

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:**
City of Burbank Bicycle Master Plan
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**
City of Burbank
150 North Third Street
Burbank, California 91502
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**
Cory Wilkerson, Assistant Transportation Planner
(818) 238-5206
4. **Project Location:**
Citywide
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**
City of Burbank
Community Development Department
150 North Third Street
Burbank, California 91502
6. **General Plan Designation:**
All designations citywide
7. **Zoning:**
All zones citywide
8. **Description of Project:**
The City of Burbank is updating its Bicycle Master Plan (Plan), which was adopted in 2003. The Plan serves as an official policy document addressing the development of programs and facilities designed to effectuate the goals of the City of Burbank, the primary being to pursue the vision that Burbank is an urban environment that fosters bicycle travel as a healthy, environmentally sustainable transportation alternative that reduces traffic congestion and improves the character of the community. The resulting Plan will continue to ensure Burbank's eligibility for funding bicycle facilities and programs through various grant opportunities, including the State of California's Bicycle Transportation Account. This Plan is a comprehensive policy document to coordinate all bicycle-related plans, programs, and projects within the City of Burbank in a manner consistent with regional, state, and federal guidelines. Further implementation of specific projects and programs contained in the plan may require project specific environmental documentation under CEQA at the time the project is considered.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**
The proposed city-wide Plan outlines proposed projects along corridors that traverse all areas within the City of Burbank, connecting parks, schools, residential neighborhoods, and commercial districts.

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

The City of Burbank is the lead agency. Additional approval from the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority is required to ensure consistency with Section 891.2 of the California Streets and Highways Code.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Storm Water |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> 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.

Signature
Michael Forbes

Printed name

November 20, 2009

Date
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

<u>I. AESTHETICS</u> – 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-d) The proposed Plan would not result in development or other activity that would impair a scenic vista or resources, or otherwise detract from the visual character of the community. For safety reasons, some of the proposed projects would require lighting along off-street corridors which would be consistent with existing on-street lighting improvements. There are no related impacts.

<u>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:</u> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-c) There are no lands designated for agricultural use in the vicinity of the proposed Plan, nor are any lands entered into local government contract, as authorized by the Williamson Act. The proposed Plan would not result in the conversion of Prime or Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses or prompt additional changes in the existing environment resulting in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use. There are no related impacts.

<u>III. AIR QUALITY</u> -- 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-f) Burbank is located in the South Coast Air Basin, a 6,745-square mile basin under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD is required to monitor air pollutant levels to ensure that the air quality standards are met and, if they are not, to develop strategies to meet the standards. The South Coast Air Basin is designated a non-attainment area for both the federal and state standards for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5. The SCAQMD recently adopted an Air Quality Management Plan (2007) creating an attainment strategy.

The Bicycle Master Plan proposes a series of potential projects to be implemented. A schedule for implementation of these projects is not included as part of the Plan. Much of the proposal and the implementation schedule will be dependent on the availability of funding sources and there is no guarantee when the proposed projects will be implemented. Therefore, while impacts are not anticipated further analysis of potential impacts related to construction activities will be required on a project level basis at the time when and in the environmental setting in which the project is implemented. Generally, the intent of the Plan is to reduce the number of single-occupant vehicle trips, resulting in improved air quality citywide. There are no related impacts.

<u>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u> -- 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-f) The proposed Plan does not have the potential to impact any candidate, sensitive, or special-status species, riparian habitat or any other sensitive natural community, or impede the movement of native or migratory fish or wildlife species or native or migratory corridors. The proposed Plan would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources nor would it be subject to the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservancy Conservation Plan, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. There are no related impacts.

<u>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> – 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-d) The proposed Plan encompasses a fully developed urban area. There are no known sites containing historic, archaeological, or paleontological resources; unique geologic features; ethnic cultural heritage; human remains; or religious or sacred uses. The proposed Plan would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. There are no related impacts.

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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) There are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones in the immediate vicinity of the proposed Plan. The Verdugo Fault (a concealed fault) lies within the city. As the projects proposed in the Plan are located along existing street corridors, they would not cause increased development to occur or expose persons or property to geological hazards (e.g. seismic ground movement, seismic-related ground failure, landslide, etc.). The extent of the damages that would be caused by seismic activity to proposed bicycle infrastructure would be consistent with roadway damage. There are no related impacts.

b-e) The proposed Plan would not cause development to occur on unstable or expansive soil. It is not anticipated that erosion and/or off site sedimentation would occur. The Plan proposes a series of potential projects to be implemented. A schedule for implementation of these projects is not included as part of the Plan. Much of the proposal and the implementation schedule will be dependent on the availability of funding sources and there is no guarantee when the proposed projects will be implemented. Therefore, further analysis of the potential impacts related to disruptions in soil will be required on a project level basis at the time when and in the environmental setting in which the project is implemented. There are no related impacts.

<u>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS –</u> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-d) The proposed Plan would not cause development to occur nor would it result in the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials or cause any hazard to the public. There are no related impacts.

e-f) Individual projects in the Plan would be within a two-mile vicinity of the Bob Hope Airport although they would not cause a safety hazard for persons residing or working within the vicinity. There are not related impacts.

g-h) The proposed Plan would not impair or interfere with any emergency action or evacuation plan adopted by the City of Burbank nor would the proposed Plan expose persons or property to increased risk of loss or injury resulting from fire. There are no related impacts.

<u>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</u> – 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in temporary modifications to existing drainage patterns that may increase the flow rate of storm water, violate water quality discharge requirements, or result in substantial erosion on or off-site due to construction activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
k) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-k) The proposed Plan would not cause development to occur and would not impact drainage or result in discharges, temporarily or otherwise resulting in a violation of water quality standards. The proposed Plan would not result in an increased risk or flooding or other water hazard as detailed above. The Plan proposes a series of potential projects to be implemented. A schedule for implementation of these projects is not included as part of the Plan. Much of the proposal and the implementation schedule will be dependent on the availability of funding sources and there is no guarantee when the

proposed projects will be implemented. Therefore, further analysis of the potential impacts related to drainage on facilities and/or flood hazards will be required on a project level basis at the time when and in the environmental setting in which the project is implemented. There are no related impacts.

<u>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING</u> – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-c) The proposed Plan encompasses an entirely urbanized area. The proposed Plan would not physically divide an established community nor would they be in conflict with any aspect of the City of Burbank’s General Plan. The proposed Plan would implement a number of the City’s Land Use goals as established by the Burbank Municipal Code which through the Transportation Demand Management Ordinance calls for vehicle trip reductions as a means of relieving traffic congestion and improving air quality, the Burbank Sustainability Action Plan which calls for the City to promote non-motorized transportation modes as an environmentally sustainable alternative transportation mode, the Transportation Elements which calls for redesign of residential streets to discourage cut-through traffic, and the Draft update of the Mobility Element of the General Plan which specifies that the Bicycle Master Plan should be updated to outline the proposed network of bicycle facilities and programs. Specific focus of the proposed bicycle network was given to increasing connectivity between origin (single- and multi-family residential) and destination land uses (libraries, schools, parks, commercial districts, etc.). There are no related impacts.

<u>X. MINERAL RESOURCES</u> – 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-b) The proposed Plan would not cause the availability of any known mineral resource to be lost. The Mineral Land Classification Map identifies zones MRZ-2 and MRZ-3 as occurring in the City of Burbank. The MRZ-3 designation denotes land containing mineral deposits of which the significance cannot be determined given the available data. The MRZ-2 designation indicates land containing significant mineral deposits, or where it is judged that a high likelihood exists for their presence. The City of Burbank’s General Plan does not designate any lands as being appropriate for mining uses. There are no related impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-f) The proposed Plan would not cause development to occur. The Plan proposes a series of potential projects to be implemented. A schedule for implementation of these projects is not included as part of the Plan. Much of the proposal and the implementation schedule will be dependent on the availability of funding sources and there is no guarantee when the proposed projects will be implemented. Therefore, further analysis of the potential noise impacts related to any construction activities will be required on a project level basis at the time when and in the environmental setting in which the project is implemented to ensure that any potential noise or vibration generating activities is in compliance with the City of Burbank’s noise ordinance. There are no related impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-c) The proposed Plan would not induce population growth directly or indirectly. The proposed Plan does not have a housing component and would not displace a substantial number of housing or persons. There are no related impacts.

<u>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES</u>	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) The proposed Plan would not cause new development to occur. The proposed Plan would not result in the need for construction of any new or remodeled government facilities, so as to maintain acceptable levels of response, service, or performance. Specific focus of the proposed bicycle network was given to increasing connectivity between origin (single- and multi-family residential) and destination land uses (libraries, schools, parks, commercial districts, etc.), as such access to public facilities will be enhanced through implementation of this proposed Plan. There are no related impacts.

<u>XIV. RECREATION</u>	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-b) The proposed Plan would not generate recreational demands and would have no impact on recreational facilities or necessitate the construction of additional recreational facilities. Specific focus of the proposed bicycle network was given to increasing connectivity between origin (single- and multi-family residential) and destination land uses (libraries, schools, parks, commercial districts, etc.), as such access to recreation facilities will be enhanced and improved through implementation of this proposed Plan. There are no related impacts.

<u>XV. STORM WATER</u> -- 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) A significantly environmental harmful increase in the flow rate or volume of storm water runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A significantly environmentally harmful increase in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Harm to the biological integrity of drainage systems and water bodies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-c) The proposed Plan would not result in storm water discharges or result in significant harmful increases in erosion. The biological integrity of drainage systems or water bodies would not be compromised by the proposed Plan. The Plan proposes a series of potential projects to be implemented. A schedule for implementation of these projects is not included as part of the Plan. Much of the proposal and the implementation schedule will be dependent on the availability of funding sources and there is no guarantee when the proposed projects will be implemented. Therefore, further analysis of the potential impacts related to construction activities adjacent to storm water facilities will be required on a project level basis at the time when and in the environmental setting in which the project is implemented. There are no related impacts.

<u>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</u> – 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Result in inadequate parking capacity resulting in an impact on traffic or circulation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-h) The proposed Plan would not cause an increase in traffic (motor vehicle or otherwise), compromise the service standards established by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, or cause inadequate parking capacities. The proposed modifications would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs in supporting alternative transportation. The primary goal of the plan is to promote bicycling as an environmentally sustainable transportation alternative. The proposed Plan is designed to reduce traffic congestion through trip reduction resulting in fewer single-occupant vehicle trips and improved air quality for the community. Across the region and the State Bicycle Master Plans have been identified as a means of achieving vehicle trip reductions and improving congestion. The State of California Street and Highways Code (Section 890-894.2) outlines the general guidelines for creating a Bicycle Master Plan, where safety and access of all users regardless of age or skill level is a primary component in the planning process. This proposed Plan is consistent with all the guidelines established by the Street and Highways Code.

The Plan proposes a series of potential projects to be implemented. A schedule for implementation of these projects is not included as part of the Plan. Much of the proposal and the implementation schedule will be dependent on the availability of funding sources and there is no guarantee when the proposed projects will be implemented. Therefore, further analysis of the potential traffic impacts related to the establishment of bicycle facilities will be required on a project level basis at the time when and in the environmental setting in which the project is implemented. There are no related impacts.

<u>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</u> – 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-g) The proposed Plan would not result in the construction of new waste or drainage facilities or expansion of existing waste or drainage facilities or require additional service, and would comply with all wastewater treatment requirements of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board and all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations as relating to solid waste. There are no related impacts.

<u>XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</u>	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-c) The proposed Plan would not create any impacts, individually or cumulatively, known to be detrimental to the environment or community. The primary goal of the plan is to promote bicycling as an environmentally sustainable transportation alternative. The proposed Plan is designed to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality. Further the proposed Plan is focused on using bicycle facilities as a means of improving and enhancing the livability and character of the community. Much of the proposal and the project implementation schedule will be dependent on the availability of funding sources and there is no guarantee when the proposed projects will be implemented. Therefore, further environmental review will be required on a project level basis at the time when and in the environmental setting in which the project is implemented. There are no related impacts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Zone Text Amendment No.08-0002284
Modifications to Fence, Wall, and Landscaping Standards in Residential Zones

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

1. Proposed Zone Text Amendment
2. Burbank Municipal Code, Chapter 31, Zoning, City of Burbank, 2005
3. Burbank Municipal Code, Chapter 21, Environmental Protection, 2001
4. Zone Map, City of Burbank, 2005
5. Land Use Element of the City of Burbank General Plan, adopted by Burbank City Council on May 31, 1988, Resolution No. 22,354
6. Land Use Element EIR, Envicom Corporation, prepared for City of Burbank, February 1988
7. Safety Element of the City of Burbank General Plan, adopted by Burbank City Council on July 1, 1997, Resolution No. 25,087
8. Circulation Element of the City of Burbank General Plan, adopted by Burbank City Council in 1964
9. Noise Element of the City of Burbank General Plan, adopted by Burbank City Council on December 8, 1992, Resolution No. 23,777
10. Open Space and Conservation Elements of the City of Burbank General Plan, adopted by Burbank City Council on December 19, 1972, Resolution No. 16,280
11. South Coast Air Quality Management District, CEQA Handbook, April 1993
12. Mineral Land and Classification Map, California Division of Mines and Geology, May 25, 1979
13. ITE *Trip Generation*, 7th Edition, 2003
14. San Diego Association of Governments *Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates*, 2002
15. Flood Insurance Rate Map, Community Panel Number 065018 0005 C, January 20, 1999