APPENDIX H

Transportation Assessment

To:

From:

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

5001 W. Wilshire Bl DOT Case No. CEN21-50601

Date:	December 2, 2021

Susan Jimenez, Administrative Clerk Department of *C*ity Planging

Wes Pringle, Transportation Engineer

Department of Transportation

Subject: TRANSPORTATION ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED MIXED-USE PROJECT LOCATED AT 5001 WEST WILSHIRE BOULEVARD

The Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) has reviewed the transportation assessment prepared by KOA, dated June 2021 and updated November 2021, for the proposed mixed-use project at 5001 West Wilshire Boulevard. In compliance with Senate Bill (SB) 743 and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis is required to identify the project's ability to promote the reduction of green-house gas emissions, the access to diverse land uses, and the development of multi-modal networks. The significance of a project's impact in this regard is measured against the VMT thresholds established in LADOT's Transportation Assessment Guidelines (TAG), as described below.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

A. <u>Project Description</u>

The project proposes to construct 243 multi-family units (including 25 affordable family units) and 10,900 square-feet of ground-floor commercial uses. The site is currently occupied by 36,300 square-feet of retail use. The project will provide 354 vehicle parking spaces in a subterranean garage. The project will also provide 21 short-term and 143 long-term bicycle parking spaces. Vehicular access will be provided by two full service driveways on Citrus Avenue. One of the driveways will provide access to the residential portion and the other will access the commercial. The project's site plan is illustrated in **Attachment A**. The project is expected to be completed by 2024.

B. <u>CEQA Screening Threshold</u>

Prior to accounting for trip reductions resulting from the application of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategies, a trip generation analysis was conducted to determine if the project would exceed the net 250 daily vehicle trips screening threshold. Using the City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator tool, which draws upon trip rate estimates published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition as well as applying trip generation adjustments when applicable, based on sociodemographic data and the built environment factors of the project's surroundings, it was determined that the project does not exceed the net 250 daily vehicle trips threshold. Therefore, no VMT analysis would be required. A copy of the VMT Calculator summary report is provided as **Attachment B.** Additionally, the analysis included further discussion of the transportation impact thresholds:

- T-1 Conflicting with plans, programs, ordinances, or policies
- T-2.1 Causing substantial vehicle miles traveled
- T-3 Substantially increasing hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use.

The assessment determined that the project would <u>**not**</u> have a significant transportation impact under Thresholds T-1 and T-3. A project's impacts per Threshold T-2.1 is determined by using the VMT calculator.

C. Access and Circulation

During preparation of the new CEQA guidelines, the State's Office of Planning and Research stressed that lead agencies can continue to apply traditional operational analysis requirements to inform land use decisions provided that such analyses were outside of the CEQA process. The authority for requiring non-CEQA transportation analysis and requiring improvements to address potential circulation deficiencies, lies in the City of Los Angeles' Site Plan Review authority as established in Section 16.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC). Therefore, LADOT continues to require and review a project's site access, circulation, and operational plan to determine if any access enhancements, transit amenities, intersection improvements, traffic signal upgrades, neighborhood traffic calming, or other improvements are needed. In accordance with this authority, the project has completed a circulation analysis using a "level of service" screening methodology that indicates that the trips generated by the proposed development will not likely result in adverse circulation conditions at several locations. LADOT has reviewed this analysis and determined that it adequately discloses operational concerns. A copy of the circulation analysis table that summarizes these potential deficiencies is provided as **Attachment C** to this report.

PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

Non-CEQA-Related Requirements and Considerations

To comply with transportation and mobility goals and provisions of adopted City plans and ordinances, the applicant should be required to implement the following:

1. <u>Citrus Avenue Closure</u>

The project proposes to close Citrus Avenue just south of the Carling Way alley and the Carling Way alley. The study analyzed the following four scenarios:

- 1a Opening up Citrus Avenue to northbound and southbound travel at Mansfield Avenue Park and closing the Carling Way alley between Citrus Avenue and Highland Avenue.
- 1b Opening up Citrus Avenue to northbound travel only at Mansfield Avenue Park and closing the Carling Way alley between Citrus Avenue and Highland Avenue.
- 1c Opening up Citrus Avenue to southbound travel only at Mansfield Avenue Park and closing Carling Way alley between Citrus Avenue and Highland Avenue.
- 2 Closing Citrus Avenue and Carling Way alley to all traffic.

The study indicated that Scenario 2 would not create any adverse conditions to the surrounding circulation system and the project is recommending to implement this scenario and fully close Citrus Avenue and the Caring Way alley. A copy of the closure plan is presented as **Attachment D.**

The proposed street closures are subject to final approval by LADOT's Hollywood-Wilshire District Office, the Bureau of Engineering, the Bureau of Street Services, and the Fire Department. If the determination that the street closures are feasible, then the Applicant would be responsible for all costs associated with the design and installation of the improvements through the B-Permit process of the Bureau of Engineering (BOE).

In addition, the Applicant shall be responsible for the cost and implementation of any traffic signal equipment modifications and bus stop relocations associated with the proposed transportation improvements and enhancements described above. All improvements, enhancements, and associated traffic signal work within the City of Los Angeles must be guaranteed through BOE's B-Permit process, prior to the issuance of any building permits and completed prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy. Temporary certificates of occupancy may be granted in the event of any delay through no fault of the Applicant, provided that, in each case, the Applicant has demonstrated reasonable efforts and due diligence to the satisfaction of LADOT. Prior to setting the bond amount, BOE shall require that the developer's engineer or contractor email LADOT's B-Permit Coordinator at ladot.planprocessing@lacity.org to arrange a pre-design meeting to finalize the proposed design needed for the project.

These improvements are voluntary and are not required for mitigation. Therefore, if found infeasible they will not be installed. An alternative improvement is not required.

2. <u>Parking Requirements</u>

The project will provide 354 vehicle parking spaces in a subterranean garage. The project will also provide 21 short-term and 143 long-term bicycle parking spaces. The applicant should check with the Departments of Building and Safety and City Planning on the number of parking spaces required for this project.

3. <u>Highway Dedication and Street Widening Requirements</u>

Per the Mobility Element of the General Plan, **Wilshire Boulevard**, is designated an Avenue I, which would require a 35-foot half-width roadway within a 50-foot half-width right-of-way. **Citrus Avenue** and **Carling Way** are designated Local Streets, which would require an 18-foot half-width roadway within a 30-foot half-width right-of-way. **Highland Avenue** is designated a Modified Avenue I. The applicant should check with the Bureau of Engineering's Land Development Group to determine if there are any other applicable highway dedication, street widening and/or sidewalk requirements for this project.

4. <u>Project Access and Circulation</u>

The conceptual site plan for the project (see **Attachment A**) is acceptable to LADOT. Review of this study does not constitute approval of the dimensions for any new proposed driveway. Review and approval of the driveway should be coordinated with LADOT's Citywide Planning Coordination Section (201 North Figueroa Street, 5th Floor, Room 550, at 213-482-7024). In order to minimize and prevent last minute building design changes, the applicant should contact LADOT for driveway width and internal circulation requirements prior to the commencement of building or parking layout design. The applicant should check with City Planning regarding the project's driveway placement and design.

5. Worksite Traffic Control Requirements

LADOT recommends that a construction work site traffic control plan be submitted to LADOT's

Citywide Temporary Traffic Control Section or Permit Plan Review Section for review and approval prior to the start of any construction work. Refer to

http://ladot.lacity.org/businesses/temporary-traffic-control-plans to determine which section to coordinate review of the work site traffic control plan. The plan should show the location of any roadway or sidewalk closures, traffic detours, haul routes, hours of operation, protective devices, warning signs and access to abutting properties. LADOT also recommends that all construction related truck traffic be restricted to off-peak hours to the extent feasible.

6. <u>TDM Ordinance Requirements</u>

The TDM Ordinance (LAMC 12.26 J) is currently being updated. The updated ordinance, which is currently progressing through the City's approval process, will:

- Expand the reach and application of TDM strategies to more land uses and neighborhoods,
- Rely on a broader range of strategies that can be updated to keep pace with technology, and
- Provide flexibility for developments and communities to choose strategies that work best for their neighborhood context.

Although not yet adopted, LADOT recommends that the applicant be subject to the terms of the proposed TDM Ordinance update expected in the future. The updated ordinance is expected to be completed prior to the anticipated construction of this project, if approved.

7. <u>Development Review Fees</u>

Section 19.15 of the LAMC identifies specific fees for traffic study review, condition clearance, and permit issuance. The applicant shall comply with any applicable fees per this ordinance.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (213) 972-8482.

Attachments

J:\Letters\2021\CEN21-50601_5001 W Wilshire BI_mixed-use_ltr.docx

c: Mashael Majid, Council District 4 Hokchi Chiu, Central District, BOE Bhuvan Bajaj, Hollywood-Wilshire District, DOT Taimour Tanavoli, Case Management Office, DOT Brian Marchetti, KOA

Attachment A 5001 W. Wilshire BI

FIGURE 1A



SITE PLAN REVIEW APRIL 7, 2021

SITE / FIRST FLOOR PLAN



Attachment B 5001 W. Wilshire Bl

CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR Version 1.3

æ

Project Screening Criteria: Is this project required to conduct a vehicle miles traveled analysis?



Project Screening Summary

Proposed	1,547 Daily Vehicle Trips	9,410 Daily VMT	iing Criteria	ntial units compared & is within one-half	iing Criteria	os < 250 trips 229 Net Daily Trips	$1T \le 0 \qquad 1,445$
Existing Land Use	1,318 Daily Vehicle Trips	7,965 Daily VMT	Tier 1 Screen	Project will have less reside to existing residential units mile of a fixed-rail station.	Tier 2 Screen	The net increase in daily trip	The net increase in daily VN

lacksquare Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)

% 0

Yes

12/4/2020

Neerufing the Miles

10.900 ksf

The proposed project consists of only retail

land uses ≤ 50,000 square feet total.

The proposed project is not required to

perform VMT analysis.





The state of the second s	Contraction of the local data		
Proposed Project Land Use Type	Value	Unit	
Retail General Retail	10.9	ksf	
Housing Multi-Family	218	DD	
Housing Affordable Housing - Family	25	DU	

TDM Strategies

Select each sectio Use 🗹 to denote

se 🚩 to denote if the TDM str	rategy is part of the	proposed project or is a	mitigation strategy	
Max Home Based TDN	Achieved?	Proposed Project NO	With Mitigation	Proj
Max Work Based TDM	l Achieved?	No No	No	
A	Parki	ing		1,5 2
Reduce Parking Supply	100 city coc	de parking provision for t	the project site	
🦵 Proposed Prj 📃 Mitigation	74 actual p	barking provision for the	project site	9,41 Daily V
Unbundle Parking Proposed Prj Mitigation	175 monthl site	y parking cost (dollar) fo	r the project	Ń
Parking Cash-Out Proposed Prj Mitigation	50 percent	t of employees eligible		Housesho per Ca
Price Workplace Parking	6.00 da	uily parking charge (dolla t of employees subject tc J	r) b priced	Work V per Emp
Residential Area Parking Permits Proposed Prj	200	ist (dollar) of annual perr	nit	Sig
•	Tran	sit		:
Ed	ucation & En	couragement		Househo
0	commute Trip	Reductions		15% Bel
	Shared N	lobility		Work
	Bicycle Infra	astructure		Thresho 15% Bel
Ne	ighborhood	Enhancement		

Analvsis Results

Ð

 If the TDM strategies If the TDM strategies If the TDM strategy is part of the proposed Project or is a mitgation strategy Ipoposed Project or is a mitgation strategy Proposed Project with Mitigation Based TDM Achieved? No Supply <li< th=""><th>roposedWithProjectU1,5471,5471,547Jaily Vehicle Tripsy vehicle TripsJaily Vehicle Trips9,4109,410Daily VMT9,410Daily VMTDaily VMTN/AN/AHouseshold VMTHouseshold VMT</th></li<>	roposedWithProjectU1,5471,5471,547Jaily Vehicle Tripsy vehicle TripsJaily Vehicle Trips9,4109,410Daily VMT9,410Daily VMTDaily VMTN/AN/AHouseshold VMTHouseshold VMT
Based TDM Achieved? No No Barking To ety code parking provision for the project site Mitigation To actual parking cost (dollar) for the project site Mitigation To actual parking cost (dollar) for the project site Mitigation To percent of employees eligible Mitigation 50 percent of employees subject to priced Mitigation 50 percent of employees subject to priced Mitigation 50 percent of employees subject to priced	ProjectWith1,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,4101,5471,410 <t< th=""></t<>
Based TDM Achieved? No 1,547 Barking Parking Parking g Supply 100 city code parking provision for the project site Mitigation 74 actual parking provision for the project site Mitigation 74 actual parking cost (dollar) for the project site Mitigation 175 monthly parking cost (dollar) for the project site Ut 50 percent of employees eligible Mitigation 50 percent of employees subject to priced Mitigation 50 percent of employees subject to priced	1,5471,547Iy Vehicle TripsDaily Vehicle Trips9,4109,410Daily VMT9,410Daily VMTN/AN/AN/APer CapitaHouseshold VMT
Parking Parking g Supply 100 city code parking provision for the project site mitigation 74 actual parking provision for the project site Mitigation 75 monthly parking cost (dollar) for the project Mitigation 175 site Mitigation 50 percent of employees eligible Mitigation 50 percent of employees subject to priced Mitigation 50 percent of employees subject to priced	J.,54/ J.,54/ Jy Vehicle Trips Daily Vehicle Trips 9,410 9,410 Daily VMT 9,410 Daily VMT Daily VMT N/A N/A Houseshold VMT Houseshold VMT
g Supply 100 city code parking provision for the project site 9,410 Mitigation 74 actual parking provision for the project site 9,410 Mitigation 77 actual parking cost (dollar) for the project 9,410 Mitigation 175 monthly parking cost (dollar) for the project 9,410 Mitigation 175 site MVA Out 50 percent of employees eligible N/A Mitigation 50 daily parking charge (dollar) work VMT et Parking 50 percent of employees subject to priced W/A Mitigation 50 percent of employees subject to priced per Employee	9,410 9,410 9,410 Daily VMT Daily VMT N/A N/A N/A Houseshold VMT Houseshold VMT Per Capita
Mitigation 74 actual parking provision for the project site 9,410 Mitigation 175 monthly parking cost (dollar) for the project 9,410 Mitigation 175 monthly parking cost (dollar) for the project 9,410 Mitigation 175 monthly parking cost (dollar) for the project P(MA) Out 50 percent of employees eligible N/A Mitigation 50 percent of employees subject to priced Work VMT ea Parking 50 parking Percent of employees subject to priced	9,410 9,410 Daily VMT Daily VMT N/A N/A N/A useshold VMT Houseshold VMT per Capita
ding 175 monthly parking cost (dollar) for the project Mitigation 175 site Dut 50 percent of employees eligible Mitigation 50 ally parking charge (dollar) Mitigation 50 percent of employees subject to priced Mitigation 50 percent of employees subject to priced	N/A N/A useshold VMT Per Capita
Out 50 percent of employees eligible Houseshold VMT Mitigation 50 ality parking charge (dollar) work VMT Mitigation 50 percent of employees subject to priced work VMT aa Parking 50 parking per Employee	useshold VMT Houseshold VMT per Capita
ce Parking 6.00 daily parking charge (dollar) Work VMT Mork VMT Mitigation 50 percent of employees subject to priced per Employee as Parking as Parking Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Solution Sol	
a Parking	N/A N/A Work VMT Work VMT work ber Employee
Ritigation cost (dollar) of annual permit	Significant VMT Impact?
Transit	
Education & Encouragement	hreshold = 6.0 Threshold = 6.0
Commute Trip Reductions	5% Below APC 15% Below APC
Shared Mobility Work: N/	Vork: N/A Work: N/A
Bicycle Infrastructure 15% Below APC	hreshold = 7.6 Threshold = 7.6 5% Below APC 15% Below APC
Neighborhood Enhancement	

		Peak	Future (without-	(2024) Project	Future (with-Pr	(2024) oject	Change in
	Study Intersections	Hour	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay
1	Sycamore Drive & Wilshire Boulevard	AM	5.3	Α	6.1	А	0.8
		PM	4.6	А	4.6	А	0.0
2	Citrus Avenue & Wilshire Boulevard*	AM	>500	F	>500	F	-
		PM	>500	F	>500	F	-
3	Highland Avenue & Wilshire Boulevard	AM	172.2	F	172.3	F	0.1
		PM	216.4	F	217.1	F	0.7
4	Highland Avenue & 6th Street	AM	71.9	E	72.6	E	0.7
		PM	88.8	F	88.0	F	-0.8

Table 8 – Future Intersection Delay Performance

LOS = Level of Service, Delay = Vehicle delay in seconds

*Two-Way Stop Controlled Intersection; Delay is based on the higher approach

As shown in Table 8, the study intersections will continue to operate similarly to the Existing with-Project conditions. Three of the four study intersections would operate at the same levels of service, with one intersection experiencing further LOS deterioration (Highland Avenue and 6th Street) in the Future without-Project conditions. The following summarizes the results:

- Sycamore Drive and Wilshire Boulevard would operates at LOS A during both a.m. and p.m. peak hours and will continue to operate at LOS A in the Future with-Project scenario during both a.m. and p.m. peak hours.
- Citrus Avenue and Wilshire Boulevard and Highland Avenue and Wilshire Boulevard both would operate at LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours and will continue to operate at LOS F in the Future with-Project scenario during both peak hours.
- Highland Avenue and 6th Street would operate at LOS E during the a.m. and LOS F during the p.m. peak hour and will continue to operate at the same levels of service during the Future with-Project scenario.

The Future without-Project traffic volumes for the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours are illustrated on Figure 13. The Future without-Project traffic analysis worksheets for this scenario are provided in Appendix F.

The Future with-Project traffic volumes for the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak-hour volumes are illustrated in Figure 14. The analysis worksheets for this scenario are provided in Appendix G.

Attachment D 5001 W. Wilshire BI

FIGURE **1B**

LA 5001 W Wilshire Blvd TIS

Citrus Avenue Roadway Improvement Plar





LADOT

Transportation Assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

This MOU acknowledges that the Transportation Assessment for the following Project will be prepared in accordance with the latest version of LADOT's Transportation Assessment Guidelines:

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name:	5001 Wilshire Boulevard Mixed-Use Project	
Project Address:	5001 Wilshire Blvd.	
Project Description:	243 apartment units (218 market rate, 25 affordable), 10.900 sq.ft. of commercial, and 292	
parking stalls. as a	mixed-use building with subterranean parking. Extension options for linear park and circulation c	changes
		he revi

LADOT Project Case Number: _____ Project Site Plan attached? (*Required*) V es \Box No

will be reviewed.

II. TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM) MEASURES

Provide any transportation demand management measures that are being considered where the eligibility needs to be verified in advance (e.g. bike share kiosks, unbundled parking, microstransit service, etc.). Note that LADOT staff will make the final determination if TDM measures eligibility for a particular project. Please confirm eligibility with the LADOT Planning and Bureau staff assigned to your project.

- 1 Reduced parking (324 res spaces<363 in LAMC, 30<40 comm 3
- per LAMC) 2
- 4

Select any TDM measures that are currently being considered that may be eligible as a Project Design Feature¹:

\checkmark	Reduced Parking Supply ²
\checkmark	Bicycle Parking and Amenities

III. TRIP GENERATION

Trip Generation Rate(s) Source: ITE 10th Edition / Other _____ ITE 10th Edition

Trip Generation Adjustment (Exact amount of credit subject to approval by LADOT)	Yes	No
Transit Usage		\checkmark
Existing Active or Previous Land Use	\checkmark	
Internal Trip	\checkmark	
Pass-By Trip	\checkmark	
Transportation Demand Management (See above)		

Trip generation table including a description of the existing and proposed land uses, rates, estimated morning and afternoon peak hour volumes (ins/outs/totals), proposed trip credits, etc. attached? (*Required*) \Box Yes \Box No

AM Trips PM Trips	<u>IN</u> 7 1	<u>оит</u> 49 -25	<u>total</u> 55 -24	NET Daily Vehicle Trips (DVT) <u>296</u> DVT (ITE <u>10</u> ed.) <u>229</u> DVT (VMT Calculator ver)

¹ At this time Project Design Features are only those measures that are also shown to be needed to comply with a local ordinance, affordable housing incentive program, or state law.

²Select if reduced parking supply is pursued as a result of a parking incentive as permitted by the City's Bicycle Parking Ordinance, State Density Bonus Law, or a the City/s Transit Oriented ted Community Guidelines.

LADOT

City of Los Angeles Transportation Assessment MOU LADOT Project Case No:

IV. **STUDY AREA AND ASSUMPTIONS**

Project Buildout Year: ²⁰²¹ Ambient Growth Rate: 1.0 % Per Yr.

Related Projects List, researched by the consultant and approved by LADOT, attached? (Required) 🛛 es 🗆 No

STUDY INTERSECTIONS and/or STREET SEGMENTS (May be subject to LADOT revision after access, safety and circulation evaluation)

Sycamore/Wilshire 3 La Brea Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard 1 2 Citrus/Wilshire 4 Highland Avenue/6th Street Sycamore and Orange Avenues, 6th St to Wilshire BI Citrus Avenue, 6th St to Wilshire Bl

Is this Project located on a street within the High Injury Network?
Second Yes Vo

V. ACCESS ASSESSMENT

VI.

- a. Does the project exceed 1,000 total DVT? \Box Yes \checkmark No
- b. Is the project's frontage 250 linear feet or more along an Avenue or Boulevard as classified by the City's General Plan? □ Yes √No
- c. Is the project's building frontage encompassing an entire block along an Avenue or Boulevard as classified by the City's General Plan? v/Yes \Box No

If questions a., b., or c. is Yes then complete Attachment C.1: Access Assessment Criteria.

CONSULTANT

VI. SITE PLAN AND MAP OF STUDY AREA			
Does the attached site plan or map of study area show	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Each study intersection and/or street segment			
Project Vehicle Peak Hour trips at each study intersection	N.		
Project Vehicle Peak Hour trips at each project access point	\checkmark		
Project driveways (show widths and directions or lane assignment)	✓		
Pedestrian access points and any pedestrian paths	\checkmark		
Pedestrian loading zones			
Delivery loading zone or area			\checkmark
Bicycle parking onsite	\checkmark		
Bicycle parking offsite (in public right-of-way)			

VII. **CONTACT INFORMATION**

Name: Brian I Address: 1100 Phone: 323-8 email: bmarcl	Marchetti - KOA) Corporate Center Dr, Suite 20 59-3129 hetti@koacorp.com)1		
Approved by:	X Consultant's Representative	X Date	LADOT Representative	*Date

*MOUs are generally valid for two years after signing. If after two years a transportation assessment has not been submitted to LADOT, the developer's representative shall check with the appropriate LADOT office to determine if the terms of this MOU are still valid or if a new MOU is needed.

DEVELOPER

CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR Version 1.3



Project Screening Criteria: Is this project required to conduct a vehicle miles traveled analysis?

Project Information

Is the project replacing an existing number of residential units with a smaller number of residential units AND is located within one-half mile of a fixed-rail or fixed-guideway transit

• Yes	• No

Existing La	and	Use		
Land Use Type		Value	Unit	
Retail General Retail	-	36.3	ksf	- + -
Retail General Retail		36.3	ksf	
Click here to add a single custom land use	type (wi	ill be included	in the above l	ist)
Proposed Proje	act I	and He		
		Value	Unit	
Housing L Affordable Housing - Family	.	25	DU	
Retail General Retail		10.9	ksf	- 1
Housing Multi-Family		218	DU	
Housing Affordable Housing - Family		25	DU	

Click here to add a single custom land use type (will be included in the above list)

Project Screening Summary

Existing Land Use	Propos	sed							
1,3181,547Daily Vehicle TripsDaily Vehicle Trips7,9659,410Daily VMTDaily VMT									
7,965 Daily VMT	0 MT								
Tier 1 Screening Criteria									
Project will have less residential units compared to existing residential units & is within one-half mile of a fixed-rail station. Tier 2 Screening Criteria									
Tier 2 Screening CriteriaThe net increase in daily trips < 250 trips229 Net Daily									
The net increase in daily VM	MT ≤ 0	1,445 Net Daily VMT							
The proposed project consists of only retail 10.900 land uses ≤ 50,000 square feet total. ksf									
The proposed project is not required to perform VMT analysis.									



CITY OF LOS ANGELES VMT CALCULATOR Version 1.3



Project Information



Proposed Project Land Use Type	Value	Unit
Retail General Retail	10.9	ksf
Housing Multi-Family	218	DU
Housing Affordable Housing - Family	25	DU

Select each section to show individual section to show individual to denote if the TDM strates	dual strate	egies t of the proposed project or is a	mitigation strategy						
Max Home Based TDM Max Work Based TDM	Achieve Achieve	Proposed Project of No ed? No ed? No	With Mitigation No No						
A Reduce Parking Supply	100	Parking city code parking provision for	the project site						
Proposed Prj 🔲 Mitigation	74	actual parking provision for th	e project site						
Unbundle Parking Proposed Prj Mitigation	175	monthly parking cost (dollar) f site	or the project						
Parking Cash-Out Proposed Prj Mitigation	50	percent of employees eligible							
Price Workplace Parking Proposed Prj Mitigation	6.00 50	daily parking charge (dollar) percent of employees subject to priced parking							
Residential Area Parking Permits Proposed Prj Mitigation	200	cost (dollar) of annual per	rmit						
в		Transit							
C Edu	cation	& Encouragement							
D Co	mmut	e Trip Reductions							
E	Sha	red Mobility							
F	Bicycle	e Infrastructure							
G Neid	ahborh	ood Enhancement							

TDM Strategies

Analysis Results

Proposed Project	With
1.547	1.547
Daily Vehicle Trips	Daily Vehicle Trips
9,410	9,410
Daily VMT	Daily VMT
N/A	N/A
Houseshold VMT per Capita	Houseshold VMT
N/A	N/A
Work VMT	Work VMT
Significant \	/MT Impact?
Significant \ Household: N/A	/MT Impact? Household: N/A
Significant \ Household: N/A Threshold = 6.0	/MT Impact? Household: N/A Threshold = 6.0
Significant N Household: N/A Threshold = 6.0 15% Below APC	/MT Impact? Household: N/A Threshold = 6.0 15% Below APC
Significant N Household: N/A Threshold = 6.0 15% Below APC Work: N/A	/MT Impact? Household: N/A Threshold = 6.0 15% Below APC Work: N/A
Significant N Household: N/A Threshold = 6.0 15% Below APC Work: N/A Threshold = 7.6	/MT Impact? Household: N/A Threshold = 6.0 15% Below APC Work: N/A Threshold = 7.6



JC01167 5001 Wilshire Mixed-Use

Trip Generation Summary

ITE RATES

Land Use ¹	Intoncity	11	Daily	1	AM Peak			PM Peak	
Land Use	intensity	Units	Total	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Trip Generation Rates									
(820) Ground Floor Retail	-	KSF	37.75	0.94	62%	38%	3.81	48%	52%
(221) Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)	-	d.u.	5.44	0.36	26%	74%	0.44	61%	39%
Affodable Housing (Family) ³	-	d.u.	4.16	0.49	37%	63%	0.35	56%	44%
Trip Generation Estimates									
(820) Ground Floor Retail	10.9	KSF	411	10	6	4	42	20	22
(221) Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)	218	d.u.	1,186	78	20	58	96	59	37
Affordable Housing (Family)	25	d.u.	104	12	4	8	1	1	0
Subtotal			1,701	100	30	70	139	80	59
Trip Generation Adjustments									
Existing Credit									
(820) Shopping Center	36.30	KSF	(1,370)	(34)	(21)	(13)	(138)	(66)	(72)
Subtotal			331	66	9	57		14	-13
Internal Capture Trip Reduction									
Commercial	per NCHRP	-	(10)	(1)	(1)	0	(9)	(3)	(6)
Residential	per NCHRP	-	(20)	(9)	(1)	(8)	(11)	(8)	(3)
Subtotal			301	56	7	49	-19	3	-22
Pass-by Trip Reduction ⁴									
(820) Ground Floor Retail	50%		(5)	(1)	(1)	0	(5)	(2)	(3)
Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)	0%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL			296	55	7	49	-24	1	-25

1) Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition.

2) d.u. = Dwelling units., KSF=thousand square feet

3) Based on LADOT Guidelines of Affordable Housing Projects (Family) within a TPA area

4) Based on LADOT Guidelines of 50% pass-by credit for shopping center-type uses with less than 50,000 sq.ft. of floor area.

JC01167 LA 5001 Wilshire Blvd Mixed-Use Related Projects Trip Generation Summary

ITE RATES

	Ducient	Land Has	Intereity	11	Daily		AM Peal	۲.		PM Peal	٢
IU	Project	Land Use	Intensity	Units Onits		Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Are	ea Project Trip Generation	- Trips									
I	La Brea Mixed-Use - 850 S La Brea Avenue	Apartments	40	DU	458	24	6	18	42	24	18
		Retail	4.5	KSF							
2	Wilshire Mixed-Use - 5411 Wilshire Boulevard	Apartments	348	DU	(81.00)	26.00	(14.00)	40.00	(27.00)	3.00	(30.00)
		Retail	13.62	KSF							
		Restaurant	1	KSF							
		Total			377	50	-8	58	15	27	-12

1) KSF=thousand square feet

2) Area projects list obtained from LADOT

Figure 1. Study Area Map with AM Project Volumes



INTERSECTION VOLUMES







Figure 1. Study Area Map with PM Project Volumes



INTERSECTION VOLUMES









	centive	Wishire Boulevard, Per TOC Yara Inc	**5-foot Building Line along I	
	N/A.	5 Feet 60' Feet Min. along Highland Avenue and Citrus A	0 Feet *Through Lot with front yards	Provided
	<u>Rear</u> N/A	5 Feet 11 Feet	Front (E/W)* 0 Feet	Required
		3 8	105-0" Per TOC Tier	Total Transitional Height
		A.10	Unlimited Per LAMC 12.21.1	C4-2D/[Q]C2-1/[Q]C2-1-HPOZ Transitional Height
		O STORIES	HEIGHT AN	
82 83 TOTAL			468,200 441,200 27,000	Total - Gross Floor Area Residential Commercial
L B1			269,900	Residential
m ∩ -			10,000 550 900	Retail Parking Paseo Office
> 10 0		EAR 3.83 to 1	Floor Area (SF) 281,350	Proposed Total - Zoning Code
FLOOR 8	Permitted Floor Area (SF) 250,025 66,844 316,868	TOC increase (Tier 4) 50% 3.75 to 1	Base Floor Area/Lot Area (SF) 166,883 17,825	10C (0)C4-2-CD0 [0)C2-1-CD0 [0)C2-1-CD0
GROSS BUILDING ARE	166,683 26,738 193,421	55,561 17,825 73,386	3 to 1 1.5 to 1 2.64 to 1	C4-2D Zone [Q]C2-1/[Q]C2-1-HPOZ T0TAL *
Trees Require Trees Provide	Permitted Floor Area (SF)	Lot Area (SF)	EAR	Permitted
Landscape Requiremen Landscape Provide		c	86 ~	Three-Bedrooms
TOTA			66 114 Ee	Studios One-Bedrooms Tuo Bodrooms
Priva Balconies (120 × 50 sl			Units 243	Proposed Total
Ame nite Tot	<u>Units</u> 244	<mark>70% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 1</mark>	Base Density (Round Up) 143	Affordable Housing Bonus TOC
Courtya Green Br Roof Dec Tot	Units 138 341	Ratio (Unit per SF) 1 unit per 400 1 unit per 5,000	Lot Area (SF) 55,561 17,825	Standard Zoning C4-2D Zone [Q]C2-1/[Q]C2-1+IPOZ TOTAL
Proposed		1.68 SITY	73,386 DENS	Combined Total
Outdo		1.28 0.41	55,561 17,825	By Zone C4-2D [Q]C2-1/[Q]C2-1-HPOZ
> 3 habitable room Tot		1.68	73,386	Carling Way Total
< 3 Habitable room 3 Habitable room		1.18 0.32	51,601 13 865	Wilshire Site Carling Site
Docutiond		IING INFORMATION	LOT AREA AND ZON	

OBEN SPACE	Office Square ber Units Square ber 180 18.000 18 7.000 6 7.000 7 1.225 86 7.000 1 26.225 10.226 1.3.113 10.229% 6.506			Ronijomat	25% provided outdoor common open space 25% provided outdoor common open space	1 per 4 dus	
	SF per Unit 100 125 175 at let up	Square Feet 10,000 18,000 2,000 30,000	3,400 3,400	6,000 39,400	7,500	61 61	
	Required 3 Habitable rooms 3 Habitable rooms > 3 habitable rooms > 3 habitable rooms Outdoor Indoor	Proposed Outdoor Countyard Green Belt Roof Deck Total	Indoor Amentites Total	Balconies (120 × 50 sf) TOTAL	Landscape Requirement Landscape Provided	Trees Required Trees Provided	OSS BUILDING AREA

		39,700 SF	39,700 SF	39,700 SF	39,700 SF	38,400 SF	40,800 SF	17,700 SF	52,600 SF	53,300 SF	53,300 SF	53,300 SF	468,200 SF
ROSS BUILDING AREA	FLOOR	8	7	9	S	4	æ	2	1	B1	B2	B3	TOTAL

	Square feet	18,000	7,000	1,225	26,225	13,113	6,556													ent 5% provided outdoor common open space	5% provided outdoor common open space	aus		
PACE	Units	180	56	7		50%	25%													Requirem 25	25	1 per 4 d		
ö	SF per Unit	100	125	175		at least	up to	Square Feet		10,000	18,000	2,000	30,000	3 400	3 400	001 10	000 9	0,000	39,400	7,500	7,500	61	61	
	Required	< 3 Habitable rooms	3 Habitable rooms	> 3 habitable rooms	Total	Outdoor	Indoor	Proposed	Outdoor	Courtyard	Green Belt	Roof Deck	Total	Amanitina	Total		Private		TOTAL	Landscape Requirement	Landscape Provided	Trees Required	Trees Provided	

Ther 2,000 Factor Factor Ther 1 Ther 1 Ther 1 Ther 2 Ther 2 Ther 2 Ther 2 Ther 2000	Chera Chera Chera Chera Chera Chera Chera Chera Long Term (Resulting Units 26 - 100 Develling Units 26 - 100 Develling Units 26 - 100 Develling Units 201 - 570 Develling Units 201 - 572 Develling Unit	
Ratio 1 per 2,000 1 per 10,000 (min. 2)	Short Term (Commercial) Retail Office	
Ratio 1 per 10 1 per 15 1 per 20 1 per 40	Required Short Torm (Residential) 1 - 25 Dweling Units 26 - 100 Dweling Units 101 - 200 Dwelling Units 201 - 572 Dwelling Units 201 - 572 Dwelling Units	
B		
324 3084 364 354 354	Residential Standard Compact Compact ADA ADA Total	n open space n open space
5 m 22	Standard Compact ADA	
Spaces	Total Proposed	
1 per 250 1 per 500	Retail Office TOC Reduction (30%)	

Residential Spaces 66 171 126 363 Residential Spaces 122 5Daces 2 30 152 Parking Stalls 5 7 Parking Stalls 25 50 11 136 Parking Stalls 5 7 143 Parking Stalls 2.5 5 1.1 1.1 1.4 21 **Units** 66 63 63 900 000 000 10,000 900 Units 243 243 10,000 900 Units 25 100 43 Units 25 100 43 SICYCLE Total Per Unit 1.5 2 Per Unit 0.5 Ratio **Total** 14 7 7 7 Required Residential (LAMC) < 3 Habitable rooms 3 Habitable rooms > 3 habitable rooms > 3 habitable rooms Total Proposed Residential Short Term Residential Long Term Commercial Short Term Commercial Long Term Required Residential (TOC Tier 3) Residential (per Unit) Long Term Total Required Commercial





TOC PRE-APPLICATION SET NOVEMBER 10, 2020

PLOT PLAN - DATA



SITE / FIRST FLOOR PLAN

 \bigcirc 80, ,04 , 20

TOC PRE-APPLICATION SET NOVEMBER 10, 2020

5001 WILSHIRE LOS ANGELES, CA TCA # 2020-048

LADOTAccess Assessment Criteria

This Criteria acknowledges that the Transportation Assessment for the following Project will be prepared in accordance with the latest version of LADOT's Transportation Assessment Guidelines:

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name:

Project Address: 5001 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90036

Project Description: 8-story Mixed-use project with 243 residential units and 10.9 KSF of ground-floor commercial

LADOT Project Case Number: _____

II. PEDESTRIAN/ PERSON TRIP GENERATION

Source of Pedestrian/Person Trip Generation Rate(s)? □ VMT Calculator \checkmark ITE 10th Edition □ Other:

	Land Use	Size/Unit	Daily Person Trips
	Multi-family (mid-rise) Residential	243 du	580
Proposed	General Retail	10.9 ksf	930
Proposed			
		Total new trips:	1,510

Pedestrian/Person trip generation table including a description of the proposed land uses, trip credits, person trip assumptions, comparison studies used for reference, etc. attached?
Que Yes
Que No

III. PEDESTRIAN ATTRACTORS INVENTORY

Attach Pedestrian Map for the area (1,320 foot radius from edge of the project site) depicting:

- site pedestrian entrance(s)
- Existing or proposed passenger loading zones
- pedestrian generation/distribution values
 - O Geographic Distribution: N ¹⁵ % S ²⁵ % E ²⁰ % W ⁴⁰ %
- transit boarding and alighting of transit stops (should include Metro rail stations; Metro, DASH, and other municipal bus stops)
- Key pedestrian destinations with hours of operation:
 - o schools (school times)
 - o government offices with a public counter or meeting room
 - senior citizen centers
 - recreation centers or playgrounds
 - o public libraries
 - o medical centers or clinics
 - o child care facilities
 - post offices

A-11 ATTACHMENT C.1: Access Assessment Criteria

- places of worship
- o grocery stores
- o other facilities that attract pedestrian trips
- pedestrian walking routes to key destinations from project site

Note: Pedestrian Count Summary, Bicycle Count Summary, Manual Traffic Count Summary will need to be attached to the Transportation Assessment

IV. FACILITIES INVENTORY

Is a High Injury Network street located within 1,320 foot radius from the edge of the project site? ☑ Yes □ No If yes, list streets and include distance from the project:

Wilshire Boulevard	at <u>0</u> (feet)
	at(feet)
	at(feet)
	at(feet)

Attach Radius Map for the area (1,320 foot radius from edge of the project site) depicting the following existing and proposed facilities:

- transit stops
- bike facilities
- traffic control devices for controlled crossings
- uncontrolled crosswalks
- location of any missing, damaged or substandard sidewalks

For a reference of planned facilities, see the <u>Transportation Assessment Support Map</u>

Crossing Distances

Does the project property have frontage along an arterial street (designated as either an Avenue or Boulevard?)

⊈ Yes 🗆 No

If yes, provide the distance between the crossing control devices (e.g. signalized crosswalk, or controlled mid-block crossing) along any arterial within 1,320 feet of the property.

_(feet) at Wilshire Blvd (June/Keniston to Highland)	2,000 (feet) at 6th Street (Highland to La Brea)
(feet) at <u>Wilshire Blvd (Highland to Mansfield)</u>	(feet) at
_(feet) at <u>Wilshire Blvd (Mansfield to S</u> ycamore)	(feet) at
_(feet) at Wilshire Blvd (Sycamore to La Brea)	(feet) at
_(feet) at(feet) at((feet) at
_(feet) at6th Street (McCadden to Highland)	(feet) at
	(feet) atWilshire Blvd (June/Keniston to Highland) (feet) atWilshire Blvd (Highland to Mansfield) (feet) atWilshire Blvd (Mansfield to Sycamore) (feet) atWilshire Blvd (Sycamore to La Brea) (feet) atHighland Ave (Wilshire to 6th Street) (feet) at6th Street (McCadden to Highland)

V. Project Construction

Will the project require any construction activity within the city right-of-way?

If yes, will the project require temporary closure of any of the following city facilities?

- sidewalk
- bike lane
- parking lane
- travel lane
- bus stop
- bicycle parking (racks or corrals)
- bike share or other micro-mobility station
- car share station
- parklet
- other: _____

ITE RATES

Pedestrian Trip Generation

1 1	Intensity	2	Daily		AM Peak			PM Peak					
Land Use	intensity	Units	Total	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out				
Trip Generation Rates													
(820) Ground Floor Retail	-	KSF	-	0.14	62%	38%	0.24	48%	52%				
(221) Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)	-	d.u.	-	0.02	26%	74%	0.03	61%	39%				
Trip Generation Estimates													
(820) Ground Floor Retail	10.9	KSF	-	2	1	1	3	1	2				
(221) Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)	243	d.u.	-	5	1	4	7	4	3				
Subtotal			0	7	2	5	10	5	5				

Rates from ITE 10th Generation Edition, Walk Trips Category. Distribution based on Vehicle Distribution

ITE RATES

Person Trip Generation

	Intensity	11×10^{2}	Daily		AM Peak			PM Peak		
Land Use	Intensity	Units	Total ³	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	
Trip Generation Rates										
(820) Ground Floor Retail	-	KSF	-	5.03	54%	46%	7.49	50%	50%	
(221) Multifamily Housing (Mid-	_	du	-	0.32	20%	80%	0.41	61%	39%	
Rise)		u.u.		0.52	2070	0070	0.41	0170	5570	
Trip Generation Estimates										
(820) Ground Floor Retail	10.9	KSF	820	55	30	25	82	41	41	
(221) Multifamily Housing (Mid-	243	dц	1000	78	16	62	100	61	39	
Rise)	215	0.0.	1000	,0	10	02	100	01	55	
Subtotal		1,820	133	46	87	182	102	80		
Internal Capture Trip Reduction										
(820) Ground Floor Retail	per NCHRP	-	(160)	(8)	(4)	(4)	(16)	(5)	(11)	
(221) Multifamily Housing (Mid-	ner NCHRP	_	(70)	(1)	0	(1)	(7)	(5)	(2)	
Rise)	permenta		(70)	(1)	0	(1)	(7)	()	(2)	
Subtotal			1,590	124	42	82	159	92	67	
Pass-by Trip Reduction ⁴										
(820) Ground Floor Retail	50%		(80)	(4)	(2)	(2)	(8)	(3)	(5)	
Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)	0%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL			1,510	120	40	80	151	89	62	

Rates from ITE 10th Generation Edition, AM and PM peak hour of generation Person Trips.

1) Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition.

 2) d.u. = Dwelling units., KSF=thousand square feet
 3) Daily Person Trips (and trip credit deductions) derived by taking higher of two peak hour Person Trip rates (and higher absolute value of deductions). No Existing Credit.

Figure C.1-a: Pedestrian Trip Generation and Destinations



Project

Landmarks and Amenities

- (
 Education
- Government Agency
- Private Industry; Non-Profit/Community Groups
- 🖂 Postal
- 📜 Grocery
- 💖 Medical/Pharmacy

Infrastructure

Bus Stop (Existing)

Entrance



Figure C-1.b: Transit and Bicycle Facilities (Existing and Proposed)



Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

- (3) Broken or Damaged Sidewalk
 - Signal-controlled Crossing
- Uncontrolled Crosswalk
 - Proposed Bikeways (Mobility Plan)

Transit

Bus Stop (Existing)







TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

Date:	February 21, 2021 DRAFT
To:	Jamie Poster Rosenberg - Craig Lawson & Co., LLC
From:	Brian Marchetti, AICP
Subject:	Roadway Volume Effects of Citrus Avenue Modification Scenarios– 5001 Wilshire Mixed-Use Project

KOA analyzed shifts in traffic volumes and project roadway segment volume impacts of various re-configurations of Citrus Avenue, related to the development of the adjacent site at 5001 Wilshire Boulevard. The four full and partial closure scenarios of Citrus Avenue are as follows:

- 1a) Opening up Citrus Avenue to northbound and southbound travel at Mansfield Avenue Park and closing the Carling Way alley between Citrus Avenue and Highland Avenue
- 1b) Opening up Citrus Avenue to northbound travel only at Mansfield Avenue Park and closing the Carling Way alley between Citrus Avenue and Highland Avenue
- 1c) Opening up Citrus Avenue to southbound travel only at Mansfield Avenue Park and closing the Carling Way alley between Citrus Avenue and Highland Avenue
- 2) Closing Citrus Avenue and the Carling Way alley to all traffic

The analysis of these scenarios and neighborhood roadway impact conclusions are summarized below.

Traffic Volume Shifts

KOA analyzed shifts in traffic volumes (vehicle trips moving to alternate roadways based on access changes) based on existing area traffic volumes and local trip patterns observed using big traffic data from conglomerated mobile device patterns. This data came from Streetlight Data's Insight traffic analysis tool.

Base volumes also were defined by average year-2019 volumes on the analyzed segments from Streetlight Data. An analysis of existing area local roadway volumes and comparison to Streetlight Data results indicated that the Streetlight Data volumes were higher and therefore those were applied to the analysis.



For the Citrus Avenue opening scenarios (1a through 1c), the analysis assumes that traffic diverts to Citrus Avenue from nearby streets in both the northbound and southbound directions. The diversions incorporate traffic from Orange Drive, Sycamore Avenue and Highland Avenue, which run parallel to Citrus Avenue, and traffic headed to or from Wilshire Boulevard via the parallel through streets. A significant component of the diversion (including all of the diversions from Orange and Sycamore and a proportion of the diversion from the Highland) consists of traffic detouring around the closure on Mansfield Avenue just north of Wilshire.

In scenario 2, traffic headed to Highland Avenue and Wilshire Boulevard via Carling Way is shifted from Citrus Avenue due to the full closure of Citrus and Carling by Mansfield Avenue Park (adjacent to the project site). Traffic from Citrus Avenue diverts to Highland Avenue, Orange Drive and Sycamore Ave. These diversions are also incorporated into scenario 1b, as the closure of Citrus to southbound movement prevents southbound travel to Highland and Wilshire.

Table 1 breaks down the diversions by their primary source or origin (providing the total diversions used in the Level-of-service analysis. The Attachment A figures illustrate the diversion patterns for each scenario, showing any increases (green) or decreases (red) on through or turn movements and the total traffic entering or exiting the area at the ultimate origin or destination of the diverted trips.



Origin	Scenario	1a Shifts	Scenario 1	b Shifts	Scenario 1c Shifts	Scenario 2 Shifts
Chight	NB	SB	NB	SB	NB	SB
Highland,						
Southbound	-	370	-		370	-
Wilshire						
Highland,						
Northbound	543	-	543		-	-
Thru @						
wiisnire						
north of 6th	-	34	-		34	-
Mansfield, 6 th to Wilshire	-	21	-		21	-
Mansfield, south of	79	-	79		-	-
wiisnire						
Citrus Avenue to Carling Way		-26		-430	-26	-430
Total	622	399	622	-430	399	-430

Table 1. Traffic Shifts by Scenario and Origin

Scenario 1b includes the Northbound shifts from Scenario 1 and the Southbound shifts from Scenario 2. Scenario 1c includes just the Southbound shifts from Scenario 1.

Roadway Volume Effects

Table 1 compares roadway Level-of-Service under future pre-diversion, post-diversion and postdiversion with project conditions with the Scenario 1 (Citrus Avenue Opening in both directions) diversions. The project diversions cause slight decreases in volumes on Sycamore Avenue and Orange Drive and a considerable increase in volumes on Citrus Avenue (as traffic diverts from the former two streets to the latter), and a significant impact per City of Los Angeles traffic guidelines thresholds for local roadway volume increases.

Project traffic increases volumes slightly on Citrus Avenue. Level-of-Service remains satisfactory on all three segments under pre- and post-project conditions and there are no significant impacts.



	Roadway Segment	Existing			Future No Project			Future No Project with Shifts			Future wit	Post-Pro th Shifts	oject	Diff in Vols,		
		Daily Volume	V/C	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C	LOS	from No Project	Percent Increase	Standard
Α	Sycamore Avenue, between 6th Street and Wilshire	3,347	0.669	В	3,381	0.676	в	3,362	0.672	в	3,362	0.672	в	-19	-0.56%	8%
в	Orange Avenue, between 6th Street and Wilshire	2,973	0.595	A	3,003	0.601	В	2,983	0.597	A	2,983	0.597	A	-20	-0.67%	10%
с	Citrus Avenue, between 6th Street and Wilshire	2,933	0.587	A	2,962	0.592	A	3,983	0.797	с	4,049	0.810	D	1,087	36.70%	8%

Table 1. Volumes and Effects of Scenario 1a (Citrus Avenue Opening)

Existing daily volume source: Streetlight Data, average weekday for year 2019; Factored to year 2021.

Tables 2 and 3 evaluate roadway volume effects with and without diversions with the Scenario 1b and 1c (Citrus Avenue opening in northbound and southbound directions, respectively) diversions.

Both diversions have similar effects to the Scenario 1a diversions. In Scenario 1b, volumes decrease slightly on Sycamore Avenue and Orange Drive (as northbound traffic diverting from Mansfield shifts to Citrus) and increase on Citrus Avenue (as traffic diverts to the street).

In Scenario 1c, volumes remain constant in the post-diversion conditions on Sycamore Avenue and Orange Drive (with no diversion of southbound traffic from these streets) and increase on Citrus Avenue. Volumes increase with project traffic on Citrus Avenue and there would be a significant impact per City of Los Angeles traffic guidelines thresholds for local roadway volume increases.



Table 2. Volumes and Effects of Scenario 1b(Citrus Avenue Partial Opening)

	Roadway Segment		Existing			Future No Project			Future No Project with Shifts			Post-Pro th Shifts	oject	Diff in Vols,		
noutral ocginent		Daily Volume	V/C	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C	LOS	from No Project	Percent Increase	Standard
A	Sycamore Avenue, between 6th Street and Wilshire	3,347	0.669	В	3,381	0.676	В	3,362	0.168	A	3,362	0.168	Α	-19	-0.56%	8%
В	Orange Avenue, between 6th Street and Wilshire	2,973	0.595	A	3,003	0.601	В	2,983	0.149	А	2,983	0.149	А	-20	-0.67%	8%
с	Citrus Avenue, between 6th Street and Wilshire	2,933	0.587	A	2,962	0.592	A	3,154	0.158	A	3,220	0.161	А	258	8.71%	10%

Existing daily volume source: Streetlight Data, average weekday for year 2019; Factored to year 2021.

Table 3. Volumes and Effects of Scenario 1c(Citrus Avenue Partial Opening)

Roadway Segment		Existin a			Euture No Project			Future No Project			Future Post-Project			Diff in Vols.		
		Daily Volume	V/C	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C	LOS	from No Project	Percent Increase	Standard
А	Sycamore Avenue, between 6th Street and Wilshire	3,347	0.669	В	3,381	0.676	В	3,381	0.169	A	3,381	0.169	A	0	0.00%	8%
в	Orange Avenue, between 6th Street and Wilshire	2,973	0.595	В	3,003	0.601	A	3,003	0.150	A	3,003	0.150	A	0	0.00%	8%
с	Citrus Avenue, between 6th Street and Wilshire	2,933	0.587	A	2,962	0.592	с	3,361	0.168	A	3,427	0.171	A	465	15.70%	8%

Existing daily volume source: Streetlight Data, average weekday for year 2019; Factored to year 2021.

Table 4 provides the volume effects of diversions based on Scenario 2. In contrast to the first three scenarios, roadway volumes increase on Sycamore Avenue and Orange Drive and decrease considerably on Citrus Avenue, as southbound traffic headed to Carling Way diverts from Citrus to alternate routes. Volumes increase slightly with project traffic on the Citrus segment but not enough to outweigh the effects of the traffic diversion. There would be no significant impacts under this scenario.



Table 4. Volumes and Effects of Scenario 2 (Full Closure of Citrus Avenue)

	Roadway Segment		Existing			Future No Project			Future No Project with Shifts			Post-Pro th Shifts	oject	Diff in Vols,		
Roadway Segment		Daily Volume	V/C	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C	LOS	from No Project	Percent Increase	Standard
A	Sycamore Avenue, between 6th Street and Wilshire	3,347	0.669	В	3,381	0.676	В	3,435	0.687	В	3,435	0.687	В	54	I.60%	8%
В	Orange Avenue, between 6th Street and Wilshire	2,973	0.595	A	3,003	0.601	В	3,030	0.606	В	3,030	0.606	В	27	0.90%	8%
с	Citrus Avenue, between 6th Street and Wilshire	2,933	0.587	A	2,962	0.592	A	2,532	0.506	A	2,598	0.520	А	-364	-12.29%	8%

Existing daily volume source: Streetlight Data, average weekday for year 2019; Factored to year 2021.



ATTACHMENT A – VOLUME SHIFT FIGURES

Scenario 1. Roadway Segment Shifts with Citrus opening in both directions





Scenario1b Roadway Segment Shifts with Citrus opening-NB Only





Scenario1c Roadway Segment Shifts with Citrus opening-SB Only





Scenario 2. Roadway Segment Shifts with Carling Way Closure







TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

Date:	March 16, 2021
То:	Jamie Poster Rosenberg - Craig Lawson & Co., LLC
From:	Brian Marchetti, AICP
Subject	Supplemental Traffic Analysis - Construction Traffic – 5001 Wilshire Blvd.

KOA conducted a supplemental analysis for this summary technical memorandum, as part of traffic analysis efforts for the proposed project at 5001 Wilshire Boulevard. The focus of the analysis was trip generation and truck routing for the project construction period.

Construction Period Trip Generation

Construction period traffic was examined based on the anticipated number of daily truck trips during the peak period of construction, with the following assumptions based on project planning by the applicant:

- 65,095 cubic yards (CY) of grading export
- Trucks with a capacity of 14 CY per haul trip
- Round hauling truck trips at 4,650
- Grading period duration of 66 working days
- 71 round trips by truck per day, nine round trips per hour on eight-hour workday
- An on-site construction employee population of 20 persons

The construction period trip generation calculations are provided in Table 1. The total trip generation in vehicle equivalents would be 395 on a daily basis, with 66 of those trips occurring in both the a.m. peak hour and the p.m. peak hour.

The proposed project in the operations period would generate a net total of 296 daily trips, including 55 trips in the a.m. peak hour and a net negative total of 24 trips in the p.m. peak hour.



	Average		AM Peak		PM Peak						
пр туре	Daily	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out				
Personnel	40	20	20	0	20	0	20				
Truck Hauling	142	18	9	9	18	9	9				
Adjustment Factor											
Passenger Car Equivalency (Truck)		2.5									
Adjusted Values											
Employees	40	20	20	0	20	0	20				
Haul Trucks	355	45	23	23	45	23	23				
Total	395	66	43	23	66	23	43				

Table 1 – Truck Trip Generation Forecast

Construction Period Operations Analysis

The study area data for the main project Traffic Assessment was used to analyze construction traffic with the trip generation defined in Table 1. At the three signalized study intersections, the increase in average vehicle delay would be minimal, ranging from no increase to 1.9 seconds. The LOS value worsens for the intersection of Highland Avenue/6th Street in the PM peak hour, from E to F, but the intersection under existing conditions is operating near the upper limits of LOS E conditions.

At the unsignalized study intersection of Citrus Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard, delay is based on the worstcase delay at the side-street (stop-sign controlled) approaches with the Wilshire Boulevard approaches as uncontrolled. Existing delay at the minor approaches at this location is high, but the project construction only causes minor delay increases of 3.4 seconds in the AM peak hour and 17.5 seconds in the PM peak hour (both less than a 10 percent increase), due to increases in traffic on Wilshire Boulevard.

Based on this analysis, the construction effects at the study intersections are less than significant.

Study Intersections			Existing Conditions		Existing with Construction		Change in			
		Peak Hour	Delay in Sec.	LOS	Delay in Sec.	LOS	Delay			
1	Sycamore Drive and Wilshire	AM	5.2	Α	6.0	А	0.8			
	Boulevard	PM	4.5	А	4.5	А	0.0			
2	Citrus Avenue and Wilshire	AM	45.4	E	48.8	E	3.4			
	Boulevard *	PM	225.5	F	243.0	F	17.5			
3	Highland Avenue and Wilshire	AM	162.9	F	164.5	F	1.6			
	Boulevard	PM	201.4	F	203.3	F	1.9			
4	Highland Avenue and 6th Street	AM	64.4	E	65.4	E	1.0			
		PM	79.5	E	81.3	F	1.8			

Table 2 – Construction Period Study Area Analysis

LOS = Level of Service; HCM average vehicle delay shown in X.X format.

* One-way stop - delay is based on stop controlled approach at the intersection



Truck Hauling Route

Project haul trucks will need to be routed to avoid residential roadways and non-arterial roadways, and to also avoid left-turn movements into and out of the project site. The proposed haul truck route is provided in Attachment A, with arriving trucks exiting the I-10 freeway and heading north on Crenshaw Boulevard and west on Wilshire to the project site. Exiting trucks would head west on Wilshire and south on La Brea to the I-10 freeway.



ATTACHMENT A – PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION TRUCK HAUL ROUTE AND TURN-BY-TURN LIST



Supplemental Traffic Analysis - Construction Trips – 5001 Wilshire Blvd.

Attachment JC01167