

RESOLUTION NO. _____

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GLENDALE
CERTIFYING A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT SCH 2021060219,
RELATED MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM PREPARED
PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FOR THE
PROJECT LOCATED AT 1642 SOUTH CENTRAL AVENUE, GLENDALE, CA 91204,
AND ADOPTING FINDINGS SUPPORTING A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING
CONSIDERATIONS**

WHEREAS, the City of Glendale, as the lead agency, has caused preparation of a Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the proposed demolition of the two residential buildings (1642 South Central Avenue and 1608 Gardena Avenue) and a detached garage, and construction of a new 40,240-square-foot, five-story, 31-unit (three of the residential units would be reserved for very low-income households), affordable rental housing project (the "Project") located at 1642 South Central Avenue, Glendale, CA 91204; and

WHEREAS, a Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR") for the Project was prepared and circulated on June 10, 2021, through July 12, 2021 for a 30-day period pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), Public Resources Code §§ 21000 et seq., and State and City Guidelines adopted pursuant thereto; and

WHEREAS, notice was duly provided to the public, government agencies and all other interested parties that they may submit written comments on the Draft EIR to the City on or before July 12, 2021; and

WHEREAS, a Partially Recirculated Draft EIR (PR-DEIR) was prepared to address public comments and expand upon the analysis in the DEIR. Consistent with the requirements of Sections 15087 and 15088.5(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the PR-DEIR was circulated for public review and comment from August 12, 2022, for public review for a period of 30 days.

WHEREAS, a Final Environmental Impact Report for the Project, State Clearinghouse No. SCH 2021060219, ("Final EIR") was prepared pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, was released on December 5, 2022, and incorporated the Draft EIR, PR-DEIR and included written responses to the comments made during the CEQA review period; and

WHEREAS, after due notice, on December 15, 2022, the Historic Preservation Commission conducted a public hearing on this matter at which it reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR as well as supplemental responses and information; and

WHEREAS, on December 15, 2022, the Historic Preservation Commission returned the Project to the applicant for redesign, and

WHEREAS, on February 16, 2023 the Project returned to the Historic Preservation Commission for consideration of the Final EIR and consideration of the design review application and the Historic Preservation Commission voted not to certify the FEIR and did not approve the design review application; and

WHEREAS, the Project applicant filed an appeal to the City Council, and on April 11, 2023,

the City Council conducted a de novo hearing of the design review application and request to certify the Project FEIR, and after reviewing all the Project materials, appeal application, receiving staff and consultant presentations, and hearing public testimony, and after having considering all the materials and testimony, the City Council finds and determines that the (i) the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA and the State and City CEQA Guidelines, (ii) the City Council has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR, and (iii) the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City of Glendale as the lead agency; and

WHEREAS, the City Council further finds that the economic, social, legal and technological benefits of the Project, which include a region-wide social, environmental and economic benefit of providing more housing, including affordable housing, in close proximity to a major transit hub – the Larry Zarian Transportation Center – outweigh the Project’s temporary significant and unavoidable environmental impact from construction noise and vibration, and outweigh the Project’s significant and unavoidable environmental impact on cultural resources due to the demolition of a historic resource, and on that basis the adverse environmental impacts are considered acceptable pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15093(a).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Glendale that:

SECTION 1. The recitals set forth herein above are true and correct and are incorporated herein.

SECTION 2. Each and all of the Findings and Determinations contained in this document are based upon competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire record relating to the Project and the Final EIR. The Findings and Determinations constitute the independent Findings and Determinations of the City Council in all respects and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence. All of the language included in this document constitutes findings by the City Council, whether or not any particular sentence or clause includes a statement to that effect.

SECTION 3. The FEIR and MMRP were circulated for public review and notice of the hearing on their adoption was completed as required by law.

SECTION 4. The following Findings are hereby adopted by the City Council of the City of Glendale as required by *Public Resources Code* §§21081, 21081.5 and 21081.6, and CEQA Guidelines §§15091 through 15093, in conjunction with the approval of the Project. The Final EIR identified significant impacts associated with the Project. Approval of a project with significant impacts requires that findings be made by the Lead Agency. Significant impacts of the Project would have a residual significant impact that requires a Statement of Overriding Considerations. Specifically, CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 requires the City Council to make one or more of the following written findings:

- a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.
- b. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the findings. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- c. Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation

measure or project alternative identified in the Final EIR.

These Findings accomplish the following: (a) they address the significant environmental effects identified in the FEIR for the Project; (b) they incorporate all mitigation measures associated with these significant impacts identified in the FEIR; (c) they indicate whether a significant effect is avoided or reduced by the adopted mitigation measures to a less-than-significant level or remains significant and unavoidable, either because there are no feasible mitigation measures or because, even with implementation of mitigation measures, a significant impact will occur, or because such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency; and (d) they address the feasibility of all project alternatives and mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. For any effects which will remain significant and unavoidable, a “Statement of Overriding Considerations” is adopted.

The City Council of the City of Glendale hereby adopts and incorporates, as conditions of approval, the mitigation measures set forth in the Findings below to reduce or avoid the potentially significant and significant impacts of the Project, as well as certain less-than-significant impacts. In adopting these mitigation measures, the City Council intends to adopt each of the mitigation measures recommended in the FEIR, except to the extent such mitigation measures are specifically rejected or specifically modified by these Findings. In the comments on the Draft EIR, a number of measures were suggested by various commenters as proposed additional mitigation measures. With respect to the measures that were proposed in the comments, and not incorporated into the FEIR, the responses to comments in the FEIR explain why the proposed mitigation measures are not recommended by the Final EIR for adoption. The City Council hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the reasons stated in the responses to comments contained in the FEIR as its grounds for rejecting adoption of these proposed mitigation measures.

Section 5. Project Description

The Project site is located at 1642 South Central Avenue, within the Tropico neighborhood of the City of Glendale (APN 5640-029-014). The Project site is a 0.23-acre rectangular parcel and is bounded to the north by South Central Avenue, to the west by Gardena Avenue, to the east by an industrial building constructed in 1985, and to the south by a single-family residence constructed in 1947.

The Project site is zoned SFMU (Commercial/Residential Mixed Use) and developed with two residential buildings (1642 South Central Avenue and 1608 Gardena Avenue) and a detached garage. The residence located at 1642 South Central Avenue was constructed in 1913, and a second residence located on the same lot but with the address of 1608 Gardena Avenue was constructed in 1920. The Project would demolish both residential dwelling units and the garage and construct a new 40,240-square-foot, five-story, 31-unit, rental housing building. Parking would be provided in a 16-space one-level subterranean garage. Per Government Code Section 65915 and Glendale Municipal Code Section 30.36 (Density Bonus Incentives), three of the residential units would be reserved for very low-income households.

Section 6. CEQA Process

Notice of Preparation

In accordance with Section 15063 of the CEQA Guidelines, a Lead Agency conducted an Initial Study to determine if the Project may have a significant effect on the environment. Preparation of an Initial Study was conducted during October 2020 identifying potentially significant impacts involving Noise and Cultural Resources. As a result, the City issued a Notice of Preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Proposed Project on June 10, 2021. The State

Clearinghouse assigned this project State Clearinghouse (SCH) No. 2021060219. The Notice of Preparation circulated for public review and comment for a 30-day period beginning on June 10, 2021.

Environmental Impact Report

The City supervised and reviewed the preparation of the Draft EIR, the Partially-Recirculated Draft EIR, and the FEIR in accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 *et seq.*) and the CEQA Guidelines. The FEIR is a full-disclosure informational document intended to inform and assist public agency decision-makers and the general public of the significant environmental effects of the project. Possible ways to minimize significant effects are identified in the FEIR, and reasonable alternatives to the project are evaluated. This document assesses the environmental impacts, including unavoidable adverse impacts and cumulative impacts that may result from approval of the Project.

Written or oral comments from the public were received. All comments and responses to those comments are included in the FEIR.

Each and all of the Findings and Determinations contained in this document are based upon competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire record relating to the Project and FEIR. The Findings and Determinations constitute the independent Findings and Determinations of the City in all respects and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence. All of the language included in this document constitutes findings by the City, whether or not any particular sentence or clause includes a statement to that effect.

All summaries of information and the findings to follow are based on the FEIR, the Project (and every component thereof), and/or other evidence in the record. The absence of any particular fact from any such summary is not an indication that a particular finding is not based in part on that fact. The summaries of information below are only summaries. Cross-references to the FEIR and other evidence in the record have been made where helpful, and reference should be made directly to the FEIR and other evidence in the record for more precise information regarding the facts on which any summary is based. In addition, unless noted or stated otherwise, the rationale for the findings is that set forth in the FEIR (including the responses to comments) or elsewhere in the administrative record.

Section 7. Findings on Significant and Potentially Significant Impacts of the Proposed Project Identified in the Draft EIR, Partially-Recirculated Draft EIR, and FEIR.

An initial study was prepared to determine the extent of project-specific and cumulative impacts in certain resource topic areas would require additional analysis in the EIR, and which topic areas would not require analysis or less extensive analysis because the Project would have no impact, less-than-significant impacts, or less-than-significant impacts with mitigation included. The topic areas where additional analysis was not required include:

- Aesthetics (all topics)
- Agricultural and Forest Resources (all topics)
- Air Quality (all topics)
- Biological Resources (all topics)
- Cultural Resources
- Energy (all topics)
- Geology and Soils (all topics)
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (all topics)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (all topics)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (all topics)
- Land Use and Planning (all topics)
- Mineral Resources (all topics)
- Noise (aviation-related topics)
- Population and Housing (all topics)
- Public Services (all topics)
- Recreation (all topics)
- Transportation (all topics)
- Tribal Cultural Resources (all topics)
- Utilities and Service Systems (all topics)
- Wildfire (all topics)

Pursuant to and in accordance with Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code, the EIR examined the potential for adverse effects to result from project implementation. In summary, implementation of the proposed Project would result in the following significant and unavoidable project-related and/or cumulative impacts:

■ Cultural Resources

Impact CR-1-Implementation of the proposed Project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

■ Noise/Vibration

Impact NO-1—Implementation of the proposed Project would generate a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the City of Glendale Noise Ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies

Impact NO-2—Implementation of the proposed Project would generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

The findings, impacts, and mitigation measures that are applicable to the proposed project are noted below.

Impact C-CR-1 Implementation of the proposed Project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines

The City commissioned the development of the South Glendale Historic Context (2014 Context) and Historic Resources Survey (2019 Survey) for the South Glendale Community Plan (SGCP) area to aid in identifying potential historic resources. The Project site was included in the 2019 Survey, which assigned the residential building located at 1642 South Central Avenue a California Historical Resource Status Code 5S3, meaning it appears individually eligible for local designation through survey evaluation. The 2019 Survey determined the 1642 South Central Avenue is eligible for its architecture as a Craftsman-style residence and for its association as a circa 1910 residence within the City of Tropic. It is identified as a historic resource since it is a rare surviving example of residential architecture from the period before the town was annexed into the City of Glendale (1918), and for the quality of its Craftsman-style design. The house and garage located at 1608 Gardena Avenue were built in 1920 and 1923, respectively, and were not identified in the South Glendale Historic Context and Historic Resources Survey as potentially historic. These two buildings were built in the City of Glendale after the 1918 annexation of Tropic, and are modest examples of Craftsman-style design, lacking in the abundance of design features that make the house located at 1642 South Central Avenue a significant example of the Craftsman style.

The EIR's analysis was conducted and completed in accordance with the practices described in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Historic Preservation, including standards for identifying, evaluating, and documenting resources. Applicable national, state, and local level

criteria were considered, as well as the context-driven methods and framework used by the 2014 Context and the 2019 Survey.

Criteria A/1/1 (Events): The residential building at 1642 South Central Avenue is not individually eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) but is individually eligible for listing in the Glendale Register of Historic Resources. The property does not have an important association with events or patterns that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of national, state, or local history. However, as previously identified by the 2019 Survey, the residential building at 1642 South Central Avenue is associated with Early Development and Town Settlement, 1872-1918, because it was constructed in 1913, before the township of Tropico was annexed into the City of Glendale in 1918. The secondary residence and garage at 1608 Gardena Avenue were constructed in 1920 and 1923, respectively (post-dating the City of Tropico). Therefore, the house located at 1642 South Central Avenue is individually eligible for listing in the Glendale Register of Historic Resources under Criterion 1 and conversely the property as a whole is not individually eligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR under Criteria A/1. The later addition of the residence and garage at 1608 are not part of the original historic context for the historic property and were not built during the period of significance for the residence located at 1642 South Central although the buildings are all on the same lot.

Criteria B/2/2 (Person): Research to date did not reveal the subject property to have an association with the lives of significant persons in our past. The numerous known owners and occupants associated with the property during the historic period (prior to 1971) do not appear to have made significant contributions to national, state, or local history. Therefore, the subject property is not individually eligible for listing in the NRHP, the CRHR, or the Glendale Register of Historic Resources under Criteria B/2/2.

Criteria C/3/3 (Design/Construction): Properties may be eligible for the National Register if they embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.¹ The residential building at 1642 South Central Avenue, built in 1913, is not individually eligible for listing in the NRHP and the CRHR because its design and construction are not outstanding example of the Craftsman design and construction technique that would be considered distinctive, the work of a master, or possessing of high artistic value. However, it is individually eligible for listing in the Glendale Register of Historic Resources because it retains the majority of Craftsman CDFs, such as horizontal massing; wood shingle cladding; front porch with battered stone piers, with square wood posts; wood-framed casement and double-hung windows; and low-pitched gable roofs with exposed beams and rafter tails. Although the residential building was expanded in 1923, the addition is in keeping in its materials and design. Thus, the property is an intact and good, example of early Craftsman architecture.

Conversely, 1920 residential building located at 1608 Gardena and its detached garage were constructed after 1918 and are not associated with the town of Tropico, and therefore they do not meet Criterion 1, and do not have the architectural character required for a post-1919 building to qualify under Criterion 3. Based on these factors, the 1608 Gardena residence and its detached garage are not individually eligible for listing in the Glendale Register of Historic Resources as they do not “embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represent the work of a master.”

¹ National Park Service, National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 2002), 17.

Criteria D/4/4 (Information Potential): The property has not yielded, nor does it appear to possess potential to yield, information important in history or prehistory. Therefore, the subject property is not individually eligible under Criteria D/4 for listing in the NRHP or the CRHR.

Based on the analysis contained in this EIR and supporting studies, the residential building located at 1642 South Central Avenue is individually eligible for listing in the Glendale Register of Historic Resources under Criterion 1 (Events) for its association with Early Development and Town Settlement as a residence in the City of Tropic; it is also individually eligible for listing in the Glendale Register of Historic Resources under Criterion 3 as a distinctive and exemplary example of the Craftsman style. As such, the property is considered a “historical resource” for the purposes of CEQA.

The Project proposes to demolish all the buildings on site and redevelop the whole site with new five-story, 31-unit residential housing project. The character-defining features, listed under Architectural Context, are the distinctive qualities and characteristics of 1642 South Central Avenue that convey the building’s historic and architectural significance and justify its eligibility for listing in the Glendale Register of Historic Resources. The proposed demolition of all onsite buildings would materially alter the physical characteristics of the 1642 South Central Avenue and would therefore cause a substantial adverse impact to an historical resource and result in a significant impact.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CR-1: Documentation of Historical Resource, would lessen the impact of the proposed demolition and new construction by documenting and presenting the house’s history and character-defining features architecture as a Craftsman-style residence and for its association as a 1913 residence within the City of Tropic. However, implementation of these mitigation measures would not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

M-CR-1: Documentation of Historical Resource

Prior to issuance of a demolition permit, the Project applicant shall undertake Historic American Building/Historic American Landscape Survey (HABS/HALS) documentation of the building features. The documentation shall be undertaken by a professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural History, History, or Architecture (as appropriate) to prepare written and photographic documentation of 1642 South Central Avenue. The specific scope of the documentation shall be reviewed and approved by City of Glendale staff (City staff) but shall include the following elements:

Measured Drawings – A set of measured drawings shall be prepared that depict the existing size, scale, and dimension of the historic resource. City staff will accept the original architectural drawings or an as-built set of architectural drawings (e.g., plans, sections, elevations). City staff will assist the consultant in determining the appropriate level of measured drawings.

Historic American Buildings/Historic American Landscape Survey-Level Photographs – Either Historic American Buildings/Historic American Landscape Survey (HABS/HALS) standard large-format or digital photography shall be used. The scope of the digital photographs shall be reviewed by City staff for concurrence, and all digital photography shall be conducted according to the latest National Park Service (NPS) standards. The photography shall be undertaken by a qualified professional with demonstrated experience in HABS/HALS photography. Photograph views for the data set shall include contextual views; views of each side of the building and interior views,

including any original interior features, where possible; oblique views of the building; and detail views of character-defining features.

All views shall be referenced on a photographic key. This photographic key shall be on a map of the property and shall show the photograph number with an arrow to indicate the direction of the view. Historic photographs shall also be collected, reproduced, and included in the data set.

The Project applicant shall transmit such documentation to the Glendale Public Library, the Glendale Historical Society, the Community Development Department, and the South Central Coastal Information Center. The HABS/HALS documentation scope will determine the requested documentation type for the Project site and the Project applicant will conduct outreach to identify other interested groups. All documentation will be reviewed and approved by City staff before any demolition or site permit is granted for the affected historical resource.

Findings This is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measure M-CR-1 would reduce this impact, but not to a less than significant level, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact. The City Council finds this significant impact to be acceptable for the reasons set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Exhibit A to this Resolution).

Noise and Vibration

Impact NO-1 Construction of the proposed Project would generate a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the City of Glendale Noise Ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies.

The EIR's analysis evaluates the noise and vibration impacts associated with construction and operation of the Project. Two types of noise and vibration impacts were considered: short-term, temporary impacts resulting from construction, and impacts due to long-term operational changes in the noise environment.

Given that the Municipal Code does not include standard criteria for construction noise impact assessment, the guidelines in the FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018) are used in this analysis.

Short-Term Construction Noise Impacts

The Project would be constructed in one development phase that would take approximately 18 months. Short-term noise impacts would be associated with demolition of the existing structures, excavation, grading, and construction of the Project. Construction-related short-term noise levels would be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project site; however, once Project construction is done, these noise levels would no longer occur.

Two types of short-term noise impacts could occur during construction of the Project. The first type is related to noise generated by trucks transporting construction equipment and materials, by hauling activities, and by vehicles carrying construction workers commuting to the Project site. These transportation activities would incrementally raise noise levels on roads leading to the site. It is expected that larger trucks used in equipment delivery would generate higher noise levels than

vehicles carrying workers commuting to the Project site. The single-event noise from equipment trucks passing at a distance of 50 feet from a sensitive noise receptor would reach a maximum level of 84 dBA Lmax. However, heavy equipment used for grading and construction activities would be moved on-site just one time and would remain on-site for the duration of each construction phase. The total number of daily vehicle trips associated with hauling during the grading phase is estimated to be approximately 14 and would be minimal compared to existing traffic volumes on the affected streets. The daily traffic noise level change associated with these trips would not be perceptible. Therefore, construction-related traffic impacts would be short term and would not result in a significant off-site noise impact.

The second type of potential short-term noise impact is related to noise generated during demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction, and paving. Construction is completed in discrete steps, each with its own mix of equipment and consequently its own noise characteristics. These various sequential phases would change the character of the noise generated on the site and therefore the noise levels surrounding the site as construction progresses. Despite the variety in the type and size of construction equipment, similarities in the dominant noise sources and patterns of operation allow construction-related noise ranges to be categorized by work phase.

The site preparation and grading phase, which includes excavation and grading of the site, tends to generate the highest noise levels because earthmoving equipment is the noisiest construction equipment (see Table 3.2.9). Additionally, this phase would be the longest of the phases expected to occur near the Project site boundary. The three loudest pieces of equipment used during the site preparation and grading phase would likely be an excavator, grader, and dozer, as no pile driving is proposed. Typical operating cycles for these types of construction equipment may involve 1 or 2 minutes of full-power operation followed by 3 or 4 minutes at lower power settings.

Table 3.2.9 Typical Maximum Construction Equipment Noise Levels (Lmax)

Type of Equipment	Suggested Maximum Sound Levels for Analysis (dBA Lmax at 50 feet)
Impact Equipment	
Excavators with Hoe Ram	85
Impact Pile Driver	101
Non-Impact Equipment	
Air Compressors	80
Bore/Drill Rigs	85
Cement and Mortar Mixers	80
Concrete/Industrial Saws	90
Concrete Truck	82
Concrete Boom Pump	82
Cranes	85
Excavators	85
Generator Sets	82

Type of Equipment	Suggested Maximum Sound Levels for Analysis (dBA Lmax at 50 feet)
--------------------------	--

Graders	85
Pavers	85
Plate Compactors	83
Pressure Washers	85
Pumps	81
Rollers	85
Rough Terrain Forklifts	85
Rubber-Tired Dozers	85
Scrapers	85
Skid Steer Loaders	80
Tie Back Drill	85
Tower Crane	85
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	84
Welders	73

Notes:

^A Based on highest anticipated noise level, assuming 100 percent use during any 1-hour period.

dBA = A-weighted decibels

Leq = equivalent continuous sound level

Source: Federal Highway Administration, *FHWA Highway Construction Noise Handbook*, August 2006, Table 9.1, p. 91.

As shown in Table 3.2.10, during the construction of the Project, it is expected that the average noise levels at the nearest noise-sensitive use, the single-family home to the south at 1616 Gardena Avenue, would range from 69 dBA Leq to 83 dBA Leq. These noise levels depend on construction phase and are based on an average distance of 85 feet from the center of construction activities. Therefore, the noise impacts would not exceed the 90 dBA Leq 1-hour construction noise level criteria established by the FTA for residential uses based on the average condition. When construction activities occur near the property line, noise levels could approach 104 dBA Leq. For the single-family homes further to the south on El Bonito Avenue, construction noise levels would be reduced due to additional distance and shielding from existing intervening structures. While construction-related impacts are short term and would no longer occur once Project construction is completed, they have the potential to be higher than existing ambient noise levels by more than 5 dBA, a typical threshold of perceptibility in an outdoor environment, in the Project area.

Table 3.2.10: Potential Construction Noise Impacts at Surrounding Residences

Receptor (Location)	Composite Noise Level (dBA Leq) at 50 feet¹	Average Distance (feet)	Range of Composite Construction Noise Levels (dBA Leq)	Exceed 90 dBA Leq Threshold?	Result in a 5 dBA Increase Over Ambient Condition
1616 Gardena Avenue	76 -88	85	69-83	No	Yes
335 El Bonito Avenue		175	63-77	No	Yes
337 El Bonito Avenue		120	66-80	No	Yes
339 El Bonito Avenue		170	63-77	No	Yes
343 El Bonito Avenue		150	64-78	No	Yes

Source: 1642 S. Central Avenue Project –Noise and Vibration Study, LSA, July 2022. See EIR Appendix D.

¹ The composite construction noise level represents the range of noise levels with the grading phases as compared to other phases.

dBA Leq = average A-weighted hourly noise level

Compliance with the time restrictions in the City’s Noise Ordinance, Municipal Code Chapter 8.36, would ensure that construction noise does not disturb the residential uses during hours when ambient noise levels are likely to be lower (i.e., at night). Although construction noise would be higher than the ambient noise in the Project vicinity during the day, construction noise would cease to occur once Project construction is completed. In addition to compliance with appropriate construction times, the Project would implement Mitigation Measure M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control.

M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control

Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the Glendale (City) Department of Building and Safety, or designee, shall verify that all construction plans include notes stipulating the following:

- Grading and construction contractors shall use equipment that generates lower vibration levels, such as rubber-tired equipment rather than metal-tracked equipment.
- Construction haul truck and materials delivery traffic shall avoid Local Streets and Urban and Community and Neighborhood Collectors as defined in the City’s Circulation Element.
- The construction contractor shall place noise- and vibration-generating construction equipment, with the exception of equipment needed to completed shoring activities associated with the construction of the subterranean garage, away from sensitive uses. All construction staging areas shall be located away from sensitive uses.

- The construction contractor shall use on-site electrical sources to power equipment rather than diesel generators.
- The construction contractor shall ensure that a minimum 12-foot-high barrier, such as plywood structures or flexible sound control curtains, shall be erected between on the proposed Project site and adjacent to the sensitive receptors to minimize the amount of noise during construction. A 12-foot-high construction noise barrier would provide an approximately 12 dBA reduction to the closest residential receptors to the south.
- All residential units located within 500 feet of the construction site shall be sent a notice regarding the construction schedule. A sign legible at a distance of 50 feet shall also be posted at the construction site. All notices and the signs shall indicate the dates and durations of construction activities, as well as provide a telephone number for the “noise disturbance coordinator”.

Construction noise would be higher than the daytime ambient noise in the Project vicinity and exceed daytime construction thresholds. However, the construction noise and threshold exceedance would cease to occur once Project construction is completed. In addition to compliance with appropriate construction times, the implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1 would reduce construction noise to the greatest extent feasible; however, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Findings **This is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measure M-NO-1 would reduce this impact, but not to a less than significant level, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact. The City Council finds this significant impact to be acceptable for the reasons set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Exhibit A to this Resolution).**

Impact NO-2: Construction of the proposed Project would generate excessive groundborne vibration levels. (Significant and Unavoidable)

Construction Vibration Impacts

Construction activities related to the Project, including excavation activities where the highest levels of vibration are anticipated, would not include vibration of foundations, utilities that are connected to existing structures, or tunneling operations. To provide an example of construction vibration levels expected for a project of this size, Table 3.2.11 shows the PPV values and vibration levels (in terms of VdB) from construction vibration sources from 25 feet away. A large bulldozer would generate approximately 0.089 PPV inches/sec or 87 VdB of groundborne vibration when measured at 25 feet, based on the Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual.

Table 3.2.11. Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

Equipment	PPV_{ref} at 25 ft (in/sec)^A	Lv (VdB)^B
Impact Pile Driver (typical)	0.644	104
Vibratory Roller	0.210	94
Hoe Ram	0.089	87
Large Bulldozer	0.089	87
Loaded Trucks	0.076	86
Jackhammer	0.035	79
Small Bulldozer	0.003	58

Notes:

^A PV_{ref} – reference Peak Particle Velocity. PPV is appropriate for evaluating potential damage to buildings.

^B RMS VdB re 1 µin/sec.

ft = feet, in/sec = inches per second

µin/sec = microinches per second

Lv = velocity in decibels

RMS = root-mean-square

VdB = vibration velocity in decibel

Source: Federal Transit Administration Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual, September 2018.

In order to assess the potential for vibration impacts, the analysis utilizes the distance between the nearest off-site buildings and the Project boundary (assuming the construction equipment would be used at or within 5 feet of the Project boundary) because vibration damage impacts occur at the buildings.

Table 3.2.12 presents a summary of potential vibration impacts of the Project construction. Based on the information in Table 3.2.12, vibration has the potential to cause damage to the commercial building to the north at 1638 South Central Avenue and the residential building to the south at 1616 Gardena Avenue if large construction equipment operates within 15 feet of the building façade. Additionally, vibration has the potential to cause annoyance to residential uses if large construction equipment operates within 110 feet of the building façade.

Table 3.2.12 Summary of Construction Vibration Levels

Land Use	Address	Equipment Reference	Reference Vibration Level (PPV) at 25 ft	Distance (ft) ¹	Maximum Vibration Level (PPV)	Exceed Damage Criteria of 0.2 PPV in/sec?	Exceed Annoyance Criteria of 0.01 PPV in/sec?
Commercial	1638 S. Central Avenue	Large Bulldozers	0.089	5	0.995	Yes	No ¹
Residential	1616 Gardena Avenue			8	0.492	Yes	Yes
Residential	335 El Bonito Avenue			92	0.013	No	Yes
Residential	337 El Bonito Avenue			37	0.049	No	Yes
Residential	339 El Bonito Avenue			87	0.014	No	Yes
Residential	343 El Bonito Avenue			75	0.017	No	Yes

Source: Compiled by LSA (2022).

Note: Due to the associated indoor uses at the commercial use to the north, construction activities are not expected to cause annoyance. ft = foot/feet

FTA = Federal Transit Administration in/sec = inch/inches per second

PPV = particle velocity

As the residences listed in Table 3.2.12 fall within the 110-foot contour for annoyance and the commercial use to the north at 1638 South Central Avenue and the residential use to the east at 1616 Gardena Avenue fall within the potential damage contour, there would be a potentially significant groundborne vibration impact at these two locations. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Construction Vibration Control, vibration damage would be avoided.

M-NO-2: Construction Vibration Control

Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the Glendale (City) Department of Building and Safety, or designee, shall verify that all construction plans include notes stipulating the following:

- **Prepare a Monitoring Plan.** The property owner shall undertake a monitoring program to avoid or reduce Project-related construction vibration damage to adjacent buildings and/or structures and to ensure that any such damage is documented and repaired. The monitoring program shall apply to all potentially affected buildings and/or structures adjacent to the Project site. Prior to issuance of any demolition or building permit, the property owner shall submit the construction vibration monitoring plan to the City for approval. The monitoring plan shall include, at a minimum, the following components, as applicable:
 - **Vibration Analysis Refinement.** Once the specific construction

equipment list becomes available, potential vibration distance contours shall be refined.

- **Vibration Monitoring.** To ensure that construction vibration levels do not exceed the established standard, an acoustical consultant shall monitor vibration levels at each affected building and/or structure on adjacent properties when heavy construction occurs in close proximity. Based on direction from the acoustical consultant, vibratory construction activities that generate vibration levels in excess of the standard shall be prohibited.
- **Alternative Construction Techniques.** Should construction vibration levels be observed in excess of the established standard, the contractor(s) shall halt construction and put alternative construction techniques into practice. Following incorporation of the alternative construction techniques, vibration monitoring shall recommence to ensure that vibration levels at each affected building and/or structure on adjacent properties are not exceeded.
- **Periodic Inspections.** A historic architect or qualified historic preservation professional (for effects on historic buildings and/or structures) and/or structural engineer (for effects on non-historic buildings and/or structures) shall conduct regular periodic inspections as specified in the vibration monitoring plan of each affected building and/or structure on adjacent properties during vibration-generating construction activity on the Project site. Should damage to any building and/or structure occur, the building(s) and/or structure(s) shall be remediated to their pre-construction condition at the conclusion of vibration-generating activity on the site.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-2 would avoid construction vibration damage. However, vibration levels could exceed the applicable annoyance criteria at nearby residences, even with the use of standard construction best practices. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable and would not be reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation.

Findings **This is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measure M-NO-1 would reduce this impact, but not to a less than significant level, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact. The City Council finds this significant impact to be acceptable for the reasons set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Exhibit A to this Resolution).**

Section 8. Findings on Project Alternatives Considered in the Environmental Impact Report.

The Alternatives chapter of the EIR was prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(d), which requires the analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives capable of eliminating or reducing significant adverse environmental effects of the proposed project. The Alternatives section contains an analysis of the effects of the following alternatives:

1. No Project Alternative
2. Reduced Density and Relocation on Site
3. Reduced Density and keep the residential building located at 1642 South Central Avenue in its existing location on the project site

Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines states the purpose of describing and analyzing a no project alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. The no project alternative analysis is not the baseline for determining whether the proposed project's environmental impacts may be significant, unless it is identical to the existing environmental setting analysis which does establish that baseline.

Under the No Project Alternative, the two residential dwellings at 1642 South Central Avenue and at 1608 Gardena and the existing garage would be retained in their current configuration and would not be disturbed; no construction would occur on site and the current residential uses would continue. No new residential or commercial uses would be added. Therefore, the existing physical features on the Project site, including the character-defining features of the historical resource, would not change and The analysis of the No Project Alternative assumes that the Project would not be approved and would result in a "no build" alternative wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained.

If the No Project Alternative were to proceed, no changes would be implemented, and none of the impacts associated with the Project would occur. However, incremental changes would be expected to occur in the vicinity of the Project site as nearby projects are approved, constructed, and occupied. With no change to existing site conditions under the No Project Alternative, land use activity on the Project site would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts beyond existing levels. There would be no construction or operational impacts related to noise and vibration compared to the Project.

Since the No Project Alternative would retain all the character-defining features of the subject property and not demolish or make any modifications to the historical resource, it would not cause material impairment to that resource. Compared to the Project, which would demolish all buildings on site and result in material impairment to the historical resource, the No Project Alternative would not result in any project-level impacts and would not contribute to any impacts related to historic architectural resources.

The No Project Alternative would not require construction activities and would not result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to construction noise and vibration.

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed Project containing 31 units of rental housing, including three very-low income units, and a one-level subterranean garage would not be constructed. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the Project objectives.

Findings: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2), if the no project alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, then an EIR is required to identify another environmentally superior alternative from among the alternatives evaluated if the Project has significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. The environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that best avoids or lessens any significant effects of the Project, even if the alternative would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives. The No Project Alternative is considered the overall environmentally superior alternative because it would represent a continuation of existing conditions on the Project site and would not result in any significant impacts associated with implementation of the Project. The No Project Alternative, however, would not meet any of the project objectives. **This Alternative is Infeasible, as set forth above and in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Exhibit A).**

Alternative 2: Reduced Density and Relocation on Site

The Reduced Density (Relocation on Site) Alternative would result in fewer environmental impacts compared to the Project given the reduced size (15 residential units versus 31 units) and shorter construction duration. The Reduced Density (Relocation on Site) Alternative would also be consistent with the SFMU (Commercial/Residential Mixed Use) and Mixed-Use District General Development Standards. The 15-unit building with a one-level subterranean garage would have a smaller building footprint than the 31-unit Project but would still result in short-term impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, geology/soils, water quality, and traffic. Similar to the Project, these short-term construction impacts from this Alternative would be less than significant and typical of small land development projects where compliance with existing codes and other regulatory standards ensure these types of impacts are below impact thresholds.

The Reduced Density (Relocation On Site) Alternative would require a shorter construction duration. However, the Reduced Density (Relocation On Site) Alternative would not result in significantly reduced construction noise compared to the Project. The site preparation and grading construction phases generate the highest noise levels because earthmoving equipment is the noisiest construction equipment. These two construction phases would still be required, although the timing would be shortened due to the reduced size of the proposed building. Compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance and implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control and Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Construction Vibration Control would ensure that construction noise and vibration is reduced to the maximum amount feasible. However, impacts related to construction noise and vibration would remain significant and unavoidable.

Finding: The Reduced Density (Relocation On Site) Alternative would preserve the on-site location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and character-defining features of the historical resource within the Tropico neighborhood. While the historic resource would be preserved, as with the Project, the Reduced Density (Relocation On Site) Alternative would modify the setting of the historic resource. This alternative would eliminate the significant and unavoidable historical architectural resources impact associated with demolition of 1642 South Central Avenue.

The Reduced Density Alternative would meet most of the Project objectives. However, it would not fulfill the Project objectives to the same extent as the Project because fewer new residential units would be built, and it would not maximize the potential residential units on the Project site. Specific Economic, Legal, Social, Technological, or Other Considerations Make This Alternative Feasible, as set forth above and in Exhibit A to this Resolution.

Alternative 3: Reduced Density (Existing Location) Alternative

The Reduced Density (Existing Location) Alternative would retain the historic residence located at 1642 South Central Avenue in its existing location on the Project site and demolish the residence at 1608 Gardena Avenue and the existing garage. The remaining buildable area, consisting of approximately 3,383 square feet (0.007 acre) could accommodate 11 residential units, including 8 market-rate and 3 very low-income units. The Reduced Density (Existing Location) Alternative would provide eight (8) subterranean parking spaces.

Similar to the Project, the Reduced Density (Existing Location) Alternative would require construction of similar improvements, including grading and construction of the footings, connections for utilities, however the construction activities would be of shorter duration. This Alternative would also require restoration and preservation of the historic resource, and protection from any adverse impacts from construction of the new building. As a consequence, mitigation measures requiring

construction monitoring would be required, as would the post-construction restoration and rehabilitation of the historic home pursuant to Secretary of Interior Standards.

The Reduced Density (Existing Location) Alternative would result in fewer environmental impacts compared to the Project given the reduced size (11 residential units versus 31 units) and shorter construction duration. Due to the approximately 1/3 size of this Alternative compared to the Project and shorter duration of construction, this Alternative would result in reduced environmental impacts compared to the Project. The Reduced Density (Existing Location) Alternative would also be consistent with the SFMU (Commercial/Residential Mixed Use) and Mixed-Use District General Development Standards. The 11-unit building with a one-level subterranean garage would have a smaller building footprint compared to the Project but would still result in short-term impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, geology/soils, water quality, and traffic. Similar to the Project, these short-term construction impacts would be less than significant and typical of small land development projects.

The Reduced Density (Relocation On Site) Alternative would result in reduced construction duration compared to the Project. However, the site preparation and grading construction phases, which generate the highest noise levels, would still be required. The timing of these phases would be shortened due to the reduced size of the proposed building. Compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance and implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control and Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Construction Vibration Control would ensure that construction noise and vibration is reduced to the maximum amount feasible. However, impacts related to construction noise and vibration would remain significant and unavoidable.

The Reduced Density (Existing Location) Alternative would preserve the existing location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and character-defining features of the historical resource within the Tropico neighborhood. The preservation of location of the historic resource at its existing location on site would eliminate the Project's significant impact from demolition of the resource. The residential dwelling at 1642 South Central Avenue would remain a good example of a Craftsman style house and would remain eligible for listing on the Glendale Register of Historic Resources under Criterion 3.

The Reduced Density (Existing Location) Alternative meet all of the Project objectives set forth in Section 4.4 of the EIR. However, it would not fulfill the project objectives to the same extent as the Project because fewer new residential units would be built, and it would not maximize the potential residential units on the Project site.

Finding: Reduced Density (Relocation on Site) Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives evaluated. The Reduced Density (Relocation on Site) Alternative would eliminate the significant and unavoidable historical architectural resources impact associated with demolition of 1642 South Central Avenue. The construction noise and vibration impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. This alternative would also meet more of the Project objectives of adding affordable housing and meeting the City's affordable housing goals, although not to the same extent as the Project since fewer new units would be built. Specific Economic, Legal, Social, Technological, or Other Considerations Make This Alternative Feasible, as set forth above and in Exhibit A to this Resolution.

8. Statement of Overriding Considerations: The City Council hereby adopts the "Statement of Overriding Considerations" attached hereto and incorporated by reference as Attachment "A" in support of this Resolution.
9. Mitigation Monitoring Program: The City Council hereby adopts the "Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program" attached hereto and incorporated by reference as

Attachment "B" in support of this Resolution.

10. Section 21081.6(a)(2) of the Public Resources Code and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e) require that the public agency shall specify the location of the custodian of the documents or other materials that constitute the record upon which its decision is based. Accordingly, the record and custodian of documents is the Glendale Planning Department, 633 East Broadway, Room 103, Glendale, California, 91206-4386.

Adopted this _____ day of _____, 2023.

Mayor

ATTEST:

City Clerk

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) SS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

I, Dr. Susie Abajian, City Clerk of the City of Glendale, certify that the foregoing Resolution No. _____ was adopted by the City Council of the City of Glendale, California, at a regular meeting held on the day _____ of _____, 2023, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Abstain:

City Clerk

ATTACHMENT "A"

I. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR") for the 1642 South Central Avenue Project (the "Project") has identified significant and unavoidable impacts which will result from implementation of the Project. These significant and unavoidable impacts are identified in the findings adopted by the City Council pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091.

CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse effects, those effects may be considered acceptable. CEQA requires the agency to provide written findings supporting the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are unavoidable. Such reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the EIR or elsewhere in the administrative record. Those reasons are provided in this Statement of Overriding Considerations.

The City Council finds that the economic, social, and other benefits of the Project outweigh the significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the EIR and in the record. In making this finding, the City Council has balanced the benefits of the Project against its unavoidable impacts and has indicated its willingness to accept those adverse impacts. The City Council finds that each one of the following benefits of the Project, independent of the other benefits, warrant approval of the Project notwithstanding the unavoidable environmental impacts of the Project:

- 1) The Project will allow for a new 40,240-square-foot, five-story, 31-unit (27, one bedroom units and 4, two bedroom units), affordable rental housing project in the Tropico Neighborhood and South Glendale Community Plan (SGCP) area that is within walking distance of high quality transit service and in a transit priority area.
- 2) Development of 10% affordable (three units total), one- and two-bedroom units, to serve low-income families will provide necessary housing stock to address the Los Angeles' regional housing affordability crisis and meets the need of providing affordable units that address social equity and fair share housing needs.
- 3) The Project is consistent with regional policies focused on supplying housing to meet the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and implements smart growth near existing commercial services and high quality transit services which improves access to jobs and promotes transportation mobility.
- 4) The Project will be constructed near existing high quality transit services encouraging transit use – thus minimizing carbon footprint consistent with the Greener Glendale Plan and regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), and adopted by the California Air Resources Board (ARB).
- 5) The Project architecture will contribute to a positive neighborhood character by constructing a contemporary building that contains, balconies, rooftop open space, articulations and landscape treatment which will increase visual interest, as envisioned in the Comprehensive Design Guidelines.

- 6) The Project will introduce additional residents to the Tropico Neighborhood and SGCP area, thereby contributing to the economic vitality of the South Glendale and viability of the commercial businesses.

The City Council hereby finds that each of the reasons stated above constitutes a separate and independent basis of justification for the Statement of Overriding Considerations, and each is able to independently support the Statement of Overriding Considerations and override the unavoidable environmental effects of the Project. In addition, each reason is independently supported by substantial evidence contained in the administrative record.

SWCA

ATTACHMENT "B"

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTION PROGRAM





1642 South Central Avenue Project

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

NOVEMBER 2022

PREPARED FOR

City of Glendale

PREPARED BY

SWCA Environmental Consultants



Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Introduction

Where a CEQA document has identified significant environmental effects, Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 requires adoption of a “reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of a project approval to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.”

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared to provide for the monitoring of mitigation measures required for the 1642 South Central Avenue Project (Project), as set forth in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The City of Glendale (City) is the Lead Agency that must adopt the MMRP for development and operation of the project. This report will be kept on file with the City of Glendale Community Development Department, East Broadway, Glendale, California.

The CEQA Statutes and Guidelines provide direction for clarifying and managing the complex relationships between a Lead Agency and other agencies with implementing and monitoring mitigation measures. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15097(d), “each agency has the discretion to choose its own approach to monitoring or reporting; and each agency has its own special expertise.” This discretion will be exercised by implementing agencies at the time they undertake any of portion of the project, as identified in the MND.

Purpose of Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

The intent of the MMRP is to ensure the effective implementation and enforcement of adopted mitigation measures. Additionally, for the purposes of public disclosure and to assist in monitoring compliance, the MMRP identifies actions necessary to comply with relevant regulatory requirements discussed in the MND. The MMRP is intended to be used by City staff and others responsible for project implementation.

A lead agency may rely on compliance with applicable laws and regulations in determining that a proposed project will result in a less than significant impact. (See *San Francisco Tomorrow v. City and County of San Francisco* (2014) 229 Cal.App.4th 49, 525 [holding the City properly relied on compliance with building codes and related regulations in determining the proposed project would not result in potential safety hazards].) As a standard condition of approval, the City requires applicants comply with federal and state laws and regulations as well as standard City requirements that are applicable to a proposed project.

The timing is the point(s) at which the mitigation measure/standard/regulatory requirement must be monitored for compliance. In many cases, the first step in compliance will be to initiate compliance with the subject mitigation measure/standard/regulatory requirement.

■ Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Roles and Responsibilities

The project applicant is responsible for fully understanding and effectively implementing the mitigation measures, standards, regulatory requirements contained within the MMRP, as directed by the City. The City is responsible for overall administration and enforcement of the MMRP.

Changes to Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Any substantive change in the MMRP shall be reported in writing. Modifications to the requirements of the MMRP may be made by the City subject to one of the following findings, documented by evidence included in the public record:

- The requirement included in the adopted MND and the MMRP is no longer required because the significant environmental impact identified in the IS/MND has been found not to exist, or to occur at a level which makes the impact less than significant as a result of changes in the project, changes in environment conditions, or other factors;
OR,
- The modified or substitute mitigation measure provides a level of environmental protection equal to, or greater than that afforded by the mitigation measure included in the IS/MND and the MMRP; and,
- The modified or substitute mitigation measure or measures do not have significant adverse effects on the environment in addition to, or greater than those which were considered by the responsible hearing bodies in their decisions on the IS/MND and the proposed project; and,
- The modified or substitute mitigation measures are feasible, and the City or, where applicable, other public agencies, through measures included in the MMRP or applicable regulations, can ensure implementation.

Findings and related documentation supporting the findings involving modifications to mitigation measures, including a determination whether further environmental review is required (see CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164), shall be maintained in the project file with this MMRP and shall be made available to the public upon request.

Table 1–1. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Table

Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Schedule and Verification of Compliance
Section 3.1, Cultural Resources (Historic Architectural Resources)				
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1: Documentation of Historical Resource Prior to issuance of a demolition permit, the Project applicant shall undertake Historic American Building/Historic American Landscape Survey (HABS/HALS) documentation of the building features. The documentation shall be undertaken by a professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards	Project applicant and qualified architectural historian	Prior to issuance of demolition permits for construction	City of Glendale	Date: _____

■ Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Adopted as Conditions of Approval	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Schedule and Verification of Compliance
for Architectural History, History, or Architecture (as appropriate) to prepare written and photographic documentation of 1642 South Central Avenue. The specific scope of the documentation shall be reviewed and approved by City staff but shall include the following elements:				Initials: _____
Measured Drawings. A set of measured drawings shall be prepared that depict the existing size, scale, and dimension of the historic resource. The Project applicant shall submit original architectural drawings or an as-built set of architectural drawings (e.g., plans, sections, elevations). City staff will assist the consultant in determining the appropriate level of measured drawings.				Date: _____ Initials: _____
Historic American Buildings/Historic American Landscape Survey-Level Photographs. Either Historic American Buildings/Historic American Landscape Survey (HABS/HALS) standard large-format or digital photography shall be used. The scope of the digital photographs shall be reviewed by City staff for concurrence, and all digital photography shall be conducted according to the latest National Park Service (NPS) standards. The photography shall be undertaken by a qualified professional with demonstrated experience in HABS/HALS photography. Photograph views for the data set shall include contextual views; views of each side of the building and interior views, including any original interior features, where possible; oblique views of the building; and detail views of character-defining features.				
All views shall be referenced on a photographic key. This photographic key shall be on a map of the property and shall show the photograph number with an arrow to indicate the direction of the view. Historic photographs shall also be collected, reproduced, and included in the data set.				
The Project applicant shall transmit such documentation to the Glendale Public Library, the Glendale Historical Society, the Community Development Department, and the South Central Coastal Information Center. The HABS/HALS documentation scope will determine the requested documentation type for the Project site and the Project applicant will conduct outreach to identify other interested groups. All documentation will be reviewed and approved by City staff before any demolition or site permit is granted for the affected historical resources.				

■ Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Schedule and Verification of Compliance
Section 3.2, Noise and Vibration				
Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the Glendale (City) Department of Building and Safety, or designee, shall verify that all construction plans include notes stipulating the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grading and construction contractors shall use equipment that generates lower vibration levels, such as rubber-tired equipment rather than metal-tracked equipment. Construction haul truck and materials delivery traffic shall avoid Local Streets and Urban and Community and Neighborhood Collectors as defined in the City's Circulation Element. The construction contractor shall place noise- and vibration-generating construction equipment with the exception of equipment needed to completed shoring activities associated with the construction of the subterranean garage, away from sensitive uses. All construction staging areas away from sensitive uses. The construction contractor shall use on-site electrical sources to power equipment rather than diesel generators. The construction contractor shall ensure that a minimum 12-foot-high barrier, such as plywood structures or flexible sound control curtains, shall be erected between on the proposed project site and adjacent to the sensitive receptors to minimize the amount of noise during construction. A 12-foot-high construction noise barrier would provide approximately 12 dBA reduction to the closest residential receptors to the south. <p>All residential units located within 500 feet of the construction site shall be sent a notice regarding the construction schedule. A sign legible at a distance of 50 feet shall also be posted at the construction site. All notices and the signs shall indicate the dates and durations of construction activities, as well as provide a telephone number for the "noise disturbance coordinator."</p>	Project Applicant and their construction contractor	Prior to issuance of demolition permits for construction	City of Glendale	Date: _____ Initials: _____

■ Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Schedule and Verification of Compliance
<p>Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Construction Vibration Control</p> <p>Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the Glendale (City) Department of Building and Safety, or designee, shall verify that all construction plans include notes stipulating the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>Prepare a Monitoring Plan. The property owner shall undertake a monitoring program to avoid or reduce project-related construction vibration damage to adjacent buildings and/or structures and to ensure that any such damage is documented and repaired. The monitoring program shall apply to all potentially affected buildings and/or structures adjacent to the project site. Prior to issuance of any demolition or building permit, the property owner shall submit the construction vibration monitoring plan to the City for approval. The monitoring plan shall include, at a minimum, the following components, as applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>Vibration Analysis Refinement. Once the specific construction equipment list becomes available, potential vibration damage distance contours shall be refined.</p> <p>Vibration Monitoring. To ensure that construction vibration levels do not exceed the established standard, an acoustical consultant shall monitor vibration levels at each affected building and/or structure on adjacent properties when heavy construction occurs in close proximity. Based on direction from the acoustical consultant, vibratory construction activities that generate vibration levels in excess of the standard shall be prohibited.</p> <p>Alternative Construction Techniques. Should construction vibration levels be observed in excess of the established standard, the contractor(s) shall halt construction and put alternative construction techniques into practice. Following incorporation of the alternative construction techniques, vibration monitoring shall recommence to ensure that vibration levels at each affected building and/or structure on adjacent properties are not exceeded.</p> 	Project Applicant and their construction contractor	Prior to issuance of demolition permits for construction	City of Glendale	<p>Date: _____</p> <p>Initials: _____</p>