

CF # 10-0017



Hirsch/Green Transportation Consulting, Inc.

January 29, 2010

Mr. Gary Schaffel  
President  
Schaffel Development Company, Inc.  
15235 Burbank Boulevard, Suite C  
Van Nuys, California 91411

RE: Supplement to Traffic Analysis for Proposed 146-Unit Apartment Project at  
11933 Magnolia Boulevard

Dear Gary,

This letter is to provide supplemental information related to both our recent (January 28, 2010) and prior (November 26, 2008) traffic impact analyses for your proposed 146-unit apartment project located at 11933 Magnolia Boulevard. As you know, both of these studies examined the potential traffic impacts of your development alone (January 2010 report), and the potential "cumulative" traffic impacts of your project plus two adjacent projects, identified as "Project A" and "Project B" in the two referenced studies. Both of these traffic impact analyses assumed that each of the subject projects, including yours, would experience an approximately 10 percent reduction in traffic generation due to their use of the nearby Metro Orange Line facility, located approximately two blocks north of the project site(s). The 10 percent transit discount is based on LADOT's recommendations regarding transit utilization in the immediate project vicinity, as well as throughout the City; we understand that LADOT has recently confirmed that the 10 percent reduction is appropriate based on data for City-wide transit utilizations.

However, the appellant to your MND approval has indicated that they believe that no more than a 5 percent transit discount should be used; these assertions are primarily based on information contained in the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP), or identified in publications on the subject by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). As we noted in our January 26, 2010 response to the appeal, these claims are not applicable, since the CMP provides regionally-based *guidelines* for the general preparation of traffic impact studies within its jurisdiction, while the information provided in the ITE manual is based on data from developments located throughout the country. Both the CMP and ITE documents clearly state that the information and assumptions presented in those documents are to be used as default values when more specific information is not available. As noted in our January 26, 2010 letter, LADOT identified that a 10 percent transit utilization trip discount factor was both reasonable and appropriate, based on their specific knowledge and judgments related to the project sites.

As such, we strongly believe that the previous traffic impact studies prepared for your project, which utilize the 10 percent transit reductions for all three "cumulative" projects including your 11933 Magnolia Boulevard development, are accurate and appropriate in their assumptions and

Letter to Mr. Gary Schaffel  
January 29, 2010  
Page 2 of 2

calculations of the potential project traffic. These studies identified that two significant impacts could result from the development of all three projects together, at Magnolia Boulevard and Colfax Avenue, and at Magnolia Boulevard and Ben Avenue. Mitigation measures sufficient to reduce both of these potential impacts to less-than-significant levels have been recommended, and reviewed and approved by LADOT.

However, in the interest of addressing the appellant's concerns, we have investigated the potential differences in the traffic analyses should the suggested 5 percent transit reductions be utilized rather than the 10 percent reductions identified in our studies. These investigations reveal that the suggested revisions to the traffic study would result in only modest increases in the potential trips identified in the earlier documents, with a maximum total net increase of approximately 54 daily trips, including 4 new trips (0 inbound, 4 outbound) during the AM peak hour and 6 net new trips (4 inbound, 2 outbound) during the PM peak hour. This nominal level of potential additional traffic would not be sufficient to change any of the conclusions of the previous analyses, and as such, the argument that incorrect transit reductions were applied to the project traffic analyses are essentially inconsequential. However, we continue to stress, as fully detailed in both our January 26, 2010 response to MND appeal letter, and in our supplemental January 28, 2010 traffic analyses, that the assumptions, methodologies, analysis results, and conclusions, including both the originally-utilized "existing use" trip credits and the 10 percent transit reductions, are appropriate.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,



Ron Hirsch, P.E.  
Principal