



Culver CITY

MIKE BALKMAN COUNCIL CHAMBERS
9770 CULVER BOULEVARD
CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA 90232-0507
CITY HALL Tel. (310) 253-5710
FAX (310) 253-5721

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 2009

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Planning Commission will listen to the public on any item on the agenda or item of interest that is not on the agenda. The Planning Commission cannot legally take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. Such items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda.

If you wish to speak to the Commissioners, please complete a Speaker's Card and present it to the Secretary before the agenda item is called. You will be called to the podium by name when it is your turn to speak to the Commissioners.

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

Persons wishing to speak on agenda items will be called at the time the agenda item is brought forward. Comments will generally be limited to five minutes per speaker; however, a three-minute limit may be declared by the Chairperson for agenda items for which many Speaker Cards have been submitted.

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

A total of twenty minutes shall be devoted to audience participation at the beginning of the agenda. Speakers will be called on in the order cards were received by the Secretary. If additional time is needed, the Chairperson will allow for same at the end of the agenda.

When the Secretary calls your name, please advance to the podium and state your name and city of residence. Speakers must limit their comments to five minutes. A three-minute limit may be declared by the Chairperson if there is a large number of individuals desiring to address the Commissioners.

NOTE: AT OR ABOUT 11:00 P.M., COMMISSION MEMBERS WILL DETERMINE WHETHER TO CONTINUE WITH DISCUSSION OF REMAINING ITEMS ON THE AGENDA OR TO CARRY SOME/ALL OF THE ITEMS OVER TO A FUTURE MEETING DATE.

CELL PHONES AND OTHER DISTRACTIONS

Use of cell phones, pagers and other communication devices is prohibited while the Planning Commission Meeting is in session. Please turn all devices off or place on silent alert and leave the Chambers to use. During the meeting, please refrain from applause or other actions that may be disruptive to the speakers or the conduct of City business.

MEETING INFORMATION

Planning Commission meetings are regularly scheduled for the second and fourth Wednesdays of every month. Planning Commission Agenda information is available 72 hours before each Planning Commission meeting via a tape recorded message by calling 310-253-5741.

City Council/Agency/Commission meetings can be viewed live on Channel 35 by Comcast subscribers. Meetings are also broadcast on the City's Radio Station AM 1690. To view the Planning Commission meetings on line please visit <http://www.culvercity.org/citygov/netcast.asp>.

ALD

Assisted Listening Devices are available through the Secretary.



Culver

CITY

Agendas are available on the web at:

www.culvercity.org

AGENDA

Planning Commission

Wednesday, June 17, 2009

7:00 p.m.

Mike Balkman Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

David Rockwell, Chair
John Kuechle, Vice Chair
Linda Smith Frost, Commissioner
Anthony Pleskow, Commissioner
Linda Shahinian, Commissioner

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC COMMENT – Items Not On The Agenda

ACTION ITEMS

- A-1. Discussion of Proposed Update of the Citywide Traffic Study Criteria
(Staff Report: Joseph Montoya (310) 253-5736). **Recommend Adoption by City Council.**

CONSENT CALENDAR. *Note: Consent Calendar items are considered to be routine in nature and may be approved by one motion. Public requests to discuss Consent Calendar items must be filed with the Secretary before the Consent Calendar is called.*

- C-1. Secretary's Report – June 10, 2009 and June 17, 2009. **Approve Reports.**
- C2. Approval of Minutes of February 25, 2009 and April 21, 2009. **Approve.**

ITEMS FROM STAFF

ITEMS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION

ADJOURN

Next Planning Commission Meeting
June 24, 2009
6:00 PM

Upcoming Public Meeting Schedule –Tentative – 2009

Date	Day	Time	Location
<i>City Council</i>			
<i>June 22</i>	<i>Monday</i>	<i>7:00PM</i>	<i>Council Chambers</i>
<i>Redevelopment Agency</i>			
<i>July 6</i>	<i>Monday</i>	<i>7:00PM</i>	<i>Council Chambers</i>
<i>Civil Service Commission</i>			
<i>July 1</i>	<i>Wednesday</i>	<i>7:00PM</i>	<i>Council Chambers</i>
<i>Cultural Affairs Commission</i>			
<i>July 14</i>	<i>Tuesday</i>	<i>7:00PM</i>	<i>Council Chambers</i>
<i>Parks & Recreation Commission</i>			
<i>July 7</i>	<i>Wednesday</i>	<i>7:00PM</i>	<i>Patacchia Room</i>
<i>Planning Commission</i>			
<i>June 24</i>	<i>Wednesday</i>	<i>7:00PM</i>	<i>Council Chambers</i>
<i>June 30</i>	<i>Tuesday</i>	<i>7:00PM</i>	<i>Council Chambers</i>

- Meetings may be added or changed.
- Times and date may be changed.

Meeting Date: June 17, 2009	Item Number:A-1
AGENDA ITEM: Discussion on the Proposed Update of the Citywide Traffic Study Criteria.	
Contact Person/Dept.: Joseph Montoya, Associate Planner Barry Kurtz, Consulting Traffic Engineer	Phone Number: (310) 253-5736 (310) 253-5625
Public Hearing: []	Action Item: [X] Attachments: [X]
Public Notification: On June 10, 2009, courtesy notices were mailed and emailed to the Master Notification List as well as to all traffic consultants that have prepared traffic studies for the City within the past years.	
Planning Review: Thomas Gorham, Planning Manager / June 10, 2009.	
Community Development Department: Sol Blumenfeld, Director, / June 10, 2009.	
Public Works Department Charles Herbertson, Director / June 10, 2009	

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Planning Commission:

1. Discuss the proposed draft update of the citywide Traffic Study Criteria [Attachment No. 1]; and
2. Recommend to the City Council adoption of Attachment No. 1.

PROCEDURES:

1. Chair calls on staff for a brief staff report and Planning Commission poses questions to staff as desired.
2. Chair opens the public meeting and solicits comments from the general public.
3. Chair seeks a motion to close the public discussion after all testimony has been presented.
4. Commission discusses the matter and makes a recommendation to the City Council including the selected threshold of significance.

BACKGROUND:

The transportation system is a vital part of the City's infrastructure, as it affects the quality of life for all users. The use of traffic study criteria provides an additional tool for the City to evaluate the potential impacts of developments, and to identify appropriate transportation improvements required by the developers to mitigate the impacts of their developments. By

doing so, the City strives to maintain the quality of its transportation system to the greatest degree possible.

Beginning in the mid-1970's as the City began to review and approve projects through the newly enacted redevelopment process, traffic related issues were initially addressed as part of the environmental impact report process. Circa 1980, separate traffic studies were required to more specifically address the traffic related issues of pending projects. Thereafter, the Planning Division and the Engineering Division began expanding on the minimum requirements for the preparation of a traffic study, a process that ultimately lead to the current traffic study guidelines [as outlined in Attachment No. 2]. Said guidelines, recommended for approval by the Planning Commission on August 12, 1987, were approved by the City Council on September 14, 1987. They were then updated via a staff memorandum dated March 13, 1991.

As development increased in the City, staff recognized the need to augment the guidelines to insure proper traffic analysis and traffic mitigation measures as may be applicable. As an example, since 1991 additional traffic study criteria such as the County of Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (METRO) Congestion Management Program (CMP) requirements, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) procedures and the availability of credits for Transit Oriented Developments (TOD) have been added to the traffic study criteria used by the City. Notwithstanding the above, staff remains of the opinion the current traffic study criteria lacks specific data and analysis as required to review today's proposed projects.

Therefore, the Department of Public Works, coordinating with the Planning Division, have developed new Traffic Study Criteria [as outlined in Attachment No. 1] for the preparation and review of traffic studies regarding proposed development projects within the city limits. These new guidelines are intended to provide the public, developers and private consultants with an up-to-date uniform set of procedures by which to analyze the traffic impact of new developments and to identify any transportation improvements needed to mitigate the impact of said developments.

SUMMARY:

The recommended new traffic study criteria is consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the Culver City General Plan Circulation Element adopted by the City Council on September 24, 1996, and later amended on May 24, 2004, in that the "... *local and regional transportation systems must be effectively linked to both serve and protect Culver City's residents and businesses ...*". By assessing the traffic impact of proposed development projects and requiring appropriate onsite and offsite traffic mitigation measures, the City's transportation system can be enhanced and the quality of life maintained and improved citywide.

In preparing the proposed new traffic study criteria, staff reviewed the traffic study criteria used by neighboring jurisdictions and throughout the county and then extracted those components best suited to the existing and future development profile of Culver City so as to best serve the residents, business community and transportation infrastructure of the City. Not only does the new criteria provide the public, developers and private consultants with an updated and uniform set of guidelines to analyze the traffic component of a proposed development project, it is anticipated the criteria will also assist in determining if such traffic would result in any impact(s) to the surrounding street system and neighborhood so as to identify any appropriate traffic mitigation measure(s) to be considered as part of the review and approval process of that particular proposed development project in order to mitigate said impact(s).

Therefore, the proposed traffic study criteria have been revised to include, but not be limited to, the following components:

1. A traffic study shall be required if the proposed development adds 500 or more daily trips or 50 or more trips during the AM or PM peak hour. All other traffic related issues SHALL be addressed;
2. Before preparing a traffic study, the traffic consultant for the developer shall submit to the City for approval a Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) indicating all the assumptions for the traffic study;
3. The traffic study shall include an executive summary;
4. Trip credits for a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) shall be discussed. Qualifying developments near transit stations generally generate less automobile traffic, and therefore may receive a trip credit;
5. An analysis is required to determine if the development project adds a significant amount of traffic on a residential street. Currently, Culver City has no adopted threshold for a project's impact on a residential street;
6. A traffic monitoring program may be required to measure a project's impact on a residential street;
7. A Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) to reduce a project's impact on a residential street or neighborhood may also be required;
8. A Transportation Demand Management (TDM) trip credit of up to ten percent (10.0%) may be allowed as a potential mitigation measure. TDM measures, such as carpools and vanpools, have been confirmed to reduce the amount of traffic generated by a development;
9. A traffic monitoring program to measure the effectiveness of a project's TDM mitigation measures may also be required;
10. Post occupancy traffic counts shall be required to confirm the findings in the traffic study without requiring additional traffic mitigation measures and/or conditions of approval.

The proposed new traffic study criteria further recommends the continued use of the traffic and trip generation rates listed in the most recent edition of Trip Generation published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) in order to calculate the number of trips expected to be generated by new developments. Staff recommends the continued use of the ITE data, which is used by local jurisdictions countywide, statewide and nationwide because it is the best source of traffic analysis data for jurisdictions such as Culver City. To not use ITE for trip generation rates would in turn require the City to undertake a costly and time consuming program to develop its own trip generation rates. Of additional concern is the Public Works Department's belief that any Culver City trip generation rate study would result in lower trip generation rates than those listed in the ITE publication. If so, the City may be obligated to use the lower trip rates, which in turn may result in fewer traffic mitigation measures.

A project's traffic impact on an intersection is deemed "significant" if the incremental increase in traffic caused by a proposed project at its build-out / horizon year meets or exceeds the City's established "significant impact" threshold.

As outlined in Table 1 below, the following chart indicates the thresholds currently used [and proposed herein] by Culver City and other cities and agencies. Approximately two-thirds of the cities listed use thresholds similar to Culver City's existing thresholds.

TABLE 1: THRESHOLDS FOR SIGNIFICANT IMPACT BY JURISDICTION

JURISDICTION	LEVEL OF SERVICE [LOS]					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Beverly Hills	---	---	---	0.04	0.02	0.02
Culver City:						
-- Existing:	---	---	---	0.04	0.02	0.02
-- <i>Recommended by Public Works Department:</i>	---	---	0.05	0.04	0.01	0.01
-- <i>Recommended by Planning Commission – City Council Traffic Sub-Committee:</i>	---	---	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.01
El Segundo	D to E or F				0.02	0.02
Glendale	---	---	---	0.02	0.02	0.02
Hawthorne	---	---	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.01
Long Beach	---	---	---	---	0.02	0.02
Los Angeles City	---	---	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.01
Los Angeles County	0.75	0.75	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.01
Los Angeles County Metro/CMP	---	---	---	---	---	0.02
Malibu	---	---	---	0.02	0.02	0.02
Pasadena	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.01
Redondo Beach	A, B, C or D to E or F				0.02	0.02
Santa Monica	Measures seconds of delay					0.005
Torrance	---	---	---	---	0.02	0.02
West Hollywood	---	---	---	---	0.02	0.02

Following staff's research of the traffic impact thresholds used by other jurisdictions, it was initially determined that:

1. No change be recommended to LOS A and LOS B;
2. Although LOS C is considered desirable and said criteria does not have a significant impact threshold for LOS C, projects which use up a significant amount of capacity at LOS C should be required to mitigate their traffic impact. Accordingly, it is recommend adding for LOS C as a "significant impact" any project that increases traffic by five percent (5.0%); and
3. The threshold for LOS D is 0.04; and for LOS E and LOS F is 0.02. Projects that increase traffic by approximately two percent (2.0%) or more cause a significant impact at LOS E and LOS F. These thresholds work well for the City and are consistent with other similar sized cities in the region. About two-thirds of the jurisdictions contacted use thresholds similar to Culver City. Accordingly, staff initially determined a recommendation of maintaining the thresholds for LOS D, LOS E and LOS F at their present rate were appropriate.

During the course of developing the proposed updated criteria, a Planning Commission Traffic Sub-Committee was appointed consisting of Chair David

Rockwell and Member Marcus Tiggs [who was later replaced by Member Linda Frost-Smith]. The sub-committee met with Planning Division and Engineering Division staff on a regular basis during the preparation of the draft document. These meetings were later expanded to include City Council representation via Mayor Scott Malsin and Member Andrew Weissman, as well as the City Manager, Assistant City Attorney, City Engineer / Public Works Director, Community Development Director and Planning Manager.

As previously noted, a transportation impact on an intersection is deemed “significant” if the incremental increase in traffic caused by a project in the build-out / horizon year meets or exceeds the threshold. Culver City’s current threshold is 0.04 for LOS D, 0.02 at LOS E and LOS F. After detailed discussion on the issue of significant impacts to the level of service on city streets from existing and pending projects, the Planning Commission / City Council Traffic Sub-Committee recommended that projects which increase traffic by approximately one percent (1.0%) or more be considered a significant impact at LOS E and LOS F.

Staff offers the following “pros” and “cons” of lowering the thresholds of significant impact:

Pros:

1. More developments would be required to implement transportation improvements as mitigation measures, if such measures are feasible;
2. There may be a slowdown of traffic congestion if there are fewer projects approved in Culver City; and
3. The lowered thresholds would be consistent with the thresholds of the City’s neighboring jurisdictions, the County and City of Los Angeles.

Cons:

1. Lowering the thresholds of significant impact would probably not significantly affect levels of congestion in Culver City. The levels of congestion at locations in Culver City and in the region would be more affected by the following other factors: the price of gas; the price of parking; the availability of transit; levels of congestion on the freeway system; the amount of pass-through traffic; and the ambient traffic growth;
2. METRO’s new Congestion Management Program (CMP), which is scheduled for implementation in April 2010, will establish developer trip fees for all developments based on the number of peak-hour trips the developments generate. If the purpose of lowering the thresholds is to exact additional mitigation measures, the new CMP will accomplish this;
3. The cost of development in Culver City would increase;
4. Smaller projects could create significant impacts; and
5. More developments may be subject to requiring the preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) as part of the initial project submission process which will add more time to the project review schedule and more cost to the applicant for the

preparation of the EIR. It is also possible that during the Planning Commission and City Council review process of future pending development projects a determination would be made that no further onsite and/or offsite traffic mitigation measures would be available and that the only manner in which to recommend approval of future projects would be via a Resolution of Overriding Consideration.

It is for these reasons staff is requesting the Planning Commission discuss this item in detail prior to making any traffic study criteria recommendation to the City Council.

ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC RELATED COMPONENTS:

In addition to adopting new traffic study criteria, staff has identified other traffic related components that will be worked on following the adoption of these traffic study criteria including, but not limited to, the following:

1. Loop Detectors:

The Department of Public Works, through a Metro grant, is in the process of updating its traffic signal system. One of the elements of the new system will be to collect, through a network of street imbedded inductive loop detectors at signalized intersections, 24-hour traffic counts on the City's major and secondary streets. The 24-hour traffic information will be more useful than the part-day counts taken for development traffic studies. This information will provide traffic counts but does not provide directional or turning movement data. Staff plans to use this information for transportation planning purposes.

2. Trip Fees:

Staff is of the opinion it would be desirable for all developments to pay trip fees for their incremental addition of traffic, regardless if the development has a significant impact at a location or not. However, for Culver City to undertake a nexus study to establish trip fees for the City would be a very costly and time consuming undertaking. The study would involve planning and estimating new transportation projects for the build out of the transportation system, and estimating the future amount of trips to be generated by the future developments in the City for the build-out development scenario. Instead, staff is coordinating with Metro's development of a countywide Congestion Mitigation Fee plan as part of their new CMP. Culver City's participation in Metro's new CMP may eliminate the need or reduce the effort required for the City to develop its own developer trip fees.

3. New Development Impact Fee Ordinance:

The current version of the New Development Impact Fee, which established a fund for traffic related improvements citywide, was established in 1983 via City Council Ordinance No. 83-021. Said fee provides for a five thousand gross square foot (5,000 GSF) credit of all net new non-residential development prior to applying a fee of One Dollar (\$1.00) per GSF. The ordinance is also silent as to mixed use. Staff intends to initiate a code amendment to consider various modifications including, but not limited to, reducing or eliminating the GSF credit, adding a provision for mixed use developments, making the ordinance applicable to residential development and increasing the rate per GSF.

4. Selection of Traffic Study Consultant:

Staff will investigate the process by which an applicant selects the traffic study consultant and make recommendations as to what – if any – City procedures should be established for this process.

5. Traffic Study Review Fees:

The fee charged by the City will be examined for possible increase taking into account the number of City departments that are now involved in the review and comment of such documents.

CONCLUSION:

Staff concurs with the recommendations of the Planning Commission / City Council Traffic Study Sub-Committee that it is proper and necessary to adopt the revised traffic study criteria in order to further protect the City and its residents, businesses and visitors. However, it remains critically important that the Planning Commission discuss in detail any change(s) to any “significant threshold level” prior to arriving at a recommendation. Once the new criteria is adopted, it is the intent of the Planning Division to establish a review schedule of these criteria on a more formal and regular basis as determined by the Public Works Department.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), no environmental review or documentation is required for this document.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council adoption of Attachment No. 1 including a recommendation on the threshold of significance.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Proposed Traffic Study Criteria [Draft as of June 10, 2009].
2. Existing Traffic Study Criteria.

DRAFT
June 10, 2009
Engineering Division / Planning Division

**TRAFFIC STUDY CRITERIA
FOR THE REVIEW OF
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
PROJECTS
WITHIN THE
CITY OF CULVER CITY**

Table Of Contents

Sections

1.	Background and Purpose	3
2.	Traffic Study Requirements	3
3.	Scoping Process	4
4.	Traffic Study Contents	5
A.	Executive Summary	5
B.	Project Description	6
C.	Trip Generation Calculations	6
D.	Maps and Plans	8
E.	Level of Service Analysis	11
F.	Thresholds of Significance	13
G.	Analysis of Potential Mitigation Measures for Significant Impacts	15
H.	Mitigation Measures for Significant Impacts	16
I.	Congestion Management Program	18
5.	Review Process	19
6.	City Contacts	20

Tables

1.	Level of Service (LOS) Characteristics and Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratios for Signalized Intersections	12
2.	Level of Service (LOS) Characteristics for Stop-Controlled Intersections	13
3.	Significant Impact Thresholds at Signalized / Stop Controlled Intersections	13
4.	Significant Impact Thresholds at Residential Streets	15

Attachments

A.	Memorandum of Understanding / Scoping For Traffic Study	21
----	---	----

SECTIONS

1. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The Department of Public Works, coordinating with the Planning Division, prepared these guidelines for the preparation of traffic study reports. The purpose of these guidelines is to provide the public, developers, private consultants and City staff with a uniform set of criteria to prepare a traffic study that includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- A. Development projects' traffic generation;
- B. Directional distribution of development / project traffic;
- C. Impact of the project's traffic on the roadway network system; and
- D. Measures needed to mitigate said impact (if any).

These guidelines are consistent with the purpose of the City's Circulation Element of the General Plan that local and regional transportations systems serve and protect Culver City's residents and businesses. By assessing the traffic impact of development projects and requiring developments to mitigate their impacts (if any), the City's transportation system can be enhanced and the quality of life maintained in the City's residential neighborhoods.

2. TRAFFIC STUDY REQUIREMENTS

Generally, a traffic study is required if the project adds 500 or more new daily trips or 50 or more trips during the AM or PM peak periods. However, the City may require a traffic study to address factors other than the amount of traffic generated including, but not limited to, the following:

- A. A project that may generate a significant amount of traffic on residential streets;
- B. A project that may generate a significant amount of additional parking on residential streets;
- C. A project's traffic that may create operational problems that interfere with the flow of traffic on roadways or driveways and a focus operational circulation study may be required if not included in the traffic study;
- D. A proposed driveway location that may have limited visibility due to the roadway's curving alignment; and
- E. A project's proximity to an intersection.

If a project description changes at any time during the review process, staff shall review the change(s) and determine if a supplemental or new traffic study shall be required.

3. SCOPING PROCESS

Prior to filing a project application for any discretionary project as defined by the CCMC and the Planning Division, and after approval of a memorandum of understanding as approved by the Public Works Department for the preparation of a traffic study, the applicant, project architect and/or consulting traffic engineer shall:

- A. Provide a description of the project, including the address of the site, legal description, assessor's data, property owner(s), applicant(s), architect(s), civil engineer(s) and traffic consultant(s), existing and proposed uses, existing and proposed gross square footage (GSF) and/or number of units, new buildings, and buildings to be removed. For purposes of the subject traffic study, the term "gross square feet (GSF)" shall include the definition listed in both the Culver City Municipal Code (CCMC) and the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE).
- B. Submit a site plan showing property lines, project driveways, internal circulation, the parking layout and loading areas as well as the surrounding onsite and offsite improvements within a five hundred foot (500'-0") radius of the project boundary. Driveways should be planned to minimize potential conflicts. It is desirable to line up major driveways across the street from existing driveways. Driveway locations should maximize motorists' visibility and be compatible with existing driveways and traffic signals. It is generally undesirable to position driveways in close proximity to other driveways or at the inside of horizontal curves. It is undesirable to have driveways within one hundred feet (100'-0") of a driveway approach to a signalized intersection. Additionally, no driveway shall be located within twenty five feet (25'-0") of a stop sign. The traffic study should demonstrate that there is adequate visibility for driveways which access onto streets and alleys. The traffic consultant should check with the City's Planning Division to determine if vehicle access is limited on certain streets where the City is encouraging a pedestrian friendly environment.
- C. Contact the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) and discuss the project and it's compliance with the most recent Congestion Management Plan (CMP) standards and other applicable requirements.
- D. Submit the completed Attachment "A": Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) / Scoping For Traffic Study, indicating the projects' name, address, description, land use, build-out (horizon) year, trip generation

rates, directional distribution, related projects, intersections to be studied and trip reductions and credits for various purposes. The Scoping for Traffic Study form must be approved by the Public Works Department prior to conducting the traffic study. During the course of the traffic study or review process the Public Works Director may require additional intersections to be studied and other traffic issues addressed, and the information must be provided in a timely manner. The traffic study shall be prepared by a registered professional civil or traffic engineer in the State of California.

- E. Provide an up-to-date list of related projects. For purposes of the subject traffic study, the term “*related projects*” shall include development projects that have a horizon (built out) year before or equal to the same year as the proposed project to be analyzed in the traffic study. The City’s Planning Division shall provide the initial list of related projects. However, it is the responsibility of the consultant to make sure the list is current and includes related projects in neighboring jurisdictions. The City may require that additional related projects be included if initially overlooked for any reason.
- F. Identify all intersections to be studied and include the jurisdiction of each intersection and indicate such intersections on a map including the City boundary lines. The City may request that additional or different intersections be studied.
- G. Identify CMP intersections and other CMP requirements.
- H. Payment to the Engineering Division of the applicable Traffic Impact Analysis Report Review fee based on the most recent adopted City Council fee schedule resolution. Other fees may also be applicable.

4. TRAFFIC STUDY CONTENTS

At a minimum, the traffic study shall contain the following sections:

A. Executive Summary

The executive summary shall include the project description, scope of the impact analysis, intersections, roadways impacted and mitigation measures, if needed. The mitigation measures must be feasible and acceptable to the City. If dedication and/or acquisition for the right of way are required, the traffic study shall indicate how it will be obtained. If there are no feasible or acceptable mitigation measures available, the traffic study must so state.

B. Project Description

- 1) State the name and address of the project.
- 2) For all single purpose or mixed use developments, provide a description of the project size, including, but not limited to, those factors which quantify traffic generators [e.g. dwelling units and gross square footage (GSF)], uses and heights of proposed new buildings and other buildings to be remodeled and/or demolished.
- 3) For residential developments, the description should include, but not be limited to, the type of residence [i.e., single family, duplex and/or multi-family (apartment, condominium or townhouse)]. For example, indicate if the condominiums are one level or townhouse.
- 4) For non-residential developments, the description should include, but not be limited to, the project's operation hours and number of employees. Indicate the number of parking spaces required and provided. Indicate any sequence of phased development, the target date for each phase and the final build out (horizon) year.

C. Trip Generation Calculations

1) Trip Generation Rates:

Trip generation calculations for the project and related projects must be based on the latest edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Handbook and the trip rates in the most recent edition of the ITE publication Trip Generation. If ITE trip rates are not available, the San Diego Traffic Generators (SDTG) manual may be used. Other trip generation rates, subject to City approval, may be used based on traffic generation studies of similar developments. As recommended in the ITE publication, site specific trip generation rates are encouraged, especially for land uses not in the ITE publication. For site-specific trip generation rates, adequate backup material must be included in the report and approved by the City prior to completion of the traffic study. The City may require a trip monitoring plan as a condition of approval (i.e., due to unique trip generation rates and/or for other reasons).

2) Trip Credits for Existing Uses:

Trip credits may be taken for an existing land use if the use was in operation at the time the base year traffic counts were taken and that said counts are less than one (1) year old. Any claim for trip credits for a previous land use must be supported by appropriate documentation of the previous active use including the percentage of building occupancy at the time of the study.

3) Trip Credits for “Pass-By” Trips:

A trip reduction for pass-by trips is allowed for retail/commercial type developments. The ITE average pass-by trip percentages, up to a maximum of twenty five percent (25.0%), may be used for pass-by trips for convenience-type land uses as approved by the City. The trip reduction cannot be more than one percent (1.0%) of the adjacent street traffic volume. Lowered trip rates are not applicable to assess impacts at project driveways and intersections immediately adjacent to the project site. Lowered trip rates shall not be considered in determining the need for a traffic study.

4) Trip Credits for Internal Trip Capture:

A trip reduction for Internal Trip Capture is allowed for mixed-use developments. A ten percent (10.0%) trip reduction may be allowed for qualifying projects without analytical back-up data. A request for a trip reduction of more than ten percent (10.0%) must have supporting data from similar developments. Any trip credits must be approved by the City during the scoping process and those trips must be included in the existing base year traffic counts.

5) Trip Credits for Transit Oriented Developments (TOD):

Trip credits for TOD projects may be allowed by the Department of Public Works for public and private developments within a quarter of a mile of transit stations such as the existing Fox Hills Mall Transit Center and the proposed transit facility within the Washington Boulevard / National Boulevard area.

6) Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Programs:

Trip credits for TDM programs that are recorded via covenant and/or conditions of approval may be allowed by the Department of Public Works if the TDM measures can be quantified and based on TDM reductions found on other similar developments. The TDM Measures will become conditions of approval for a development project, and a monitoring program may be required to evaluate the effectiveness of the TDM program.

7) Future Transportation Improvements:

The traffic study may assume certain road, intersection and other transportation improvements are in place, if the improvements are constructed by the build-out (horizon) year of the project.

D. Maps and Plans

The following maps and plans shall be included in the traffic study, unless otherwise specified in the scoping process:

- 1) A site plan for the development showing all applicable onsite and offsite improvements including, but not limited to, driveway locations, driveway widths, the parking layout, and the internal circulation. Prior to commencing the subject traffic study, the traffic engineer shall meet with the applicable City staff assigned to the project to review and gain “conceptual staff approval” of all driveway locations, driveway widths, parking lot layout, loading areas and docks and all other vehicle and pedestrian circulation elements of the plan that are both onsite and offsite as well as within any enclosed parking area.

Any proposed restricted or gated driveways, or other vehicle ingress/egress locations should be shown on the plans and designed in a manner that does not impede vehicular or pedestrian access on the adjacent streets. Site plans with vehicle turning paths may be required to demonstrate there is sufficient room to accommodate the largest vehicles anticipated to travel on the site. There should be sufficiently wide driveways and turn radii to allow service vehicles to enter and exit the site without encroaching upon opposing lanes or curbed areas. There should be sufficient separation between external and internal circulation roads so large vehicles can be queued on entry or exit without blocking access to parking spaces or internal roadway circulation. A queuing analysis may be required to demonstrate adequate ingress and egress capacity at proposed access driveways.

- 2) A site vicinity plan showing the intersections to be analyzed in the study area. The intersections should be listed by jurisdiction. Throughout the report, designate by number each intersection in all figures, lists of intersections, traffic counts and levels of service analysis.
- 3) A map showing the existing and proposed transportation circulation in the study area, the street system, the existing traffic controls (traffic signals and stop signs), freeways (including on-ramps and off-ramps), bus routes and bicycle routes. Indicate the roadway classification of the roads in the study area according to the City’s Circulation Element of the General Plan as well as the

number of travel lanes, the parking restrictions and bus stop locations. This information may be obtained from the various City departments or filed observations / inventory.

- 4) A map showing the lane configurations for each of the intersections to be analyzed for the existing conditions. Show any changes recommended in the lane configurations as part of proposed mitigation measures in the final build out (horizon) year. The recommended changes should be indicated by a different contrast arrow symbol or pattern.
- 5) A map showing “existing” (specify base year) traffic volumes for the AM and PM peak hours at the study intersections and street segments. The existing traffic counts must be taken within one year of the traffic study completion date, unless otherwise approved by the City.

Manual traffic counts shall be collected in 15-minute intervals between 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM. Additional periods shall be counted if the project generates significant traffic volumes during other periods, such as evening traffic generated by a theater or playhouse.

Traffic counts should be taken when school is in session; unless there is sufficient back-up data showing that out-of-session school counts are not significantly lower than in-session counts. Additional traffic counts and warrant analyses may be required to determine the need for traffic signals or additional traffic controls.

Traffic counts shall not be conducted during days of poor weather conditions or if traffic conditions are affected by construction activity.

- 6) An area map showing the location of related projects for the horizon year(s). Each related project on the area map should also be listed in a table indicating the project’s name, location, size, land use and trip generation. The traffic consultant should obtain the list of related projects from the Planning Division and from other neighboring jurisdictions. Generally, the traffic study should include related projects within a one-and-a-half (1 1/2) mile radius of the project, except for large projects that could potentially impact the study intersections.

Related projects or phased portions of related projects with a horizon year later than the subject project are exempted from the list. The City may require additional related projects to be included in the study during the review process.

- 7) A map showing the project's trip distribution percentages for each land use (inbound and outbound) at the study intersections and project driveways. This map must be submitted to the City with the Memorandum of Understanding / Scoping for Traffic Study.
- 8) A map showing traffic generated by the related projects for the horizon year(s).
- 9) A map showing the future traffic volumes at study intersections and street segments with ambient growth without the project in the specified horizon (build-out) year of the project. Specify the horizon year for each phase if the project will have phased development. The study should use a one percent (1.0%) per year ambient growth rate unless a different rate is approved by the City.
- 10) A map showing the total future traffic volumes from steps 8 and 9 without the project.
- 11) A map showing the future traffic volumes generated by the project in the horizon year of the project at study intersections, project driveways and street segments.
- 12) A map showing the total future traffic volumes with the project at study intersections, project driveways and street segments (add steps 10 and 11 above).
- 13) All maps shall show AM and PM peak traffic volumes unless otherwise specified by the City.
- 14) All maps shall include a date, north arrow, scale with scale bar and a labeled City boundary line where applicable.
- 15) If color is used on any map, table and/or graphic, the data shall be readable and understood what it uniquely represents when reproduced in black and white.
- 16) All maps, tables and/or graphics shall be in 8 1/2" x 11" format.
- 17) List all intersection references and analysis by jurisdiction.

E. Level of Service Analysis

1) Signalized Intersections

The latest version of the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) method or the Transportation Research Board Critical Movement

Analysis (CMA), Circular 21 Planning Method may be used to analyze existing and future levels of service (LOS) for signalized intersections. For the ICU method, a maximum of 1,600 vehicles per hour per lane, a total of 2,880 vehicles per hour for dual left-turn lane, loss time [i.e., any time there is no “green light”] and a maximum of ten percent (10.0%) of the cycle length [i.e., start up time, partial yellow and all red] must be used. Unmarked lanes, [i.e., a right-turn lane], may be allowed in the capacity calculations if the lane is a minimum of 22 feet wide, with no bus stops, and the parallel pedestrian volume crossing the street is not significant.

The Level of Service Analysis determines the volume to capacity (V/C) ratios and LOS for a signalized intersection. The established V/C ratios are measured on a scale between 0 and 1.00 or more. LOS describes the quality of traffic flow in terms of the level of congestion, travel speed and delay. The LOS ranges between “A” to “F”, with LOS “A” equals free-flow conditions and LOS “F” equals forced-flow or significant delays with long queue lengths.

Table 1 describes the typical characteristics of LOS and V/C ratios at signalized intersections as defined by the Transportation Research Board.

Table 1: Level of Service (LOS) Characteristics and Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratios for Signalized Intersections

LOS	V/C Ratio	Characteristics
A	0.600 or Less	EXCELLENT. No vehicles wait longer than one red light and no approach phase is fully used.
B	0.601 – 0.700	VERY GOOD. An occasional approach phase is fully utilized; many drivers begin to feel somewhat restricted within groups of vehicles.
C	0.701 – 0.800	GOOD. Occasionally, drivers may have to wait through more than one red light; backups may develop behind turning vehicles.
D	0.801 – 0.900	FAIR. Delays may be substantial during portions of rush hours, but enough lower volume periods occur to permit clearing of developing lines preventing excessive backups.
E	0.901 – 1.000	POOR. Represents the most vehicles that intersection approaches can accommodate; may be long lines of waiting vehicles through several signal cycles.

F	1.001 or More	FAILURE. Backups from nearby intersections or on cross streets may restrict or prevent movement of vehicles out of the intersection approaches. Tremendous delays with continuously increasing queue lengths.
---	---------------	--

2) Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio Scenarios

The V/C ratios shall be calculated to three decimals places. The LOS and V/C ratios shall be shown in a table format for study days AM and PM peak hours for the following scenarios:

- (a) Existing conditions;
- (b) Future horizon year with ambient growth and related projects;
- (c) Future horizon year with ambient growth and related projects plus proposed project;
- (d) Project impact;
- (e) Future horizon year with ambient growth, related projects and proposed project with traffic mitigation; and
- (f) Net project impact.

3) Non-Signalized Intersections

The methods in the latest version of the Highway Capacity Manual shall be used to analyze LOS at non-signalized intersections and non-signalized freeway ramps. Table 2 describes the typical characteristics of LOS at stop-controlled intersections as defined by the Transportation Research Board. The ICU or CMA methods may be used to calculate the difference in the V/C ration with and without the project. Any other methods must be approved by the City. If a project adds a significant amount of traffic as determined by the City to a non-signalized intersection or impacts it, a traffic signal or additional stop sign warrant study must be conducted.

Table 2: Level of Service (LOS) Characteristics for Stop-Controlled Intersections

<u>LOS</u>	<u>Average Total Delay (Seconds/Vehicle)</u>	<u>Expected Delay to Minor Street Traffic</u>
A	10.0 or Less	Little or no delay
B	10.1 and less than 15.0	Short traffic delays
C	15.1 and less than 25.0	Average traffic delays
D	25.1 and less than 35.0	Long traffic delays
E	35.1 and less than 50.0	Very long traffic delays
F	50.1 or More	Extreme delays

F. Thresholds of Significance

1) Intersections

A project's transportation impact at an intersection is considered to be significant if the project increases the V/C ratios beyond the threshold shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Significant Impact Thresholds At Signalized / Stop Controlled Intersections

LOS	V/C Ratio	Project Increase In V/C Ratio
A	0.600 or less	No Significant Impact
B	0.601 – 0.700	No Significant Impact
C	0.701 – 0.800	Equal or greater than 0.05
D	0.801 – 0.900	Equal or greater than 0.04
E	0.901 – 1.000	Equal or greater than 0.02
F	1.001 or more	Equal or greater than 0.02

The “Final V/C Ratio” is defined as the horizon-year V/C ratio at an intersection with ambient growth, related projects and the project, but without any traffic mitigation. The “Project Increase in V/C Ratio” is defined as the change in horizon-year V/C ratio between the scenario with ambient growth, related projects and the project without any traffic mitigation, and the scenario with ambient growth and related projects only.

Development projects in other jurisdictions should use their criteria when analyzing intersections in Culver City.

2) Residential Streets

A project that adds eight percent (8.0%) or more additional daily or peak-period traffic to a local residential street in the horizon year after the inclusion of ambient growth and related projects constitutes a significant impact.

3. Certain projects or the proximity of the projects may require additional traffic impact analysis such as:

- (a) Evening analysis for movie theaters, playhouses and commercial / industrial uses that generate traffic during off-peak hours;
- (b) University / school graduation and special events;

- (c) Developments with special visitor, employee, shopping hours or weekend business hours; and
- (d) Mainline freeway and on-ramp and off-ramp capacity analyses.

Recognizing the County of Los Angeles at this time has no criteria for determining impacts on residential streets, and since there are many local residential streets that are partially in the City of Los Angeles that serve the Culver City community, using the Los Angeles residential street guidelines would promote uniformity in street impact analysis. Accordingly, the following thresholds for determining the significance of vehicle traffic on local residential streets shall be used:

Table 4 Significant Impact Thresholds At Residential Streets

Projected Average Daily Traffic (ADT) With Project (Final ADT)	Project-Related Increase In Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volume
999 or Less	120 or More
1,000 to 1,999	12 percent or more of final ADT
2,000 to 2,999	10 percent or more of final ADT
3,000 or More	8 percent or more of final ADT

G. Analysis of Potential Mitigation Measures for Significant Impacts

In this section, the traffic study will assess the ability of the transportation circulation system to accommodate additional traffic generated by the related projects and the subject project. If the subject project creates significant impacts, the traffic study must analyze potential mitigation measures to reduce the impacts to less than significant.

The traffic study must indicate any other potential traffic impacts associated with the project, such as the following:

- 1) Motorists' entry at driveways,
- 2) Motorists' visibility at the project's driveways,
- 3) Ability of left-turn lanes to accommodate additional project traffic,
- 4) Ability to conduct loading operations on site; and
- 5) Ability to maneuver into parking stalls.

A queuing analysis may be required to assure that traffic entering project driveways does not back out onto the street.

In addition to the physical mitigation measures indicated above, the traffic study shall consider feasible traffic signal synchronization improvements, and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures. The TDM measures minimize the demand for trips by single occupant vehicles and encourage other alternative transportation measures such as bicycling, transit use and ridesharing.

The traffic study should include in the discussion mitigation measures that were considered but found to not be feasible, so that the public is aware that other potential mitigation measures were considered and the reasons they were rejected. If there are no feasible mitigation measures available, then the project's environmental analysis must include a Statement of Overriding Consideration.

H. Mitigation Measures for Significant Impacts

1) Street Widening and Other Physical Improvements

Any recommended street widening must be feasible and meet City standards. The remaining sidewalks must be adequate for pedestrian needs and meet the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. If additional right of way is needed to mitigate an impact, it should be available from the public road right of way and/or the development's on-site private property prior to any project site plan approval.

2) Street Re-Striping and Parking Prohibitions

For recommendations to increase the number of travel lanes on a street or at an intersection by re-striping, the traffic study must clearly identify the associated impacts, such as whether the additional lanes would require additional right of way and if any on-street parking would be removed. If removal of parking is recommended, the report must state the economic and physical impact of removing the parking on adjacent land uses. Proposed striping changes and parking prohibitions must be approved by the Department of Public Works.

3) Plan Preparation and Standards

For physical improvements or re-striping at each significantly impacted intersection, the developer must submit to the City geometric design drawings to a scale of at least one inch (1") equal to forty feet (40'-0") for existing conditions and proposed

mitigation measures. The drawings must show all significant roadway details, including adjacent land uses, parking restrictions, sidewalk widths, driveway widths, lane dimensions, roadway striping, curb and right-of-way lines, existing and proposed property lines and building footprints. All mitigation measures must be approved by the City and funded / constructed by the developer or as otherwise approved by the City.

4) Traffic Signal Installation and Traffic Signal Modifications

For project impacts at non-signalized intersections, the traffic study must conduct a traffic signal warrant analysis to determine if the project alone or with related projects, causes the need for a traffic signal installation. For significant impacts at a signalized intersection(s), the traffic study must analyze the intersection to determine if traffic signal modifications and improved traffic signal synchronization could mitigate the impact. The traffic signal warrant analysis must be conducted using the latest version of the State of California Department of Transportation (CalTrans) Traffic Manual Peak-Hour Traffic Warrant Analysis. If the traffic signal is warranted with the addition of the project's traffic, then the installation will be the responsibility of the project.

5) Establish a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures are designed to reduce a project's trips and the reliance on single-occupant vehicle automobile trips. The TDM measures may include, but not be limited to, carpooling, preferential parking for carpools, vanpooling, bicycle facilities, flexible work hours, telecommuting, incentives for employees to use transit such as transit vouchers, and financial contributions for the capital and/or operating costs of improved transit, shuttle service and pedestrian connections. The City may also require a monitoring program to ensure the effectiveness of TDM measures. The TDM measures are more appropriate for larger developments, particularly non-residential developments in excess of 25,000 or more gross square feet of floor area. The TDM measures are also required to satisfy the requirements of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 2202 (as may be amended) to reduce vehicle trip emissions. This rule requires employers of 250 or more employees to implement measures to reduce vehicle trip emissions. These measures include categories such as encouraging employees to use public transit to and from work. In addition, the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP)

requires implementation of TDM measures for new non-residential development project of 100,000 gross square feet or more.

6) Fair-Share Contributions for Mitigation Measures

If two or more projects cause a significant impact at an intersection or street segment, the City may accept fair-share contributions based on the percentages of the increased number of trips by each project prior to the first project occupancy.

7) Traffic Monitoring Program

The City may require the developer of a project to establish a traffic monitoring program to ensure that project traffic does not impact a residential street or that employees of and visitors to the project do not impact residents' parking in the nearby neighborhood. For the monitoring process, the developer will be required to take baseline "before-project" traffic counts and parking surveys prior to construction, and "after-project" traffic counts and parking surveys as required by the City.

8) Residential Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP)

The City may require the developer of a project to establish a residential Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) to prevent a development's traffic from impacting a residential neighborhood. Typical elements of an NTMP may include speed humps, street diverters, traffic circles and turn restrictions.

I. Congestion Management Program

A Congestion Management Program (CMP) analysis must be provided if a project meets the latest criteria established in the County of Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (METRO) CMP guidelines. A CMP Transportation Impact Analysis (CMP-TIA) shall be prepared for all projects required to prepare an environmental assessment based on local determination. The geographic area examined in the CMP-TIA must include at a minimum the following:

- 1) All CMP arterial monitoring intersections, including existing and proposed freeway on-ramps and off-ramp intersections, where a proposed project will add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours of adjacent street traffic;
- 2) Mainline freeway monitoring locations where a project will add 150 or more trips, in either direction, during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours; and

- 3) CalTrans shall be consulted to identify other specific locations to be analyzed on the state highway system.

If based on these criteria the CMP-TIA identifies no impact to regional facilities, then further CMP traffic analysis is not required. A copy of the latest CMP Guidelines can be obtained from the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) as follows:

County of Los Angeles
Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, California
90012-2952
(213) 922-2000
E-mail: planning@metro.net
Web page: <http://metro.net>

5. **REVIEW PROCESS**

The applicant shall submit two (2) bound copies of the “administrative draft” traffic study to the Planning Division for review and comment to determine if the report has been prepared per the established criteria and is reflective of the site and project specifics. Payment of the required Engineering Division fee to review the traffic study shall be made at that time.

If corrections are required, the applicant shall be provided with applicable notations for report revision and resubmission.

Once deemed acceptable, the Planning Division shall inform the applicant as to the required number of copies of the “final draft” traffic study for staff and Planning Commission review. Additional copies may be required for subsequent meetings and/or presentation to the Redevelopment Agency and/or City Council.

The applicant and the traffic consultant preparing the report shall be present at all public meetings and hearing on the proposed project and shall be available to respond to all questions from City representatives and the public.

Once approved, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Division an electronic version of the “approved” traffic study in a format as directed by the City.

6. CITY CONTACTS

In the event additional information is required, please contact the following:

City of Culver City / City Hall
9770 Culver Boulevard
Culver City, California
90232-0507

- A. Engineering Division
 (310) 253-5600
 E-mail:engineering@culvercity.org

- B. Planning Division
 (310) 253-5710
 E-mail:planning@culvercity.org

Attachment A

Memorandum Of Understanding / Scoping For Traffic Study

This Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) acknowledges all of the City of Culver City requirements and fees for the preparation of a traffic study for the following project:

Project Name: _____
Project Address: _____
Project Description*: _____ GFA Office / _____ GFA Industrial
_____ GFA Retail / _____ Residential Units

* Gross Floor Area (GFA) includes the ITE and CCMC definitions [area between exterior walls].

Project Horizon Year: _____ Ambient Growth Rate: One (1.0) % Per Year
Directional Distribution: N: _____% S: _____% E: _____% W: _____%
[Attach plan illustrating directional distribution percentages at all intersections and driveways. Consultant shall review all traffic counts and receive written confirmation from the City staff that the proposed traffic distribution and assignments are valid prior to proceeding with the balance of the traffic study. Said City confirmation may result in changes to the original traffic distribution listed above.]

Trip Generation Rate(s): _____	ITE Latest Edition / Other: _____	
Land Use: _____		
	ITE Code #: _____	ITE Code #: _____
	In _____ / Out _____	In _____ / Out _____
AM Trips: _____		Total In _____ / Total Out _____
PM Trips: _____		

Prior to the start of any proposed project analysis, the Traffic Consultant shall:

- 1) Obtain from the Planning Division the list of Culver City related projects;
- 2) Prepare a draft list of "related projects specific to the proposed project"; and
- 3) Obtain written approval from the Engineering Division of the "related projects specific to the proposed project" list.

Study Intersections [Indicate jurisdiction of each intersection]:

No.	Intersection: _____	/ Jurisdiction: _____
1.	_____	/ _____
2.	_____	/ _____
3.	_____	/ _____
4.	_____	/ _____
5.	_____	/ _____
6.	_____	/ _____
7.	_____	/ _____
8.	_____	/ _____
9.	_____	/ _____
10.	_____	/ _____

Use additional pages if necessary. Additionally, indicate any intersections that are subject to capacity analysis credit for advanced traffic signal control operations.

Indicate trip credits to be requested (Amount subject to City approval):	Yes	No
1. Internal:	☐	☐
2. Land Use / Existing:	☐	☐

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. Land Use / Previous: | ☐ | ☐ |
| 4. Pass-By Trips: | ☐ | ☐ |
| 5. Transit Oriented Development (TOD) District: | ☐ | ☐ |
| 6. Transportation Demand Management (TDM): | ☐ | ☐ |

Proposed Traffic Mitigation

Any proposed offsite traffic mitigation measure shall be listed and accompanied by a drawing of the existing and proposed improvements [including city boundary lines and existing / proposed property lines] and said plans shall be of a minimum scale of one inch (1") equal to forty feet (40'-0").

Post Occupancy Traffic Counts

By signing below, the Property Owner / Developer / Applicant hereby agrees to pay for and submit to the City a post occupancy traffic count analysis prepared by a state licensed traffic engineer or other professional as determined by the City Engineer. Said analysis shall include a traffic count of all onsite driveways taken upon reaching eight five percent (85.0%) occupancy of the total building gross floor area or within one (1) year of the issuance of the first Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO), as determined by the City Engineer. Said data shall be used to confirm the findings in the approved traffic study and shall not result in any additional traffic mitigation measures and/or conditions of approval on the subject project.

Signatures

	<u>Property Owner / Applicant:</u>	<u>Developer / Applicant:</u>
Name:	_____	_____
Company:	_____	_____
Address:	_____	_____
	_____	_____
City / State / Zip:	_____	_____
Office:	(____) _____	(____) _____
Fax:	(____) _____	(____) _____
Cell:	(____) _____	(____) _____
E-Mail:	_____	_____

Traffic Consultant:

Name: _____

Company: _____

Address: _____

City / State / Zip: _____

Office: (____) _____

Fax: (____) _____

Cell: (____) _____

E-Mail: _____

If any of the intersection(s) to be studied as part of this traffic study are located within the city limits of Los Angeles, the unincorporated territory of Los Angeles County and/or impact any other public agency [i.e., CalTrans], then this MOU shall also be acknowledged by the reviewing staff representative from each agency:

	<u>City of Los Angeles:</u>	<u>County of Los Angeles:</u>
Name:	_____	_____
Company:	_____	_____
Address:	_____	_____
	_____	_____
City / State / Zip:	_____	_____
Office:	() _____	() _____
Fax:	() _____	() _____
Cell:	() _____	() _____
E-Mail:	_____	_____
	<u>Other Public Agency:</u>	<u>Other Public Agency:</u>
Name:	_____	_____
Company:	_____	_____
Address:	_____	_____
	_____	_____
City / State / Zip:	_____	_____
Office:	() _____	() _____
Fax:	() _____	() _____
Cell:	() _____	() _____
E-Mail:	_____	_____

Approved by:

_____/_____
Property Owner – Applicant Date

_____/_____
Developer – Applicant Date

_____/_____
Traffic Consultant Date

_____/_____
City of Culver City Date

JM-BK/abn

CITY OF CULVER CITY
INTER - OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

Date: March 13, 1991
To: Distribution
From: Tom Sorrentino, Traffic Engineering Consultant
Subject: GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDIES

The following guidelines for the preparation of Traffic Impact Studies will apply, once it is determined that a traffic study is required. The need for a study will be determined based on the criteria established in the "Culver City Criteria for Requiring Traffic Impact Studies for Proposed Developments", approved by City Council on September 14, 1987, and on the August 10, 1988 list of development projects developed by Arthur L. Kassan.

These guidelines were developed to standardize the procedures for preparing traffic impact studies. However, it is intended that this be a dynamic document that may be revised or updated periodically. The City Engineer and the City Planner reserve the right to add, subtract or modify requirements, as deemed necessary, to address specific conditions or issues, or to resolve problems that may arise in their application.

REQUIRED GUIDELINES:

1. Either the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) or Critical Movement Analysis (CMA) methods of analysis may be used to determine Levels of Service (LOS).
2. The study shall include determination of ICUs and LOS for the following scenarios:
 - a. Existing conditions
 - b. Existing + background growth to target year at an annual percentage rate to be determined by the City's Traffic Engineering Consultant (Future Base Condition).
 - c. Future Base + related projects only (w/o project).
 - d. Future Base + project only (may only be required under certain circumstances).
 - e. Future Base + related projects + project.