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NEGATIVE DECLARATION
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAD CITY AGENCY AND ADDRESS:</th>
<th>COUNCIL DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1149 S. Broadway, Suite 600, Los Angeles 90015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT TITLE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STREET VACATION- SHATTO STREET BETWEEN WITMER STREET AND VALENCIA STREET (W.O. 1401160)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOG REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.G. 634: D3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT LOCATION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project will be located within the Public Right-of-Way along Shatto Street, between Witmer Street and Valencia Street, Community of Westlake, City of Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposed project consists of the vacation by the City of Los Angeles of the public right-of-way along Shatto Street, between Witmer Street and Valencia Street in the City of Los Angeles. The total area to be vacated is approximately 30,113 square feet (0.691 acres). The vacated area would revert to the vestee(s) of the underlying fee title/interest, which is generally the adjacent property owner(s). Frontage properties along both sides of Shatto Street are owned by the Hospital of the Good Samaritan (540 South Valencia Street, Los Angeles, CA 90017). Shatto Street would be closed to existing traffic. The street vacation is intended to increase public safety by reduction of automobile traffic as well as to integrate and centralize the Hospital of the Good Samaritan, whose facility occupies both sides of proposed vacated street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT IF OTHER THAN CITY AGENCY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDING:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City Engineer of the City of Los Angeles has determined that this project will not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See the attached Initial Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO MITIGATION MEASURES WILL BE IMPOSED.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any written objections received during the public review period are attached, together with the responses of the lead City agency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE INITIAL STUDY PREPARED FOR THIS PROJECT IS ATTACHED.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON PREPARING THIS FORM</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TELEPHONE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Jones</td>
<td>1149 S. Broadway, Suite 600</td>
<td>(213) 485-5760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Specialist II</td>
<td>Los Angeles, 90015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNATURE (Official)</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James E. Doty, Acting Manager Environmental Management Group</td>
<td>9-1-16-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial Study/
NegativeDeclaration
for
Street Vacation- Shatto Street, between Witmer Street and Valencia Street (E1401160)
I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of an Initial Study

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was enacted in 1970 for the purpose of informing decision-makers and the public regarding potential environmental effects of proposed projects; identifying methods of avoiding environmental damage; and disclosing to the public reasons for a project’s approved even if it leads to environmental damage. The City of Los Angeles (City) Bureau of Engineering Environmental Management Group (EMG) has determined the proposed project is subject to CEQA and no exemptions apply. Therefore, the preparation of an initial study is required.

An initial study is a preliminary analysis conducted by the lead agency, in consultation with other agencies (responsible or trustee agencies, as applicable), to determine whether there is substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the initial study concludes that the project, even with mitigation, may have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report should be prepared; otherwise, the lead agency may adopt a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration.

B. Process

The proposal to adopt a negative declaration (or mitigated negative declaration) initiates a twenty-day public comment period. The purpose of this comment period is to provide public
agencies and the public an opportunity to review the initial study and comment on the adequacy of the analysis and the findings of the lead agency regarding potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. If a reviewer believes there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, the reviewer should (1) identify the specific effect, (2) explain why it is believed the effect would occur, and (3) explain why it is believed the effect would be significant. Facts or expert opinion supported by facts should be provided as the basis of such comments.

After close of the public review period, the Board of Public Works considers the negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration, together with any comments received during the public review process, and makes a recommendation to the City Council on whether or not to approve the project. One or more Council committees may then review the proposal and documents and make its own recommendation to the full City Council. The City Council is the decision-making body and also considers the negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration, together with any comments received during the public review process, in the final decision to approve or disapprove the project. During the project approval process, persons and/or agencies may address either the Board of Public Works or the City Council regarding the project.

Public notification of agenda items for the Board of Public Works, Council committees and City Council is posted 72 hours prior to the public meeting. The agenda can be obtained by visiting the Council and Public Services Division of the Office of the City Clerk at City Hall, 200 North Spring Street, Suite 395; by calling 213/978-1047, 213/978-1048 or TDD/TTY 213/978-1055; or via the internet at http://www.lacity.org/CLK/index.htm.

If the project is approved, the City will file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk within 5 days. The notice of determination will be posted by the County Clerk within 24 hours of receipt. This begins a 30-day statute of limitations on legal challenges to the approval under CEQA. The ability to challenge the approval in court may be limited to those persons who objected to the approval of the project, and to issues which were presented to the lead agency by any person, either orally or in writing, during the public comment period.

As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and, upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Location

The project is located within the Public Right-of-Way along Shatto Street, between Witmer Street and Valencia Street, Community of Westlake, City of Los Angeles. The vacation lies within the Central City West Specific Planning District of the City of Los Angeles General Plan; (see Figure 2 - Regional Map;
The plan designated land use for adjacent parcels to the north and south of Shatto Street, as well as along Witmer and Valencia Streets is zoned “CW” (Central West Specific Plan, Figure 4 – Zoning Map), per the Central West Specific Plan Ordinance (166,703, Effective 4/3/1991). The vacation is entirely within existing, public right-of-way. The easterly extension of Shatto Street (from Lucas Avenue to Witmer Street) was vacated in two Council actions (ORD. 134,144 (1967); ORD. 140,063 (1970)), while the westerly extension of of Shatto Street (from Union Avenue to Valencia Street) was vacated via City Council Resolution (C.F. 2-2148 (2006)).

B. Purpose

The street vacation is intended to increase public safety by reduction of automobile traffic as well as to integrate and centralize the Hospital of the Good Samaritan, whose facility occupies both sides of proposed vacated street.

C. Description

The proposed project consists of the vacation of the public right-of-way along Shatto Street, between Witmer Street and Valencia Street in the City of Los Angeles. The total area to be vacated is approximately 30,113 square feet (0.691 acres). The vacated area would revert to the vestee(s) of the underlying fee title interest, which is generally the adjacent property owner(s). Frontage properties along both sides of Shatto Street are owned by the Hospital of the Good Samaritan (540 South Valencia Street, Los Angeles, CA 90017). Shatto Street would be closed to existing traffic.

Various conditions are established as the requirements to be complied with by the petitioner for this vacation. These conditions are specified in the Central District Office memorandum dated December 21, 2009. The conditions are as follows:

1. That the following dedications are to be provided adjoining the petitioner’s properties in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer:

   a) Valencia Street (Collector). No dedication is required within the existing 70-foot right of way, except for a 15-foot-by-15-foot diagonal or 20-foot radius corner dedication at Wilshire Boulevard.

   b) Witmer Street (Secondary Highway). Within the existing (80-foot right of way, the required half right of way is 45 feet. Therefore, 15 feet of dedication is required. Also dedicate a 15-foot-by-15-foot diagonal or 20-foot radius corner dedication at Wilshire Boulevard.

   c) 6th Street (Secondary Highway). The existing right of way is 82.5 feet. The required half right of way is 45 feet. Therefore, 3.75 feet of dedication is required.
d) Wilshire Boulevard (Major Highway, Class II). The existing right of way is 90 feet. The required half right of way is 52 feet. Therefore, a 7-foot dedication is required. Also dedicate 15-foot-by-15-foot diagonal or 20-foot radius corner dedications at Witmer and Valencia Streets.

e) Shatto Street (to be vacated) [Local Street]. No dedication is required.

2. That the following improvements are constructed adjoining the petitioner’s properties in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer:

a) Valencia Street. Since the existing roadway width is 46 feet, no widening is required. However, street work will be required via B-permit. This will involve removal of existing curb, gutter and sidewalk, and construction of new sidewalk, integral curb, and gutter at the intersection of Valencia Street and Shatto Street (to be vacated). Storm drain catch basins will require relocation or remodeling at this intersection.

b) Witmer Street. The existing half roadway width is 20 feet, and the required half roadway width is 35 feet. Therefore, 15 feet of widening is required via B-permit. From the new property line, the applicant must construct a 10-foot sidewalk, integral curb and gutter, and asphalt pavement to provide for a 35-foot half roadway, and to also provide for a proper transition to existing improvements.

c) 6th Street. The existing roadway is 58.5 feet (29.25-foot half-width). The required half roadway is 35 feet. Consequently, 5.75 feet of widening is required. From the new property line, the applicant will construct a 10-foot sidewalk, integral curb and gutter, and asphalt pavement to provide for a 35-foot half roadway, and to also provide proper transition to existing improvements. A B-permit will be required.

d) Wilshire Boulevard (Major Highway, Class II). The existing roadway is 56 feet (28-foot half-width). The required half-roadway is 45 feet. Therefore, 17 feet of widening are required. From the new property line, the Applicant will construct a 10-foot sidewalk, integral curb and gutter, and asphalt pavement to provide for a 45-foot half roadway. Provide proper transition to existing improvements. A B-permit would be required.

e) Shatto Street. Close existing roadway via B-permit.

3. That the following additional conditions be required in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer:

a) Repair and/or replace all other existing public improvements that may get damaged during the renovation to the vacation.

b) A public main sewer line is to be abandoned within the proposed vacated street, which will require a B-permit. Use of the abandoned sewer
for onsite improvements, would require modification to meet City standards for private sewers.

c) Storm drain catch basins would require relocation and possible redesign to accommodate new street flow conditions.

d) Street light standards in the area are to be vacated, and will require either abandonment of relocation per requirements of the Bureau of Street Lighting. In addition, ownership transfer of five existing street trees would have to meet the requirements of the Bureau of Street Services (Urban Forestry Division).

e) The vacation street area may not need modification for non-motorized transportation purposes.

f) Vacation areas are neither passable nor available and travel for vehicular access.

g). The proposed vacated Public Ailey area is not necessary for public use for traffic circulation.

h) Revocable Permit: Applicant is advised to apply for and secure a revocable permit from the Bureau of Engineering Central District Office for the Alley closure and use of alley as shown on the preliminary vacation map (See Figure 1) prior to completion of Street Vacation process.

i): Utility poles that lie within the area to be vacated. Any easements with public utilities must be maintained.

The analysis in this document assumes that, unless otherwise stated, the project will be designed, constructed and operated following all applicable laws, regulations, ordinances and formally adopted City standards (e.g., Los Angeles Municipal Code and Bureau of Engineering Standard Plans). Also, this analysis assumes that construction will follow the uniform practices established by the Southern California Chapter of the American Public Works Association (e.g., Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction and the Work Area Traffic Control Handbook) as specifically adapted by the City of Los Angeles (e.g., The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Additions and Amendments to the Standard Specifications For Public Works Construction (AKA “The Brown Book,” formerly Standard Plan S-610)).

As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and, upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities.
III. EXISTING ENVIRONMENT
The project site and vicinity are located within a fully urbanized area. Shatto Street runs east west and is a designated local street.

The proposed project is located in Shatto Street, a 55-foot wide (total) improved right of way. The roadway is improved with curb; gutter as well as concrete sidewalks on the southerly margin (8-feet wide) and northerly margin (10-feet wide). Parcels that are zoned for commercial uses and are developed with facilities of the Good Samaritan Hospital surround the project site. (Refer to Figure 3 for an aerial view of the project site).

The project site is located within the Hollywood Quadrangle of the United States Geological Survey 7.5-Minute series topographic map (see Figure 1) and is situated at approximately 330 feet above mean sea level. No bodies of water are present on or adjacent to the project site; however, the nearest water body is an artificial lake at McArthur Park, 2,600 feet to the west.

The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo fault zone area, an earthquake landslide or liquefaction hazard area, high wind area, very high fire hazard severity zone, flood hazard area, or area subject to inundation from a tsunami or dam failure. There are no oil wells within the boundaries of the project site.

A search of the California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database found six species which are federally and/or state listed as endangered or threatened, within the Hollywood Quadrangle of the USGS topographic map set. However, the project site does not contain any habitat suitable for these species.

The Shatto Street vacation site lies in the Community of Westlake, approximately 2 miles west of City Hall in downtown Los Angeles. Surrounding land use is highly urbanized, both commercial and institutional.

The nearest parks, and/or recreation centers are McArthur Park (2,600 feet to the west), Miguel Contreras Learning Center Pool (2,100 feet to the northeast), as well as Hope and Peace Park (2,750 feet to the southwest).

Numerous MTA transit lines serve the area. The nearest transit lines run parallel to Shatto Street, along Wilshire Boulevard to the south (Red Line Subway, Lines 20 and 720) and along 6th Street to the north (Line 18). Foothill Transit (Line 481) offers rush hour service along Wilshire Boulevard, while DASH (Line E) connects Good Samaritan Hospital with points downtown.
### IV. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (13) Sections A1 and A2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>introduces incompatible visual elements within a field of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>containing a scenic vista or substantially alters a view of a scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vista.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No scenic vistas exist on or in close proximity to the project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highway?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (13) Sections A1 and A2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: A significant impact may occur where scenic resources within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a state scenic highway would be damaged or removed because of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No state-designated scenic highways are located within the vicinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the site and its surroundings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (13) Sections A1 and A3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>introduces incompatible visual elements to the project site or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visual elements that would be incompatible with the character of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area surrounding the project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed project would not make any changes to the visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>character that currently exists. Any new structures would replace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing ones and would therefore have no significant impact on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visual character of the site and its surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (13) Section A4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment: A significant impact would occur if the proposed project caused a substantial increase in ambient illumination levels beyond the property line or caused new lighting to spill-over onto light-sensitive land uses such as residential, some commercial and institutional uses that require minimum illumination for proper function, and natural areas.

No new lighting is proposed for this project. Any future development on the vacated land would need to ensure that any lighting would be directed on-site and no glare producing materials used.

2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES – Would the project:
   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?  
      Reference: (6).
      Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to result in the conversion of state-designated agricultural land from agricultural use to another non-agricultural use.

      No Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance exists within the City of Los Angeles.

   b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?  
      Reference: (6).
      Comment: Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to result in the conversion of land zoned for agricultural use, or indicated under a Williamson Act contract, from agricultural use to another non-agricultural use.

      The area surrounding the proposed project is zoned for commercial and manufacturing/industrial uses. No nearby land is zoned for or contains agricultural uses.

   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?  
      Reference: (6).
      Comment: Comment: A significant impact may occur if a project results in the conversion of farmland to another non-agricultural use.

      Refer to discussion under 2 (a) and 2 (b) above.

3. AIR QUALITY -- Would the project:
   a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  
      Reference: (21).
Comment: Although development is not planned as part of the project proposal, the project would create the potential for future commercial development. The Central City West Specific Plan recognizes the need to conserve and strengthen viable commercial development in the community and to provide additional opportunities for new commercial development and services. Thus, the potential future commercial development would be in accordance with the intent and goals of the community plan, which is in conformance with the Air Quality Element of the City’s General Plan.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  
Reference: (13) Sections B1, B2, and B3; (21).
Comment: Impacts to air quality resulting from planned development in the Westlake Community were evaluated in the CEQA document prepared for the Central City West Specific Plan. The Plan projected significant commercial development that has not occurred and additional development is not anticipated to occur within the life of the plan. The potential future commercial development created because of the street vacation falls within the limits of the development projected in the community plan.

An air quality analysis for the potential future development would be unreasonably speculative. Potential mandates such as construction phasing and use of low emission architectural coatings, could be placed on such development, as applicable, to reduce impacts to air quality. Furthermore, if a project requiring any kind of permit, including grading, foundation, building, sign or use of land permits, develops in the future, a "project permit" pursuant to Section 11.5.7 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, with its own environmental assessment, would be required.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?  
Reference: (21).
Comment: Los Angeles County is designated as a non-attainment area for ozone, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter. As discussed above, with applicable construction conditions placed on potential future development, significant impacts to air quality are not anticipated.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?  
Reference: (13) Sections B1, B2 and B3.
Comment: The project site is surrounded by commercial uses. The street vacation is adjacent to a hospital and day-care center; however, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in substantially increased pollutant concentrations.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?  
Reference: (13) Section B2.
Comment:

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:
Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would remove or modify habitat for any species identified or designated as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulation, or by the state or federal regulatory agencies cited.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The California Department of Fish and Game’s California Natural Diversity Database (2011) lists occurrences of four plant species-marsh sandwort (<em>Arenaria paludica</em>), Brauntion’s milk-vetch (<em>Astragalus brauntonii</em>), coastal dunes milk-vetch (<em>Astragalus tener var. titi, respectively</em>), and Gambel’s water cress (<em>Nasturtium gambelli</em>), along with two animal species-coastal California gnatcatcher (<em>Polioptila californica californica</em>) and southwestern willow flycatcher (<em>Empidonax traillii exterimus</em>), which are federally and state listed endangered or threatened within the Hollywood topographic quad. However, none of the habitats (freshwater marsh, closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland) associated with these species are present at the project site. The site is highly urbanized and completely developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: A significant impact may occur if riparian habitat or any other sensitive natural community were to be adversely modified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed vacation is not located within a Significant Ecological Area or other natural community containing riparian habitat or sensitive biological resources. See comment for 4(a).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: A significant impact may occur if federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act would be modified or removed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no wetlands within or adjacent to the project site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?
   Reference: (13) Section C
   Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project interferes or removes access to a migratory wildlife corridor or impedes the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

   The proposed project is located within a developed urban area of Sun Valley. No sensitive, or viable natural habitats were identified within the project site or vicinity.

   e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
      Reference: (13) Section C, (11) (12)
      Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would cause an impact that was inconsistent with local regulations pertaining to biological resources.

      No sensitive or protected tree species are present on the project site.

   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?
      Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would be inconsistent with mapping or policies in any conservation plans of the cited type.

      No habitat conservation plan, or any plan as cited above, is in place for the project site or immediate vicinity.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:
   a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5?
      Reference: (5) (13) Section D, (18).
      Comment: A significant impact may result if the proposed project caused a substantial adverse change to the significance of a historical resource (as identified above).

      An Initial Records Search conducted by the South Central Coastal Information Center found no historical resources within the project site or immediate vicinity.

   b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5?
      Reference: (5)
Comments: No archaeological resources were identified within the project area. However, the project area has not been fully surveyed for archaeological resources. The proposed vacated right-of-way under consideration is entirely paved, precluding the usefulness of an archaeological survey at this time.

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

Reference: (1) Section 6-3.2, (25) (26)

Comment: A significant impact may occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the proposed project would disturb unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features.

The project is in an area identified as having alluvium soils, including gravel, sand and clay of valley areas. Additionally, the project site is not within a known sensitive area for paleontological resources. If discovery of paleontological resources or unique geologic features were made during construction, standard construction practices would be employed such as the suspension of work until a qualified paleontologist can evaluate the find and make recommendations as necessary for the protection of the discovered paleontological resources.

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

Reference: (26)

Comment: A significant impact may occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the proposed project would disturb interred human remains.

No known burial sites are located within the project site. However, a standard halt-work condition would be in place in the event that human remains were discovered during construction so that appropriate measures could be followed to avoid any significant impacts.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

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?

References: (7) ; (8).

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within a state-designated Alquist-Priolo Zone or other designated fault zone and appropriate building practices were not followed.

The project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.
Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Reference: (13) Section E1, (7).
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project design did not comply with building code requirements intended to protect people from hazards associated with strong seismic ground shaking.

In general, the Los Angeles region is subject to the effects of seismic activity. However, the proposed project does not involve construction of any structures, other than street improvements. Future development would need to comply with seismic building code requirements.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Reference: (13) Section E1, (4), (14) (26).
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would be located in an area identified as having a high risk of liquefaction and appropriate design measures required within such designated areas were not incorporated into the project.

The project site is not in an area identified as being susceptible to liquefaction.

iv) Landslides?

Reference: (13) Section E1, (7) (8) (26).
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in a hillside area with soil conditions that would suggest high potential for sliding and appropriate design measures were not implemented.

The project site is not located in an area identified as being susceptible to landslides.

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

Reference: (13) Section E2
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to expose large areas to the erosion effects of wind or water for a prolonged period.

The project site is partially paved and the vacation is subject to street improvements. All future construction would need to comply with Best Management Practices to prevent erosion or loss of topsoil.

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?

Reference: (13) Section E2, (10)
ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were built in an unstable area without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for project buildings, thus posing a hazard to life and property.

See 6 (a) (iii) and (iv) above.

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?  
Reference: (4)  
Comment: The proposed project is in an area identified as having alluvium soils. Prior to any construction and as a standard practice, a geotechnical evaluation would be prepared which would prescribe methods, techniques, and specifications for: site preparation, treatment of undocumented fill and/or alluvial soils, fill placement on sloping ground, fill characteristics, fill placement and compactions, temporary excavations and shoring, permanent slopes, treatment of expansive soils, and treatment of corrosive soils. Design and construction of the proposed project would conform to recommendations in the geotechnical evaluation; therefore, impacts from potentially expansive soil would not be significant.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?  
Reference: (8)  
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were built on soils that were incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal system, and such a system was proposed.

The project area is served by the City’s wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment systems.

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?  
Reference: (3) (28)  
Comment:

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?  
Reference: (3) (15) (16) (28)  
Comment:

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  
Reference: (13) Section F1
**Issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project involved the use or disposal of hazardous materials as part of its routine operations and would have the potential to generate toxic or otherwise hazardous emissions.

The proposed project does not involve the use, transport, or disposal of any hazardous materials. Future development would comply with applicable laws and regulations for use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials.

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? ✔

Reference: (13) Section F1

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project involved a risk of accidental explosion or utilized substantial amounts of hazardous materials as part of its routine operations that could potentially pose a hazard to the public under accident or upset conditions.

The proposed project does not involve the use, transport, or disposal of any hazardous materials.

Refer to discussion under 7 (a) above.

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

Reference: (13) Section F1, (23) (26).

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school site and were projected to release toxic emissions, which pose a hazard beyond regulatory thresholds.

There are two existing school sites within one-quarter mile of the proposed project.

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? ✔

Reference: (29) (30) (31).

Comment: The project site is not listed in the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker system, which includes leaking underground fuel tank sites and Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanups sites, or the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor Data Management System, which includes CORTESE sites, or the Environmental Protection Agency’s database of regulated facilities.
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference: (13) (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project site were located within a public airport land use plan area, or within two miles of a public airport, and would create a safety hazard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference: (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: The proposed vacation lies neither within, nor within two-miles of a private airport.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference: (13) Section F1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to substantially interfere with roadway operations used in conjunction with an emergency response plan or evacuation plan or would generate sufficient traffic to create traffic congestion that would interfere with the execution of such plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference: (13) Section K2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in a wild land area and poses a significant fire hazard, which could affect persons or structures in the area in the event of a fire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project discharged water, which did not meet the quality standards of agencies, which regulate surface water quality and water discharge into stormwater drainage systems. For example, if a project did not comply with all applicable regulations with regard to surface water quality as governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). These regulations include compliance with the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements to reduce potential water quality impacts.

The proposed vacation would not involve any discharge of water. In addition, improvements for vacating the street and any future development would need to comply with all applicable regulations, code requirements, and permit provisions pertaining to water quality and waste discharge.

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)?

Reference: (13) Section G3, (20).

Comment: Groundwater is a major component of the water supply for many public water suppliers in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, and is used by private industries, as well as a limited number of private agricultural and domestic users. A project would normally have a significant impact on groundwater supplies if it were to result in a demonstrable and sustained reduction of groundwater recharge capacity or change the potable water levels sufficiently that it would reduce the ability of a water utility to use the groundwater basin for public water supplies or storage of imported water, reduce the yields of adjacent wells or well fields, or adversely change the rate or direction of groundwater flow.

The proposed project would not utilize existing groundwater resources nor would it interfere with groundwater recharge. Any future development is expected to be an expansion of the hospital facility and would use existing water supplies rather than groundwater.

The site is currently developed and only small landscaped areas are permeable.

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?

Reference: (13) Section G1; (23)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in a substantial alteration of drainage patterns that resulted in a substantial increase in erosion or siltation during construction or operation of the project.

The proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. Vacation of the street would be subject to improvement conditions. Such improvements and all future construction would need to comply with Best Management Practices to prevent erosion or siltation; therefore, no erosion or siltation would be expected to occur.

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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site?  
Reference: (8) (13) Section G1; (22) (23)  
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in increased runoff volumes during construction or operation of the proposed project that would result in flooding conditions affecting the project site or nearby properties.

The proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. See comments for 8 (a) and 8 (c) above.

e) Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?  
Reference:  
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the volume of runoff were to increase to a level, which exceeded the capacity of the storm drain system serving a project site. A significant impact may also occur, if the proposed project would substantially increase the probability that polluted runoff would reach the storm drain system.

The proposed project would not change the volume of storm water runoff. See comment 8(a) above.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?  
Reference: (13) Section G2.  
Comment: A significant impact may occur if a project included potential sources of water pollutants and potential to substantially degrade water quality.

No potential sources of water quality degradation are anticipated.

g) 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?  
Reference: (13) Section G1, (22).
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="" alt=" " /></td>
<td><img src="" alt=" " /></td>
<td><img src="" alt=" " /></td>
<td><img src="" alt=" " /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The proposed project does not include housing.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?  
Reference: (13) Section G1, (22).
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within a 100-year flood zone and would impede or redirect flood flows.

According to Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel 060137 0074C (effective date 2008), the project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area.

i) 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?  
Reference: (13) Section G1, (22).
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in an area where a dam or levee could fail, exposing people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death.

The Inundation and Tsunami Hazard Areas map (Exhibit G) of the Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan (adopted by City Council November 26, 1996) shows that the project site is not located in an area subject to flooding from a dam or levee failure. No impacts related to flooding are anticipated.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?  
Reference: (13) Section E1.
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in an area with inundation potential due to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

The Inundation and Tsunami Hazard Areas map (Exhibit G) of the Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan (adopted by City Council November 26, 1996) shows that the project site is not located in an area subject to flooding from a tsunami. No inland water bodies are located nearby, making inundation due to a seiche unlikely. The project site is flat and no potential source of mudflow has been identified.

### 10. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?  
Reference: (13) Section H2.
Issues

Comment: Although the proposed project involves a street vacation, the extension of Shatto Street, west of Valencia Street, has been closed to through traffic since 1998 and has been used by adjacent businesses for circulation to and from buildings, parking structures, and surface parking lots. That closure was originally granted in an effort to reduce crime, thereby stabilizing the environment for local residents and tenants. The adjacent street system adequately served the needs of the community.

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?

Reference: (13) Section H1, (12).

Comment: Although not currently planned or proposed, the proposed project would create the potential for an estimated 78,200 square feet of future commercial development. The Central City West Specific Plan projected significant commercial development that did not occur and is not anticipated to occur within the life of the plan. The potential future development would fall within the limits of the planned development and can therefore be considered as accounted for in the Community Plan. Although the 1997 update of the community plan identifies the project area as a collector street, the Department of City Planning has confirmed that this designation was a mapping error and the current designation should be as a local street, thus not requiring a General Plan amendment for its vacation.

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

Reference: (12) (13) Section C; (9)

Comment:

11. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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?

Reference: (13) Section E4

Comment:

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?

Reference: (17).

Comment:

12. 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?

Reference: (13) Sections I1, I2, I3, and I4

Comment: The project would comply with standards established in the general plan and the City’s noise ordinance. For instance, the project would not introduce a new usage that would exceed typical ambient noise levels for commercial land use. Future construction will comply with Cal OSHA requirements for hearing protection.
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (13) Sections I1, I2, I3, and I4; (10).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (13) Sections I1, I2, I3, and I4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: Refer to 11 (a) above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: Noise created during construction will be temporary and in compliance with the municipal code, which restricts the hours during construction can occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>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?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (13) Section I4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: No public airport is located within the vicinity of the project area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>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?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: No private airstrips are located within the immediate vicinity of the project area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 13. 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)?**

  Reference: (13) Section J2

  Comment: 

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

  Reference: (13) Section J2

  Comment: 

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

  Reference: (13) Section J2

  Comment: 

#### 14. PUBLIC SERVICES --

- 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:**

  - i) **Fire protection?**

    Reference: (13) Section K2
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

ii) Police protection?

Reference: (13) Section K1

Comment: Crime and safety were the original concerns that prompted the temporary closure of Shatto Street. The vacation (permanent closure) is being petitioned to sustain the reduction in crime achieved.

iii) Schools?

Reference: (13) Section K3

Comment:

iv) Parks?

Reference: (13) Section K4

Comment:

v) Other public facilities?

Reference: (13) Section K5

Comment:

15. RECREATION --

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?

Reference: (13) Section K4

Comment:

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Reference:

Comment:

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

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)?

Reference: (13) Sections L1, L2, L3, L4, and L8

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project causes an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

The proposed vacation would not cause an increase in traffic. The one-block long street segment provides access to the existing off-street hospital parking and for the pre-school childcare center. Nevertheless, any future development may have the potential to increase traffic, but would need to comply with restrictions in the existing Municipal Code, as well as in applicable redevelopment and community plans, which address potential increased traffic from new development. The City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation would need to be consulted with regarding traffic circulation for any future development plans.
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (13) Section L1, L2, L3 &amp; L4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See comment to Section 15 (a).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location those results in substantial safety risks?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (13) Section L5; (17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project substantially increased road hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project would not introduce design features or new uses to surrounding roadways that would create increased hazards. The project will provide parcel consolidation to serve existing uses of the Good Samaritan Hospital.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (13) Sections L5, L8, and K2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in inadequate emergency access.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project will not impact emergency access to the area. Adjacent properties would retain adequate access after vacation. The Hospital’s emergency access on 6th Street would not be affected. As the roadway would be closed with driveways at both ends, the driveways would be designed in accordance with applicable building codes and the City’s Fire Code to ensure that adequate egress and ingress are provided. The location and width of the access points would be coordinated with LADOT. The proposed project will not impact emergency access to the area. Adjacent businesses would retain adequate access routes after vacation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (13) Sections L5 and L7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Issues**

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in inadequate parking capacity based upon Municipal Code requirements.

On-street parking (approximately 30 spaces) is currently available along Shatto Street; however, any future development of the vacated street would have to accommodate for the loss of any existing parking capacity. Nevertheless, adequate parking capacity would still be available by way of on site, off-street parking structures and parking lots. Therefore, existing parking facilities would not be impacted.

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

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?  
Reference: (13) Section K2  
Comment:  

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?  
Reference: (13) Sections M1 and M2  
Comment: Department of Water and Power facilities and a sewer line with terminus at a maintenance hole near the northern project limits are located within the project area. Arrangements would be made with the Department of Water and Power for the removal of the affected facilities, or easements or rights would be maintained for their protection, if they were to remain in place. Easements would be reserved for the sewer line protection or arrangements would be made for the abandonment or relocation of the sewer line.

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?  
Reference: (13) Section M1  
Comment: Easements would be reserved for the protection of storm drain facilities or arrangements would be made for the abandonment or relocation of the facilities. If abandonment of the facilities were necessary, two catch basins would have to be abandoned and relocated if needed.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  
Reference: (13) Section M1  
Comment: The proposed project is located in a developed area that is serviced by the City’s Department of Water and Power. Utilities are adequate to serve the site and although some utility relocation may be needed, substantial alterations to utility infrastructure are not anticipated.
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (13) Section M2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (13) Section M3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (13) Section M3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --

| 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? |                        |                       |                       | ✓         |
| Reference:                                                             |                        |                       |                       |           |
| Comment: The project is located in a developed, urbanized area that does not contain significant biological resources, or known cultural resources, including historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources. |                        |                       |                       |           |

An Initial Records Search conducted by the South Central Coastal Information Center indicates that no archeological work is needed prior to approval of the street vacation. However, a halt-work condition should be in place in the event that cultural resources are discovered during any future construction activities, including excavation.

The proposed project would not significantly degrade the quality of the environment. The proposed project would not reduce or threaten any fish or wildlife species (endangered or otherwise). The proposed project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

| 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)? |                        |                       |                       | ✓         |
| Reference:                                                             |                        |                       |                       |           |
| Comment: No significant impacts have been identified as result of the proposed project or foreseeable future development either on an individual or cumulative basis. The proposed street vacation, as well as future development, is consistent with applicable land use plans. |                        |                       |                       |           |
**Issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**c) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?**

Comment: No significant impacts have been identified because of the proposed project or foreseeable future development. The proposed project does not involve environmental goals, such as enhancement of the existing environment or creation of habitat. The project only involves the vacation of the public right-of-way. Therefore, the proposed project does not have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals at the expense of long-term environmental goals.

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

Comment: the proposed project does not have the potential to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Future development would be limited to the size of the vacated street area, or 30,113 square feet of area, which is not growth inducing and would be consistent with applicable land use plans. No existing hazards were identified that would threaten the viability of safe implementation of the proposed project; however, should contamination or other hazards be uncovered during construction, standard practices for removal and/or other remediation would be employed in conformance with all applicable rules and regulations to prevent human exposure and harm.

**V. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION**

The proposed project consists of the vacation of Shatto Street between Valencia Street and Witmer Street as shown on Figure 2. An area consisting of approximately 30,113 square feet of land would be vacated. The vacated land would be reverted to adjacent parcels. One property owner (Good Samaritan Hospital) would be affected. Under the current commercial zoning of the adjacent parcels, C2 (CW)-U3, the 30,113 square feet of vacated land would create the potential for an estimated 75,234 square feet of future commercial development. However, no development is currently planned or proposed as part of this project. No Significant impacts have been identified and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**VII. COMPATIBILITY WITH EXISTING ZONING AND PLANS**

The project site lies within the Central City West Specific Plan area. The proposed project has been designed to be compatible with the underlying zoning and land use
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designations.

VIII. PREPARATION AND COORDINATION / CONSULTATION

A. Prepared by:

William Jones
Environmental Specialist II
Environmental Management Group
Bureau of Engineering
Department of Public Works

B. Coordination / Consultation with:

Dale Williams
Project Manager
Land Development Group
Bureau of Engineering
Department of Public Works

IX. DETERMINATION - RECOMMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

A. Summary

The proposed project will vacate the public right-of-way in the following street adjacent to the applicant’s property: Shatto Street between Valencia Street and Witmer Street, in the Central City West Specific Plan of the City of Los Angeles. The total area to be vacated is approximately 30,113 square feet (0.691 acres). The vacated area would revert to the vestee(s) of the underlying fee title interest, which is generally the adjacent property owner(s).

The project site is surrounded by parcels, which are zoned commercial and are developed with facilities of the Good Samaritan Hospital. There is a potential for future development. However, no development is proposed as part of this project. The vacation would consolidate the proposed areas to be vacated with the adjoining properties owned by the Good Samaritan Hospital (applicant). The vacation will further the Authority’s ability to promote airport security.

An Initial Records Search conducted by the South Central Coastal Information Center indicates that no archeological work is needed prior to approval of the street vacation. However, a halt-work condition should be in place in the event that cultural resources are discovered during any construction activities. No other potential impacts have been identified.
B. Recommended Environmental Documentation

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** should be adopted.

Prepared By: William Jones, Environmental Specialist II

Approved By: Gary Lee Moore, P.E.
City Engineer

By: James E. Doty, Acting Manager
Environmental Management Division

Figures:

1. Preliminary Vacation Map and Site Photographs
3. Project Site Location with Vacation Boundary.
4. Planning and Zoning Map with Key.
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Figure 2: Portion of Hollywood (USGS) Quad with Project Site.
Figure 3: Project Site Location with Vacation Boundary.
Figure 4: Planning and Zoning Map with Key