PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Burbank, the Lead Agency, the Community Development Department, Planning Division, after review of the Initial Study, found that the following project would not have a significant effect on the environment and has directed that this Mitigated Negative Declaration be prepared.

1. **Project Title:** PROJECT NO. 2006-105, VARIANCE, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, DEVELOPMENT REVIEW FOR WHOLE FOODS MARKET

2. **Project Location:** 901 West Alameda Avenue

3. **Project Description:** The applicant requests authorization to construct a 59,540 square foot Whole Foods grocery store with two levels of subterranean parking which includes a 5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet parking requirement. The applicant is requesting a variance for the front, side and rear setbacks to provide less than is permitted by code. The proposed setbacks for the project are a zero rear setback, a zero interior side setback, a 21' street-facing side setback and a 10' front setback. The applicant additionally is applying for a conditional use permit (CUP) in order to obtain a type 21 (off-sales general) a type 41 (eating place) and type 42 (wine tasting) alcohol licenses. The project is located in a Rancho Commercial (RC) zone. The type 21 license is a standard permit that many grocery stores obtain and the type 41 is a standard alcohol permit that restaurants obtain. The type 42 permit will allow wine tasting in an enclosed section of the store and will be incidental to the grocery food sales.

4. **Support Findings:** Based on the Initial Study, which is attached hereto and made a part hereof, it is the finding of the Community Development Department, Planning Division, that the above mentioned project is not an action involving any unmitigated significant environmental impacts.

The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and reflects the independent judgement of the City of Burbank. A copy of the Initial Study is attached, and environmental documentation is on file in the Office of the Community Development Department, Planning Division.

Prepared by the Community Development Department, Planning Division, ~~October 3, 2006~~ JANUARY 17, 2007

Greg Herrmann
Chief Assistant Community Development Director/City Planner

Attachments

EXHIBIT 10

California Environmental Quality Act

Initial Study

(as required by Sec. 15063 of the Public Resources Code)

To be completed by the lead agency

1. **Project Title:** Whole Food Market

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Burbank
Community Development Department
333 East Olive Avenue
Burbank, CA 91502

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Avital Shavit, Assistant Planner
(818) 238-5250

4. **Project Location:** 901 West Alameda Avenue

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** 901 Alameda Investors, LLC
2225 Glastonbury Road
Westlake Village, CA 91361

6. **General Plan Designation:** Shopping Center, Rancho Commerical

7. **Zoning:** Rancho Commercial

8. **Description of Project:** (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

   See Attachment A

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:**

   See Attachment B

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).**

    None

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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.

Greg Herrmann by pf
Signature

1/17/07
Date

GREG HERRMANN
Printed name

City of Burbank
For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

    a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

    b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

    c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

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

The project is located within an urbanized area of the City of Burbank and surrounded by developed properties of varying heights. The project is proposed to be a one-story building with a maximum height of 35' to the top of the pitch of the roof of the building with an architectural tower element at the corner at Alameda and Main that will be 50'tall. The architecture will conform to the standards set for the Rancho Commercial Zone which requires design elements that reflect the unique character of the neighborhood.

A building of this size and height at this location will not block any view corridors or degrade the visual character of the area. The site is current developed and the project is not located in a hillside area or in an area recognized in the municipal code as having protected scenic views. The existing views of the Hollywood Hills looking south across the project site is partially blocked by existing street trees that are approximately 50' or taller in height and the building would not block views in excess of the views currently blocked by these trees and the existing building. The surrounding single family residential area views will not be affected by the building as it is not directly in their line of sight to the Hollywood Hills. There is a 1000' distance from the proposed site to any northern R-1 neighbor. This distance will create a perspective view that will still allow for some views of the Hollywood Hills with the proposed building height.

The project will not have a substantial effect on light or glare or effect nighttime views. The existing building has external lighting and there are existing street lights on Main Street along the frontage of the project site. The building will have external lights as required for safety and identification purposes, but will be required as a condition of approval to not have lights that do not unnecessarily glare into any residential neighborhood. This project is situated in an urbanized area that has existing commercial establishments across the street from the site that produce similar ambient light levels during nighttime hours as expected from the proposed project. The project will be required to meet all Municipal Code standards with regard to light and glare. (1,2,16)

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	X

The City of Burbank does not contain farmland resources nor any land zoned for agricultural use. There are no agricultural resources in the vicinity of the project. As such, the project will have no impact on such lands. (3,4)

III. 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 With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	X	☐
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	X	☐
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	X	☐
d) Result in a temporary increase in the concentration of criteria pollutants (i.e., as a result of the operation of machinery or grading activities)?	☐	☐	X	☐
e) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	X	☐
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	X	☐

The site is located in the Los Angles County sub-area of the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). Los Angeles County is designated as a non-attainment area for ozone (O_3), particulate matter (PM_{10}), and carbon monoxide (CO) and a maintenance area for oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), which denotes that it had

once been a nonattainment area for the pollutant. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), the regional agency empowered to regulate stationary sources, maintains an extensive air quality monitoring network to measure criteria pollutant concentrations throughout the basin.

State and Federal Agencies have set ambient air quality standards for various pollutants. Both California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) have been established to protect public health and welfare. SCAQMD has prepared the CEQA Air Quality Handbook to provide guidance to those who analyze air quality impacts of proposed projects. The handbook provides information on the types of projects that will not result in significant air quality impacts as well as standard factors and formulas that can be used to quantify a project's air quality impact. The handbook also outlines standard mitigation measures that can be used to reduce the potential impact of a project.

The land use components of this project individually did not meet the thresholds identified by the SCAQMD as having a potentially significant impact. URS consultants produced a supplemental air quality analysis to support the Initial Study (IS) document produced by the City of Burbank Community Development Department (CDD) for the Whole Food Market Project. The purpose of this supplemental air quality analysis is to provide additional information to support the IS document and also respond to comments provided by the public.(20)

In general, the analysis of air quality impacts for any project can be separated into two phases: construction and operation. The following thresholds of significance have been established for criteria pollutants by the SCAQMD:

SCAQMD REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

Pollutant	*Reative Organic Compounds (ROC)*	*Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x)*	*Carbon Monoxide (CO)*	*Sulfur Oxides (SO_x)*	*Particulate Matter (PM_{10})*
Construction Threshold (lbs./day)	75	100	550	150	150
Post Construction Threshold (lbs./day)	55	55	550	150	150

Construction Emissions
Construction emissions are temporary emissions sources that result from construction activities including, but not limited to, the use of heavy equipment, grading and hauling of dirt, and construction traffic.

Total construction time for the project is anticipated to be approximately twenty (20) months and involve the excavation of the proposed parking garage, construction of a new concrete parking structure, and construction of the retail structure.

URS calculated construction emissions using emission factors available from SCAQMD's website, http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/hdbk.html, instead of using the URBEMIS2002 model because it is much more precise. Because construction emissions are below the significance thresholds, no mitigation measures are necessary, however it is recommended and required that the developer applies feasible Best Available Control Measures listed in SCAQMD's Rule 403, *Fugitive Dust*, during construction activities to reduce construction emissions. (20)

It was determined that the project, without mitigation, would not have a significant impact on air quality. Therefore, mitigation measures are not necessary.

While construction activities for the project do not exceed the regional significance thresholds for any criteria pollutants the project will still comply with all building codes to reduce fugitive dust.

Pollutant	*Reative Organic Compounds (ROC)*	*Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x)*	*Carbon Monoxide (CO)*	*Sulfur Oxides (SO_x)*	*Particulate Matter (PM_{10})*
Construction without Mitigation (lbs./day)	6.10	87.68	24.03	0.11	0.86

Operational Emissions
Operational emissions are the long term emissions resulting from a project. These include mobile source emissions, such as vehicles traveling to and from the project site, emissions from power usage by a building, and any point source emissions, such as smoke stacks that may directly expel pollutants into the air.

Based on a calculation using URBEMIS2002 the operational emissions estimates are listed in the chart below.

Pollutant	*Reative Organic Compounds (ROC)*	*Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x)*	*Carbon Monoxide (CO)*	*Sulfur Oxides (SO_x)*	*Particulate Matter (PM_{10})*
Operational Emissionsd (lbs./day)	37.59	38.66	408.30	0.32	28.57

A number of project attributes contribute to reduced operational emissions. For example, the project's proximity to many residents who may walk to the market and to bus stops all contribute to reduced vehicle trips which, in turn, reduce air quality emissions.

The majority of operational emissions from implementation of the proposed project would be from vehicles entering and exiting the underground parking garage. As previously shown in the IS, operational emissions are well below SCAQMD's significance thresholds, therefore the operation of the Whole Food Market is considered to have less-than-significant air quality impacts.

Furthermore, to prevent an accumulation of vehicle exhausts within the garage, a ventilation exhaust system will be installed within the garage. Although exact specifications are not available, the ventilation exhaust system can be considered as an air exchange system (i.e., bring in fresh air from outside and exchange it with vehicle exhausts.) The exhaust system(s) would expel the "garage" air through ductworks, which would extend beyond the roof of the Market. Through this process, vehicle exhausts would be diluted prior to being released to ambient air. The release of diluted vehicle exhausts is not expected to create detrimental health effects to sensitive receptors within close proximity of the Market. In addition, regional ambient air is expected to improve or at worst-case, remain the same because of other improvements made to the project area to promote the use of alternative transportation modes such as Class II bike lanes and wider sidewalks. These improvements would reduce the need for use of personal vehicles and reduce vehicle exhausts emissions as demonstrated conservatively in the traffic study.

Odors

The types of uses proposed as part of the project are not anticipated to result in significant objectionable odors in the area. Any unforeseen odors from the site would be controlled in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 402. (1,2,3,4,5,9,14)

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) 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
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	X
f) 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

The property is located within an urbanized area and has been previously utilized for commercial uses. There are no wildlife species or habitats on the site. The site is not located in an area that is part of a Habitat Conservation Plan or other plan intended for the protection of natural or wildlife resources. (1,2,4,5,10,14,15)

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	X

All of the property has been previously developed with commercial activities. There are no known sites or areas with historic, archaeological, or paleontological resources, ethnic cultural heritage, human remains, or religious or sacred uses.

The buildings at 832 Main Street and 901 West Alameda are not considered culturally or historically significant. Neither building is listed on a list of historically significant buildings in the City of Burbank's 1999 Historic Preservation Plan. The building at 832 Main Street is a common building with no unique characteristics and there is no evidence, other than the 50 year plus age of the building, to suggest that this building has cultural or historical significance.
(1,4,5,10,14)

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	X	☐
c) 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	☐

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	X

The most significant faults capable of producing earthquakes affecting the Burbank area are the San Andreas Fault, the Verdugo Fault system, and the San Gabriel Mountains (Sierra Madre – San Fernando) frontal fault system. There are no known Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault zones in the area.

The project is located in a regional basin which there is historical occurrence of liquefaction, or local geological or geotechnical and groundwater conditions indicate a potential for permanent ground displacement. However, a geotechnical report for the 901 West Alameda Site concluded that based on the type of soil and the saturation level of the soil with ground water that soil liquefaction will not occur at this site in the case of a seismic event. Soil testing conducted for the study found no water in a boring drilled to a depth of 51.5 feet.

As required by municipal code, the project will be required to provide a geotechnical report to the building department for review and will hold to the building standards accordingly. This project, as other projects with subterranean parking lots recently constructed in close proximity to the site, will not have a significant impact on geology or soils with compliance of all building requirements.

The project will be required to meet all current Building Code standards relating to seismic safety. The project will be a one story building with two levels of subterranean parking. Considering the scope of the project and the regulatory conditions placed on the construction; the proposed structure will not have any significant impact on the seismic safety of the site, building, occupants and the surrounding structures. (1,5,7,11,16,17)

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) 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
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) 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

e) 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?	☐	☐	☐	X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☐	X

The construction and operation of the project will not require the use or transport of hazardous substances. Because the site is located more than two (2) miles of the Bob Hope Airport, the location and scope of the project will not interfere with existing air traffic or otherwise result in air hazards. As the project is located within an urbanized area of the City, there is no expectation that the project would be subject to wildland fires or similar natural event.

The project will not impact existing emergency response or evacuation plans. The traffic study for the project found that the intersection at Alameda Avenue and Main Street would not be significantly impacted by the forecasted project traffic and that the intersection is at an existing level of service B and would remain at a level of service B or better with the required improvements. Considering the traffic study's findings, it is unlikely that project traffic would conflict with access to the emergency response location at Alameda and Oak Street and in the event of a major emergency or disaster it is unlikely that the store would be open for regular operations. Also, considering traffic will remain at a level of service B, access to the Alameda Care Center or any location in the neighborhood will not be compromised. The Alameda Care Center was contacted prior to Planning Board hearing by phone as well as they were noticed by mail and they had no objections to the project.
(1,2,7,16)

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☐	X

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	X	☐
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☐	X
f) Result in temporary modifications to existing drainage patterns that may increase the flow rate of stormwater, violate water quality discharge requirements, or result in substantial erosion on or off-site due to construction activities?	☐	☐	X	☐
g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	X
h) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	X
i) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	X
j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	X
k) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	X

The project is subject to all applicable requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). The types of discharges anticipated from a this size commercial project is not anticipated to result in violations to water quality standards.

The project site is presently occupied by a 42 ,653 SF post production office and 2,900 SF smaller post production office with a large surface parking lot and has a similar amount of impermeable surfaces as proposed for the subject property. Additionally, the project is not expected to increase the rate of flow such that additional storm drain facilities are required. The grading and building activities on site will be subject to all applicable requirements of the Building Code, Burbank Municipal Code and NPDES and will not result in substantial erosion on or off site. The site currently has minimal landscaping; approximately less than 10% of the site is covered by landscaping. The proposed development will have a similar percentage of hardscape and lot coverage and proposes more landscaping than currently on the site.

The property is located within an A0 100-year flood hazard zone that may have 1'-2' flood depths. However, this site is currently a developed with a one story building and staff does not believe that the

project attributes would increase the risk of flooding that would affect the building or the surrounding area. The site is not subject to, seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The increase in the amount of development on the site considering the built-out condition of the neighborhood does not pose a significant increase in risk for flooding that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death. The Building Division requires that all structures built in a flood zone provide a flood protection system that may consist of drains, pumps, or physical barriers at entrances to underground garages. The project must conform to this requirement as specified in the conditions of approval. The Building Division reviewed proposed plans and believes that with the implementation of flood protection barriers or devices the risk of flooding is not significant for the project including the subterranean garage.

The site is close in proximity to the crystal springs area where there are known sources of chromium in the soil. However, the site is currently not listed on any national disclosure list for ground water or soil contamination. Additionally, The project applicant, Tom Davies, received confirmation in May of 2006 that a "No Further Action Letter" from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (CRWQCB) was sent in July 1998 to a past property owner (Dr. Osman Aly, Campbell Soup Company). In the 1998 letter CRWQCB reported that soil samples taken from the site did not contain significant levels of any contaminates, and that the minor concentration of volatile organic compounds (VOC) found in the soil did not pose a threat to underlying groundwater as compared with CRWQCB VOC screening criteria. The letter to the project applicant also stated that if any contaminated soils are encountered during future site construction activities or redevelopment, the applicant is required to provide notification to (CRWQCB) and implement the appropriate clean up and heath and safety measures. The letter also stated that if any contaminated soils are discovered in the future that they shall be removed from the site and be disposed of at a legal point of disposal. (1,2,16,18,19)

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X

The proposal does not involve the development of infrastructure or other facilities that might divide an existing community.

The subject property is located within the Rancho area and is consistent with the land uses and intensities established by that Rancho Master Plan as adopted through zone text and general plan amendments. The Rancho Master Plan encourages the development of commercial projects that complement the surrounding residential equestrian community in this area of the City. The area is located in Rancho Commercial section of the rancho that is designed to encourage and support the development of community oriented retail and service commercial uses in conjunction with professional offices. The proposed Whole Foods store will serve as a food sales market, and a restaurant/coffee shop resource for the adjacent residential neighborhood. Additionally, the proposed Whole Foods store will provide offices in the area with a breakfast/lunch destination within walking

distance and a place to shop for groceries on the way home. The current zoning, Rancho Commercial, permits the use of the grocery store.

The project will not divide an existing neighborhood. The project is being constructed within the existing street infrastructure, and no streets or sidewalks are being removed or significantly modified. The existing infrastructure provides sufficient vehicle, pedestrian and equestrian access from the section of the Rancho north of Alameda Avenue to the section of the Rancho south of Alameda Avenue. The required bike lanes may be used for horses and will improve access along Main Street. The project does not create a significant amount of traffic that would potentially affect pedestrian or equestrian access at the intersection of Main Street and Alameda. The level of service at the intersection of Main and Alameda is currently a B and the forecasted level of service with the required road improvements will remain at a B or higher level of service. No change is being made to land use, or the regulations for horse keeping on existing R-1 horse keeping properties north of Alameda Avenue. The project complies with the existing general plan. .

The site is not located in an area that is part of a Habitat Conservation Plan or other plan intended for the protection of natural or community resources. (1,2,3,10,14)

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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
b) 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

The project is not expected to cause a loss in the availability of known mineral resources. No actual mineral resources are known to exist on the site. The project site is located in an urbanized area designated for non-mining-compatible uses, and mining use is not required by any applicable state law or local ordinance. The construction of the project is not considered to have a significant environmental impact. These findings were made subject to, and in compliance with, the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) of 1975 as amended. (1,2,10,11)

XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	X	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	X	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	X

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity due to construction activities above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	X	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	X

The nature of the project, once constructed, is not such that it is likely to result in a significant increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity. The project, once constructed, does not include uses that would require the operation of mechanical equipment that could be substantial source of noise or vibration in the area. However, exterior construction activities could result in a temporary increase in noise levels in the area. In order to prevent noise from affecting the adjacent residential neighborhood, the hours of construction have been limited.

According to the Noise Element of the General Plan, the subject property is located within a sixty (60) decibel contour area. As such, California Code of Regulations requires that an acoustical report be submitted for the project as part of the building permit process to insure that project exterior noise levels do not exceed sixty (60) decibels. The project will have to comply with all requirements of the acoustical study

The project is located more than two miles of the Bob Hope Airport, and thus it is not located in an area that would be subject to excessive aircraft noise. (1,2,13,15)

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X

The project does not involve the construction or demolition of dwellings units. There are no existing residences on the site that will require relocation or replacement housing as a result of the project. (1,2,4,14,15)

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	X
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	X
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	X
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	X
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	X

The project will not have a significant adverse impact on the provision of these services. The project will be required to pay applicable development impact fees for these services. Various City departments have reviewed the proposal and the project will be required to meet all of their code requirements. (1,15,16)

XIV. RECREATION	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	X

This project will not increase the amount of residential density as it does not contain any residential units; thus there is no impact on existing facilities nor is there a need for new or expanded facilities. The project will be required to pay the park development impact fees that have been adopted by the City. (1,15,16)

XV. STORM WATER – Would the proposed project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Storm water system discharges from areas for materials storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage delivery or loading docks or other work areas?	☐	☐	☐	X

b) A significantly environmental harmful increase in the flow rate or volume of storm water runoff?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) A significantly environmentally harmful increase in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Storm water discharges that would significantly impair the beneficial uses of receiving waters or areas that provide water quality benefits (e.g., riparian corridors, wetlands, etc.)?	☐	☐	☐	X
e) Harm to the biological integrity of drainage systems and water bodies?	☐	☐	☐	X

The project will not result in a significant increase in the amount of impermeable surface on the property. However, the site grading and paving activities will require the establishment of new on-site drainage facilities. The project will be required to comply with all applicable components of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) as well as the requirement of the Burbank Municipal Code regarding on-site drainage facilities. In accordance with the Burbank Municipal Code, a drainage plan and hydrology/hydraulic study may be required for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit. (1,15,16)

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	X	☐	☐
b) Result in the temporary street or lane closures that would result in either a change of traffic patterns or capacity that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system during construction activities (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	☐	X	☐
c) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	X
e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	X	☐	☐
f) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	X

g) Result in inadequate parking capacity resulting in an impact on traffic or circulation?	☐	☐	☐	X
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	X

As defined in the City of Burbank Traffic Study Policies and Procedures, a proposed project is considered to have a significant traffic impact at an intersection if the following two criteria are satisfied:

- The addition of project traffic to an intersection results in an increase of 0.020 or greater in the volume to capacity (V/C) ratio, and
- The intersection is projected to operate at a LOS E or F after the addition of the project traffic.

While the project will increase traffic volumes in the vicinity, a traffic study conducted by Parsons Brinkerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. has indicated that the amount of increase does meet the City of Burbank's threshold of significance with the exception of one intersection at Alameda Avenue and Buena Vista Street out of thirteen intersections analyzed for the project. In terms of mitigation for this intersection the study has recommended the following:

- Convert the unstriped right turn lane into a shared through/right turn lane to provide two exclusive left turn lanes, two through lane, and one shared through/right turn lane for the eastbound and westbound approaches. The improvements require additional right of way which has already been acquired by the city.

Additionally, the study recommends modifications to the proposed ingress/egress to the site to improve the general traffic circulation. The study recommends the following in terms of access to the site:

- The Main Street driveway shall be a full access driveway with stop controls at the driveway egress and at Valencia Avenue. The Alameda Avenue driveway shall operate as a right out only, stop controlled driveway.

- The loading area configuration shall be reversed with trucks entering the alley from Main Street and existing from Glenwood Place turning right at Oak Street to return to Main Street. Trucks are restricted from traveling on Glenwood Place north of Oak Street and from using other adjacent residential neighborhood streets.

The report concluded that if the recommended mitigation measure at Alameda Avenue and Buena Vista Street, driveway controls and truck access modifications are implemented, then the proposed project shall not have significant traffic impacts.

The City of Burbank utilizes the guidelines outlined in the 2004 Congestion Management Program (CMP) to analyze project impacts to the CMP network. These guidelines state that if a project is not expected to add more than 50 trips to a CMP arterial, or 150 trips to a CMP Freeway mainline segment, then no further CMP analysis is required. The only CMP facilities located within the project study area are the Golden State Freeway (I-5) and Ventura Freeway (SR-134). The traffic study showed that less than 150 trips will be utilizing either freeway during the AM and PM peak hour. This can be seen by examining the project traffic expected to travel through intersection #3 (Buena Vista Street and Riverside Drive) and intersection #11 (Alameda Avenue and Lake Street), shown in Figure

4 of the Traffic Study. Thus, because these volume criteria are not met, no further CMP analysis is required. In addition, the traffic study reviewed bus operations from the single bus line operating in the vicinity of the project and concluded that due to infrequent headways there would be no impact to transit services caused by the project.

Staff conducted a Saturday traffic analysis using data collected by a Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas to confirm that the project traffic generation would not create a significant impact when combined with a weekend equestrian center event and ambient levels of traffic.

For the Saturday analysis, traffic counts were taken at the four nearest intersections, identified in the Whole Foods Market Traffic Impact Study prepared by Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. dated October 2006, on Saturday, November 4, 2006 for the purpose of capturing existing conditions. In particular, the counts were taken to capture typical Saturday travel patterns and volumes, including weekend traffic to the nearby Los Angeles Equestrian Center (LAEC). These counts included traffic generated by an equestrian event occurring on November 4 which, according to LAEC staff, drew approximately 1500 spectators.

Applying the City's thresholds of significance to the four intersections studied for the Saturday analysis shows that the project does not create a significant impact at any of the four nearest intersections on a Saturday. With the addition of Saturday project traffic to future 2008 conditions, each of the four study intersections continues to operate at LOS C or better. Because this is within the City's standard of LOS D, there are no significant impacts at these intersections. Because these four nearby intersections do not show a significant impact, staff believes that there will be no significant impacts caused by the Whole Foods Market to the city's street system during the Saturday peak hour.

Staff additionally conducted visual analyses of vehicle, pedestrian, and equestrian access at the proposed project intersection of Main Street and Alameda Avenue. Field observations and video surveillance of the intersection verified the traffic study's findings. Additionally, it was observed that the intersection is operating at an acceptable level of service according to the City's established level of service definitions and that the amount of pedestrians using the intersection was low within the peak school hours (less than 20 pedestrians per hour). Staff did not observe in person or on a surveillance video any equestrian cross the intersection, although it is known equestrians use this area.

Fehr & Peers/Kaku Associates Inc. conducted a peer review of the traffic study and found that the report meets industry standards and accurately identifies the traffic and parking impacts of the project. The peer review reviewed the following elements of the traffic study: the proposed project trip generation, the trip generation pass-by credit, project trip distribution, and neighborhood impacts/cut through traffic. Fehr & Peers/Kaku Associates Inc. found the analysis of these items to be correct and consistent with industry standards. Additionally, the peer review found that the estimates of project traffic to be consistent with actual field data collected at three nearby Whole Foods Markets.

Additionally, Burbank Public Works has reviewed the traffic study, made recommendations to revise the applicant's plans and supports the findings.

The project is not located in a manner that would interfere with any existing or proposed air traffic patterns.

Overall, the project is parked consistent with code standards at 5 per 1000 parking ratio and this amount of parking is well above the expected demand. With the implementation of the recommended

4 of the Traffic Study. Thus, because these volume criteria are not met, no further CMP analysis is required. In addition, the traffic study reviewed bus operations from the single bus line operating in the vicinity of the project and concluded that due to infrequent headways there would be no impact to transit services caused by the project.

Staff conducted a Saturday traffic analysis using data collected by a Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas to confirm that the project traffic generation would not create a significant impact when combined with a weekend equestrian center event and ambient levels of traffic.

For the Saturday analysis, traffic counts were taken at the four nearest intersections, identified in the Whole Foods Market Traffic Impact Study prepared by Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. dated October 2006, on Saturday, November 4, 2006 for the purpose of capturing existing conditions. In particular, the counts were taken to capture typical Saturday travel patterns and volumes, including weekend traffic to the nearby Los Angeles Equestrian Center (LAEC). These counts included traffic generated by an equestrian event occurring on November 4 which, according to LAEC staff, drew approximately 1500 spectators.

Applying the City's thresholds of significance to the four intersections studied for the Saturday analysis shows that the project does not create a significant impact at any of the four nearest intersections on a Saturday. With the addition of Saturday project traffic to future 2008 conditions, each of the four study intersections continues to operate at LOS C or better. Because this is within the City's standard of LOS D, there are no significant impacts at these intersections. Because these four nearby intersections do not show a significant impact, staff believes that there will be no significant impacts caused by the Whole Foods Market to the city's street system during the Saturday peak hour.

Staff additionally conducted visual analyses of vehicle, pedestrian, and equestrian access at the proposed project intersection of Main Street and Alameda Avenue. Field observations and video surveillance of the intersection verified the traffic study's findings. Additionally, it was observed that the intersection is operating at an acceptable level of service according to the City's established level of service definitions and that the amount of pedestrians using the intersection was low within the peak school hours (less than 20 pedestrians per hour). Staff did not observe in person or on a surveillance video any equestrian cross the intersection, although it is known equestrians use this area.

Fehr & Peers/Kaku Associates Inc. conducted a peer review of the traffic study and found that the report meets industry standards and accurately identifies the traffic and parking impacts of the project. The peer review reviewed the following elements of the traffic study: the proposed project trip generation, the trip generation pass-by credit, project trip distribution, and neighborhood impacts/cut through traffic. Fehr & Peers/Kaku Associates Inc. found the analysis of these items to be correct and consistent with industry standards. Additionally, the peer review found that the estimates of project traffic to be consistent with actual field data collected at three nearby Whole Foods Markets.

Additionally, Burbank Public Works has reviewed the traffic study, made recommendations to revise the applicant's plans and supports the findings.

The project is not located in a manner that would interfere with any existing or proposed air traffic patterns.

Overall, the project is parked consistent with code standards at 5 per 1000 parking ratio and this amount of parking is well above the expected demand. With the implementation of the recommended

truck route to the site there will be sufficient access for truck deliveries through the back existing alley. The traffic study has recommended some improvements to the site that would facilitate truck movements into the alley as well as the Public Works Department will require the plans to comply with engineering standards for truck turning radii. The project site is located in close proximity to a large residential community and near a number of bus routes. As such, the project is designed to be pedestrian friendly with deign features such as a sidewalk café that may attract pedestrian patrons. Likewise, the nature of the project is consistent with programs directed towards the use of alternative transportation (1,2,5,6,8,15,16)

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	X
e) 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
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	X

The project site is already served by utilities. Any additional water mains or connections needed as a result of this project shall be paid for by the applicant as required by the City. Any new connections to the County storm drain system will not be of a scale to result in significant environmental impact or require substantial upgrades to existing facilities. Pursuant to City requirements, the applicant will be required to prepare a sewer study to determine whether the size and number of sewer connections is adequate and in accordance with code will have to comply with all requirements of the sewer study. However, the City's wastewater treatment plant will not be significantly impacted by this project. (1 ,16)

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) 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	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	X

The project site is located within an urban area on a previously developed site. There are no significant natural habitats or historical/prehistorical artifacts on the site. (1,4,5,10)

The cumulative impacts of the proposed project in conjunction with other projects in the vicinity are not significant. The traffic study conducted for the project included forecasted future traffic conditions based on cumulative projects in the surrounding area that are entitled for future construction. There are no proposed projects on the abutting or adjacent properties that would create a cumulative significant negative impact. The project does not pose any significant impacts with the required mitigation. Mitigation for any significant impact will be required at the time of construction and completed prior to the project opening. The mitigation measures are including the mitigated negative declaration and will be part of the conditions of approval for the project entitlement. The project will be required to conform to Burbank Municipal Code including the Uniform Building Code. (1 ,15,16)

The project will not create any nuisances or other environmental effects that would result in adverse health effects on the population. (1,16)

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT 2006-105: VARIANCE, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, DEVELOPMENT REVIEW
WHOLE FOODS MARKET

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

OVERVIEW: The applicant requests authorization to construct a 59,540 square foot Whole Foods grocery store with two levels of subterranean parking which includes a 5/1000 parking ratio. The applicant is requesting a variance for the front, side and rear setbacks to provide less than is permitted by code. The proposed setbacks for the project are a 0' rear setback, zero interior side setback, a 21' street-facing side setback and a 10' front setback. The applicant additionally is applying for a conditional use permit (CUP) in order to obtain a type 21 (off-sales general) a type 41 (eating place) and type 42 (wine tasting) alcohol licenses. The project is located in a Rancho Commercial (RC) zone. The type 21 license is a standard permit that many grocery stores obtain and the type 41 is a standard alcohol permit that restaurants obtain. The type 42 permit will allow wine tasting in an enclosed section of the store and will be incidental to the grocery food sales.

LOCATION: 901 West Alameda at the corner of Alameda Avenue and Main Street.

REQUIRED PROJECT APPROVALS

Discretionary approvals and permits that are required from the City of Burbank Planning Board include:

- CUP for alcohol licenses
- Variance for reduced setbacks
- Development Review for construction of a 59,540 SF building with two levels of subterranean parking

CODE REQUIREMENTS AND CONDITIONS OF PROJECT

<u>Air Quality</u>

1 Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall submit a Fugitive Dust Control Plan for approval by the Building Official. The plan shall include:

- Designation of a full-time, on-site monitoring firm that is experienced in environmental control, applicability and compliance with AQMD Rules 402 and 403, recommended dust control including fugitive dust sources, dust control measures implementation responsibility, and monitoring responsibility,

- A site air monitoring program including meteorological stations, personal dust monitoring, site perimeter and dust monitoring, implementation responsibility, and a response to monitoring findings,
- A description of the best high wind control measures and track-out controls,
- A schedule of weekly reports to be submitted to the Building Official for approval including a summary of activities, a description and location of inactive areas, a record of visible dust emissions, a record of high wind conditions, and a list of mitigation measures for any unexpected problems.

2 Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall submit a plan for approval by the Community Development Department and Public Works Department indicating:

- The type, location and extent of all track-out control paving,
- The locations and type of all track-out control devices and procedures
- The boundaries of public paved surface to be maintained by sweeping or vacuuming,
- The number of water trucks provided,
- The number, type, make, and model

3 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the developer shall include the following measures on construction plan and in all construction contracts to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director:

- The Construction Contractor shall select the construction equipment used on site based upon low emission factors and a high level of energy efficiency as reported by the federal government.
- The Construction Contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.
- The Construction Contractor shall time the construction activities so as not to interfere with peak hour traffic and minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the project site; if necessary, a flag person shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways.
- The Construction Contractor shall provide ridesharing and transit incentives for the construction crew, such as free bus passes and preferred carpool parking.

4 Prior to issuance of building permits, the Construction Contractor shall verify, to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director, that the project will utilize, to the extent possible, precoated/natural colored building materials, water based or low volatile organic compound (VOC) coatings, and coating transfer or spray equipment with high transfer efficiency, such as high volume low pressure (HVLP) method, or manual coatings application.

5 Construction related exhaust and dust emissions shall be controlled through the use of energy efficient equipment that produces low particulate and nitrogen oxides emissions.

6 All grading, excavation, and other activities involving the use of fossil fuel powered equipment shall cease during second and third stage smog alerts as designated by the SCAQMD.

7 Use a water truck during grading. All unpaved demolition and construction areas are to be wetted as necessary during excavation to reduce dust emissions and meet SCAQMD Rule 403.

8 Cease grading and water truck use during periods of high winds, or when wind speeds exceed 25 mph.

9 Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall submit a truck haul route plan for approval by the Traffic Engineering Division of the Public Works Department.

10 All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose material shall be covered or shall maintain at least two (2) feet of freeboard.

Flood Control

11 The applicant shall comply with all Building Division requirements for flood prevention within the subterranean garage which may consist of a system with drains, pumps or physical barriers.

Noise

12 Hours of construction are limited to between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. Interior tenant improvements and other interior construction activities may be exempted from these restrictions with the approval of the Community Development Director.

13 To ensure that construction personnel are aware of the restricted construction times, the developer shall install professionally made sign(s) 2 ft. X 3 ft. in size in location(s) satisfactory to the City Planner that states, "NOTICE: THE CITY OF BURBANK LIMITS EXTERNAL CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES OF THIS PROJECT (DEMOLITION, EXCAVATION, GRADING, ACTUAL CONSTRUCTION AND LANDSCAPING) TO ONLY MONDAYS THROUGH FRIDAYS FROM 7:00 AM TO 6:00 PM."

Traffic/Transportation

14 The City of Burbank is upgrading Main Street to a Class II bicycle route by striping bicycle lanes on both sides of the street. The applicant shall pay the city's cost to ensure that bicycle lanes are maintained as part of any street modifications required for circulation to and from the site is part of this project. These improvements shall be made before the operation of the proposed market. To further distinguish the bicycle lane as a shared equestrian lane, a horse symbol shall be painted in the bicycle lane pavement to alert riders, cyclists, and motorists that the bike lane is to be shared with equestrians or other approved warning device.

15 Currently, Main Street has no specific features designed to improve horse travel. The project will attract new vehicles to the area that are unaware of the horse travel on Main Street. Therefore, a yellow horse travel warning sign, as described in the traffic study, shall be posted on the sidewalk at the northeast corner of Main Street and Alameda

16 The loading area configuration should be designed so that trucks entering the alley from Main Street and exiting from Glenwood Place turning right on Oak Street to return to Main Street. Trucks are restricted from traveling on Glenwood Place north of Oak Street and from using the other adjacent residential neighborhood streets.

17 The project shall provide a minimum of a 5' rear alley dedication prior to the issuance of a building permit

18 The project shall provide up to a 4' dedication along the west side of Main Street prior to the issuance of a building permit. The applicant shall pay to widen the street to provide for a right hand turn lane at the northwest corner of Almeda Avenyue and Main Street, and two-way left turn lane north of the intersection of Alameda Avenue and Main Street to the satisfaction of the Public Works Department prior the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

19 A traffic calming device shall be placed at the entrance to Valencia from Main and paid for by the applicant if traffic volumes meet or exceed the significant threshold standard set by the City of Burbank within two years of the project opening.

20 The developer must pay in to a reserve fund, the estimated cost of installing speed bumps in the residential streets in the adjacent neighborhood. These funds may be used (within 2 years of project opening) if the neighborhood elects through a Public Works petition process to install speed bumps. These funds may be used for the following street segments.

Between Main Street and South Victory Boulevard
Elm Avenue
Chavez Street
Valencia Avenue
Elm Avenue
Lutge Avenue
Linden Avenue
Cedar Avenue
Spazier Avenue
Elmwood Avenue
Providencia Avenue

Between Alameda Street and Riverside Drive
Chavez Street

Between Verdugo and Oak
Glenwood Place

ATTACHMENT B
Project 2006-105, 901 West Alameda Avenue

PHYSICAL SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The project site is located on 1.74 acres within an urbanized area of Burbank. The property has street frontage along Main Street and Alameda Avenue The property is a developed flat lot in the Rancho area of Burbank.

ON-SITE AND SURROUNDING LAND USES

The site is currently improved with a 42,653 SF post production office and 2,900 SF smaller post production office that have light industrial and commercial uses in it. The 42,653 SF office has been previously used as a bakery manufacturing and distribution center for Martinos Bakeries.

Most of the properties in the vicinity (around the corner of Main Street and Alameda Avenue) are improved commercial uses, particularly retail shops and restaurants. The greater surrounding community is a residential horsekeeping area. There is also a residential care facility in the area, child care and school uses.

REGULATORY SETTING

The project is subject to all applicable regulations of the City of Burbank. The project must be consistent with the City's General Plan, the Burbank Rancho Master Plan, and the Municipal Code, including, but not limited to, the Zoning Ordinance.

City of Burbank General Plan

The City of Burbank General Plan is intended to serve as the development blueprint for City and established goals, objectives, and policies for the City's decision-makers and staff to utilize in making judgments as to the future development of the City. The Land Use Element of the General Plan, which was adopted in 1988, regulates growth within the City. The land use designation for the project site is Shopping Center, Rancho Commerical.

Rancho Master Plan

The Rancho Master Plan was adopted in 1993 via zone text and general plan amendments. The plan established general land use policies for the area as well as established specific zoning standards to implement those policies. The plan established particular zones including a "Rancho Commercial" zone which the project is located in for more localized land use planning.

The subject property is located within the "Rancho Commercial" zone of the Rancho. This zone is intended to encourage and support the development of community oriented retail and service commercial uses in conjunction with professional offices.

Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 31 of the Burbank Municipal Code)

The Zoning Ordinance separates the City into districts and establishes development standards and appropriate uses for each district. The subject property is presently zoned Rancho Commerical.

ORDINANCE NO. 3340

In 1993, the City of Burbank adopted Ordinance No. 3340 in order to address the burden of new development on existing public facilities (specifically library, police, fire, parks and recreation, and transportation facilities). These development impact fees are collected by the City prior the issuance of building permits or, in certain circumstances, prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. Fees that are collected under the Ordinance are distributed among the various City agencies listed above. Payment of these fees does not eliminate the need for project specific mitigation measures or cumulative development concerns. However, the City of Burbank generally accepts that payment of these fees will substantially offset certain City-wide impacts related to the above service providers.

CUMULATIVE

Cumulative impacts consider the effects of two or more projects which may produce impacts that are considerable or compounded when viewed as a whole. Cumulative impacts relate to the effects of the project that have recently been constructed or approved or that are planned in the near future.

There are three (3) projects that have been, or are in the process of being, entitled within the vicinity of the project that must be considered in an analysis of the cumulative impacts of this project. The projects are as follow:

- Carmax Auto Dealer, Horizon Date 2006: A 4.7 acre car dealership Located at 1000 South Flower Street.
- Medical Office Building Project Phase II, Horizon Date 2007: A 155,000 GSF medical-dental office building located at 201 South Buena Vista Street
- Catalina Property Phase I, Horizon Date 2007: 325,000 OEGSF of general office. Located at the southeast corner of Bob Hope Drive and Alameda Avenue.

The analysis of cumulative impacts is governed by Section 15130 of the State Guidelines for the California Environmental Quality Act. Projects that may not have significant impacts individually may have cumulatively considerable impacts when combined with other projects in the vicinity.

ATTACHMENT C
Project 2006-105, 901 West Alameda Avenue
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Materials listed in this bibliography are available for review at the City of Burbank Planning Division Public Counter.

1. Proposed Development Plans and Applications

2. City of Burbank, "Burbank Municipal Code," Chapter 31, Zoning, Burbank, California

3. City of Burbank "Zoning Map," Burbank, California

4. City of Burbank, Community Development Department, "Land Use Element of the City of Burbank General Plan," Burbank, California, adopted by Burbank City Council on May 31, 1988, Resolution No. 22,354

5. Envicom Corporation, "Land Use Element EIR," Prepared for the City of Burbank Community Development Department, February 1988.

6. Institute of Traffic Engineers, Trip Generation, Sixth Edition, 1997

7. City of Burbank, Community Development Department, "Safety Element of the City of Burbank General Plan," Burbank, California, adopted by Burbank City Council on July 1, 1997, Resolution No. 25,087

8. City of Burbank, Community Development Department, "Transportation Element of the City of Burbank General Plan," Burbank, California, adopted by Burbank City Council in 1964

9. South Coast Air Quality Management District, CEQA Handbook, April 1993

10. City of Burbank, Community Development Department, "Open Space/Conservation Element of the City of Burbank General Plan," Burbank, California, adopted by Burbank City Council on December 19, 1972, Resolution No. 16,280

11. Mineral Land and Classification Map - California Division of Mines and Geology, May 25, 1979

12. Flood Insurance Rate Map, Community Panel Number 065018 0005 C January 20, 1999

13. City of Burbank, Community Development Department, "Noise Element of the City of Burbank General Plan," Burbank, California, adopted by Burbank City Council on December 8, 1992, Resolution No. 23,777

14. The Rancho Master Plan Advisory Committee The Community Development Department, The Planning Center Master Plan Consultant, Crain and Associates Consulting Traffic Engineers. "Rancho Commercial Recreation Master Plan" prepared for The Planning Board and City Council in Joint Study Session April 28, 1992.

15. Parsons Brinkerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. "Whole Foods Market Traffic Impact Study," prepared for the City of Burbank Community Development Department, January 2007.

16. Department Comments from: Building, Public Works, Burbank Water and Power, Parks and Recreation, Fire, Police, and Redevelopment Agency staff

17. Applied Earth Sciences. "Geotechnical Investigation Proposed Mix-Use Building Project at 901 West Alameda Avenue", prepared for Captions Inc. February 17, 2006

18. Letters from California Regional Water Quality Control Board to Tom Davies and Dr Osman Aly, Campbell Soup Company.

19. San Fernando Basin Plume Maps, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Water Resources Business Unit, City Groundwater Management Group.

20. URS Coproration. "Supplemental Air Quality Analysis: Whole Food Market 901 West Alameda Avenue Burbank, California", prepared for the City of Burbank Community Development Department.

Summary of Mitigation Measures
Project No. 2005-105
Whole Foods Market
901 West Alameda Avenue

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

1. To the satisfaction of the Community Development Department and the Public Works Department covert the unstriped right turn lane into a shared through/right turn lane to provide two exclusive left turn lanes, two through lane, and one shared through/right turn lane for the eastbound and westbound approaches. The improvements require additional right of way which has already been acquired by the city.

2. To the satisfaction of the Community Development Department and the Public Works Department the Main Street driveway should be a full access driveway with stop controls at the driveway egress and at Valencia Avenue. The Alameda Avenue driveway should operate as a right out only, stop controlled driveway.

PROJECT MONITORING CHECKLIST
(CEQA Mitigation Measures)

PROJECT NAME CUP, DR and Variance Project No. 2006-105 Whole Foods Market ..... FILE NUMBER 901 West Alameda Avenue

APPROVAL DATE proposed February 6, 2007 ..... ENVIRONMENTAL Prepared January 17, 2007 .....

All of the mitigation measures required for this project are consolidated on this checklist for the purpose of monitoring them for completion as a part of the project approval process. Each responsible department/division will assign a deadline for completion of the conditions it has required. Numbers of conditions are entered in the appropriate column. A signature at each point in the approval process indicates completion of conditions required by a responsible department/division at that point in time. Final approval for C of O must be obtained from the Planning Division.

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT/ DIVISION	I DEMOLITION	II DURING DEMOLITION	III GRADING	IV BUILDING PERMIT	V DURING CONSTRUCTION	VI CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY	VII OTHER	ONGOING
CDD - Planning					1,2	1,2		

SUPPLEMENTAL AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS

WHOLE FOODS MARKET
901 WEST ALAMEDA AVENUE
BURBANK, CALIFORNIA

Prepared for

City of Burbank
Community Development Department
333 East Olive Avenue
Burbank, CA 91502

January 16, 2007

Prepared by

URS

URS Corporation
2020 East First Street, Suite 400
Santa Ana, CA 92705
(714) 835-6886 Fax: (714) 433-7701

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

URS was requested by the City of Burbank to provide a supplemental air quality analysis to support the Initial Study (IS) document produced by the City of Burbank Community Development Department (CDD) for the Whole Food Market Project. The purpose of this supplemental air quality analysis is to provide additional information to support the IS document and also respond to comments provided by the public.

As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), CDD disseminated the IS to centralized locations (e.g., library, City Hall) within the affected community for public review and to solicit public comments regarding the implementation of the Whole Food Market. No comments were received during the public review period that were directly germane to the IS, however, after the public review period ended, CDD received comments disputing the finding of less-than-significant air quality impacts provided in the IS. The comments specifically state that with the information provided in the IS, the proposed project would cause significant air quality impacts during construction and operation of the Whole Food Market, which contradicts the findings provided in the IS.

2.0 AIR QUALITY ASSESSMENT METHOD

To determine whether the implementation of a proposed project would create significant air quality impacts, construction and operational emissions from a proposed project are quantified and compared to the significance thresholds established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). SCAQMD's significance thresholds are used because the proposed project site is located within their jurisdiction. In addition, SCAQMD provides a document, *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, October 1993, which provides guidelines on how to prepare an air quality analysis. CDD adhered to the SCAQMD's CEQA guidelines during the preparation of the IS.

3.0 IMPACT DETERMINATION

Construction and Operational emissions were quantified using the worst-case scenario and traffic data provided in the traffic impact study, *Whole Foods Market Traffic Impact Study, October 2, 2006, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.*, respectively.

3.1 *CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS*

To accurately estimate air quality impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed project, data provided by the developer and reasonable assumptions were made to assess significance of air quality impacts. To provide an accurate estimate, project-specific data is required, however because it's in the planning stage, precise logistics are not available, therefore, assumptions were made based on realistic conditions and experience with similar projects. It is assumed that construction activities will only occur five days each week. Each of the construction phases is analyzed in the following manner to determine the worst-case scenario:

1. Demolition,
2. Site Grading,
3. Soil Excavation, and
4. Construction of Building

3.1.1 Demolition

Demolition activities are expected to be completed in approximately six weeks. The existing structures are wood-framed with concrete foundation and concrete tilt-up, therefore minimal equipment would be required to demolish and haul the debris to a certified landfill. It is envisioned that the following demolition equipment would be utilized: an excavator with the proper attachments (e.g., buckets, claws, concrete breaker), a tracked loader, water truck, street sweeper, and multiple haul trucks. Based on the size of the buildings to be razed (i.e., 45,553 square feet), it is estimated that approximately 15,000 cubic yards (cyds) of material would be generated. As such, approximately 2,500 cyds would be generated each week or 500 cyds per day. Trucks hauling demolition debris typically has a capacity of 20 cyds, therefore, approximately 25 daily truck trips are required to dispose of the debris generated.

3.1.2 Site Grading

After the demolition of the existing structures and removal of all debris, site grading and soil excavation activities would be initiated. It is assumed for soil compaction purposes and efficiency of exporting unused soil, the remainder of the project site, slightly over one-third of an acre (i.e., 0.37 acre), which is the difference between the size of the Whole Food Market (i.e., 60,000 square feet) and total lot size (i.e., 76,118 square feet), would be graded and compacted prior to excavation of the soil for the underground parking structure. It is also assumed that the perimeter can be graded and compacted within one week duration. These are considered reasonable assumptions because of area to be compacted is relatively small and during soil excavation activities, haul trucks

traversing on the site would further compact the soil to optimal density. Site grading will also utilize similar equipment used for soil excavation with the exception of the haul trucks. As such, air pollutants generated from site grading activities would be substantially less than the other and not discussed any further in this document.

3.1.3 Soil Excavation

To construct the two-level underground parking garage, approximately 55,000 cyds of soil have to be hauled off-site within nine weeks. Because the site is relatively small (i.e., 1.75 acres), soil excavation activities will occur after the perimeter of the underground parking structure has been overexcavated and compacted. During the soil excavation activity, it is assumed that the similar construction equipment used for site grading and demolition would be retained (i.e., an excavator with a large bucket (e.g., 2-3 cyds), water truck, street sweeper, and multiple haul trucks) and a tractor/loader/backhoe to excavate the 55,000 cyds. To complete the soil hauling within nine weeks, approximately 1,222 cyds has to be hauled each day, assuming a five day work week. Soil hauling trucks typically have a capacity of 14 cyds, therefore, approximately 88 daily truck trips are required to dispose of the excavated soil. It is estimated that the trucks will travel 20 miles roundtrip.

3.1.4 Construction of Building

The construction of the Market would require numerous workers and different types of construction equipment. Forklifts, aerial-lifts, trenching equipment, air compressors, concrete trucks, and electric generators are typical construction building equipment. These small equipment and the worker's vehicles generate much less air pollutants when compared to the other construction activities, therefore, will not be assessed any further in this document.

Based on the assessment of the construction phases, air pollutants emitted on a typical day from off-site soil hauling activities are quantified and compared to the SCAQMD's significant thresholds.

3.1.5 Conclusion of Construction Activities Analysis

As shown in Table 1, *Construction Emissions on a Typical Soil Hauling Day*, all criteria pollutants are well below the SCAQMD' significance thresholds. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required. Please note that construction emissions were calculated using emission factors available from SCAQMD's website, http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/hdbk.html, instead of using the URBEMIS2002 model because it is much more precise. Because construction emissions are below the significance thresholds, no mitigation measures are necessary, however it is recommended that the developer applies feasible Best Available Control Measures listed in SCAQMD's Rule 403, *Fugitive Dust*, during construction activities to reduce construction emissions.

TABLE 1. CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS ON A TYPICAL SOIL HAULING DAY

Source [1]	Parameter 1 [1]	Parameter 2 [1]	Parameter 3 [1]	ROG		CO		NOx		SOx		P
				Emission Factor	Emission (lbs/day)	Emission Factor	Emission (lbs/day)	Emission Factor	Emission (lbs/day)	Emission Factor	Emission (lbs/day)	Emission Factor
CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT:												
Construction												
Tractor/Loader/Backhoe		4 hours/day	1 unit	0.131 lb/hr	0.52	0.414 lb/hr	1.66	0.830 lb/hr	3.32	0.001 lb/hr	0.00	0.0639 lb/hr
Excavator		8 hours/day	1 unit	0.182 lb/hr	1.45	0.598 lb/hr	4.78	1.423 lb/hr	11.38	0.001 lb/hr	0.01	0.078 lb/hr
Water Truck		8 hours/day	1 unit	0.001 lb/hr	0.01	0.006 lb/hr	0.04	0.036 lb/hr	0.29	0.00005 lb/hr	0.0004	0.001 lb/hr
Street Sweeper	8 hours/day		1 unit	0.196 lbs/mile	1.57	0.567 lbs/mile	4.54	1.028 lbs/mile	8.22	0.00090 lbs/mile	0.007	0.082 lbs/mile
Haul Trucks (soil)	20 miles/trip	9 trips/day	10 unit	0.001 lbs/mile	2.21	0.006 lbs/mile	9.94	0.036 lbs/mile	64.14	0.00005 lbs/mile	0.082	0.001 lbs/mile
Worker's vehicles		40 miles/day	6 employee	0.001 lbs/mile	0.33	0.013 lbs/mile	3.08	0.001 lbs/mile	0.33	0.00001 lbs/mile	0.002	0.00008 lbs/mile
Fugitive Dust		1.75 acres	22 days/month									0.11 tons/acre-mo
Daily Total (lbs/day)					**6.10**		**24.03**		**87.68**		**0.11**	
SCAQMD Daily Construction Thresholds (pounds/day)					***75***		***550***		***100***		***150***	
Exceed SCAQMD Significance Threshold (Y/N)					**NO**		**NO**		**NO**		**NO**	

NOTES:

[1] Hours of operation, haul distances, number of employees, type of equipment, and traveling distance were assumed based on experience with similar projects.

[2] Construction equipment composite emission factors were derived from SCAQMD web site - http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/hdbk.html for year 2007.

[3] Emission factors for fuel truck and workers vehicles are derived from SCAQMD's web page - http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/hdbk.html for year 2007. For haul trucks, the heavy-heavy-duty emission factors were used.

[4] PM10 emissions from fugitive dust were calculated using document found on CARB's web site - http://www.arb.ca.gov/ei/areasrc/ONEHTM/ONE7-8.HTM.

3.2 *OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS*

The majority of operational emissions from implementation of the proposed project would be from vehicles entering and exiting the underground parking garage. As previously shown in the IS, operational emissions are well below SCAQMD's significance thresholds, therefore the operation of the Whole Food Market is considered to have less-than-significant air quality impacts.

Furthermore, to prevent an accumulation of vehicle exhausts within the garage, a ventilation exhaust systems will be installed within the garage. Although exact specifications are not available, the ventilation exhaust systems can be considered as an air exchange system (i.e., bring in fresh air from outside and exchange it with vehicle exhausts.) The exhaust system(s) would expel the "garage" air through ductworks, which would extend beyond the roof of the Market. Through this process, vehicle exhausts would be diluted prior to being released to ambient air. The release of diluted vehicle exhausts is not expected to create detrimental health effects to sensitive receptors within close proximity of the Market. In addition, regional ambient air is expected to improve or at worst-case, remain the same because of other improvements made to the project area to promote the use of alternative transportation modes such as Class II bike lanes and wider sidewalks. These improvements would reduce the need for use of personal vehicles and reduce vehicle exhausts emissions as demonstrated conservatively in the traffic study.

4.0 CONCLUSION

As discussed above, construction and operational emissions from the implementation of the Whole Food Market would create air quality impacts that are considered less-than-significant. It is also determined that the project as proposed to be constructed (i.e., with exhaust systems that expel diluted vehicle exhausts through the roof) should not impact sensitive receptors during the operation phase of the proposed project.