



INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1.	Project Title: Central Avenue Mixed Use Project EIR
2.	Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Glendale Community Development Department Planning Division 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	Contact Person and Phone Number: Dennis Joe, Senior Planner Tel: (818) 937-8157
4.	Project Location: 236 North Central Avenue and 212 West California Avenue, Glendale, Los Angeles County
5.	Project Sponsor's Name and Address: MGP XII GLENDALE CENTRAL, LLC 4365 Executive Drive, Suite 1400 San Diego, California 92121
6.	General Plan Designation: Downtown Specific Plan
7.	Zoning: Downtown Specific Plan/Orange Central District
8.	<p>Description of the Project: The proposed project includes the development of new 8-story, 655,418 square-foot, mixed-use development consisting 666 multi-family residential dwellings units (15% reserved as affordable), 16 live/work units, and 930 parking space garage (one above grade and two levels subterranean) on a 3.7 acre site located south of West California Avenue and between North Central Avenue and North Orange Street consisting of four parcels (APNs: 5642-015-045, 5642-015-056, 5642-015-057, and 5642-015-058, addressed as 236 North Central Avenue) which is bisected by a 18 foot wide public alley (alley 239), and the future development of a public park on a 0.87 acre site located at the northwest corner of North Orange Avenue and West California Avenue consisting of three parcels (APNs 5643-020-038, 5643-020-039, and 5643-020-040, addressed as 212 West California Avenue), all of which are located in the Downtown Specific Plan - Orange Central District (Project). See Figure 1, Regional and Local Vicinity, for the Project's location.</p> <p>236 North Central Avenue is a 3.7-acre site that is developed with a 176,629 square-foot three-story retail building (formerly Sears department store that was constructed in 1934), a 164,308 square-foot three-level parking structure, and a small asphalt surface parking that provides access from North Central Avenue. The former Sears building is largely vacant, although it is temporarily occupied by seasonal businesses. The Project site also includes a north-south alley that runs between the three-story retail building and the three-level parking structure. The Project site is almost entirely paved with minimal landscaping and the public sidewalk contains some mature street trees along the Project site's boundary.</p> <p>As part of the Project, the City and developer are engaged in discussions regarding the potential sale of 201 West California Avenue that is an 0.87-acre parcel located on northwest corner of California Avenue and Orange Street for future development by the City of a public park. The site is developed with two vehicle repair buildings totaling 15,933 square-foot (formerly Sears Auto Center) and associated surface parking; the site is almost entirely paved and contains</p>

minimal landscaping. Development of the site as park would require the demolition of all on-site structures and improvements.

Regional access to the Project site is available via Brand Boulevard to the east, State Route (SR) 134 to the north, and Interstate (I) 5 to the west. The City is bordered by the cities of Los Angeles to the west, south, and east; Burbank to the north/northwest; La Cañada Flintridge to the north/northeast; Pasadena to the east; and La Crescenta-Montrose to the north (unincorporated Los Angeles County)

Construction of the Project will occur over an approximately 4-year period and across two phases as follows:

- Phase I - demolition of the former Sears department store building, existing parking structure and ancillary structures across all sites, and development of 344 multi-family residential units (27 studios, 248 1-bedroom, 68 2-bedrooms, 1 3-bedrooms), 9 live/work units, and ground-floor retail on the Project site's eastern side.
- Phase II – development of 322 multi-family residential units (10 studios, 245 1-bedroom, and 67 2-bedrooms), and 7 live/work units on the site's western side.

Each of the project's two phases will take place over a period of approximately 2 years. The amount of soil export from the site will be approximately 147,696 cubic yards between during Phases 1 and 2. Based on this estimate, the excavation material would require approximately 888 truck trips during Phase 1 and approximately 792 truck trips during Phase 2. Due to the nature of the project, excavation would be concentrated within initial weeks of both Phases 1 and 2. The maximum number of haul truck trips per eight-hour workday is anticipated to be 72. The primary inbound haul route to the Project site is projected to be from the Brand Boulevard exit of the 134 Freeway, then right onto West California Avenue. The same route would be used for outbound trucks. Staging during phases I and II will occur separately on the western and eastern sides during separate times and each side be used as the staging area and parking during each respective construction periods.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

North: Downtown Specific Plan/ Orange Central District (DSP/OC) / Mixed-Use Residential

South: Downtown Specific Plan/ Orange Central District (DSP/OC)/ Commercial & Hospitality

East: Downtown Specific Plan/ Mid Orange District (DSP/MO)/ Public Facilities (parking garage) and Commercial

West: Downtown Specific Plan/Transitional District (DSP/T)/ Commercial

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.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forest Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards / Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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: _____

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

Director of Community Development: _____

Date: _____

A. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. A scenic vista is generally described in two ways: panoramic views (visual access to a large geographic area, for which the field of view can be wide and extend into the distance) and focal views (visual access to a particular object, scene, setting, or feature of interest). According to the Downtown Specific Plan Program EIR, no focal views of natural landforms were identified within the Downtown Specific Plan area. However, there are various man-made focal view features, such as public art/signs, and visually important structures, such as historic buildings, which occur throughout the downtown area (City of Glendale 2006).

Implementation of the proposed Project would comply with the Downtown Specific Plan’s setback standards and would be developed within the footprint of the currently-existing structures (except for construction across the now-existing alley, which does not support existing visual resources, and off-site utility infrastructure improvements). Moreover, the Project would be required to undergo design review and approval during the City’s plan check and permitting process, in accordance with Chapter 30.47, Design Review, of the City’s Municipal Code, to ensure substantial adverse effects would be less than significant.

The City’s General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element identifies the San Gabriel Mountains, the San Rafael Hills, and the Verdugo Mountains as visual and scenic resources within the City which provide a dramatic scenic backdrop, open space, and valuable habitat (City of Glendale 1993). The proposed Project would demolish existing structures on site, consisting of a three-story retail building, two vehicle repair buildings and three-level parking structure, and would construct a new eight-story, mixed-use development. Although the Project’s maximum height is proposed to be beyond the site’s existing conditions, the development surrounding the Project site currently limits publicly accessible views of the above defined scenic vistas to the north. Moreover, as detailed in the Downtown Specific Plan Program EIR, the Orange-Central District (including the Project site) was identified as an area of the downtown where significant change in building heights would occur. Since the adoption of the Downtown Specific Plan in 2006, the buildings surrounding the Project site are no longer characterized as “surface parking and vacant areas” (see Section 1.4, Environmental Setting, of this Initial Study for more details). Long distance views of these mountains to the north and west of the downtown (including Project site) are limited to the views available through major street corridors, as existing buildings block or obstruct the views (City of Glendale 2006). The Project does not propose to construct within the street right-of-way and would not

obstruct any views along street corridors. Due to the limited nature of scenic vistas from areas surrounding the Project site under existing conditions, construction of the proposed Project would not substantially alter views of the San Gabriel Mountains, the San Rafael Hills, or the Verdugo Mountains, as stated in the Downtown Specific Plan Program EIR.

Implementation of the Project would be required to comply with applicable design guidelines, including provisions outlined in the Downtown Specific Plan and the City's Comprehensive Design Guidelines for multi-family residential buildings, which would be reviewed during the City's plan check and permitting process to ensure consistency with established regulations, guidelines, and development review processes set forth in the City's Municipal Code and General Plan. Given the above, the proposed Project would not directly result in substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

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

No Impact. According to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) California Scenic Highway Mapping System, there are no officially designated or eligible state scenic highways located within the Project site's vicinity (Caltrans 2024). The nearest official or eligible highway is a segment of State Route 210 within the Crescenta Valley located over 4 miles to the north and physically separated from the Project site by foothills of the Verdugo Mountains. Therefore, the Project site is not within the viewshed of an official designated state scenic highway. As such, the proposed Project would not substantially damage scenic resources within viewshed of a designated state scenic highway and no impact would occur. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. California Public Resources Code Section 21071 defines an "urbanized area" as "(a) an incorporated city that meets either of the following criteria: (1) Has a population of at least 100,000 persons, or (2) Has a population of less than 100,000 persons if the population of that city and not more than two contiguous incorporated cities combined equals at least 100,000 persons." According to the United States Census, 189,221 people are estimated to live within the City (U.S. Census 2022). As such, the Project site is considered to be within an urbanized area. Therefore, a significant impact would occur in the event the Project conflicts with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

The proposed Project does not require an amendment to the General Plan, Downtown Specific Plan, or a change to the existing zoning for the site. Given this, the Project would be required to comply with applicable regulations governing scenic quality. The Project site is zoned DSP/OC District which permits a maximum FAR of 3.0 and a maximum building height of 95 feet. As stated above, Project Description, of this Initial Study, the Project is requesting a density bonus and proposes to set aside 15% of the base density residential units for affordable housing, in accordance with AB 2345 and the City's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. For that reason, the Project is entitled to incentives, concessions, and waivers from development standards, including the FAR and required open space, which would deviate from applicable regulations governing the Project site. The Project is proposing development that would be a maximum height of 95 feet. Additionally, the Project is proposed a FAR

of 3.16. The minor deviations to increase the FAR and reduce required open space would not create inconsistencies with regulations governing scenic quality. The Project proposes a mixed-use project consistent with the urbanized area and compliance with other applicable urban design standards set forth in the City's Municipal Code, General Plan, Downtown Specific Plan would be ensured through the plan check and permitting process. The Project is proposing to remove the existing buildings on the site to be replaced with a new mixed-use development. Building materials would incorporate a number of architectural elements and design features that articulate the building façades, including high quality and varied building materials, texture, windows, and awnings (see Figure 4A and 4B, Exterior Elevations). As such, the Project would be consistent with the City's existing zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality and the impact is less than significant. No mitigation is required. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

Similar to the discussion above, implementation of the potential future public park would not result in substantial adverse effects to the City's existing zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. As discussed above, the location of the potential public park is within an urbanized area and would be required to comply with the urban design standards set forth by the City, including the City's Municipal Code, General Plan, Downtown Specific Plan. As discussed in Section 5 (Open Space) of the City's Downtown Specific Plan, community benefits have been identified to encourage the creation of publicly accessible open space, as well as outdoor activity areas in conjunction with private development with the intention of creating open spaces within five-minute walking distances of one another in Downtown. Furthermore, Policy 5.1.5 of the DSP establishes the goal of a Parkland Acquisition Program to obtain new open space in the downtown – which the Orange Central District was identified an ideal location for a potential one-acre park given proximity to existing residential development. Given that the City and Project Applicant are engaged in discussions for purchase of the approximately 0.87-acre site, it is anticipated that this property will be developed by the City as a public park/open space amenity. At the time of drafting this Initial Study no design concepts for the Potential Public Park site have been proposed. In the event the City purchases the property, the City would be required to comply with the existing zoning and adopted design standards established by the City. As such, less than significant impacts related to the potential future development of this off-site component are anticipated. No mitigation is required. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

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. Given the Project site's location within an urbanized environment, existing sources of day and nighttime illumination exist, including sources from interior and exterior lighting from existing residential, commercial, office, and industrial buildings, parking lot lights, and security lights, as well as from vehicular traffic and streetlights along adjacent roadways. Additional sources of light and glare are anticipated as a result of the proposed Project. The Project would introduce lighting sources associated with the new buildings, including interior and exterior, security, signage, and parking lights. However, the Project's lighting would be consistent with the design standards set forth in the City's Downtown Specific Plan, in addition to lighting standards outlined in Section 30.30.040, Lighting, of the City's Municipal Code. Compliance with the applicable lighting standards would limit light trespass onto adjacent properties. In addition, according to Section 30.33.210, Miscellaneous Signs, any lighting of window signs shall be in compliance with the electrical code and shall not cause disturbing glare onto any adjacent areas due to excessive

brightness or method of illumination. Signs shall also be designed, installed, and maintained in such a manner that the spillover of any illumination of signs onto property located in a residential zone shall not exceed two-foot candles above ambient light levels. Moreover, any external lighting on site would be required to be directed towards the Project site and shielded to prevent light from spilling over onto neighboring properties. Due to existing conditions within an urbanized environment which include sources of light and compliance with existing regulations, the Project would not create new sources of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Less than significant impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

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. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?				X
4. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

- 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 the City, to nonagricultural use?**
- 2) **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**
- 3) **Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?**
- 4) **Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?**
- 5) **Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?**

No Impact. The Project site is zoned DSP/OC (Downtown Specific Plan/Orange Central) District. There is no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance within or adjacent to the Project site and no agricultural activities take place on the Project site.¹ No agricultural use zones currently exist within the city, nor are any agricultural zones proposed. No impacts would occur. The Project site is located in an 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 contract would result.² There is no existing zoning of forestland or timberland in the City of Glendale. No forestland exists within the City of Glendale; therefore, no forestland would be converted to non-forest use under the Project. According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, the Project site and the surrounding area are not candidates for listing as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.³ Therefore, the Project has no impact related to agriculture and forestry resources. No additional analysis of this topic in the EIR is needed.

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. 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?	X			
3. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	X			
4. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

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

Less than Significant Impact. 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 is the agency responsible for preparing the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the Basin. Since 1979, a number of AQMPs have been prepared. The most recent comprehensive plan fully approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection

¹ California Department of Conservation, California Important Farmland Finder website, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>. Accessed March 2022.

² California Department of Conservation, State of California Williamson Act Contract Land, [https://planning.lacity.org/eir/HollywoodCenter/Deir/ELDP/\(E\)%20Initial%20Study/Initial%20Study/Attachment%20B%20References/California%20Department%20of%20Conservation%20Williamson%20Map%202016.pdf](https://planning.lacity.org/eir/HollywoodCenter/Deir/ELDP/(E)%20Initial%20Study/Initial%20Study/Attachment%20B%20References/California%20Department%20of%20Conservation%20Williamson%20Map%202016.pdf). Accessed August 2021.

³ Department of Conservation, California Important Farmland Finder, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>. Accessed August 2021.

Agency (U.S. EPA) is the 2022 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which includes a variety of strategies and control measures.

The AQMP was prepared to accommodate growth, to reduce the high levels of pollutants within the areas under the jurisdiction of SCAQMD, to return clean air to the region, and to minimize the impact on the economy. Projects that are considered to be consistent with the AQMP would not interfere with attainment because this growth is included in the projections utilized in the formulation of the AQMP. Therefore, projects, uses, and activities that are consistent with the applicable assumption used in the development of the AQMP would not jeopardize attainment of the air quality levels identified in the AQMP, even if they exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily emissions thresholds.

Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified in the Growth Management Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since the Growth Management Chapter forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP.

Population growth associated with the Project is included in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) projects for growth in the City of Glendale. The project does not result in population and housing growth that would cause growth in Glendale to exceed the SCAG forecast, because the Project is consistent with the General Plan and therefore is included in SCAG's growth projections. Consequently, implementation of the Project would be consistent with AQMP attainment forecasts and with applicable air quality plans. No impact would occur. This issue will not be further analyzed in the EIR.

- 2) **Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard?**
- 3) **Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

Potential Significant Impact. Construction and operation of the Project will result in the generation of air emissions. An Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy Technical Report was prepared by Dudek (dated July 2024), which evaluated the potential short-term construction and long-term operational impacts that would result from implementation of the project. This study will be used to further analyze the construction and operational air quality emissions generated by the Project in the EIR.

- 4) **Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?**

Less than Significant Impact. The analysis of other emissions is focused on the potential for an odor impact to occur. The occurrence and severity of potential odor impacts depends on numerous factors. The nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; the wind speeds and direction; and the sensitivity of receiving location each contribute to the intensity of the impact. Although offensive odors seldom cause physical harm, they can be annoying and cause distress among the public and generate citizen complaints.

Odors would be generated from vehicles and/or equipment exhaust emissions during construction of the project. Odors produced during construction would be attributable to concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from tailpipes of construction equipment, architectural coatings, and asphalt pavement

application. Such odors would disperse rapidly from the project site and generally occur at magnitudes that would not affect substantial numbers of people. Therefore, impacts associated with odors during construction would be considered less than significant. Land uses and industrial operations associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The project does not propose and would not engage in any of these activities or other potential activities that would generate operational odors. The project entails operation of a multifamily/live-work project and would not create any new sources of odors during operation. Therefore, the project would result in an odor impact that is less than significant. This issue will not be further analyzed in the EIR.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the project:</i>	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 Wildlife 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (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 Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

- 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is a 3.7-acre site that is developed with a 176,629 square-foot three-story retail building, a 164,308 square-foot three-level parking structure, and a small asphalt surface parking that provides access from North Central Avenue. The former Sears building is largely vacant, although it is temporarily occupied by seasonal businesses. The Project site is almost entirely paved with minimal landscaping and the public sidewalk contains some mature

street trees along the Project site's boundary and is surrounded by development primarily consisting of residential and commercial land uses. No wildlife species other than those which can tolerate human activity and/or are typically found in urban environments are known to exist on or near the Project 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 Wildlife or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Given the above, no permanent, temporary, direct, or indirect, impacts are expected to occur to special-status plants or wildlife as a result of the proposed Project and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required. This topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

Similar to the discussion above, implementation of the Potential Public Park would not result in substantial adverse effects to sensitive or special status species. The site is developed with two vehicle repair buildings totaling 15,933 square-feet (formerly Sears Auto Center) and associated surface parking; the site is almost entirely paved and contains minimal landscaping. Given the existing developed condition of the property and location in an urbanized area, it is unlikely that special-status plants or animals would occur on or near the property. However, the property supports existing ornamental trees and shrubs, similar to the Project site. Therefore, the potential future development of the public park would result in less than significant impacts, and no mitigation would be required. This topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if riparian habitat or any other sensitive natural community identified locally, regionally, or by state and federal regulatory agencies would be adversely modified by a project. The Project site is located in a developed area of the City's downtown where there is very little undisturbed natural land. Additionally, the Project site is not located in an area identified with riparian habitat by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS 2024). Moreover, the General Plan's Open Space and Conservation Plan identified the Project site's vicinity as not located within or near any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community (City of Glendale 1993). As such, the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community and no impact would occur. This topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

3) Have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, were to be modified or removed by a project. The Project site is located in a developed area of the City's downtown and does not contain any wetland resources, as mapped by the USFWS and in the City's General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element (USFWS 2024; City of Glendale 1993). As such, the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on state or

federally protected wetlands and no impact would occur. This topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if a project were to interfere or remove access to a migratory wildlife corridor or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. The Project site is located within a highly urbanized area of the City. As described in Section D-1 (above), the Project site's vicinity consists of similar land uses, including residential and commercial development, surrounded by roadways. As such, there are no migratory wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites on or near the Project site. Therefore, short term construction impacts would not occur as a result of Project implementation. Once the proposed Project has been constructed, construction-related disturbances would not occur, and landscaping trees would be planted throughout the Project site. Therefore, long-term operational impacts to nesting and migratory birds would be less than significant. No mitigation is required. This topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if a project were to cause an impact that is inconsistent with local regulations pertaining to biological resources, such as the provisions outlined in Chapter 12.40, City Street Trees, or Chapter 12.44, Indigenous Trees, of the City's Municipal Code.

An Arborist Report, prepared by Dudek (dated February 2024), conducted an evaluation and analysis of tree resources in the tree survey area to assess the Project's potential impacts to trees. A field survey was conducted which identified 49 trees, 15 of which are City street trees that are subject to regulation under the City's Municipal Code. No protected indigenous trees were found within the tree survey area. The Surveyed City street trees consist of 7 Chinese pistache (*Pistacia chinensis*), 2 Indian laurel figs (*Ficus microcarpa* 'Nitida'), and 6 pink trumpet trees (*Handroanthus heptaphyllus*). The inventoried tree locations are depicted within the appendix of the Arborist Report.

Based on grading and development plans for the proposed Project, construction activities are expected to require removal of up to 29 trees at the Project site (all non-City street trees), none of which are regulated by the City. Furthermore, the Project would not result in the removal of sidewalks and tree planting wells. As such, trees located within the public right-of-way are not anticipated to be removed. However, the protected zones of 15 City Street trees would be encroached on as a result of proposed grading and construction. A City-issued permit and proper tree protective measures would therefore be required by the City, in compliance with the Municipal Code. Given that the Project would not result in the removal of any City-regulated trees, no replacement trees are required.

For these reasons, the Project is not anticipated to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Less than significant impacts would occur, and no mitigation would be required. This topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

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. A significant impact would occur if a project were inconsistent with policies in any draft or adopted habitat conservation plan. According to the City’s General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element, the Project site is not within or near any applicable habitat conservation plan areas (City of Glendale 1993). Furthermore, the Project area is not within any of the regional conservation plans designated by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW 2019). As such, the Project would not conflict with an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or any other applicable habitat conservation plan and no impact would occur. This topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the project:</i>	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 pursuant to §15064.5?	X			
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	X			
3. 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 section 15064.5?

Potentially Significant Impact. The property is developed with a 176,629 square-foot three-story retail building (formerly Sears department store that was constructed in 1934), a 164,308 square-foot three-level parking structure, and a small asphalt surface parking that provides access from North Central Avenue. A Phase I Historic Assessment (Historic Assessment) was prepared by Teresa Grimes | Historic Preservation (dated December 6, 2021), to conduct focus research on the former Sears department store (excluding the three-level parking structure and two vehicle repair buildings located at 201 and 212 West California Avenue). The Historic Assessment consulted State of California Office of Historic Preservation’s Built Environment Resource Directory (BERD), Master List of Historic Districts and Glendale Register Properties, and the 2018 South Glendale Historic Resource Survey Report (SGHRSR). The research revealed the building is not listed or determined to be eligible for listing under national or state landmark or historic district programs or previously surveyed as a potential historical resource that involved State of California Office of Historic Preservation (SOHP) concurrence, not located within a designated Historic District or listed in the Glendale Register and was not identified as significant in the SGHRSR. According to the SGHRSR survey methodology, the former Sears department store should have been evaluated ineligible for listing in the National Register, California Register, and local designation and assigned a Status Code of 6z. However, an assigned status code was not included within the survey findings. The Sears building was discussed in the South Glendale Historic Context and described as “substantially altered ,”which likely explains why it was not identified in the South Glendale Historic Resources Survey. Department stores are not specifically referred to in the registration requirements for the

Great Depression and World War II Theme within the Commercial Development Context. One might argue that the Sears building represents a rare commercial property type because it was the only department store constructed in Glendale during the period. However, it does not meet the registration requirements because it does not display most of the character-defining features of the department store property type or Streamline Moderne style. Additionally, it does not retain the essential aspects of integrity to convey its significance and Criteria A/1/A. Although the building retains some basic features conveying massing, it has lost the majority of the features that once characterized its style. Replacement of original storefronts is a common alteration, but in this case the storefronts have not been replaced but removed and infilled. The property retains integrity of location and setting; however, it lacks integrity of design, workmanship, and materials as a result of alterations. It also lacks integrity of feeling and association because it no longer expresses the aesthetic of a department store from the 1930s.

For similar reasons, the Sears building does not meet the registration requirements for the Architecture and Design Context. It does not retain the essential aspects of integrity to convey its significance and Criteria C/3/C. In its current state, the building does not embody the distinctive characteristics of the Streamline Moderne style.

While the Historic Assessment concluded the former Sears building does not retain the essential aspects of integrity to convey its significance and Criteria A/1/A and Criteria C/3/C, the report did not research the existing three-level parking structure and two vehicle repair buildings located at 212 West California Avenue. Further analysis is required to determine the proposed Project's potential to result in adverse changes to historical resources. As such, potentially significant impacts could occur. This issue will be further evaluated in the Draft EIR.

2) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to section 15064.5?

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed Project would include ground-disturbing activities. Further analysis is required to determine the proposed Project's potential to result in adverse changes to archaeological resources. As such, potentially significant impacts could occur. This issue will be further evaluated in the Draft EIR.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed Project would include ground-disturbing activities. In the event that human remains are inadvertently encountered during ground disturbing activities, they shall be treated consistent with state and local regulations including California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98, and the California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5(e). In accordance with these regulations, if human remains are found, the County Coroner must be immediately notified of the discovery. No further excavation or disturbance of the Project site or any nearby (no less than 100 feet) area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains can occur until the County Coroner has determined if the remains are potentially human in origin. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are, or are believed to be, Native American, he or she is required to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC shall notify those persons believed to be the

most likely descendant. The most likely descendant shall determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains. Compliance with these regulations would ensure that potential impacts to human remains resulting from the proposed Project would be less than significant. No mitigation is required. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

F. ENERGY

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	
2. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X	

1) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less than Significant Impact. An Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy Technical Report was prepared by Dudek (dated July 2024), which evaluated the energy resources during construction and operation of the Project.

Project Construction

Electricity Usage

Temporary electric power for as-necessary lighting and electronic equipment, such as computers inside temporary construction trailers, would be provided by Glendale Water & Power. The electricity used for such activities would be temporary, would be substantially less than that required for project operation, and would therefore have a negligible contribution to the project’s overall energy consumption.

Natural Gas Usage

Natural gas is not anticipated to be required during construction of the project. Fuels used for construction would primarily consist of diesel and gasoline, which are discussed under the subsection “Petroleum Usage,” below. Any minor amounts of natural gas that may be consumed as a result of project construction would be temporary and negligible, and would not have an adverse effect; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Petroleum Usage

Petroleum would be consumed throughout construction of the project. Fuel consumed by construction equipment would be the primary energy resource expended over the course of construction, and VMT associated with the transportation of construction materials and construction worker commutes would also result in petroleum consumption. Heavy-duty construction equipment associated with construction activities and haul trucks involved in relocating dirt around the project site are assumed to use diesel fuel. Construction workers would travel to and from the project site throughout the duration of construction. It is assumed that construction workers would travel to and

from the project site in gasoline-powered vehicles. Heavy-duty construction equipment of various types would be used during project construction.

CalEEMod was used to estimate construction equipment usage; results are included in Appendix A of the Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Energy Technical Report (Dudek, dated July 2024) . The estimated diesel fuel usage from construction equipment, and vendor trucks, as well as estimated gasoline fuel usage from worker vehicles is shown below.

Table 1 Construction Petroleum Demand

Project	Off-road Equipment (diesel)	Vendor Trucks (diesel)	Haul Trucks (diesel)	Worker Vehicles (gasoline)
	Gallons			
2025	26,560	15,913	41,100	35,945
2026	27,716	26,049	0	58,644
2027	22,923	19,068	24,173	44,104
2028	28,549	25,632	0	58,159
2029	29,279	24,590	0	58,401
Total	135,027	111,252	65,273	255,253

In summary, construction of the project is conservatively anticipated to consume 255,253 gallons of gasoline and 311,550 gallons of diesel. Project construction would represent a “single-event” petroleum demand and would not require on-going or permanent commitment of petroleum resources for this purpose. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Project Operation

Electricity Usage

The operational phase would require electricity for multiple purposes, including building heating and cooling, lighting, electronics, electric pumps, and electric forklifts. CalEEMod was used to estimate project emissions from electricity uses (see the project’s Air Quality Impact Analysis for calculations). Default electricity generation rates in CalEEMod were used based on the proposed land use and climate zone. Table 2 shows the estimated annual Operational Electricity Demand by land use.

Table 2 Project Annual Operational Electricity Demand Summary

Electricity Demand	kWh/year
Building	2,721,675
Parking	1,366,182
Total Project Electricity Demand	4,087,857

As shown in Table 2, the project is anticipated to consume approximately 4,087,857 kilowatt hours of electricity per year. The project proposes residential and commercial uses reflecting contemporary energy efficient/energy conserving designs and operational programs. Uses proposed by the project are not inherently energy intensive, and the project electricity demands in total would be comparable to other projects of similar scale and configuration. Additionally, the project would be required to comply with the applicable Title 24 standards, which would further ensure that the project energy demands would not be inefficient, wasteful, or otherwise unnecessary and impacts would be less than significant.

Natural Gas Usage

As previously discussed, the project would comply with the City’s Green Building code and in particular ordinance 5999 that would require all new buildings to be electrified at buildout. Therefore, there would be no natural gas demand associated with the project and there would be no impact to natural gas reserves or resources.

Petroleum Usage

During operations, the majority of fuel consumption resulting from the project would involve the use of motor vehicles traveling to and from the project site, as well as fuels used for alternative modes of transportation that may be used by employees of the project.

Petroleum fuel consumption associated with motor vehicles traveling to and from the project site is a function of the VMT as a result of project operation. The annual VMT attributable to the project is expected to be 13,385,912 VMT (Appendix A). Fuel demand estimates for the project are provided in Table 3.

Table 3 Total Project-Generated Transportation Annual Fuel Demand

Vehicle Type	Vehicle MT CO ₂	Kg/CO ₂ /Gallon	Estimated Annual Fuel Consumption (gallons)
Gasoline	3,786	8.78	431,260
Diesel	516	10.21	50,572
Total			481,832

As summarized on Table 3, the project would result in an estimated annual fuel demand of 481,832 gallons of fuel. Fuel would be provided by current and future commercial vendors. Trip generation and VMT generated by the project are consistent with other residential uses of similar scale and configuration. That is, the project does not propose uses or operations that would inherently result in excessive and wasteful vehicle trips and VMT, nor associated excess and wasteful vehicle energy consumption.

Enhanced fuel economies realized pursuant to federal and state regulatory actions, and related transition of vehicles to alternative energy sources (e.g., electricity, natural gas, biofuels, hydrogen cells) would likely decrease future gasoline fuel demands per VMT. Location of the project proximate to regional and local roadway systems tends to reduce VMT within the region, acting to reduce regional vehicle energy demands. The project would implement sidewalks, facilitating and encouraging pedestrian access. In compliance with CALGreen, the project would promote the use of bicycles as an alternative mean of transportation by providing short-term and/or long-term bicycle parking accommodations. Facilitating pedestrian and bicycle access for employees would reduce VMT and associated energy consumption. As supported by the preceding discussions, project transportation energy consumption would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or otherwise unnecessary and impacts would be less than significant.

Renewable Energy Potential

As part of the project’s planning process, the applicant considered how the project could potentially increase its reliance on renewable energy sources to meet the project’s anticipated energy demand. Consistent with the CEC’s definition of eligible renewables, energy sources that were considered for

their potential to power the project include biomass, geothermal, solar, wind, and small hydroelectric facilities. Given the project's location in an urban area and the nature of the project, there are anticipated considerable site constraints at a parcel level including potential limited land availability, incompatibility with onsite and surrounding land uses for large scale power generation facilities, unknown interconnection feasibility, compatibility with utility provider systems, and no known water or geothermal resources to harness, that would eliminate the potential for biomass, geothermal, and hydroelectric renewable energy to be installed within the project area. Regarding wind power, due to the urban nature of the project area parcels and surrounding land uses, wind turbines are generally anticipated to not be feasible as it represents an incompatible use due to the height of the wind turbine blades and the need to avoid nearby obstacles.

Regarding solar power, the project is anticipated to include solar power, which at a minimum, is anticipated to be provided for newly built or modified low-rise residential buildings, and non-residential buildings are anticipated to be solar-ready to comply with Title 24 building energy efficiency standards. As solar power technology improves in the future and regulations require additional solar, the potential for solar generation increases. In addition, the potential for installation of battery storage in future developments, if determined to be a feasible and compatible land use of the site, could also be provided, but is unknown at this time of the scale and level of adoption.

In summary, the project is anticipated to include the onsite renewable energy source (i.e., solar) that is determined to be feasible for the project area and type of development; however, incorporation of solar energy was not included in the quantification and CalEEMod outputs. Therefore, this analysis provides a conservative assessment of energy use. Further, this analysis assumes that the project would likely not include the onsite renewable energy sources and are anticipated to be infeasible. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact. This issue will not be further analyzed in the EIR.

2) Conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Less than Significant Impact. The project would be subject to and would comply with, at a minimum, the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards and Title 24, Part 11. Part 6 of Title 24 establishes energy efficiency standards for residential and non-residential buildings constructed in California in order to reduce energy demand and consumption. Specifically, Title 24 addresses a number of energy efficiency measures that impact energy used for lighting, water heating, heating, and air conditioning, including the energy impact of the building envelope such as windows, doors, skylights, wall/floor/ceiling assemblies, attics, and roofs. Additionally, Per the city's green building code the project would install photovoltaic require the project infrastructure that covers 50% of the total roof area and that all appliances in the building would be electric. As such, the project would comply with the City's and California code requirements for energy efficiency.

Part 11 of Title 24 sets forth voluntary and mandatory energy measures that are applicable to the project under the CALGreen Code. The CALGreen Code institutes mandatory minimum environmental performance standards for all ground-up, new construction of commercial, low-rise residential, high-rise residential, state-owned buildings, schools, and hospitals, as well as certain residential and non-residential additions and alterations. Additionally, energy consumed by the project's operation is calculated to be comparable to energy consumed by other residential and commercial uses of similar scale and intensity that are constructed and operating in California. On this basis, the project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or

energy efficiency. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant. This issue will not be further analyzed in the EIR.

G. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<i>Would the project:</i>	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	
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 Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X	
5. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
6. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	

1) Would the project directly or indirectly cause 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. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, California Public Resources Code sections 2621 et seq., regulates development near active faults to reduce hazards associated with surface fault rupture. The law prohibits most structures for human occupancy from being built across the trace of active faults and establishes special study zones called Alquist-Priolo Zones, which extend 500 feet from the fault. These zones are delineated and defined by the state geologist and identify areas where potential surface rupture along a fault could prove hazardous.

The site is not within a state-designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (California Geologic Survey, 2022) or a city-designated Fault Hazard Management Zone (City of Glendale, Safety Element, 2003) for surface fault rupture hazards. No Holocene-active or pre-Holocene faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are known to pass directly beneath the site. Therefore, the potential for surface rupture due to faulting occurring beneath the site during the design life of the proposed development is considered low. However, the site is located in the seismically active Southern California region and could be subjected to moderate to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake on one of the many active Southern California faults. The closest surface trace of an active fault to the site is the Verdugo Fault located approximately 1.0 mile to the northeast (USGS, 2006; City of Glendale Safety Element, 2003). Other nearby active faults are the Hollywood Fault, the Raymond Fault, the Sierra Madre Fault Zone, and an unnamed fault located 2.3 miles south, 2.9 miles southeast, 5.7 miles northeast, and 6.3 miles northwest of the site, respectively (USGS, 2006; Ziony and Jones, 1989). The active San Andreas Fault Zone is located approximately 28 miles northeast of the site. Several buried thrust faults, commonly referred to as blind thrusts, underlie the Los Angeles area at depth. These faults are not exposed at the ground surface and are typically identified at depths greater than 3.0 kilometers. The October 1, 1987 Mw 5.9 Whittier Narrows earthquake and the January 17, 1994, Mw 6.7 Northridge earthquake were a result of movement on the Puente Hills Blind Thrust and the Northridge Thrust, respectively. These thrust faults and others in the Los Angeles area are not exposed at the surface and do not present a potential surface fault rupture hazard at the site; however, these deep thrust faults are considered active features capable of generating future earthquakes that could result in moderate to significant ground shaking at the site.

Therefore, the potential for surface fault rupture is considered low and, as such, the Project would not cause or exacerbate the potential for fault rupture to occur. The proposed Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault. As a result, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. This topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. Due to the Project site's location within Southern California where there are many active faults, the Project could experience moderate to strong ground shaking. The closest surface trace of an active fault is the Verdugo fault located approximately 1 mile northeast of the Project site. Other nearby faults to the Project site include the Hollywood Fault (2.3 miles south), the Raymond Fault (2.9 miles southeast), the Sierra Madre Fault (5.7 miles northeast), and an unnamed fault (6.3 miles northwest) (USGS, 2006; Ziony and Jones, 1989). The risk posed from potential ground shaking exists throughout Southern California and any risk of loss, injury or death would be lessened through implementation of the recommendations made in the Project's Geotechnical Investigation (Geocon, dated 2022) and conformance with current City building codes, the California Building Code, and engineering practices, all of which are stringently designed to ensure buildings are constructed to standards intended to withstand seismic ground shaking. As such, the Project would not cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving ground shaking.

Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. This topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Project's Geotechnical Investigation (prepared by Geocon, dated 2022), the Project site is not located in area of liquefaction potential. Additionally, the historic high groundwater level is approximately 80 feet beneath the ground surface. As a result, the potential for liquefaction and other ground deformations to occur is low. Additionally, risk of other seismic-related ground failure would be reduced through implementation of the recommendations made in the Project's Geotechnical Investigation and conformance with current City and state building codes and engineering practices. As such, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. This topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

iv. Landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact. Seismically-induced landslides can adversely affect structures, people or property, utilities, and infrastructure. The Project site's topography is relatively flat with a gentle slope to the southwest according to the Project's Geotechnical Investigation (prepared by Geocon, dated 2022). Furthermore, the Project site is not located within an area identified as having the potential for slope stability hazards, seismic slope instability hazards, or within an area of known or potential landslide events. As a result, the potential for adverse slope stability hazards is low. Additionally, compliance with the recommendations made in the Project's Geotechnical Investigation and conformance with current City and state building codes and engineering practices would reduce impacts. As such, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. This topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

2) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact. During construction, soils could temporarily be subject to erosion, particularly during site preparation and grading phases. Soils would be exposed and disturbed while the site is graded and wind and/or storm events during this period could result in potential erosion and/or loss of topsoil on the Project site. However, erosion-control measures would be implemented during construction as part of the stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) required for the Project. Prior to the start of construction activities, the Contractor is required to file a Permit Registration Document with the State Water Resources Control Board in order to obtain coverage under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with the Construction and Land Disturbance Activities. This permit is required for earthwork that result in the disturbance of 1 acre or more of total land area. The required SWPPP mandates the implementation of best management practices (BMPs) to reduce or eliminate construction-related pollutants in the runoff, including sediment.

Upon buildout of the Project, the site would be covered with a new building, pavement, flood control facilities, and landscaping, which would preclude or minimize erosion potential. The stormwater

drainage system for the development would be designed to capture rainfall from storm events and direct it to the nearest on-site sewer system. Further, the Project would be required to comply with the applicable City grading regulations, which contain design standards and performance requirements that must be met to avoid or reduce, to an acceptable level, excessive erosion. As such, impacts related to soil erosion or loss of topsoil would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. This topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

3) Would the project 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. As previously described by Section G -1 (above), landslides and/or liquefaction on site is not considered to be a potential risk. Subsidence occurs when a large portion of land is displaced vertically, usually due to the withdrawal of groundwater, oil, or natural gas. Soils that are particularly subject to subsidence include those with high silt or clay content. The Project site is not located within an area of known ground subsidence. No large-scale extraction of groundwater, gas, oil, or geothermal energy is occurring or planned at the site or in the Project site's vicinity. Therefore, the potential for ground subsidence due to withdrawal of fluids or gases at the site is considered low by the Project's Geotechnical Investigation (prepared by Geocon, dated 2022). Additionally, potential impacts from unstable soils would be reduced through implementation of recommendations made in the Geotechnical Investigation and conformance with current City and state building codes and engineering practices. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. This topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

4) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project's geotechnical investigation (prepared by Geocon, dated 2022) included a site reconnaissance, field exploration, laboratory testing, engineering analysis, and the preparation of this report. The site was explored on December 15, 2021, by excavating two 8-inch diameter borings to depths of approximately 50½ feet below the existing ground surface utilizing a truck-mounted hollow-stem auger drilling machine. The upper 5 feet of existing site soils and the soils at the proposed subterranean level encountered during this investigation are considered to have a "very low" expansive potential; and are classified as "non-expansive" in accordance with the 2019 California Building Code (CBC) Section 1803.5.3. As such, impacts regarding expansive soils would be less than significant. This topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

5) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No Impact. The Project site is served by the existing municipal sewer system. As such, the Project would not require the use of septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impact would occur, and this issue will not be further analyzed in the Draft EIR.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Plant and animal fossils are typically found within sedimentary rock deposits. Most of the City of Glendale consists of igneous and metamorphic rock, and the local area is not known to contain paleontological resources. Nonetheless, paleontological resources may possibly exist at deep levels and could be unearthed with implementation of the Project. In the event that paleontological resources or geological feature are unearthed during the Project-related subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until a paleontologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, less than significant impact would occur. This issue will not be further analyzed in the EIR.

H. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	X			
2. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

1) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction and operation of the Project will result in the generation of greenhouse gas emissions. The applicant has submitted an Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Energy Technical Report date July2024 that analyzes the construction and operational greenhouse gas emissions of the Project needed to determine significance. This issue will be further evaluated in the Draft EIR.

2) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less Than Significant Impact. The California State Legislature passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) to provide initial direction to limit California’s GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and initiate the state’s long-range climate objectives. Since the passage of AB 32, the state has adopted GHG emissions reduction targets for future years beyond the initial 2020 horizon year. For the project, the relevant GHG emissions reduction targets include those established by Senate Bill (SB) 32 and AB 1279, which require GHG emissions be reduced to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030, and 85% below 1990 levels by 2045, respectively. In addition, AB 1279 requires the state achieve net zero GHG emissions by no later than 2045 and achieve and maintain net negative GHG emissions thereafter.

As defined by AB 32, CARB is required to develop the Scoping Plan, which provides the framework for actions to achieve the state's GHG emission targets. The Scoping Plan is required to be updated every 5 years and requires CARB and other state agencies to adopt regulations and initiatives that will reduce GHG emissions statewide. The first Scoping Plan was adopted in 2008, and was updated in 2014, 2017, and most recently in 2022. While the Scoping Plan is not directly applicable to specific projects, nor is it intended to be used as the sole basis for project-level evaluations,¹⁰ it is the official framework for the measures and regulations that will be implemented to reduce California's GHG emissions in alignment with the adopted targets. Therefore, a project would be found to not conflict with the statutes if it would meet the Scoping Plan policies and would not impede attainment of the goals therein.

CARB's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan update was the first to address the state's strategy for achieving the 2030 GHG reduction target set forth in SB 32 (CARB 2017), and the most recent CARB 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality update outlines the state's plan to reduce emissions and achieve carbon neutrality by 2045 in alignment with AB 1279 and assesses progress toward the 2030 SB 32 target (CARB 2022b). As such, given that SB 32 and AB 1279 are the relevant GHG emission targets, the 2017 and 2022 Scoping Plan updates that outline the strategy to achieve those targets are the most applicable to the project.

The 2017 Scoping Plan included measures to promote renewable energy and energy efficiency (including the mandates of SB 350), increase stringency of the LCFS, measures identified in the Mobile Source and Freight Strategies, measures identified in the proposed Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Plan, and increase stringency of SB 375 targets. The 2022 Scoping Plan builds upon and accelerates programs currently in place, including moving to zero-emission transportation; phasing out use of fossil gas use for heating homes and buildings; reducing chemical and refrigerants with high GWP; providing communities with sustainable options for walking, biking, and public transit; and displacement of fossil-fuel fired electrical generation through use of renewable energy alternatives (e.g., solar arrays and wind turbines) (CARB 2022). Many of the measures and programs included in the Scoping Plan would result in the reduction of project-related GHG emissions with no action required at the project-level, including GHG emission reductions through increased energy efficiency and renewable energy production (SB 350), reduction in carbon intensity of transportation fuels (LCFS), and the accelerated efficiency and electrification of the statewide vehicle fleet (Mobile Source Strategy). Given that the project would be located in a High-Quality Transit Area (SCAG 2021, 2022), the project would also not conflict with the Second Update's goal of reducing GHG emissions through reductions in VMT statewide. 2045 carbon neutrality goal required CARB to expand proposed actions in the Third Update to include those that capture and store carbon in addition to those that reduce only anthropogenic sources of GHG emissions. The proposed project would support the state's carbon neutrality goals, as implementation includes addition of urban-tree and native plantings throughout the project site, which represent opportunities for potential carbon removal and sequestration over the project life-time. However, the Third Update emphasizes that reliance on carbon sequestration in the state's natural and working lands will not be sufficient to address residual GHG emissions, and achieving carbon neutrality will require research, development, and deployment of additional methods to capture atmospheric GHG emissions (e.g., mechanical direct air capture). Given that the specific path to neutrality will require development of technologies and programs that are not currently known or available, the project's role in supporting the statewide goal would be speculative and cannot be wholly identified at this time.

Table 4 evaluates the project’s potential to conflict with the measures from the 2022 Scoping Plan that are relevant and applicable to the project. As shown below, the project would not conflict with the 2022 Scoping Plan.

Table 4 Project Potential to Conflict with 2022 Scoping Plan Climate Change Policies and Measures	
Plan Project Attributes	Potential to Conflict
Transportation Electrification	
Provide EV charging infrastructure at least in accordance with CALGreen Tier 2 standards ⁱ	No conflict. The project would meet the EV charging infrastructure standards required by the most recent CALGreen standards.
VMT Reduction	
Is located on infill sites that are surrounded by existing urban uses and reuses or redevelop previously undeveloped or underutilized land presently served by existing utilities and essential public services (e.g., transit, streets, water, sewer) ^d	No conflict. The project site is currently occupied by a vacant Sears building and associated parking lot within the downtown area of the City. The project would redevelop the site to provide ground floor commercial amenities and provide new housing in an established urban area. Therefore, the project would be considered in infill development by the standard of the 2022 scoping plan. The project is also located in a High-Quality Transit Area.
Do not result in the loss or conversion of the State’s natural and working lands	No conflict. The project would not convert natural and working lands. The project would develop a mixed-use development at an infill site in downtown Glendale.

Table 4 Project Potential to Conflict with 2022 Scoping Plan Climate Change Policies and Measures

Plan Project Attributes	Potential to Conflict
<p>Consists of transit-supportive densities (minimum of 20 residential dwelling units/acre^e), or</p> <p>In in proximity to existing transit (within ½ mile),^f or</p> <p>Satisfies more detailed and stringent criteria specified in the region’s Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)</p>	<p>No conflict. This attribute accounts for the VMT reduction achieved by a project that is designed with a higher density of dwelling units compared to the average residential density in the United States. Increased densities affect the distance people travel and provide greater options for the mode of travel they choose. Increasing residential density results in shorter and fewer trips by single-occupancy vehicles and thus a reduction in GHG emissions of up to 30% from project VMT in the study area (CAPCOA 2021).</p> <p>Similarly, transit-oriented development [defined as being located within a 10-minute walk/0.5 miles of a high frequency transit stop reduces VMT and associated vehicle GHG emissions by up to 31% (CAPCOA 2021).^e The project within 0.25 miles of the Express 11 route, which goes to the Glendale Transportation Center. Additionally, the project is adjacent to Route 1, which also goes to Glendale Transportation Center. Both routes have headways of less than 15 minutes, which qualifies as high quality transit.</p> <p>The project site would develop 682 homes on an approximately 3.7-acre site. Therefore the project would meet the minimum density established in the CARB 2022 scoping plan to be considered transit-supportive.</p>
<p>Relax parking requirements^l by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eliminating parking requirements or including maximum allowable parking ratios. ▪ Providing residential parking supply at a ratio of <1 parking space per unit. ▪ Unbundling residential parking costs from costs to rent or lease. 	<p>No conflict. This attribute unbundles, or separates, a residential project’s parking costs from property costs, requiring those who wish to purchase parking spaces to do so at an additional cost. The assumption of this attribute is that parking costs are passed through to the vehicle owners/drivers utilizing the parking spaces, thus, this measure results in decreased vehicle ownership and, therefore, a reduction in VMT and GHG emissions. The intent of this measure is to incentivize increased use of public transit and thus result in less emissions. This measure can achieve up to 15.7% reduction in emissions from project VMT in the study area (CAPCOA 2021).</p> <p>As discussed above, transit-oriented development [defined as being located within a 10-minute walk/0.5 miles of a high frequency transit stops reduces VMT and associated vehicle GHG emissions by up to 31% (CAPCOA 2021).^e</p> <p>The project provides residential parking in accordance with City standards. The amount of parking provided is consistent with other similar uses in Southern California and is not intended to over supply parking on the project site. The project is in a HQTAs near the high service bus line and because the project is in a HQTAs and has a less-than-significant VMT impact, it would be well-positioned to decrease VMT. As such, the project would be well-positioned to decrease VMT and associated vehicular GHG emission reductions contemplated by the parking attribute.</p>

Table 4 Project Potential to Conflict with 2022 Scoping Plan Climate Change Policies and Measures

Plan Project Attributes	Potential to Conflict
<p>At least 20% of the units are affordable to lower-income residents^{a,b}</p>	<p><i>No conflict.</i> Affordable housing provides greater opportunity for lower income families to live closer to job centers and achieve a jobs/housing match near transit. It is also an important strategy to address the limited availability of affordable housing that might force residents to live far away from jobs or school, requiring longer commutes. The affordable housing designation is intended to reduce VMT through living more compactly in location-efficient areas.</p> <p>Affordable housing achieves up to 28.6% reduction in GHG emissions from project/site multifamily residential (CAPCOA 2021).^c</p> <p>As discussed above, Transit-oriented development achieves up to 31% reduction in GHG emissions from project VMT (CAPCOA 2021).^c</p> <p>The project proposes 682 homes, 69 of which would be affordable to very low-income households. These 69 units comprise approximately 10% of the total units and therefore do not meet the 20% or greater recommendation. However, the development of residential uses on a commercial site helps to increase the supply of homes and promotes affordability. The mixed used development also helps the City balance its jobs to housing match near transit. The project would provide access to transit and be in a location-efficient area. The project site is in a High-Quality Transit Area near two high service bus lines and would be well-positioned to decrease VMT and achieve GHG reductions contemplated by the affordable housing attribute.</p>
<p>Result in no net loss of existing affordable units</p>	<p><i>No conflict.</i> The project site does not contain any existing residences. Implementation of the project would convert the existing commercial land to homes, infrastructure, and associated amenities, and commercial uses, and would not displace any existing housing or people, or necessitate construction of replacement housing elsewhere.</p>
<p>Building Decarbonization</p>	
<p>Use all electric appliances, without any natural gas connections, and would not use propane or other fossil fuels for space heating, water heating, or indoor cooking^{g,h}</p>	<p><i>No conflict.</i> The proposed project has would comply with the City's 2023 Building and Safety code, which requires that all new construction after January 1, 2023, be built with all electric appliances.</p>

Source: CARB 2022b.

Notes: MMT CO₂e = million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent.

^a Newmark and Haas 2015.

^b California Housing Partnership Corporation and TransForm 2014.

^c These measures are not additive such that you could achieve a greater than 50% reduction by incorporating both characteristics in a project design.

^d California Government Code Section 65041.1.

^e Federal Transit Administration 2014.

^f Washington Department of Transportation 2013.

^g Energy and Environmental Economics 2019.

^h Energy and Environmental Economics 2021.

ⁱ Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 24, Part 11.

Potential to Conflict with SCAG's RTP/SCS

The SCAG 2024–2050 RTP/SCS is a regional growth management strategy that targets per capita GHG reduction from passenger vehicles and light trucks in the Southern California Region pursuant to SB 375. In addition to demonstrating the Region's ability to attain the GHG emission-reduction targets set forth by CARB, the 2024–2050 RTP/SCS outlines a series of actions and strategies for integrating the transportation network with an overall land use pattern that responds to projected growth, housing needs, changing demographics, and transportation demands. Thus, successful implementation of the 2024–2050 RTP/SCS would result in more complete communities with a variety of transportation and housing choices, while reducing automobile use.

The following strategies are intended to be supportive of implementing the 2024–2050 RTP/SCS and reducing GHG emissions: focus growth near destinations and mobility options; promote diverse housing choices; leverage technology innovations; support implementation of sustainability policies; and promote a green region (SCAG 2020). The strategies that pertain to residential development and SCAG's support of local jurisdiction sustainability efforts would not apply to the project. The project's compliance with the remaining applicable strategies is presented below.

- **Focus Growth Near Destinations and Mobility Options.** One of the strategies within the 2024–2050 RTP/SCS is to expand job opportunities near transit and along center-focused main streets and to promote the redevelopment of underperforming sites and other outmoded non-residential uses. The project would not conflict with this strategy of the 2024–2050 RTP/SCS as the project is located immediately adjacent to North Central Avenue and supports the development of an infill parcel with a mixed-use development, which will provide housing new existing transit and employment. The project is also directly adjacent to a bus stop at the intersection of California Avenue and North Central Avenue, which provides a connection to the Glendale Metrolink Station.
- **Leverage Technology Innovations.** One of the technology innovations identified in the 2024–2050 RTP/SCS that would apply to the project is the promotion and support of low emission technologies for transportation, such as alternative fueled vehicles to reduce per capita GHG emissions. Approximately 14% of the total parking spaces would be equipped with EV chargers.
- **Promote a Green Region.** The third applicable strategy within the 2024–2050 RTP/SCS, for individual developments, such as the project, involves promoting a green region through efforts such as supporting local policies for renewable energy production and promoting more resource efficient development (e.g., reducing energy consumption) to reduce GHG emissions. The project would support this measure by complying with the 2022 Title 24 building standards, which include requirements for high efficiency indoor and outdoor lighting, thermostat and HVAC energy efficiency requirements, and electrical metering requirements.

Based on the analysis above, the project would not conflict with the SCAG 2020–2045 RTP/SCS.

Potential to Conflict with Greener Glendale Plan for Community Activities

The City adopted its Greener Glendale for Community Activities in March 2012 with the intention of implementing and implement required measures; as such the project would not conflict with the Greener Glendale Plan for Community Activities.

As discussed above, the project would develop an underutilized developed site instead of developing on greenfield lands (undeveloped lands in an urban or rural area). The project would comply with

California building code standards, which require the incorporation of increasing building energy efficiency standards, renewable energy in the form of solar photovoltaics, and EV infrastructure.

The 2022 Scoping Plan, the SCAG 2020–2045 RTP/SCS, and the Greener Glendale Plan were determined to be the applicable GHG reduction plans to evaluate project consistency. As shown above the project does not conflict with the 2022 Scoping Plan, the SCAG RTP/SCS, and the Greener Glendale Plan prior to implementation of mitigation. Therefore, impacts related to the consistency with an applicable GHG reduction plan are considered to be less than significant.

Quantification of Emissions

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(c), the project’s construction and operational GHG emissions have been quantified for disclosure purposes only. The project’s significance has been evaluated based on its potential to conflict with applicable GHG reduction plans.

Construction Emissions

Construction of the project would result in GHG emissions, which are primarily associated with the use of off-road construction equipment, haul trucks, on-road vendor trucks, and worker vehicles. CalEEMod was used to calculate the annual GHG emissions. Construction of the project is anticipated to commence in March 2025 and would last approximately 4 years, ending in July 2029. On-site sources of GHG emissions include off-road equipment and off-site sources including vendor trucks and worker vehicles. Table 5 presents construction emissions for the project in 2025, 2026, 2027 2028 and 2029 from on-site and off-site emission sources.

GHG reduction measures that would apply to community wide development to achieve GHG reduction targets through 2035. These measures include green building standards for development projects. The City amended its Building Code in November 2022 to adopt new reach codes that would electrify new building construction, increase local solar generation, and increase EV charging. The project would comply with the City’s Building Code

Table 5 Estimated Annual Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Year	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	R	CO ₂ e
Metric Tons per Year					
2025	1,169	0.05	0.10	1.13	1,202
2026	1,064	0.05	0.06	1.09	1,084
2027	1,203	0.04	0.09	1.12	1,233
2028	1,037	0.03	0.06	0.91	1,055
2029	613	0.02	0.03	0.50	624
Total					5,197

Notes: CO₂ = carbon dioxide; CH₄ = methane; N₂O = nitrous oxide; R = refrigerant; CO₂e = carbon dioxide equivalent.
 <0.01 = reported value less than 0.01. The values shown are the annual emissions reflect CalEEMod "mitigated" output.
 Totals may not add due to rounding.
 See Appendix A for complete results.

As shown in Table 5, the estimated total GHG emissions during construction of the project would be approximately 5,197 MT CO₂e over the construction period. Estimated project-generated construction emissions amortized over 30 years would be approximately 173 MT CO₂e per year. As with project-generated construction criteria air pollutant emissions presented in Table 10, GHG

emissions generated during construction of the project would be short-term in nature, lasting only for the duration of the construction period, and would not represent a long-term source of GHG emissions.

Operational Emissions

Operation of the project would generate GHG emissions through residents and employee vehicles to and from the project site; landscape maintenance equipment operation; energy use (natural gas and generation of electricity consumed by the project); solid waste disposal; and generation of electricity associated with water supply, treatment, and distribution and wastewater treatment. CalEEMod was primarily used to calculate the annual GHG emissions based on the operational assumptions described in Section 4.4.2.2, Operation. The estimated operational project-generated GHG emissions from area sources, energy usage, motor vehicles, solid waste generation, and water usage and wastewater generation, are shown in Table 6.

Table 6 Estimated Annual Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Emission Source	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	R	CO ₂ e
	Metric Tons Per Year				
Existing Emissions					
Mobile	2,489.14	0.18	0.13	4.95	2,536.66
Area	3.58	0.00	0.00	-	3.60
Energy	818.12	0.03	<.01	-	819.77
Water	45.58	0.43	0.01	-	59.31
Waste	45.58	0.43	0.01	-	59.31
Refrigerants	-	-	-	0.14	0.14
Total	3,531.18	18.11	0.14	5.09	4,030.93
Project Emissions					
Mobile	4,301.53	0.18	0.17	4.29	4,360.96
Area	41.18	<0.01	<0.01	-	41.39
Energy	560.09	0.06	<0.01	-	563.83
Water	32.14	0.83	0.02	-	58.95
Waste	45.15	4.51	0.00	-	157.98
Refrigerants	-	-	-	0.79	0.78
Total	4,980.10	5.60	0.20	5.07	5,183.89
<i>Net Total Emissions (Project Emissions - Existing Emissions)</i>					1,152.96
<i>Amortized 30-Year Construction Emissions</i>					173
Net Total Emissions + Amortized Construction Total					1,325.96

Notes: CO₂ = carbon dioxide; CH₄ = methane; N₂O = nitrous oxide; CO₂e = carbon dioxide equivalent.
<0.01 = reported value less than 0.01.

As shown in Table 6, estimated annual project-generated GHG emissions would be approximately 5,184 MT CO₂e per year as a result of project operation; with amortized construction emissions of approximately 173 MT CO₂e per year. Existing emissions from the Sears building to be demolished is approximately 4,031 MT CO₂e per year. Therefore, the net total emissions would be approximately 1,326 MT CO₂e per year. The project would not conflict with the 2022 Scoping Plan or, 2020–2045 RTP/SCS, and it would not conflict with the state's long-term climate goals. Impacts would be less than significant.

I. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<i>Would the project:</i>	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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X
6. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
7. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the redevelopment of the Project site, including the demolition of an existing retail building (formerly Sears), a three-level parking structure, and associated surface parking. The Project would construct a new mixed-use development on site. Construction of new residential and commercial land uses would require the use of hazardous materials such as fuels, solvents, pesticides. Further analysis is required to evaluate the Project’s potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. As such, potentially significant impacts could occur. This issue will be further evaluated in the Draft EIR prepared for the Project.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. Similar to the discussion provided under I-1 (above) of this Initial Study, redevelopment of the Project site could 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. For example, demolition and construction activities could result in the disturbance of hazardous materials such as asbestos, lead-based paint, and universal wastes that may be present in existing structures on site. Additional information is needed to determine whether the implementation of the proposed Project could create a significant hazard to the public. As such, impacts could be potentially significant. This issue will be further evaluated in the Draft EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The Project site is located within an urbanized area of the City. Implementation of the proposed Project could result in hazardous emissions or involve the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Further analysis is required to identify the location of the closest existing or proposed school and to evaluate the potential for the Project to result in potentially significant impacts related to hazardous materials. As such, potentially significant impacts could occur. This issue will be further evaluated in the Draft EIR.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. California Government Code Section 65962.5 combines several regulatory lists of sites that may pose a hazard related to hazardous materials or substances. The Department of Toxic Substances Control's (DTSC's) EnviroStor database and State Water Resources Control Board's GeoTracker database identifies sites that have known contamination or sites for which there may be evidence to investigate further. Further analysis is required to evaluate if the Project site has been identified as containing a known contaminant. As such, the Project could result in potentially significant impacts related to hazardous materials. This issue will be further evaluated in the Draft EIR.

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 area?

No Impact. The Project site is located over 6 miles to the east of the Hollywood Burbank Airport, which is the closest airport to the site. Thus, the Project site is not located within or near any airport land use plan and not within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. As such, the Project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project site's vicinity. No impact would occur. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed Project would consist of the demolition of the existing retail building (formerly Sears), the existing three-level parking structure, surface parking lots, and the vacation of the on-site alley. Implementation of the Project would also require infrastructure improvements, such as the connection to existing offsite utilities serving the site. On and off-site utility infrastructure (e.g., water, sewer, electrical, telecommunications) improvements are anticipated as part of the proposed Project. As such, construction activities could affect the implementation of an emergency response plan by causing temporary construction blockages and impeding access while transporting construction debris, for example. However, the Project would be required to comply with fire code standards, which would be ensured through the plan check process prior to the issuance of building permits in collaboration with the City's Police Department, Fire Department, and Public Works Department Traffic and Transportation Division. In accordance with Section 12.08.130, Protection of public travel and safety requirements, of the City's Municipal Code, construction activities would be required to maintain safe crossings for vehicle traffic at all street intersections and safe crossings for pedestrians at intervals of not more than 300 feet. With compliance of existing regulations, implementation of the Project would not significantly impact a major roadway or arterial that are identified in emergency planning documents and would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Further, the City's Emergency Plan is a planned response to extraordinary emergency situations associated with natural disasters, technological incidents, and national security emergencies. This document is designed to include the City of Glendale as part of the California Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) and National Incident Management System (NIMS), which have been adopted for the purpose of exercising operational management and coordination of emergency operations. The City of Glendale maintains a dedicated Emergency Operations Center (EOC) to manage and coordinate major emergencies or disasters.

The City's EOC serves to keep citizens informed and prepared for an emergency, coordinates resources during an emergency, and provides relief after an emergency. The goal of EOC personnel is to save lives and protect property by developing programs and emergency operational capabilities in the event of a natural or man-made disaster. Planning for and responding to disasters and emergencies requires many different actions, such as evacuations, shelter set-ups or preparations for power outages. All of these activities are coordinated and directed by the EOC. Training for residents and employees within the City continues through the Community Emergency Response Team program (Glendale 2003).

Construction activities, associated with development, may result in temporary construction barricades or other obstructions that would impede emergency access. However, development projects that involved work within a public ROW would be subject to review and approval from the Public Works Department, which requires coordination to inform police and fire departments of potential obstructions or street closures.

The Office of Emergency Services is tasked with coordinating disaster operations within the City. Glendale General Plan Safety Element Goal 8, Policy 8-1 and Program 8-1.1 is directly related to emergency services, as it requires that emergency response and recovery plans are sufficient to protect public safety and the general welfare in accordance with regional, State, and federal regulations. The City's Emergency Plan is updated annually, and City personnel are trained annually

in exercises ranging from tabletop discussions to full-scale exercises involving dozens of personnel in the field supported by the activation of the City's EOC. Continued adherence to Goal 8, and related policies and programs, in the Safety Element of the Glendale General Plan would reduce impacts associated with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan by keeping the community prepared for emergency response and recovery from natural and urban disasters, in light of local conditions.

According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, Verdugo Boulevard is a City Disaster Response Route, which is a road that can best move emergency services and supplies to where they are needed the most immediately following a major disaster. Implementation of the project would neither result in a reduction of the number of lanes along this roadway nor result in the placement of an impediment, such as medians, to the flow of traffic. During construction, the contractor shall notify the City of Glendale Police and Fire Departments of construction activities that would involve the movement of equipment so as to give first emergency response teams the option of rerouting traffic to an alternative route. Further, during construction the applicant would be required to obtain any necessary permits from the City of Glendale Public Works Department for all work occurring within the public right-of-way. Implementation of these requirements would be incorporated as conditions of approval. By complying with these regulations and conditions the Project would not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with the City's adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Consequently, project impacts would be less than significant.

Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required. This topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

7) 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?

No Impact. According to the City's General Plan Safety Element, the Project site is not located within an area of the City designated as a Fire Hazard Area (City of Glendale 2003). Given this, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires and no impact would occur. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

J. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<i>Would the project:</i>	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 or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?			X	
2. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X	

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			X	
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;			X	
iii) 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; or			X	
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
4. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
5. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X	

1) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed Project would include earthwork activities that could potentially result in erosion and sedimentation, which could subsequently degrade downstream receiving waters and violate water quality standards. Stormwater runoff during the construction phase may contain silt and debris, resulting in a short-term increase in the sediment load of the municipal storm drain system. Substances such as oils, fuels, paints, and solvents may be inadvertently spilled on the Project site and subsequently conveyed via stormwater to nearby drainages, watersheds, and groundwater.

The Project would result in ground disturbance of more than 1 acre; therefore, the Project would be subject to the NPDES stormwater program, which includes obtaining coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board’s General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit). Construction activities subject to the Construction General Permit include clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling or excavation. The Construction General Permit requires development and implementation of a SWPPP. Among the required items that must be included within a SWPPP are project design features intended to protect against substantial soil erosion as a result of water and wind erosion, commonly known as BMPs. Compliance with the requirements set forth under the Construction General Permit, including preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of BMPs, would limit sedimentation and other substances that could affect ground water quality reducing impacts of stormwater runoff during construction to acceptable levels. In addition, the Project Applicant would be required to comply with the City’s requirements outlined in the Municipal Code, including but not limited to Chapter 13.42, Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Control to the satisfaction of the City’s Public Works Department. These requirements are consistent with the above discussion, including the preparation of a SWPPP and compliance with Low Impact

Development (LID) mandates. For example, BMPs required by the NPDES General Construction Permit would include spill prevention and cleanup guidelines, dewatering operations guidelines, and stormwater runoff prevention. These BMPs would protect surface water and any nearby drainages from contamination due to Project construction.

Upon completion of construction, development of the Project would add impervious surfaces to the site through associated building footprints, parking areas, and walkways. While the total landscaped area may slightly increase upon Project implementation, the Project site would remain primarily covered with impervious surfaces. As such, the total impervious area on the Project site is not expected to substantially change, indicating that the volume of stormwater runoff from the Project site would not substantially change relative to existing conditions. The proposed Project would maintain existing drainage patterns. However, Project operations could increase the potential for stormwater runoff to contain pollutants, such as spilled or leaked petroleum products, trash, and sediment due to an increase in occupants of the site. On-site landscaping could introduce an additional source of pesticides, fertilizers, and sediments, which are considered water pollutants. During operation, the Project would be subject to the City's standards and regulations pertaining to stormwater runoff and municipal separate stormwater sewer system (MS4) discharges, issued by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. These standards and regulations, which include state requirements would reduce the potential effects of Project operations on water quality. In addition, the Project Applicant would be required to comply with the City's requirements outlined in the Municipal Code, including but not limited to Chapter 13.43, Low Impact Development Standards, to the satisfaction of the City's Public Works Department.

Implementation of proposed BMPs, the SWPPP, and compliance with applicable regulations would ensure impacts to water quality as a result of Project construction and operation would be less than significant. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

2) Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede substantial groundwater management of the basin?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would redevelop a developed site that is primarily covered by impervious surfaces under existing conditions. As such, Project site does not support groundwater and groundwater recharge activities and conditions are anticipated to remain largely unchanged once Project construction is complete. Groundwater recharge areas are typically located along major water bodies, streams, or rivers, not in urbanized areas. While the total landscaped area may slightly increase upon Project implementation, the total impervious area on the Project site is not expected to substantially change relative to existing conditions. Due to the Project location and size of the Project site implementation of the Project would not substantially alter the Project site's contribution to groundwater recharge, or potential to interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Project would impede sustainable management of the groundwater basin. Moreover, the Project site is not currently used for groundwater extraction. For these reasons, the indirect impact of the Project's water demand on groundwater supplies would be less than significant. No mitigation is required. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

3) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site;

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the discussion presented in Section J-1 (above), the proposed Project would redevelop a site that is covered by impervious surfaces under existing conditions and Project site drainage conditions are anticipated to remain largely unchanged after construction is complete. The site does not contain any type of natural or manmade water source; therefore, the Project would not make any alterations to any water sources. As discussed above under Section J-1 (above), the Project would comply with all required regulatory requirements, including the NPDES and Construction General permit requirements, preparation of a SWPPP, and the City's requirements for compliance with LID mandates. Compliance with these existing requirements is designed to protect against substantial soil erosion, both on and off-site. Additionally, BMPs would be implemented throughout Project construction to avoid significant impacts to Project site drainage conditions. Compliance with all applicable requirements would reduce any potentially significant impacts relating to erosion and siltation on or off-site to less than significant, and no mitigation would be required. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

ii. 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 redevelop a developed site that is covered by impervious surfaces under existing conditions. Project site drainage conditions, including surface water runoff, are anticipated to remain largely unchanged after Project construction is complete. The Project would connect to the City's stormwater system and due to the developed nature of the site stormwater runoff would not change significantly as compared to existing conditions. Consistent with City requirements outlined in Chapter 13.43 of the Municipal Code, the Project's post-Project conditions would not be allowed to exceed pre-Project conditions to ensure there would be no downstream flooding. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

iii. 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;

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would redevelop a developed site that is covered by impervious surfaces under existing conditions. The Project would add impervious surfaces to the site through associated building footprints, parking areas, and walkways. While the total landscaped area may slightly increase upon Project implementation, the Project site would remain primarily covered with impervious surfaces. As such, the total impervious area on the Project site is not expected to substantially change, indicating that the volume of stormwater runoff from the

Project site would not substantially change relative to existing conditions. The proposed Project would connect to the City's stormwater system, the same as under existing conditions and is not anticipated to exceed the capacity of the existing system or provide additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, Project impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the EIR.

iv. *impede or redirect flood flows?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is located within Flood Zone X, an area of minimal flooding that is not considered a flood hazard zone (Geotechnical Investigation, prepared by Geocon, dated 2022). The proposed Project would redevelop a developed site that is covered by impervious surfaces under existing conditions; therefore, flood flows, are anticipated to remain largely unchanged. Due to the location of the Project site in a developed area of the City and not subjected to flooding, the Project would not be designed to impede or redirect flood flows and impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

4) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

No Impact. Seiches are typically caused when strong winds and rapid changes in atmospheric pressure push water from one end of a body of water to the other, causing the water then continues to oscillate back and forth for hours or even days. The proposed Project site is not located downslope of any large body of water that would produce a seiche. 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 is not within the mapped tsunami inundation boundaries. The Project site is also located within Flood Zone X, an area of minimal flooding that is not considered a flood hazard zone (Geotechnical Investigation, prepared by Geocon, dated 2022). Therefore, there would be no impact relating to flood hazards tsunami or seiche. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

5) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is located within the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. As discussed above under Section 3.10(a), the Project would comply with applicable water quality regulatory requirements, including implementation of a SWPPP, stormwater BMPs, and LID design, which would minimize potential off-site surface water quality impacts and contribute to a reduction in water quality impacts within the watershed. As a result, the Project would not conflict with any water quality control plan. As discussed above under Section 3.10(b), the Project would redevelop a developed site that is primarily covered by impervious surfaces under existing conditions. Due to the Project location and size of the Project site implementation of the Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The proposed Project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or a groundwater management plan; therefore, impacts are less than

significant, and no mitigation is required. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

K. LAND USE AND PLANNING

<i>Would the project:</i>	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 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			

1) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The physical division of an established community typically refers to the construction of a linear feature (e.g., a major highway or railroad tracks) or removal of a means of access (e.g., a local road or bridge) that would impair mobility within an existing community or between a community and outlying area. Under existing conditions, the Project site consists of a retail building (formerly Sears), a three-level parking structure, associated surface parking, and an alley. The Project site is surrounded by a mix of land uses, including retail and office uses to the west; residential to the north/northwest; a former Sears Auto Center to the north; a parking structure and retail to the east; and residential, retail, and a hotel to the south. Implementation of the proposed Project would include the construction of a new mixed-use development and involve the vacation of an existing alley. Moreover, on- and off-site utility infrastructure (e.g., water, sewer, electrical, telecommunications) improvements are anticipated as part of the proposed Project. The Project’s components would not impair mobility through an established neighborhood. Instead, the proposed alley vacation would allow for the development of the proposed Project. Moreover, east-west connectivity would be provided through the establishment of the proposed mid-block pedestrian paseo to the south. Existing throughput to the adjacent land uses would remain along the surrounding streets. Overall, this Project would constitute as an infill project on the Project site. No impact would occur. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

2) Conflict with 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?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Project site is located within the Orange Central neighborhood of the City’s Downtown Specific Plan (City of Glendale 2024). Land use plans applicable to the Project site, include the City’s various revised General Plan Elements, the City’s Downtown Specific Plan, and the SCAG’s Connect SoCal RTP/SCS (referred to as Connect SoCal). Further analysis is required to evaluate the Project’s potential to conflict with applicable land use plans, revised General

Plan Elements or policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. As such, this is considered a potentially significant impact that will be further evaluated in the Draft EIR.

L. MINERAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the project:</i>	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 future value to the region and the residents of the State?**
- 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. The Project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban landscape and include commercial and industrial uses. The Project site is not within an oil drilling district, State-designated oil field, or surface mining district.⁴ The Project site is not located within a Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2) Area. The Project site is not designated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Thus, there would be no impacts. No additional analysis of this topic in the EIR is needed.

M. NOISE

<i>Would the project result in:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X		
2. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		X		
3. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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 area to excessive noise levels?				X

⁴ City of Glendale General Plan, Open Space and Conservation Element, <https://www.glendaleca.gov/government/departments/community-development/planning/city-wide-plans>. Accessed August 2021.

1) **Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

2) **Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction and operation of the project will generate noise. A Noise Technical Report was prepared by Dudek (dated July 2024), which evaluated the potential short-term construction and long-term operational impacts that would result from implementation of the Project. This study will be used to further analyze the construction and operational noise and vibration impacts generated by the Project in the EIR.

3) **For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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 area to excessive noise levels?**

No Impact. The Project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest public airport to the Project site is the Hollywood Burbank Airport, which is located approximately 6 miles northwest of the site in the City of Burbank. Thus, no impact related to the exposure to people residing or working in the Project site to excessive noise levels would occur. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

N. POPULATION AND HOUSING

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial unplanned 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 existing 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)?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The Project proposes a new mixed-use development, which could result in unplanned population growth. Further analysis is required to assess if the Project would directly or indirectly result in unplanned growth that exceed growth forecasts and goals. As such, potentially significant impacts could occur related to substantial unplanned population growth. This issue will be further evaluated in the Draft EIR

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

No Impact. The project site is developed without existing housing and with a 176,629 square-foot three-story retail building (formerly Sears department store), a 164,308 square-foot. When completed, the project will provide a net increase of 666 additional units. No impacts would occur. This issue will not be further analyzed in the EIR.

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

No Impact. The Project site consists of an existing retail building (formerly Sears), a three-level parking structure, and associated surface parking. Under existing conditions, the Project site does not contain existing housing units. As such, the Project’s redevelopment and potential to displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing would not occur. No impact would occur. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

O. PUBLIC SERVICES

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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	

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:

1) Fire Protection?

Potentially Significant Impact. As discussed in Section N-1 of this Initial Study, implementation of the proposed Project would result in an increase in population. Typically, population growth leads to an increase in demand for fire protection services. Further analysis is required to assess the environmental setting of the Project site, including but not limited to existing fire service ratios (if applicable), in order to determine potential impacts related to fire protection services. As such, potentially significant impacts could occur in the event performance objectives for fire protection services are unable to be maintained and construction of new or physically altered government

facilities are required to maintain acceptable services. This issue will be further evaluated in the Draft EIR.

2) Police Protection?

Potentially Significant Impact. As discussed in Section N-1 of this Initial Study, implementation of the proposed Project would result in an increase in population. Typically, population growth leads to an increase in demand for police protection services. Further analysis is required to assess the environmental setting of the Project site, including but not limited to existing police service ratios (if applicable), in order to determine the potential impacts related to police protection services. As such, potentially significant impacts could occur in the event performance objectives for police protection services are unable to be maintained and construction of new or physically altered government facilities are required to maintain acceptable services. This issue will be further evaluated in the Draft EIR.

3) Schools?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Section N-1 of this Initial Study, implementation of the proposed Project would result in an increase in population. Typically, population growth (particularly housing growth) leads to an increase in demand for schools. The Project site is served by Glendale Unified School District (GUSD) with Columbus Elementary School, Toll Middle School, and Hoover High School (GUSD 2024). The need for new school facilities is typically associated with a population increase that generates an increase in enrollment large enough to cause new schools to be constructed. As described in Project Description, the proposed Project would involve construction of 666 new residential units and 16 live/work units in the City. Using the GUSD Student Generation Rates included in the DSP Program EIR, the following ratios are estimated for student populations: 0.170 student per unit (kindergarten through 6th grade), 0.054 student per unit (7th and 8th grade), and 0.116 student per unit (9th through 12th grade), or a total generation rate of 0.340 student per unit (City of Glendale 2006). As such, the Project is anticipated to result in approximately 232 new students.⁵ According to the California Department of Education, GUSD had a total enrollment of 24,456 students district-wide in the 2022-2023 school year (CDE 2024). As such, the Project's potential student generation would represent less than one percent of GUSD's total enrollment. Therefore, the Project is not anticipated to result in a substantial student generation when compared to existing conditions.

Additionally, pursuant to SB 50, the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, the Project Applicant would be required to pay development fees to GUSD prior to the issuance of the Project's building permit. Currently, GUSD fees are \$3.48 per square foot for residential and \$.56 per square foot for commercial uses (GUSD 2024b). The funding program established by SB 50 has been found by the State Legislature to constitute "full and complete mitigation of the impacts by any legislative or adjudicative act on the provision of adequate school facilities" (Government Code Section 65995[h]). As a result, the payment of fees authorized for collection under SB 50 to the GUSD are conclusively considered full mitigation for Project impacts. Therefore, with the payment of the applicable school fees, Project operations would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered schools, or the need for new or physically altered schools, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives for schools. Such impacts on schools would be less than

significant. No mitigation is required. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

4) Parks?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Section N-1 of this Initial Study, implementation of the proposed Project would result in an increase in population, which typically leads to an increase in demand for parks. The Project would provide publicly accessible open space with courtyards and plazas located at the northeast and northwest corners of the site. A mid-block pedestrian paseo, approximately 13,397 square feet in size, is also proposed along the southernly portion of the site. In addition, indoor and outdoor residential amenity areas and decks are proposed within the proposed building. Moreover, the Project Applicant would be subject to the City’s Public Use Facilities Development Impact Fee, as codified in Chapter 4.10 of the City’s Municipal Code. Payment of fees would address the incremental increase in demand for park facilities that would be caused by the Project.

For the reasons listed above, less than significant impacts would occur related to performance objectives for parks. No mitigation is required. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

5) Other Public Facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in this Initial Study, implementation of the proposed Project would result in an increase in population. Typically, population growth leads to an increase in demand for other public facilities, such as libraries. Implementation of the proposed Project would be subject to the City’s Public Use Facilities Development Impact Fee, as codified in Chapter 4.10 of the City’s Municipal Code. Thus, the Project Applicant would be required to pay development impact fees in accordance with local regulations. Payment of fees would help address the incremental increase in demand for other public facilities (such as libraries) that would be caused by the Project. Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

P. RECREATION

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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?			X	
2. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

1. 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. Similar to the discussion provided under Section N-1 of this Initial Study, implementation of the proposed Project would result in an increase in population. Typically,

population growth leads to an increase in demand for parks and recreational facilities. The Project would provide publicly accessible open space with courtyards and plazas located at the northeast and northwest corners of the site. A mid-block pedestrian paseo is also proposed along the southernly portion of the site. In addition, indoor and outdoor residential amenity areas and decks are proposed within the proposed building. The inclusion of on-site open space and recreational facilities would reduce the Project’s demand on existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. Moreover, the Project Applicant would be subject to the City’s Public Use Facilities Development Impact Fee, as codified in Chapter 4.10 of the City’s Municipal Code. Payment of fees would help address the incremental increase in use of park facilities a result of the Project. Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

2. 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. Construction of the proposed Project would include on-site open space features, including courtyards and plazas, and paseos. These components of the Project would provide on-site recreational facilities for future residents and visitors of the Project site. The potential for adverse physical effects on the environment as a result of the Project’s on-site open space features are included as part of the Project and, therefore, have been analyzed for their potential environmental effects in this Initial Study. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. No mitigation is required. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

Q. TRANSPORTATION

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	X			
2. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	X			
3. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
4. Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	

- 1. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?**
- 2. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivisions (b)?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction and operation of the proposed Project will generate additional trips. Analysis is needed to determine the amount of vehicle miles the proposed use will induce and if the Project will conflict with applicable transportation plans and policies, increase traffic hazards or affect emergency access. Transportation impacts of the proposed Project will be further analyzed in the EIR.

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

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed in Section Q-1 (above) vehicular access onto the Project Site will be via driveways from California Avenue, Orange Street, and Wilson Avenue. The City's Public Works – Traffic Division reviewed the Project and did not express major concern in regard to the traffic design. To ensure all construction traffic impacts (including construction worker trips and truck traffic for material delivery and material import/export) are less than significant, as a project design feature, a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be submitted to the City's Public Works Department for approval prior to any construction related activities. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will include a Construction Traffic Control Plan, a Construction Parking Plan, a Haul Routes Plan, and construction hours. As a result, construction traffic impacts would be less than significant. This issue will not be further analyzed in the EIR.

4. Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less than Significant Impact. The ingress and egress for the site have been evaluated by the City's Traffic Division and found to be adequate for emergency access or access to nearby uses. Further, the project does not involve the elimination of a through-route or the narrowing of a roadway. While temporary and occasional lane closures may be required during construction, two-way traffic would still be maintained along North Central Avenue, West California Avenue and North Orange Avenue, allowing for emergency access, as necessary. As indicated in Section Q-3 above, a traffic control plan will be required for the construction phases of the Project. The plan will be reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Division to ensure that emergency access is not impacted during construction.

As such, implementation of the proposed project would not create new obstructions to emergency access in the Project area. All proposed accesses and drive lanes would be subject to the Fire Department's access standards. The project must also comply with all Building, Fire, and Safety Codes. Project plans would be subject to review and approval by the Public Works Engineering and Traffic Divisions, Community Development Department Building & Safety Division and Fire Department. Upon compliance with City standards for emergency access, impacts would be less than significant. As a result, less than significant impacts to emergency access will occur. This issue will not be further analyzed in the EIR.

R. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the project:</i>	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 tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in the local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or			X	
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.			X	

1. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or**

Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed Project would result in ground-disturbing activities which could result in the disturbance of tribal cultural resources listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or a local register of historical resources. However, given the nature of the Project within an urbanized area of downtown Glendale on a property that has been fully developed and partially subject to excavation for subterranean parking, the Project is anticipated to result in less than significant impacts. In addition, outreach to local tribes by the City is required under Assembly Bill (AB) 52. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

- ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.**

Less Than Significant Impact. AB 52 requires that lead agencies evaluate a project’s potential to impact tribal cultural resources. Such resources include “sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or included in a local register of historical resources.” AB 52 also gives lead agencies the discretion to determine, supported by substantial evidence, whether a resource qualifies as a tribal cultural resource. Per AB 52 (specifically PRC Section 21080.3.1), Native American consultation is required upon request by a California Native American tribe that has previously requested that the City provide it with notice of such projects. Given this, outreach to local tribes is required and will be initiated

by the City. Project-related impacts to tribal cultural resources are anticipated to be less than significant given the site’s location within an urbanized area of downtown Glendale. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed or evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

S. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	X			
2. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	X			
3. 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			
4. Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	X			
5. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

1. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water, drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Project site is located within an urbanized area of the City and is developed. The Project site is served by existing water, wastewater, stormwater, electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications facilities. The proposed Project would increase demand on existing infrastructure facilities due to an increase in population. Further analysis is required to assess whether the Project would require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded utilities and service systems. As such, impacts could be potentially significant. This issue will be further evaluated in the Draft EIR.

2. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Potentially Significant Impact. Senate Bill (SB) 610 was passed on January 1, 2002, amending the California Water Code (CWC) to require detailed analysis of water supply availability for certain types of development projects. The primary purpose of SB 610 is to improve the linkage between water and land use planning by ensuring greater communication between water providers and local planning agencies and ensuring that land use decisions for certain large development projects are fully informed as to whether a sufficient water supply is available to meet project demands. SB 610 requires preparation of a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) for a project that is subject to the

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and meets certain requirements. SB 610 is codified in CWC Division 6, Part 2.10 (Sections 10910–10915).

The Project satisfies the statutory definition of a “project” for the purpose of determining SB 610 applicability because it is considered a residential development of more than 500 dwelling units, per CWC Section 10912(a)(1). The lead agency will make an independent determination as to whether there is adequate water supply for the proposed Project, having considered the entire administrative record. In compliance with SB 610, this WSA examines the availability of the identified water supply under normal-year, single-dry-year, and multiple-dry-year conditions over a 20-year projection and the 35-year estimated project life, accounting for the projected water demand of the Project plus other existing and planned future uses of the identified water supply. As such, impacts could be potentially significant. This issue will be further evaluated in the Draft EIR.

- 3. 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?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Similar to the discussion presented in Section S-1 (above), the Project would increase demand on existing infrastructure facilities. This includes an increase in demand for wastewater treatment. Further analysis is required to assess the wastewater treatment capacity serving the Project site in order to determine if the Project would result in potential impacts. As such, impacts could be potentially significant. This issue will be further evaluated in the Draft EIR.

- 4. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed Project would generate an increase in solid waste generation requiring disposal. Further analysis is required to assess the anticipated solid waste generated by the Project in order to determine the potential impacts to landfill capacity and solid waste reduction goals. As such, impacts could be potentially significant. This issue will be further evaluated in the Draft EIR.

- 5. Comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

Less Than Significant Impact. Per CALGreen, 65 percent of construction and demolition waste must be diverted from landfills. As such, at least 65 percent of all construction and demolition debris from the site would be diverted. Additionally, CALGreen requires 100 percent of trees, stumps, rocks, and associated vegetation and soils resulting primarily from land clearing to be reused or recycled. The Project would be consistent with the applicable solid waste regulations, including GMC 8.58.050. Since the Project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, impacts would be less than significant. No additional analysis of this topic in the EIR is needed.

T. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility area or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
2. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				X
3. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel, breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				X
4. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				X

1. **Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**
2. **Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?**
3. **Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?**
4. **Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?**

No Impact. The Project is not located in or near a State Responsibility Area of land classified as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.⁶ Furthermore, the Project would not impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan as the Project site is not located near a non-compliant access road as depicted in the City’s Safety Element.⁷ The Project is located on relatively flat land and would not change or exacerbate current risks of wildfire or pollutant concentrations from a wildfire. The Project would not require the installation of infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk. Future driveway and building configurations would comply with applicable fire code requirements for emergency evacuation, including proper emergency exits for patrons, employees, and residents. Project site access and circulation plans would be subject to review and approval by the GFD. No impact would occur. No additional analysis of this topic in the EIR is needed.

⁶ CalFire, Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP), Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer, <https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>. Accessed August 2021.

⁷ City of Glendale General Plan, Safety Element, Ch. 4 Fire Hazards, Plate 4-3.

U. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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 substantially 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, substantially 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?**
- 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)?**
- 3. Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Impacts related to substantially degrading 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal would not be significant. Analysis of the potential for the Project to affect historic resources will be evaluated in the EIR. The potential of the Project to contribute to significant cumulative impacts will also be evaluated in the EIR. The Project does not have the potential to result in significant environmental effects which would cause substantial direct or indirect adverse effects on human beings.

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. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Open Space and Conservation Element," as amended.
2. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Noise Element," as amended.
3. California Department of Conservation, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program*, Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2010 (September 2011).
4. South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning* (May 2005).
5. City of Glendale, *General Plan*, "Safety Element" (2003).
6. California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, *State of California General Plan Guidelines* (2024).
7. City of Glendale Municipal Code, as amended.
8. The City of Glendale's Downtown Specific Plan, as amended.
9. Phase I Historic Assessment, December 6, 2021, Teresa Grimes I Historic Preservation.
10. Arborist Report, 236 North Central Avenue Project, February 2024, Dudek.
11. Noise Technical Report, 236 North Central Avenue Project, July 2024, Dudek.
12. City of Glendale, California, California
13. Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy Technical Report, July 2024, Dudek.
14. City of Glendale, Greener Glendale Plan for Community Activities (March 27, 2012).
15. City of Glendale, Bicycle Transportation Plan (September 2012)