.	**General Plan Designation:** Mixed Use
7.	**Zoning:** SFMU (San Fernando Mixed Use) Zone
8.	**Description of the Project:** (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary support or off-site features necessary for its implementation.) The applicant proposes to construct a new four-story, 44-unit affordable family apartment development with 106 subterranean parking spaces (including 13 tandem spaces) on a 33,292 square foot site. The project will include residential units, a recreation/community room, laundry rooms, a leasing office, an interior landscaped courtyard and recreation park. The park will include a sports court, picnic tables, tot lot, trellis element and landscaping. The 44 residential units will include 14 three-bedroom units (1,165 square foot average), 2 two-bedroom, two-bath units (971 square foot average), 27 two-bedroom, one-bath units (827 square foot average) and 1 one-bedroom, one-bath unit (666 square foot average). All units will have their main entrances off the proposed central courtyard. Both pedestrian and vehicular access to the site will be from Mira Loma Avenue. The site currently contains a storage yard and surface parking lot. The project will require approval of a parking exception from the Glendale Redevelopment Agency to allow project construction without the required number of parking spaces. (Tandem parking spaces are not counted in terms of providing required parking.) Design Review Board approval for design of the site and building and for neighborhood compatibility is also required.
9.	**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *North:* One-story storage and warehouse buildings. *South:* Two-story office and warehouse buildings. *East:* Four-story multi-family housing project and one-story adult day care facility. *West:* One- and two-story commercial buildings.
10.	**Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).** None.

11. **Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agricultural Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	☐ Geology / Soils
☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology / Water Quality	☐ Land Use / Planning
☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise	☐ Population / Housing
☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation / Traffic
☐ Utilities / Service Systems	Mandatory Findings of Significance	

LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Prepared by: _____ Date: May 9, 2006

Reviewed by: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Director of Planning or his or her designee authorizing the release of environmental document for public review and comment.

Director of Planning: _____ Date: May 10, 2006

12. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The following section provides an evaluation of the impact categories and questions contained in the checklist and identifies mitigation measures, if applicable.

A. AESTHETICS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

1) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No Impact. The project site is located within a heavily urbanized area of the City and is generally flat. No scenic vistas, as identified in the Open Space and Conservation Element, exist within, or in proximity to, the project site. Therefore, no impacts to scenic vistas would result from project construction.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. No state scenic highway is located adjacent to, or within view of, the project site, nor within the City of Glendale. No impacts to scenic resources within a State scenic highway would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Less Than Significant Impact. The subject site contains a storage yard and surface parking lot. The project proposed will replace this use with a four-story multi-family residential building, landscaping, public recreation park and subterranean parking. The Design Review Board will review the site planning, aesthetics and neighborhood compatibility of the project and provide a recommendation on the project to the Glendale Redevelopment Agency for their approval. The proposed project will not degrade the existing visual character of the site, given the present use of the site. A less than significant impact is anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less Than Significant Impact. Day and nighttime lighting may increase slightly as a result of the proposed project. Proposed lighting for the project will be typical of other multi-family housing developments. The subject site as well as the surrounding area is zoned for mixed-use and it is anticipated that the area will develop to include significant commercial and residential uses in buildings developed in similar heights to the proposal. Because of the current commercial nature of the area and the mix of uses desired in the future for this area, a less than significant impact associated with lighting is anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

B. AGRICULTURE 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. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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?				X
2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
3. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X

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

No Impact. There is no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide significance within or adjacent to the proposed project site and no agricultural activities take place within the project site. No agricultural use zone currently exists within the City, nor are any agricultural zones proposed. Therefore, no impacts associated with the conversion of farmland would result from project implementation.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. The project site is currently a storage yard and surface parking lot and is located in a highly urbanized area. No portion of the project site is proposed to include agricultural zoning designations or uses, nor do any such uses exist within the City under the current General Plan and zoning. There are no Williamson Act contracts in effect for the project site or surrounding vicinity. No conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts would result. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. There is no farmland in the vicinity of the proposed project site. The surrounding area is highly urbanized and developed with a variety of commercial and residential uses. No farmland would be converted to non-agricultural uses under the proposed project. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

C. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

The project site is located within the City of Glendale, which is part of the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) and is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD's current guidelines and emission thresholds established in the *CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook*, updated October, 2003, are used for the assessment of air quality impacts of development projects. The City of Glendale relies on the SCAQMD standards as the standards for the City.

Both the State of California and the Federal government have established health-based Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS) for six criteria air pollutants. These pollutants include ozone (O_3), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NO_X), sulfur oxides (SO_X), particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of less than 10 microns (PM_{10}) and lead (Pb). Currently, O_3, CO, and PM_{10} are designated by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) as non-attainment in Los Angeles County. O_3 (smog) is formed by a photochemical reaction between oxides of nitrogen (NO_X) and reactive organic compounds (ROC). Thus, impacts from O_3 are assessed by evaluating impacts from NO_X and ROC.

The net increase in pollutant emissions determines the significance and impact on regional air quality as a result of a development project. The results also allow the local government to determine whether the proposed project will prevent the region from achieving the goal of reducing pollutants in accordance with the AQMP in order to comply with Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS).

Construction Emission Thresholds

The following CEQA significance thresholds for construction emissions have been established for the Basin:

- 75 pounds per day or 2.5 tons per quarter of ROC (Reactive Organic Compounds);
- 100 pounds per day or 2.5 tons per quarter of NO_X (Nitrogen Oxide);
- 550 pounds per day or 24.75 tons per quarter of CO (Carbon Monoxide);
- 150 pounds per day or 6.75 tons per quarter of PM_{10} (Particulates); and
- 150 pounds per day or 6.75 tons per quarter of SO_X (Sulfur Oxides).

Projects in the Basin with construction-related emissions that exceed any of the emission thresholds are considered to be significant under the SCAQMD guidelines.

Operational Emission Thresholds

The daily operational emissions "significance" thresholds for the Basin are detailed below.

Emission Thresholds for Pollutants with Regional Effects

Projects with operation-related emissions that exceed any of the emission thresholds listed below are considered significant under the SCAQMD guidelines:

- 55 pounds per day of ROC;
- 55 pounds per day of NO_X;
- 550 pounds per day of CO;
- 150 pounds per day of PM_{10}; and
- 150 pounds per day of SO_X.

Local Microscale Concentration Standards

The significance of localized project impacts under CEQA depends on whether ambient CO levels in the vicinity of the project are above or below State and Federal CO standards. If ambient levels are below the standards, a project is considered to have a significant impact if project emissions exceed one or more of these standards. If ambient levels already exceed a State or Federal standard, project emissions are considered significant if they increase one-hour CO concentrations by 1.0 part per million (ppm) or more or eight-hour CO concentrations by 0.45 ppm or more. The following are applicable local emission concentration standards for CO:

- California State one-hour CO standard of 20.0 ppm; and
- California State eight-hour CO standard of 9.0 ppm.

The aforementioned SCAQMD standards and thresholds are used to determine the significance of air quality impacts of development projects, where applicable.

1) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. A potentially significant impact to air quality would occur if the project would conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Although the project would represent an incremental negative impact to air quality in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) during the construction phase of the project, the primary concern is that project-related impacts have been properly anticipated in the regional air quality planning process and reduced whenever feasible. Therefore, it is necessary to assess the proposed project's consistency with the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP).

According to the SCAQMD's *Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook* (updated October 2003), the purpose of the consistency finding is to determine if a project is inconsistent with the assumptions

and objectives of the regional air quality plans, and thus if it would interfere with the region's ability to comply with Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS). If the project is inconsistent, local governments need to consider project modifications or inclusion of mitigation to eliminate the inconsistency. Growth assumptions within the AQMP are based on the growth assumptions and land use designations included within local general plans. Therefore, consistency with the AQMP is analyzed in regards to the project's consistency with the local general plan.

The project is the construction of a 44-unit affordable family apartment development with associated parking, recreation/community room and a public recreation park. The proposed use is consistent with the General Plan and zoning. The project does not violate ambient air quality standards and is considered consistent with the AQMP, since the net increase in land use intensity which will occur is consistent with the City's General Plan and zoning. Therefore, no notable increase in air pollutant emissions would occur. A less than significant impact is anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?***

Less Than Significant Impact. A less than significant impact is anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project. Although impacts are anticipated to be less than significant, the SCAQMD requires compliance with specific conditions for construction such as the conditions described below that would serve to minimize adverse air quality impacts.

Standard Conditions – Construction Activities

The proposed project is required to comply with regional rules that assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emissions. SCAQMD Rule 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with best available control measures so that the presence of such dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. In addition, SCAQMD Rule 402 requires implementation of dust suppression techniques to prevent fugitive dust from creating a nuisance off-site. Applicable dust suppression techniques from Rule 403 are summarized below. Implementation of these dust suppression techniques would reduce the fugitive dust generation (and thus the PM_{10} component). Compliance with these rules would ensure that impacts to any nearby sensitive receptors are less than significant. A less than significant impact would occur.

The following are the applicable Rule 403 Measures:

- Apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more);
- Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where grading is to occur will be thoroughly watered prior to earthmoving); and
- All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).

In addition, compliance with the SCAQMD Rules and Regulations on the use of architectural coatings would be required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality***

standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Response C-1 and C-2 above.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

No Impact. Cerritos School is within ¼ mile of the project site. However, the project is a multi-family residential development and not expected to generate substantial pollutant concentration. Refer to Response C-1 and C-2 above. No impact will result.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activity associated with the proposed project may generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust. Any detectable odors or heavy-duty equipment exhaust would be associated with initial construction and, therefore, is short-term. Significant long-term odor impacts are not anticipated to occur from the project since it is a multi-family residential use. A less than significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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?				X
2. 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?				X
3. 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?				X
4. 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?				X
5. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
6. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				

1) ***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?***

No Impact. The proposed project involves the construction of a 44-unit affordable family apartment building and associated parking, community facilities and a public recreation park. The site is currently a storage yard and surface parking lot and is located in a heavily urbanized area. No natural vegetation exists on-site or adjacent to the site. No wildlife species other than those which can tolerate human activity and/or are typically found in urban environments are known to exist on-site. These human-tolerant species are neither sensitive, threatened, nor endangered. Implementation of the project would not result in any impact to species identified as endangered, threatened, sensitive or being of special concern by the California Department of Fish and Game or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. The site does not provide suitable habitat for endangered or rare species. No impact will occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***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?***

No Impact. The proposed project involves the construction of a multi-family residential building on an already-developed site that is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years. No riparian habitat and/or other sensitive natural communities are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present on-site or adjacent to the project site. No impact will occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***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?***

No Impact. The proposed project involves the construction of a multi-family residential building on a developed site that is located in an area that is heavily urbanized. No federally protected wetlands are present on the project site. No impact will occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***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?***

No Impact. The proposed project involves the construction of a multi-family building on a developed site that is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years. The area has been substantially modified by human activity. Implementation of the proposed project will not interfere with the movement of 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. No impact will occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

No Impact. The proposed project lies within an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years. No protected biological resources are present on the site. There are no indigenous trees, as defined pursuant to Chapter 12.44 of the GMC, located on or within twenty feet of the subject site. Implementation of the proposed project will not conflict with any local policy designed to protect biological resources. No impact will occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) *Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*

No Impact. There is no adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved plans within the project site. No impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?				X
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?			X	
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	
4. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	

1) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?*

No Impact. The project site currently contains a storage yard and surface parking. No buildings are located on the site and the site does not appear to be historically significant. No impact would occur as a result of the project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?*

Less Than Significant Impact. No known archaeological resources exist on the subject site. The project site has been previously graded and is developed with a storage yard and surface parking lot. It is unlikely that any such resources would be uncovered during preparation or construction of the proposed project. A less than significant impact to archaeological resources is anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

Less Than Significant Impact. No known paleontological resources exist on the subject site. The project site has been previously graded and is developed with a storage yard and parking use. It is unlikely that any such resources would be uncovered during preparation or construction of the proposed project. A less than significant impact to archaeological resources is anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located within a heavily-urbanized area. Within the project site, any traditional burial resources would likely be associated with the Native American group know as the Gabrielino. No known traditional burial sites exist within the project site, nor have any resources been identified in the vicinity. A less than significant impact to human remains is anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
3. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
4. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
5. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

1) ***Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:***

i) ***Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.***

Less Than Significant Impact. In 1972, the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act (now known as the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act) was passed into law. The Act defines "active" and "potentially active" faults utilizing the same criteria as that used by the California Geological Survey (CGS). However, established state policy has been to zone only those faults, which have direct evidence of movement within the last 11,000 years. It is this timing of fault movement that the CGS considers as a characteristic for faults that have a relatively high potential for ground fault rupture in the future.

CGS policy is to delineate a boundary from 200 to 500 feet wide on each side of the known fault trace based on the location precision, the complexity, or the regional significance of the fault. If a site lies within an Earthquake Fault Zone, a geologic fault rupture investigation must be performed that demonstrates that the proposed building site is not threatened by surface displacement from the fault before development permits may be issued.

Ground rupture is defined as surface displacement, which occurs along the surface trace of the causative fault during an earthquake. Based on research of available literature, there are no known active or potentially active faults that underlie the subject site. In addition, according to the City's Safety Element (August 2003), the subject site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Based on these considerations, the potential for surface ground rupture at the subject site is considered low. Therefore, impacts from the rupture of a seismic fault are considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

ii) ***Strong seismic ground shaking?***

Less Than Significant Impact. Seismic-induced settlement or compaction of dry or moist, cohesionless soils can be an effect related to earthquake ground motion. Such settlements are typically most damaging when the settlements are differential in nature across the length of structures. Some seismically-induced settlement in controlled fill should be expected as a result of strong ground shaking, however, excessive differential settlements are not expected to occur. Construction of the project will be required to meet all current building and seismic safety standards and established building codes regulating grading and building construction. Compliance with the Uniform Building Code (UBC) will reduce impacts regarding seismic ground shaking or rupture of earthquake fault to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated. Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which saturated silty to cohesionless soils below the groundwater table are subject to a temporary loss of strength due to the buildup of excess pore pressure during cyclic loading conditions such as those induced by an earthquake. Liquefaction-related effects include loss of bearing strength, amplified ground oscillations, lateral spreading, and flow failures. The project site is not located within an area prone to liquefaction as indicated in the City's Safety Element (August, 2003).

iv) Landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site and the area surrounding the subject site are generally flat and already developed . The probability of seismically-induced landslides occurring on the site is considered low. The project site is not located within a designated landslide hazard zone, according to the City of Glendale Safety Element (August 2003). A less than significant landslide impact is anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project will result in exposure of on-site soils during construction. Since soils would be exposed for only a limited amount of time and the site is generally flat, substantial erosion is not expected to occur. A less than significant impact would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an onsite or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated. Subsidence is the process of lowering the elevation of an area of the earth's surface and can be caused by tectonic forces deep within the earth or by consolidation and densification of sediments sometimes due to withdrawal of fluids such as groundwater. The project site is not located in an area of significant subsidence activity and the project would not include fluid withdrawal or removal. A less than significant impact is anticipated.

4) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project involves the construction of a residential project. The soil around the project site is generally Alluvium; which has a low shrink-swell potential because it is

well drained and moderately permeable. Compliance with the California Building Code (CBC) would serve to further reduce impacts. A less than significant impact would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) *Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?*

No Impact. The proposed project involves the construction of a multi-family residential development. The site will be connected to the City's sewer system. No septic tanks will be utilized as part of the project. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

G. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X	
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?				X
7. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
8. 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?			X	

1) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

Less than Significant Impact. The existing use on the site is a storage yard and surface parking lot. The project involves the construction of a multi-family residential building. It does not involve routine transport of hazardous materials. It is not anticipated that hazardous materials will be transported or used at the site. A less than significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

No Impact. The project involves the development of a multi-family residential building. No release of hazardous materials into the environment will occur. No impact would occur as a result of the project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. Cerritos School is located within one-quarter mile of the subject project. However, the project is not anticipated to emit hazardous emission or handle hazardous materials or waste. No impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

Less than Significant Impact. A Phase 1 study was performed on the site. This study did not identify hazardous waste existing on the site. During project construction, should hazardous waste be found, this waste needs to be disposed of in compliance with all applicable local, State and Federal laws and regulations. A less than significant impact will occur as a result of this proposal.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?*

No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?*

No Impact. No private airstrips are located in the City of Glendale or in the vicinity of the project site. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any safety hazards for people residing or working in the project site. No impact is expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

7) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

No Impact. The proposed project does not involve any changes to the existing street network and, therefore, the project will not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. No impacts to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

8) *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?*

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for years and is not classified as a Fire Hazard Area by the City of Glendale Fire Department, as indicated in the City of Glendale Safety Element (August 2003). A less than significant impact is anticipated.

Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are required.

H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
4. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
6. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
8. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
9. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
10. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

1) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste water discharge requirements. However, as part of Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established regulations under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program to control direct storm water discharges. In Glendale, the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWCQB) administers the NPDES permitting program and is responsible for developing NPDES permitting requirements. The NPDES program regulates industrial pollutant discharges, including construction activities. Implementation of the proposed project will require compliance with all the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements including the submittal and certification of plans and details showing both construction and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) that are integrated into the design of the project. The submittal of a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) approved by the City Engineer will also be required to be integrated into the design of the project. Impacts related to water quality due to construction activity are considered to be less than significant with the compliance of all applicable permitting requirements.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) *Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?*

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not involve additions or withdrawals of groundwater. The amount of hardscape proposed on the project site would be similar to the previous use. A less than significant impact would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*

Less Than Significant Impact. No water courses run through the site. Currently, water which falls on the site drains to adjacent Mira Loma Avenue or the alley. This will not change as a result of the

project. The project will not alter the course of a stream or river since no river or stream is located on the site. A less than significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?*

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not alter the course of a stream or river. Flood hazards due to heavy precipitation can result in inundation of developed areas due to overflow of nearby stream courses or from inadequate local storm drain facilities, if not sized to accommodate large storm events. The amount of surface runoff will not increase from previous levels. The City has developed a flood control system that provides protection for its residents. In addition, no Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)-designated flood zones are located within the project site as indicated in the City's Safety Element (August 2003). Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) *Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to Responses H-1, H-3 and H-4 above. The proposed project involves the construction of a multi-family residential development. The amount of impervious surfaces will remain similar to previous levels and, therefore, no increase in runoff from the site is anticipated. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) *Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to Response H-1 above.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

7) *Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?*

No Impact. The proposed project is a multi-family residential development. As indicated above in Response H-4, no portion of the project site is located within a 100-year floodplain or other flood hazard area, as shown on the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map. No impacts from 100-year flood hazards would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

8) *Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?*

No Impact. As previously stated in Response H-7 above, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. The proposed project involves the construction of a multi-family residential development. Construction of the proposed project would not result in any impacts related to flood flows.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

9) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?*

No Impact. According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003), the project site is not located within inundation zones from failure of upstream dams. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

10) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No Impact. Tsunamis are large ocean waves generated by sudden water displacement caused by a submarine earthquake, landslide, or volcanic eruption. A review of the County of Los Angeles Flood and Inundation Hazards Map, indicates that the site does not lie within the mapped tsunami inundation boundaries. The project site is located on relatively flat land with no potential to be affected by mud flow impacts. No seiche, tsunami, or mudflow impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community?				X
2. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
4. Remove or add affordable housing stock through density bonus or inclusionary housing requirements?				X

1) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The project site is located on an infill site, which was previously developed with a storage yard and surface parking. The project is the construction of a multi-family residential development. The site is generally surrounded by commercial uses and was recently re-zoned for mixed-use development, although development of entirely residential uses is permitted if the site does not have frontage on San Fernando Road, Colorado Street or Broadway. The proposed project, while not mixed-use, is in keeping with the higher density transit village concept that is being encouraged to development in the area, which is very close to the Glendale Metrolink and Amtrak station. The established neighborhood would not be divided as a result of the project. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less than Significant Impact. The existing zoning designation on the project site is SFMU (San Fernando Mixed Use) and the General Plan designation is Mixed Use. The zoning immediately surrounding the site is SFMU. Within 300 feet of the subject site the zoning includes CG (Commercial General), T (Transportation) and R-3050 (Multi-family Residential). The proposed project complies with the Land Use Element of the General Plan. The applicant is requesting a parking exception from the Glendale Redevelopment Agency. The project requires 106 parking spaces. While the site plan provides 106 spaces, 13 of these spaces are in a tandem arrangement. Tandem spaces are not counted toward required parking. This item will be further discussed under parking impacts. Given the nature of the project, affordable housing, and its location near a train station, providing less parking than technically required, would not significantly impact the environment. A less than significant impact associated with applicable land use plans and policies would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?***

No Impact. There is no habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan in the project site or vicinity. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Remove or add affordable housing stock through density bonus or inclusionary housing requirements?***

No Impact. The previous use on the project site was a storage facility and surface parking lot. The project is the construction of a multi-family affordable housing development. Therefore, the project would add affordable housing stock to the community, a much needed resource, rather than deplete the affordable housing stock. No impacts associated with affordable housing would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

J. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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?				X
2. 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?				X

1) ***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?***

No Impact. The project site is urbanized and is not within an area that has been identified as containing valuable mineral resources, as indicated in the City's Open Space and Conservation Element (January, 1993). The project involves the construction of a multi-family housing development. Development within the project site would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) *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?*

No Impact. As indicated in Response J-1 above, there are no known mineral resources within the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

K. NOISE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
2. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
3. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
4. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?				X

1) *Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is the construction of a multi-family affordable residential development. This is a permitted use on the subject site. Surrounding land uses include mostly commercial and industrial uses, although mixed-use projects with residential components are encouraged in the area and are being proposed. The project site is located approximately 500 feet from existing railroad tracks. Trains running on these tracks serve both commercial and commuter purposes. Noise generated by the trains traveling on the existing railroad tracks may negatively impact the residents living in the proposed units and is common to transit-oriented project such as this. The use is not anticipated to generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element nor, with construction techniques, provide exposure of persons living on the site to noise levels in excess of established standards. A less than significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?***

Less Than Significant Impact. Excessive groundborne vibration is typically associated with activities such as blasting used in mining operations, or the use of pile drivers during construction. The project would not require any blasting activities and any earth movement associated with project construction is not expected to require pile driving. Therefore, the project is not expected to generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. A less than significant impact is anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

Less Than Significant Impact.

As indicated in Response K-1 above, noise impacts are not anticipated to result from the long-term use of the proposed project. A less than significant impact is anticipated to occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

Less Than Significant Impact. Temporary noise impacts may occur as a result of on-site construction activities. All development within the project site will be required to comply with the City of Glendale Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 8.36, *Noise*), which prohibits construction activities to between the hours of 7:00 p.m. on one day and 7:00 a.m. of the next day or from 7:00 p.m. on Saturday to 7:00 a.m. on Monday or from 7:00 p.m. preceding a holiday. A less than significant impact would occur as a result of development.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, no impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) ***For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?***

No Impact. There are no private airstrips located on or within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

L. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
3. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

1) ***Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?***

Less than Significant Impact. The project proposed is a multi-family residential development and would increase population growth in an area that currently does not have a large residential population. The subject site is zoned SFMU with a General Plan Land Use Designation of Mixed Use. The project is consistent with the zoning and land use designation of the area, which allows for single use residential projects if they are not fronting on San Fernando Road, Colorado Street or Braodway, and, therefore, is not growth inducing. Further, this area is close to the Glendale Amtrak and Metrolink station. The City is encouraging transit-oriented residential development in this area. A less than significant impact is anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

No Impact. The project involves the construction of a multi-family residential building. A commercial storage yard and surface parking use previously existed on the site. No residential uses were located on the site and, therefore, none will be displaced. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

No Impact. No residential units exist on the subject site and, therefore, no residential population will be displaced. A multi-family affordable housing development is proposed. No impacts will occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

M. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire protection?			X	
b) Police protection?			X	
c) Schools?			X	
d) Parks?			X	
e) Other public facilities?				X

1) ***Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:***

a) *Fire protection?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Glendale Fire Department (GFD) provides fire and paramedic services to the project site. The nearest fire station is located at 1201 South Glendale Avenue, approximately 1 mile away from the subject site. The project will be required to comply with the Uniform Fire Code, including installation of fire sprinklers, and to submit plans to the Glendale Fire Department at the time building permits are submitted. A less than significant impact is anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b) *Police protection?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Glendale Police Department (GPD) provides police services to the project site. The nearest police facility is located at 131 North Isabel Street. The Glendale Police Department did not cite any concerns related to the proposed project. A less than significant impact is anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c) *Schools?*

Less than Significant Impact. Section 65995 of the Government Code provides that school districts can collect a fee ($2.24) on a per square foot basis for new residential development to assist in the construction of or addition to schools, which reduces the impact that this project may create on the neighborhood schools to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d) *Parks?*

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not involve the displacement of a park. The project is located in Recreation Planning Area 7. Pacific Park, which is approximately 5.1 acres, is the only recreation facility located within this area. The area is deficient in total park land. The project site was not planned for park use, however, approximately 9,000 square feet of the site is proposed for recreation space. This area is currently proposed to include a recreation room, tot lot, sports court, trellis feature and picnic tables. A less than significant impact is anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e) *Other public facilities?*

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is an already developed infill parcel and can be adequately served by existing public facilities. A less than significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

N. RECREATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical detericration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

1) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

Less than Significant Impact. The project, as proposed, is consistent with the Land Use Element. Because the proposed project is a multi-family residential development designed for families, it is anticipated that this project will increase the use of nearby park space and other recreational facilities. As previously discussed, the project will include an approximately 9,000 square foot recreation area. This area is currently proposed to include a recreation center, sports court, tot lot, trellis element and picnic tables. The potential demand for new parks, or increased maintenance and additional improvements at existing parks, with the creation of this new open space area, would be minimal and, therefore, is anticipated to result in a less than significant impact associated with the demand of existing park facilities. See explanation M(f) above.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

Less than Significant Impact. The project provides a recreation area on a portion of the subject site. It is not anticipated that inclusion of the recreation facility will have an adverse impact on the environment. A less than significant impact to recreation resources is anticipated with implementation of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

O. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
2. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
3. 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?				X
4. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		X		
5. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
6. Result in inadequate parking capacity?		X		
7. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

1) ***Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?***

Less than Significant Impact. Mira Loma and Gardena Avenues are located adjacent to the project site. The site also fronts an alley. Both streets are considered local streets in the City's General Plan adjacent to the subject site. Vehicular access to the site will be from Mira Loma Avenue. Based upon vehicle trip-generation factors published in *Trip Generation*, Institute of Transportation Engineers, the project would generate approximately 25 total vehicle trips during the weekday morning peak hours and approximately 20 total vehicle trips during the weekend evening peak hours. The project would generate approximately 240 total vehicle trips on an average weekday. Based on this nominal increase in trip generation, the project would not create an adverse impact on the surrounding street system. Therefore, a less than significant impact related to traffic is anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?***

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed above in Response O-1, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any significant increase in traffic on the area roadway network. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***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?***

No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private air strip and, therefore, will have no impact on air traffic patterns.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?***

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Access to the semi-subterranean garage is located off of Mira Loma Avenue. In order to maintain adequate visibility when exiting the garage, the south side of this street shall be painted with red curb for a distance of 15 feet both east and west of the project driveway. Additionally, to maintain safe ingress to the site and internal circulation within the garage, the driveway shall contain a painted double yellow centerline delineating the two 12-foot-wide travel lanes. "Bots dots" and reflectorized pavement markers shall also be installed as specified by the Traffic and Transportation Division. The proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing roadway network. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures:

1. The south side of Mira Loma Avenue shall be painted with red curb for a distance of 15 feet both east and west of the project driveway.
2. The project driveway shall contain a painted double yellow centerline delineating the travel lanes and "bots dots" and reflectorized pavement markers shall be installed as specified by the Traffic and Transportation Division.

5) ***Result in inadequate emergency access?***

No Impact. No changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the project. The subterranean garages will be accessed from Mira Loma Avenue. The City's Police and Fire Departments did not cite any concerns related to emergencies. No impacts to emergency access would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) ***Result in inadequate parking capacity?***

Less than Significant Impact. The City of Glendale Municipal Code (GMC) requires 2 parking spaces for each 1 and 2 bedroom multi-family unit and 2.5 parking spaces for each 3 bedroom unit. Additionally, ¼ parking spaces per unit is required for guest parking. Based on the requirements in the GMC, the project is required to provide 106 parking spaces. The proposed project will provide 106 parking spaces, however, 13 of those spaces will be in a tandem arrangement and, therefore, not counted toward the required parking. The applicant is requesting a parking exception from the Glendale Redevelopment Agency to allow construction of the project with tandem spaces. Should the parking exception be granted, each set of tandem spaces shall be assigned to a single unit to prevent one tenant from blocking another tenant from being able to park in the assigned stall. While this is not the most convenient parking arrangement, it will not be a significant environmental impact if this mitigation measure is incorporated into the approval of the project.

Mitigation Measures:

1. Each set of tandem parking spaces, if approved with a Parking Exception, shall be assigned to a single unit.

7) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

No Impact. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) and Glendale Beeline provide bus service to the vicinity. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding alternative transportation since no changes to the existing transportation policies, plans, or programs would result from project implementation. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

P. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X	
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
3. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
4. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
5. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	
6. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
7. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

1) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would increase the intensity of the use of the site and slightly increase wastewater. This increase can be accommodated with existing facilities. Construction work associated with the project would be required to comply with all applicable wastewater treatment requirements, including NPDES and Best Management Practices (BMPs). A less than significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would result in an increase in the intensity of development on the site. This increase would result in a slight increase in demand for new water or wastewater treatment facilities. This, however, would not create the need to expand existing facilities. A less than significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

Less than Significant Impact. As indicated in Response P-2 above, the project involves a slight increase in intensity of on-site uses. This increase in demand for new storm water drainage facilities would not result in the need for the construction of new or expansion of existing facilities. A less than significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?***

Less than Significant Impact. Water would be provided to the project site via existing supply lines along Mira Loma Avenue. Adequate water exists to serve the proposed project. A less than significant impact to the availability of water would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) ***Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?***

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not create a significant increase in the generation of wastewater and will comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to wastewater. The project is considered to have a less than significant impact regarding wastewater treatment.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) ***Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The majority of solid waste generated in the City of Glendale is transported to Scholl Canyon Landfill, which is owned by the City. An ordinance passed by the City of Glendale limits disposal at the landfill to solid wastes generated within the Los Angeles County incorporated Cities of Glendale, La Canada Flintridge, Pasadena, South Pasadena, San Marino, Sierra Madre; the Los Angeles County unincorporated communities known as Altadena, La Crescenta, Montrose; the unincorporated area bordered by the Cities of San Gabriel, Rosemead, Temple City, Arcadia, and Pasadena; and the unincorporated area immediately to the north of Arcadia, and Pasadena; and the unincorporated area immediately to the north of the City of San Marino bordered by the City of Pasadena on the west, north and east sides.

Scholl Canyon Landfill has the capacity to accept solid waste until January 2019. Solid waste generation is expected to increase during the construction phase of the project as well as when the

future residents move into the residential units. However, the existing solid waste system would be sufficient to accommodate wastes generated during construction. A less than significant impact to solid waste facilities would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

7) ***Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

No Impact. The project will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations relating to solid waste. All construction debris will be disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local statutes. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Q. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
3. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		

1) ***Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?***

No Impact. The proposed project is located in a developed urban area. No impacts would occur to the quality of the environment, fish or wildlife habitats, fish or wildlife populations, plant or animal communities, or to rare, threatened or endangered plant and animal species as a result of the proposed project. No important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory exists on the project site as indicated above in Section E of the Initial Study.

2) ***Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?***

Less than Significant Impact. Development of the proposed project will not substantially increase traffic nor would it result in an increase in population. Public facilities are available to accommodate the intensification of development on the site.

3) ***Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?***

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Development of the proposed project would not create direct and indirect adverse effects on humans with some traffic- and parking-related mitigation measures attached to the project. These mitigation measures include:

O.4.1. The south side of Mira Loma Avenue shall be painted with red curb for a distance of 15 feet both east and west of the project driveway.

O.4.2. The project driveway shall contain a painted double yellow centerline delineating the travel lanes and "bots dots" and reflectorized pavement markers shall be installed as specified by the Traffic and Transportation Division.

O.6.1. Each set of tandem parking spaces, if approved with a Parking Exception, shall be assigned to a single unit.

13. Earlier Analyses

None

14. Project References Used to Prepare Initial Study Checklist

One or more of the following references were incorporated into the Initial Study by reference, and are available for review in the Planning division Office, 633 E. Broadway, Rm. 103, Glendale, CA 91206-4386. Items used are referred to by number on the Initial Study Checklist.

1. Environmental Information Form application and materials submitted on April 7, 2006.
2. The City of Glendale's General Plan, Open Space and Conservation Element, January 1993.
3. The City of Glendale's General Plan, Safety Element, August 2003.
4. The City of Glendale's Municipal Code, as amended.
5. "Guidelines of the City of Glendale for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended," August 19, 2003, City of Glendale Planning Division.
6. Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq and California Code of Regulations, Title 14 Section 15000 et seq.
7. *"CEQA Air Quality Handbook,"* April, 1993, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
8. *"CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook,"* updated October 2003, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
9. The City of Glendale's General Plan, Noise Element, 1978