

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

3216 W. 8th St
DOT Case No. CEN 17-46564

Date: December 28, 2017

To: Luciralia Ibarra, Senior City Planner
Department of City Planning

From: Wes Pringle, Transportation Engineer
Department of Transportation

Subject: **SUPPLEMENTAL TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE
PROPOSED MIXED-USE PROJECT AT 3216 WEST 8th STREET**

A traffic impact study for the mixed use project was submitted to the Department of Transportation (DOT) on July 2017 and a corresponding DOT assessment report was issued to the Department of City Planning (DCP) on August 24, 2017. Since then, the developer has modified the project; adding amenity space, a bar area, fitness center, business center designated for hotel guests only, reducing the number of condominiums, increasing the number of hotel rooms, reducing 277 square feet of the ground-floor retail, reducing 753 square feet of karaoke room, reducing the total number of bicycle parking spaces.

The latest proposal is described in the table below that provides a comparison between the new project scope and the scope that was last reviewed by DOT

Land Use	Original Project	Revised Project
Apartments	72 units	80 units
Condominiums	16 units	8 units
Retail	5,085 square feet (SF)	4,808 SF
Karaoke	3,218 SF	2,465 SF
Bicycle Parking	52 spaces	32 spaces

An updated analysis dated October 2017 was prepared and submitted by Gibson Transportation Consulting Inc. to account for a revised trip generation table reflecting the modification in the project scope of the land use codes proposed. Based on the revised net trip generation, a Critical Movement Analysis was recalculated for the existing plus project conditions and project opening year (2022) with project conditions.

The original project was estimated to generate approximately 682 net new daily trips, 40 net new trips in the a.m. peak hour, and 80 net new trips in the p.m. peak hour. The revised project is expected to generate approximately 694 net new daily trips, 42 net new trip in the a.m. peak hour, and 74 net new trips in the p.m. peak hour. The previous traffic analysis determined that none of the nine analyzed intersections would be significantly impacted by project related traffic. DOT concurs with the findings of the updated analysis that the revised project would also not result in any new significant traffic impacts.

All of the project requirements that are identified in LADOT's August 24, 2017 letter (attached for reference) shall remain in effect. If you have any questions, please contact Eduardo Hermoso of my staff at (213) 972-8451.

Attachments

M:\Letters\2017\CEN17-46564_3216 W. 8th St_rev_ltr.doc

c: Jordan Beroukhim, Council District No. 10
Carl Mills, BOE Development Services
Bhuvan Bajaj, Hollywood-Wilshire District Office, DOT
Taimour Tanavoli, Case Management Office, DOT
Jonathan Chambers, Gibson Transportation Inc.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

3216 W 8th St
DOT Case No. GEN 17-45997

Date: August 24, 2017

To: Karen Hoo, City Planner
Department of City Planning

From: Wes Pringle, Transportation Engineer
Department of Transportation

Subject: **TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY FOR THE PROPOSED MIXED-USE PROJECT
LOCATED AT 3216 WEST 8TH STREET**

DOT has reviewed the traffic analysis dated July 2017 prepared Gibson Transportation Consulting Inc. for the proposed mixed-use project located at 3216 West 8th Street. In order to evaluate the effects of the project's traffic on the available transportation infrastructure, the significance of the project's traffic impacts is measured in terms of change to the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio between the "future no project" and the "future with project" scenarios. This change in the V/C ratio is compared to DOT's established threshold standards to assess the project-related traffic impacts. Based on DOT's traffic impact criteria¹, the proposed development is not expected to result in any significant traffic impacts at the nine signalized and one un-signalized intersections identified for detailed analysis, as noted in **Attachment 1**. The results of the traffic analysis accounted for other known development projects in evaluating potential cumulative impacts and adequately evaluated the project's traffic impacts on the surrounding community.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

A. Project Description

The project will be replacing a surface parking lot and four unit apartment building with a six-level mixed-use building over three levels of subterranean parking. The project will include 16 condominium units, a 72-room hotel, 5,085 square foot of ground-floor retail, and a 3,218 square foot karaoke room.

Vehicular access will be provided via full-access driveways on Mariposa Avenue and 8th Street; the driveway on Mariposa Avenue will provide direct access to parking, and the 8th Street driveway will provide access to the valet pick-up and drop-off area. A secondary ramp from the valet area to the subterranean parking would be for valet operators only. The project will provide 142 vehicular parking spaces, 52 bicycle parking spaces, and is expected to be completed by 2022.

B. Trip Generation

The project is estimated to generate a net increase of 682 daily trips, 40 trips in the a.m. peak hour, and 80 trips in the p.m. peak hour. The trip generation estimates are based

¹ Per the DOT Traffic Study Policies and Procedures, a significant impact is identified as an increase in the Critical Movement Analysis (CMA) value, due to project related traffic, of 0.01 or more when the final ("with project") Level of Service (LOS) is LOS E or F; an increase of 0.020 or more when the final LOS is LOS D; or an increase of 0.040 or more when the final LOS is LOS C.

on formulas published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation, 9th Edition, 2012. A copy of the trip generation table can be found in **Attachment 2**.

C. Freeway Analysis

The traffic study included a freeway impact analysis that was prepared in accordance with the State-mandated Congestion Management Program (CMP) administered by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA). According to this analysis, the project would not result in significant traffic impacts on any of the evaluated freeway mainline segments. To comply with the Freeway Impact Analysis Agreement executed between Caltrans and DOT in October 2013, the study also included a screening analysis to determine if additional evaluation of freeway mainline and ramp segments was necessary beyond the CMP requirements. The project did not meet or exceed any of the four thresholds defined in the latest agreement, updated in December 2015. Exceeding one of the four screening criteria would require the applicant to work directly with Caltrans to prepare more detailed freeway analyses. No additional freeway analysis was required.

PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

A. Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

In the preparation of traffic studies, DOT guidelines indicate that un-signalized intersections should be evaluated solely to determine the need for the installation of a traffic signal or other traffic control device. When choosing which un-signalized intersections to evaluate in the study, intersections that are adjacent to the project or that are integral to the project's site access and circulation plan, or that can facilitate pedestrian access should be identified. This traffic study included a traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of **Mariposa Avenue & James M Wood Boulevard**. In accordance with the guidelines established under the California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD 2012), the intersection was analyzed according to Warrant 3. Under Future with Project Conditions, the intersection does not meet the minimum peak hour traffic volume threshold; therefore, it should not be signalized. Signal warrant worksheets are provided in the study.

B. Construction Impacts

DOT recommends that a construction work site traffic control plan be submitted to DOT for review and approval prior to the start of any construction work. 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. DOT also recommends that all construction related traffic be restricted to off-peak hours.

C. Highway Dedication And Street Widening Requirements

On August 11, 2015, the City Council adopted the Mobility Plan 2035 which is the new Mobility Element of the General Plan. A key feature of the updated plan is to revise street standards in an effort to provide a more enhanced balance between traffic flow and other important street functions including transit routes and stops, pedestrian environments, bicycle routes, building design and site access, etc. Per the new Mobility Element, **West 8th Street** is designated as an Avenue II, which would require a 28-foot half-width roadway and a 43-foot half-width right-of-way. **South Mariposa Avenue** is designated as a Local Street Standard, which would require an 18-foot half-width roadway and a 30-foot half-width right of way. The applicant should check with BOE's

Land Development Group to determine if there are any other applicable highway dedication, street widening and/or sidewalk requirements for this project.

D. Parking Requirements

The project will provide a three level subterranean parking garage. Vehicular access will be provided via full-access driveways on Mariposa Avenue and 8th Street, which the driveway on Mariposa Avenue providing direct access to parking, while the 8th Street driveway would provide access to the valet pick-up and drop-off area. A secondary ramp from the valet area to the subterranean parking would be for valet operators only. The project will provide 142 vehicular parking spaces and 52 bicycle parking spaces. The applicant should check with the Department of Building and Safety on the number of Code-required parking spaces needed for the project.

E. Driveway Access and Circulation

The proposed site plan illustrated in **Attachment 3** is acceptable to DOT; however, review of the study does not constitute approval of the driveway dimensions and internal circulation schemes. Those require separate review and approval and should be coordinated with DOT's Citywide Planning Coordination Section (201 N. Figueroa Street, 5th Floor, Room 550, at (213-482-7024). In order to minimize potential building design changes, the applicant should contact DOT for driveway width and internal circulation requirements so that such traffic flow considerations are designed and incorporated early into the building and parking layout plans. All new driveways should be Case 2 driveways and any security gates should be a minimum 20 feet from the property line. All truck loading and unloading should take place on site with no vehicles backing into the project via the project driveways.

F. Development Review Fees

An ordinance adding Section 19.15 to the Los Angeles Municipal Code relative to application fees paid to DOT for permit issuance activities was adopted by the Los Angeles City Council in 2009. This ordinance 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 Johnathan Yu of my staff at (213) 972-4993.

Attachments

J:\Letters\2017\CEN17-45997_3216 W 8th St_hotel condo retail karaoke MU.docx

- c: Jordan Beroukhim, Council District No. 10
Jeannie Shen, Hollywood-Wilshire, DOT
Taimour Tanavoli, Case Management Office, DOT
Carl Mills, Central District, BOE
Casey Le, Gibson Transportation Inc.

ATTACHMENT 1

Summary of Volume to Capacity Ratios (V/C) and Level of Service (LOS)

TABLE 9
EXISTING WITH PROJECT CONDITIONS (YEAR 2017)
SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION LEVELS OF SERVICE AND SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

No.	Intersection	Peak Hour	Existing Conditions		Existing with Project Conditions			
			V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	Δ V/C	Impact
1.	Normandie Avenue / Irolo Street & Wilshire Boulevard	A.M.	0.595	A	0.597	A	0.002	NO
		P.M.	0.687	B	0.691	B	0.004	NO
2.	Mariposa Avenue & Wilshire Boulevard	A.M.	0.484	A	0.486	A	0.002	NO
		P.M.	0.479	A	0.484	A	0.005	NO
3.	Vermont Avenue & Wilshire Boulevard	A.M.	0.820	D	0.823	D	0.003	NO
		P.M.	0.799	C	0.802	D	0.003	NO
4.	Irolo Street & 8th Street	A.M.	0.740	C	0.745	C	0.005	NO
		P.M.	0.699	B	0.709	C	0.010	NO
5.	Mariposa Avenue & 8th Street	A.M.	0.437	A	0.446	A	0.009	NO
		P.M.	0.478	A	0.497	A	0.019	NO
6.	Catalina Street & 8th Street	A.M.	0.535	A	0.538	A	0.003	NO
		P.M.	0.657	B	0.659	B	0.002	NO
7.	Vermont Avenue & 8th Street	A.M.	0.665	B	0.665	B	0.000	NO
		P.M.	0.681	B	0.685	B	0.004	NO
8.	Irolo Street & James M Wood Boulevard	A.M.	0.641	B	0.643	B	0.002	NO
		P.M.	0.662	B	0.665	B	0.003	NO
9.	Vermont Avenue & James M Wood Boulevard	A.M.	0.685	B	0.688	B	0.003	NO
		P.M.	0.667	B	0.671	B	0.004	NO

TABLE 10
FUTURE WITH PROJECT CONDITIONS (YEAR 2022)
SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION LEVELS OF SERVICE AND SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

No.	Intersection	Peak Hour	Future without Project Conditions		Future with Project Conditions			
			V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	Δ V/C	Impact
1.	Normandie Avenue / Irolo Street & Wilshire Boulevard	A.M.	0.939	E	0.941	E	0.002	NO
		P.M.	1.149	F	1.156	F	0.007	NO
2.	Mariposa Avenue & Wilshire Boulevard	A.M.	0.614	B	0.616	B	0.002	NO
		P.M.	0.659	B	0.664	B	0.005	NO
3.	Vermont Avenue & Wilshire Boulevard	A.M.	1.088	F	1.091	F	0.003	NO
		P.M.	1.146	F	1.152	F	0.006	NO
4.	Irolo Street & 8th Street	A.M.	1.028	F	1.033	F	0.005	NO
		P.M.	1.108	F	1.117	F	0.009	NO
5.	Mariposa Avenue & 8th Street	A.M.	0.512	A	0.521	A	0.009	NO
		P.M.	0.554	A	0.573	A	0.019	NO
6.	Catalina Street & 8th Street	A.M.	0.619	B	0.622	B	0.003	NO
		P.M.	0.738	C	0.740	C	0.002	NO
7.	Vermont Avenue & 8th Street	A.M.	0.849	D	0.850	D	0.001	NO
		P.M.	0.864	D	0.865	D	0.001	NO
8.	Irolo Street & James M Wood Boulevard	A.M.	0.837	D	0.839	D	0.002	NO
		P.M.	0.919	E	0.923	E	0.004	NO
9.	Vermont Avenue & James M Wood Boulevard	A.M.	0.903	E	0.905	E	0.002	NO
		P.M.	0.947	E	0.951	E	0.004	NO

ATTACHMENT 2 Project Trip Generation Estimates

**TABLE 8
PROJECT TRIP GENERATION ESTIMATES**

Land Use	ITE Land Use	Rate or Size	Daily	Morning Peak Hour			Afternoon Peak Hour		
				In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Trip Generation Rates [a]									
Condominium	230	per du	5.81	17%	83%	0.44	67%	33%	0.52
Hotel	310	per room	8.17	59%	41%	0.53	51%	49%	0.60
Shopping Center	820	per 1,000 sf	42.94	61%	39%	1.00	49%	51%	3.73
Drinking Place	925	per 1,000 sf	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	66%	34%	11.34
Apartments	220	per du	6.65	20%	80%	0.51	65%	35%	0.62
Trip Generation Estimates									
Proposed Project									
Condominium	230	16 du	93	1	6	7	5	3	8
Transit/Walk-In Adjustment - 10% [b]			-9	0	-1	-1	-1	0	-1
Hotel	310	72 rooms	588	22	16	38	22	21	43
Transit/Walk-In Adjustment - 10% [b]			-59	-2	-2	-4	-2	-2	-4
Retail	820	5,085 sf	218	3	2	5	9	10	19
Transit/Walk-In Adjustment - 10% [b]			-22	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	-2
Internal Capture Adjustment - 5% [c]			-10	0	0	0	0	-1	-1
Pass-By Adjustment - 50% [d]			-93	-2	0	-2	-4	-4	-8
Karaoke	925	3,128 sf	--	--	--	--	23	12	35
Transit/Walk-In Adjustment - 10% [b]			--	--	--	--	-2	-2	-4
Internal Capture Adjustment - 10% [c]			--	--	--	--	-2	-1	-3
TOTAL PROPOSED PROJECT TRIPS			706	22	20	42	47	35	82
Existing Uses to be Removed									
Apartments	220	4 du	27	0	2	2	1	1	2
Transit/Walk-In Adjustment - 10% [b]			-3	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL EXISTING PROJECT TRIPS			24	0	2	2	1	1	2
TOTAL NET NEW PROJECT TRIPS			682	22	18	40	46	34	80

Notes:

sf = square feet; du = dwelling units;

[a] Trip generation rates are from *Trip Generation, 9th Edition* (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2012).

[b] Per LADOT's *Transportation Impact Study Guidelines* (LADOT, December 2016), the Project Site is located adjacent to a transit corridor, therefore a 10% transit adjustment was applied to account for transit usage and walking visitor arrivals from the surrounding neighborhoods and adjacent commercial developments.

[c] Internal capture adjustments account for person trips made between distinct land uses within a mixed-use development without using an off-site road system.

[d] Per LADOT's *Transportation Impact Study Guidelines*, pass-by adjustment of 50% is allowed for retail space under 50,000 sf.

ATTACHMENT 3 Project Site plan



Source: EWAI Architects, June, 2017.

PROJECT SITE PLAN

FIGURE
1