



**CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS
PUBLIC WORKS & TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT**

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Martha Eros, Transportation Planner
DATE: September 16, 2010
SUBJECT: CEQA Traffic Thresholds of Significance

INTRODUCTION

The Beverly Hills City Council discussed traffic thresholds of significance at the May 4, 2010 Council Study Session to assess whether the current criteria applied to development projects is less stringent than other communities. The City Council directed staff to proceed with a two-step process: (1) refine guidelines for more consistency with adjacent jurisdictions, and (2) undertake a full review of Traffic Thresholds of Significance when funding is available to consider possible alternative methods such as establishing thresholds based on vehicle 'delay' or methods to encourage transit and pedestrian activity. Staff estimates approximately \$50,000 for outside consultant services to analyze Step 2.

Public Works & Transportation staff presented the Beverly Hills Planning Commission with modifications to the existing traffic thresholds of significance guidelines at its June 24, 2010 meeting. Staff recommended maintaining existing thresholds for signalized intersections and all-way stop unsignalized intersections; refining the definition for 2-way stop intersections; and modifying the daily traffic range and percentage threshold for residential streets (Attachment 2).

The Planning Commission requested staff to provide further detail on:

1. Methodology and impact of the proposed change for local residential streets
2. Provide a comparative matrix for residential streets to test actual past projects with existing and proposed threshold of significance criteria
3. Compare a 1% versus 2% modification for signalized intersections for level of service (LOS) "E" and "F"
4. Include LOS "D" analysis

METHODOLOGY

Staff surveyed adjacent and countywide jurisdictions to compare current threshold of significance guidelines applied for intersections and residential streets (Attachment 3). Based on discussions with staff from the surveyed cities, traffic threshold guidelines were developed administratively by internal traffic engineering and planning staff based on their local environment, street infrastructure, observation of local traffic conditions and patterns, and adjacent jurisdictions' thresholds. The guidelines have been applied by most jurisdictions a minimum of 10 years.

In addition to collecting the guideline criteria used by other cities, staff reviewed the 1995-1997 reports prepared by Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc (MMA) for the Westside Cities¹ Sub-regional Team tasked with developing uniform traffic thresholds for the sub-region. The four cities could not agree on uniform criteria and ultimately established individual thresholds to fit their unique environmental characteristics. The MMA reports served as the foundation for the existing *1997 Recommended Thresholds of Significant Impact Guidelines* for intersections and residential streets, with staff modifying the general recommendations to meet the specific demands of Beverly Hills activity.

Staff also utilized the existing 24-Hour Traffic Counts Summary to evaluate the existing traffic volumes for residential streets abutting streets with potential commercial or residential development, and the experience gained from reviewing past development proposals. Staff considered the possible mitigation options available as a result of developing too stringent criteria for the daily residential traffic, including a need for more Environmental Impact Reports, Statement of Overriding Consideration, and/or reducing project size.

RESIDENTIAL STREETS

Traffic thresholds of significance for neighborhood streets are intended to evaluate how a project's traffic might affect the existing characteristics of a residential neighborhood. For residential streets, staff determined the thresholds used by Los Angeles, Culver City and West Hollywood to be most comparable for Beverly Hills based on similarities of the street geometric grid pattern where local residential streets directly intersect with major arterials.

Staff proposes a hybrid of the average daily traffic (ADT) and threshold percentage criteria based on border cities² criteria for residential streets, review of existing Beverly

¹ The Cities of Beverly Hills, Culver City, Santa Monica and West Hollywood.

² Existing Thresholds of Significance for Los Angeles, Culver City, and West Hollywood:

	TIER 1	TIER 2	TIER 3	TIER 4
Los Angeles	0-1,000 ADT: 120+ trips	1,000-2,000 ADT: 12%	2,000-3,000 ADT: 10%	3,000+ ADT: 8%
Culver City	0-99 ADT: 120+ trips	1,000-1,999 ADT: 12%	2,000-2,999 ADT: 10%	3,000+ ADT: 8%
West Hollywood	0-2,000 ADT: 12%	2,001-3,000 ADT: 12%	3,001-6,449 ADT: 8%	6,750 ADT: 6.25%

Hills 24-Hour Traffic Counts Summary data, and the professional knowledge gained from past development project reviews:

- Tier 1: 0-2,000ADT traffic volume with 16% daily and peak hour increase
- Tier 2: 2,001-4,000ADT traffic volume with 12% daily and peak hour increase
- Tier 3: 4,001-6,750ADT traffic volume with 8% daily and peak hour increase
- Tier 4: 6,750+ traffic volume with 6.25% daily and peak hour increase

Staff did not include a separate tier for traffic volumes below 1,000ADT. Any development on a residential street (i.e., a multiple family conversions or new build) with traffic volume under 1,000ADT would need to meet the same traffic threshold criteria for Tier 1.

Staff proposes adjusting the traffic volume range for Tier 1 from 0-3,750ADT to 0-2,000ADT, and reducing the current percentage threshold from 25% to 16% to align with the bordering cities of Los Angeles and West Hollywood. An alternative option considered was to select a lower threshold of 12% for Tier 1; however, since Beverly Hills requires a more exhaustive assessment of residential street impacts by evaluating peak hour traffic in addition to daily traffic, a 16% threshold appears more appropriate for the peak hour evaluation.

Similar to the Tier 1 criteria, staff applied the same tests to Tiers 2 and 3. The added requirement of peak hour evaluation in addition to the ADT presents more stringent thresholds. For Tier 2 (2,001 to 4,000ADT), a 12% threshold for one hour is more stringent than 10% threshold for one day; the same principle applies for Tier 3. Tier 4 threshold of 6.25% for ADT and peak hour continues to apply a stringent threshold for higher volume residential streets.

Eight past development projects were tested using the proposed threshold levels for both ADT and peak hours traffic volumes (Attachment 4)³. To date, no development project has exceeded the existing daily residential thresholds. Of the 47 street segments evaluated, four street segments exceeded the new threshold criteria (an average of 2%). Staff has concluded that the majority of the streets reflected a less than significant increase in traffic, and did not exceed either the existing or proposed thresholds.

Historically, transportation staff has tested the daily and peak hour traffic volumes for potential traffic impacts generated by a project. The initial MMA report recommended the threshold of significance be "based on both the increase ADT and the increase in traffic during the peak hour of the generator (not necessarily the commute peak)". The

³ The 8767 Wilshire project was reviewed using both General Office and Medical Use traffic data to include midday peak hour counts for the project.

practice has been to require developers to include a peak analysis, either the project peak generation or the City peak for adjacent streets, depending on the type of development. Staff recommends defining the peak hour requisite to include both project peak (based on use) and City peak hour activity during the highest 1-hour period during the AM (7am-9am), midday (12pm-2pm), and PM (4pm-6pm).

Staff recommends using the “existing” daily traffic counts as the base volume for evaluating traffic impacts by developments. To address adjacent or cumulative projects that may add new traffic to neighborhoods, a general guideline that defines a “radius of impact” to the residential streets may be considered. The rule should take into consideration the type of land use and traffic generators that show evidence of affecting or contributing to local traffic, regardless of distance.

1% VERSUS 2% IMPACT AT SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

A high number of intersections in Beverly Hills currently operate at an existing LOS “E” (“poor,” poor traffic flow conditions) or “F” (“failure,” stop and go flow conditions). Changing the threshold to 1% will result in an overwhelming significant impact for a majority of proposed projects without any potential for mitigation. Mitigation options would be limited, or may not be available, due to the built-out conditions and existing infrastructure of the City, the existing LOS conditions, and the limited choices for capacity enhancement (i.e., widening streets, intersections, alleys, etc). Project costs would increase as a result of additional traffic studies and Environmental Impact Reports (EIR), thus potentially rendering a project unfeasible for the developer and/or denying a development project that may be a benefit to the community.

Designation of a 2% threshold is practiced by more local communities with similar characteristics of Beverly Hills than the 1% applied by the City and County of Los Angeles. For example, Culver City, Glendale, El Segundo, Torrance, Redondo Beach, Malibu and Long beach apply a 2% threshold for LOS “E” and “F”. The traffic patterns of some of these cities match Beverly Hills more than those of City of Los Angeles, which applies the 1% criteria to its diverse districts with variable density and urban planning patterns.

Further, the factor of 2% was established as the Congestion Management Program Threshold for all 78 cities within Los Angeles County based on the following rationale:

- a) It was the consensus of transportation engineers that the public could not perceive a change in volume to capacity (v/c) ratio any smaller than 2%
- b) It was the threshold already established in the largest number of jurisdictions in the country
- c) 2% represents 20% of one level of service, and that it was not reasonable to allow any one development to “use up” more than 20% of one level of service without calling that an impact.

Staff reviewed the traffic impact reports of 16 projects (Attachment 5) that were presented to the City within the last 10 years, and tested a 1% v/c threshold level. Of the 16 projects, 13 resulted with significant impacts at 1%. Some projects produced multiple impacts at more than one intersection within the scope of their studies. This could mean a majority of future developments could result with a significant impact if 1% instead of 2% v/c is applied. These developments would need to provide traffic mitigation to address the significant impacts. With fully built-out conditions of major corridors, including Wilshire and Olympic, La Cienega, Beverly, and Robertson, there is limited room for capacity enhancement mitigation measures. As a result, a project with no mitigation would need to undertake an expensive and lengthy process of EIR preparation and/or require the Planning Commission or City Council to adopt a Statement of Overriding Consideration in order to approve that project.

2% VERSUS 4% IMPACT AT INTERSECTIONS WITH FINAL LOS "D"

Arterial streets that intersect with a local residential street may operate at LOS "D" during peak periods (i.e., AM, midday, PM), then resume to better LOS conditions during non-peak periods. Presence of traffic control devices and the type of land uses contribute to the temporary peak hour conditions for LOS "D." Staff evaluated six projects for a 2% versus existing 4% threshold using the similar process applied for LOS "E" and "F" (Attachment 6). No impacts or changes occurred for any project when applying the more stringent criteria of 2%, thus staff concludes that the existing 4% criteria for LOS "D" is an appropriate threshold.

Staff recommends that changes to signalized intersections be considered as part of step two when alternative approaches, such as delayed methodology, can be evaluated.

ANALYSIS

Based on a review of the thresholds of adjacent jurisdictions, staff is recommending revising the City's thresholds for residential street segments, but not for signalized intersections.

Residential Streets

The threshold for residential street segments is proposed to be lowered to levels similar to Los Angeles. This means that smaller increases in traffic would result in significant impacts compared to the existing standards. While the proposed change is not anticipated to result in a significant number of new impacts compared to existing thresholds, the amendment is recommended to bring current guidelines more in line with adjacent jurisdictions, and acknowledge a greater sensitivity to increased traffic along residential streets compared to the City's commercial thoroughfares.

Signalized Intersections

No changes are proposed to the existing signalized intersections. While staff evaluated lowering thresholds to mirror Los Angeles, this approach is not recommended at this time. A volume to capacity ratio of 2% would not be a perceptible change to circulation patterns. Additionally, given the number of signalized intersections within the City that currently operate at LOS E or F and the analysis of peak hour traffic (unlike Los Angeles), a 1% threshold may not necessarily be appropriate for Beverly Hills.

While staff does not recommend adjusting the thresholds for signalized intersections, staff has identified a number of implications associated with lowering the thresholds. As indicated in Attachment 4, a 1% threshold would have resulted in a significant impact in a number of projects that the City has reviewed that were determined not to have an impact under the existing thresholds. Staff would expect a 1% threshold for signalized intersections to result in more significant impacts for future developments, resulting in a greater number of EIRs, longer processing times, increased staff hours, and greater development costs.

In addition, due to existing limitations of our roadways, it is also likely that applying a 1% threshold would result in impacts which could not be mitigated; if a project were to be approved, the Commission would also be required to make findings in support of a Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC). This would add additional uncertainties and complexities to the entitlement process.

It is important to consider that projects that result in significant and unavoidable impacts may still be approved under CEQA if the SOC findings are made; the same is not true for the City's entitlements. For instance, if a project requires Development Plan Review, one of the findings is that *"the proposed plan will not create any significantly adverse traffic impacts, traffic safety hazards, pedestrian-vehicle conflicts, or pedestrian safety hazards."*

While each project stands on its own merits and is evaluated under its own circumstances, it may be difficult for a decision maker to determine that a project does not create any significantly adverse traffic impacts if it results in significant and unavoidable traffic impacts under CEQA thresholds. As a result, despite being able to make the required SOC findings, it is possible that Development Plan Review may not be able to be approved.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Planning Commission adopt the attached resolution adopting thresholds of significance for traffic impacts.

- Attachment 1: Resolution
- Attachment 2: 2010 Recommended Thresholds of Significant Impact Guidelines
- Attachment 3: Comparison of Traffic Thresholds for Adjacent Jurisdictions
- Attachment 4: Residential Streets ADT-Peak Hour Analysis
- Attachment 5: LOS "E" and "F" 1% vs. 2% Project Analysis
- Attachment 6: LOS "D" 4% vs. 2% Project Analysis

Attachment 1

Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE
CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS ADOPTING THRESHOLDS OF
SIGNIFICANCE FOR TRAFFIC IMPACTS

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Beverly Hills has requested revisions to the City's thresholds of significance for certain traffic impacts, which are utilized in the City's actions implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

WHEREAS, Planning Commission finds and determines that the City of Beverly Hills' existing thresholds of significance for certain traffic impacts, which are utilized in the City's actions implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), have not been amended in over twelve (12) years and are not reflective of the thresholds used by adjacent jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, on June 24, 2010, the Planning Commission held a public meeting to discuss potential changes to the thresholds, and continued the meeting and discussion to its public meeting on July 22, 2010 and subsequently to September 16, 2010. Notice of the June 24th meeting was published in the *Beverly Hills Courier* newspaper, and opportunities for public input were provided at the June 24, July 22, 2010 and September 16 meetings.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Planning Commission of the City of Beverly Hills does resolve as follows:

Section 1. The Planning Commission finds and determines based on the staff reports and research, expert testimony from the City's Transportation Division staff, and public testimony, that the revised thresholds are more in line with those used by adjacent jurisdictions and more appropriately evaluate the traffic impacts of new development projects on the City's residential streets.

Section 2. The revised traffic thresholds change the City's existing guidelines for analysis of the traffic impacts on the City's residential streets caused by new development. The revised thresholds are a means to evaluate impacts during the environmental review process required by CEQA and their adoption is not subject to environmental review by CEQA.

Section 3. The Planning Commission hereby adopts the revised Traffic Thresholds of Significance for the City of Beverly Hills, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "A".

Section 4. The Secretary of the Planning Commission shall certify to the passage, approval, and adoption of this resolution, and shall cause this resolution and his certification to be entered in the Book of Resolutions of the Planning Commission of this City and a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the City Council.

Adopted: September 16, 2010

Lili Bosse
Chair of the Planning Commission of the
City of Beverly Hills, California

Attest:

Secretary

Approved as to form:

David M. Snow
Assistant City Attorney

Approved as to content:

Susan Healy Keene, AICP
Director of Community Development

EXHIBIT A
Traffic Thresholds of Significance

~

Attachment 2

**2010 Recommended Thresholds
of Significant Impact Guidelines**



CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS

Beverly Hills Traffic Thresholds of Significance

Adopted by the Planning Commission

on September 16, 2010 by

Resolution No. _____.

The following is the recommended traffic thresholds of significant impact for 4 different scenarios:

1. Threshold of Impacts at Signalized Intersections:

Calculation Methodology: Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU), using criterion similar to Congestion Management Program (CMP). Selected lane capacity of 1,600 vehicles per hour.

An impact will be considered significant if traffic generated by a project causes an increase of:

- 0.020 or more on V/C at the final LOS "F"
- 0.020 or more on V/C at the final LOS "E"
- 0.040 or more on V/c at the final LOS "D" or better

2. Threshold of Impacts at Unsignalized (all-way stop) Intersections:

Calculation Methodology: ~~The 1994~~ Based on the **most current edition of Highway Capacity Manual.**

An impact will be considered significant if the following increase of average total delay per vehicle results in:

- 3.0 seconds or more average total delay at the final LOS "F"
- 3.0 seconds or more average total delay at the final LOS "E"
- 4.0 seconds or more average total delay at the final LOS "D"

3. Threshold of Impacts at Unsignalized (2-way stop) Intersections:

Calculation methodology: Highway Capacity Manual (latest edition) special report 209 or a comparable software.

~~Significant Impact: A Change in LOS to LOS E OR F from LOS D or better that occurs on any direction of travel.~~

Significant Impact: A Change in level of service (comparison of cumulative plus without project, to cumulative plus with project) on any direction of travel:

- LOS D or better to LOS E or worse
- LOS E to LOS F
- LOS F to LOS F (resulting in increase of 10 or more average total delay (sec/veh) on any direction.

4. Threshold of Impacts at Residential (Local) Streets:

Significant Impact:

~~I ADT less than 3,750, project increases ADT by 25% and/or increases of the peak hour by 25%.~~

- I. ADT less than 2,000 volume per day (vpd): project increases ADT by 16%, or increases peak hour by 16% or both.

~~II ADT greater than 3,750 but less than 6750, project increases ADT by 12.5% and/or increases the peak hour by 12.5%.~~

- II. ADT greater than 2,001 but less than 4,000 vpd: project increases ADT by 12% or more, or increases peak hour by 12% or more or both.

- III. ADT greater than 4,001 but less than 6,750 vpd: project increases ADT by 8% or more, and increases peak hour by 8% or more or both

~~III ADT greater than 6,750, project increases ADT by 6.25% and/or increases the peak hour by 6.25%.~~

- IV. ADT greater than 6,750 vpd: project increases ADT by 6.25% or more, or increases peak hour by 6.25% or more or both

Attachment 3

Comparison of Traffic Thresholds
for Adjacent Jurisdictions

SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

	Beverly Hills	Culver City	Los Angeles	Pasadena	Santa Monica*	West Hollywood*
LOS "D" (0.81-0.900)	4% or more increase in v/c	4% or more increase in v/c	2% or more increase in v/c	3% or more increase in v/c	Average delay by any amount for collector; or 15 seconds or more for arterial; or becomes LOS E or F	12 seconds or more delay
LOS "E" (0.91-1.00)	2% or more increase in v/c	2% or more increase in v/c	1% or more increase in v/c	2% or more increase in v/c	Average delay increases by any amount	12 seconds or more delay
LOS "F" (over 1.00)	2% or more increase in v/c	2% or more increase in v/c	1% or more increase in v/c	2% or more increase in v/c	Half Percent (1/2) increase in v/c	8 seconds or more delay

* Cities of Santa Monica and West Hollywood measure seconds of delay.

RESIDENTIAL STREETS

	Beverly Hills Existing ¹	Beverly Hills Proposed	Culver City ²	Los Angeles ³	Pasadena ⁶	Santa Monica ⁴	West Hollywood ⁵
0 - 3,750 ADT: 25% increase and 25% peak hour increase	0 - 2,000 ADT: 16% increase and 16% peak hour increase	0 - 99 ADT: 120 or more trips	0-1,000 ADT: 120 trips or more	0-2,000 ADT: 2.4% (staff review)	1 - 1,250 ADT: 25% or more increase	0-2,000 ADT: 12% or more increase	
3,750 - 6,750 ADT: 12.5% increase and 12.5% increase peak hour	2,001 - 4,000 ADT: 12% increase and 12% peak hour increase	1,000 - 1,999 ADT: 12% or more increase of final ADT	ADT 1,000-2,000: 12% or more increase	2,000+ ADT: 2.5%-4.9% (study required if count greater than 2K; plus soft mitigation)	1,250 - 2,250 ADT: 12.5% or more increase	2,001-3,000 ADT: 10% or more increase	
6,750+ ADT: 6.25% increase	4,001-6,750 or more ADT: 8% increase and 8% peak hour increase	2,000 - 2,999 ADT: 10% or more increase of final ADT	ADT 2,000 or more: 10% or more increase	2,000+ ADT: 5.0-7.4% (study if +2K; soft mitigation; physical mitigation may be required)	2,250 or more ADT: net increase of 1 trip	3,001-6,749 ADT: 8% or more increase	
	6,750+ ADT: 6.25% increase and 6.25% peak hour increase	3,000+ ADT: 8% or more increase of final ADT	ADT 3,000 or more: 8% or more increase	2,000+ ADT: 7.5% and more (initial study +2K; soft mitigation; extensive physical mitigation may be required; project alternatives may be considered)		6,750+ ADT: 6.25% or more increase	

LOS: Level of Service

ADT: Average Daily Traffic

V/C: Volume to Capacity Ratio

1. City of Beverly Hills, Public Works Dept. - Engineering Div., Existing Thresholds, February 19, 1998.
2. City of Culver City, June 17, 2009, Planning Commission, Agenda Item A-1, Discussion on Proposed Updates of the Citywide Traffic Study Criteria.
3. City of Los Angeles, Draft Los Angeles CEQA Threshold Guide, L-4-2-A, Neighborhood Intrusion Impacts, Significant Threshold, 2006, p. L-4-2.
4. City of Santa Monica.
5. City of West Hollywood, City Council Meeting, October 19, 2009, Item 5.A, Traffic Study Thresholds.
6. City of Pasadena, Transportation Planning & Development Division-DOT, Transportation Impact Review Current Practice and Guidelines 2005, Section 2: Thresholds, p.2.2.

TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
SIGNIFICANT TRAFFIC THRESHOLDS
COMPARISON MATRIX

THRESHOLD

Unsignalized (All Way Stop)	Beverly Hills	Santa Monica	West Hollywood
LOS "D" (0.81-0.90)	4.0 seconds or more delay	15 seconds or more delay	8 seconds or more delay
LOS "E" (0.91-1.00)	3.0 seconds or more delay	0 seconds or more delay	5 seconds or more delay
LOS "F" (over 1.00)	3.0 seconds or more delay	0 seconds or more delay	5 seconds or more delay

* The Cities of Culver City, Los Angeles, and Pasadena do not have specified measurements for unsignalized intersections.

Unsignalized (2-Way Stop)	Beverly Hills	Santa Monica	West Hollywood
	A change in level of service from LOS "D" or better in any direction of travel to LOS "E" or "F"	None	None

* The City of Beverly Hills has a Threshold of Significance at unsignalized 2-way stops; no other city surveyed.

LOS: Level of Service
ADT: Average Daily Traffic
V/C: Volume to Capacity Ratio

LOCAL JURISDICTION
LEVEL OF SERVICE THRESHOLDS

Jurisdiction	LEVEL OF SERVICE					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Beverly Hills				0.04	0.02	0.02
Culver City				0.04	0.02	0.02
City of Los Angeles			0.04	0.02	0.01	0.01
County of Los Angeles			0.04	0.02	0.01	0.01
Santa Monica	Measures seconds of delay					0.005
West Hollywood	Measures seconds of delay					
Pasadena	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.01
Glendale				0.02	0.02	0.02
Hawthorne			0.04	0.02	0.01	0.01
El Segundo	D to E or F				0.02	0.02
Torrance					0.02	0.02
Redondo Beach	A, B, C or D to E or F				0.02	0.02
Malibu				0.02	0.02	0.02
Long Beach					0.02	0.02

Attachment 4

Residential Streets ADT-Peak Hour Analysis

**TRAFFIC THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE
RESIDENTIAL STREET ANALYSIS**

	Existing		Proposed	
	TIER 1	0-3,750 ADT	25%	0-2,000 ADT
TIER 2	3,750-6,750	12.50%	2,000-4,000	12.0%
TIER 3	6,750+	6.25%	4,000-6,750	8.0%
TIER 4			6,750+	6.25%

Beverly Hilton Revitalization Plan Recirculation Draft EIR, October 2007

January 17-30, 2007

WHITTIER DRIVE	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	ADT	10,500	65	10,565	0.6%	6.25%	NO	6.25%
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	1,169	2	1,171	0.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
MID PEAK (11AM-2PM)	600	8	608	1.3%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	1,134	8	1,142	0.7%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
SAT (11AM-2PM)	623	7	630	1.1%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO

ELEVADO DRIVE	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	ADT	3,500	0	3,500	0.0%	25%	NO	12%
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	724	0	724	0.0%	25%	NO	12%	NO
MID PEAK (11AM-2PM)	187	0	187	0.0%	25%	NO	12%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	599	0	599	0.0%	25%	NO	12%	NO
SAT (11AM-2PM)	175	0	175	0.0%	25%	NO	12%	NO

9900 Wilshire Project, Recirculated Draft EIR, October 2007

January 17-30, 2007

WHITTIER DRIVE	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	ADT	10,500	65	10,565	0.6%	6.25%	NO	6.25%
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	1,169	2	1,171	0.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
MID PEAK (11AM-2PM)	600	8	608	1.3%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	1,134	8	1,142	0.7%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
SAT (11AM-2PM)	623	7	630	1.1%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO

ELEVADO DRIVE	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	ADT	3,500	0	3,500	0%	25%	NO	12%
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	724	0	724	0%	25%	NO	12%	NO
MID PEAK (11AM-2PM)	187	0	187	0%	25%	NO	12%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	599	0	599	0%	25%	NO	12%	NO
SAT (11AM-2PM)	175	0	175	0%	25%	NO	12%	NO

9090 Wilshire Blvd., Traffic Impact and Parking Utilization Study, Hirsch Green, February 2009

(WITH PARKING RELOCATION)

OAKHURST btw WILSHIRE/CHARLEVILLE	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

TRAFFIC THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE
RESIDENTIAL STREET ANALYSIS

	Existing		Proposed	
	ADT	%	ADT	%
TIER 1	0-3,750	25%	0-2,000	16.0%
TIER 2	3,750-6,750	12.50%	2,000-4,000	12.0%
TIER 3	6,750+	6.25%	4,000-6,750	8.0%
TIER 4			6,750+	6.25%

	ADT	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
ADT	2,352	206	2,558	8.8%	25%	NO	12%	NO
MID PEAK	206	36*	242	17.0%	25%	NO	12%	YES

*STAFF ESTIMATE BASED ON TRIP GENERATION DATA FOR MIDDAY

CHARLEVILLE btw OAKHURST/DOHENY

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
ADT	5,898	85	5,983	1.4%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
MID PEAK	445	23*	468	5.0%	13%	NO	8%	NO

*STAFF ESTIMATE BASED ON TRIP GENERATION FOR MIDDAY

Wallis Annenberg Center, Draft EIR, June 2008

CANON DR

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
ADT	10,881	82	10,963	0.8%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	806	7	813	0.9%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
MID PEAK (12PM-2PM)	633	11	644	1.7%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	1,106	8	1,114	0.7%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
WEEKEND ADT	8,251	96	8,347	1.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
W-END MID (1PM-3PM)	579	12	591	2.1%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO

CRESCENT DR

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
ADT	9,349	20	9,369	0.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	985	2	987	0.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
MID PEAK (12PM-2PM)	574	3	577	0.5%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	973	1	974	0.1%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
WEEKEND ADT	5,891	24	5,915	0.4%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
W-END MID (1PM-3PM)	470	3	473	0.6%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO

9200 Wilshire Blvd. Environmental Impact Report, January 2006

September 30, 2005

100 NORTH REXFORD

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	9,028	48	9,076	0.5%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	626	3	629	0.5%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	759	5	764	0.7%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
SAT ADT	4,986	50	5,036	1.0%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
SAT PEAK (12PM-2PM)	503	5	508	1.0%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
SUN ADT	4,111	36	4,147	0.9%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO

100 SOUTH REXFORD

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	8,084	95	8,179	1.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO

TRAFFIC THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE
RESIDENTIAL STREET ANALYSIS

	Existing		Proposed	
	TIER 1	0-3,750 ADT	25%	0-2,000 ADT
TIER 2	3,750-6,750	12.50%	2,000-4,000	12.0%
TIER 3	6,750+	6.25%	4,000-6,750	8.0%
TIER 4			6,750+	6.25%

AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	517	7	524	1.4%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	678	7	685	1.0%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
SAT ADT	5,126	99	5,225	1.9%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
SAT PEAK (12PM-2PM)	442	9	451	2.0%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
SUN ADT	4,187	73	4,260	1.7%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO

200 SOUTH
REXFORD

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	7,006	16	7,022	0.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	456	1	457	0.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	632	1	633	0.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
SAT ADT	4,285	16	4,301	0.4%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
SAT PEAK (12PM-2PM)	366	2	368	0.5%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
SUN ADT	4,139	14	4,153	0.3%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO

300 SOUTH
REXFORD

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	6,084	16	6,100	0.3%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	560	1	561	0.2%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	429	1	430	0.2%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
SAT ADT	3,765	16	3,781	0.4%	12.5%	NO	12%	NO
SAT PEAK (12PM-2PM)	372	2	374	0.5%	12.5%	NO	12%	NO
SUN ADT	3,640	14	3,654	0.4%	25%	NO	12%	NO

100 SOUTH
MAPLE

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	2,605	127	2,732	4.9%	25%	NO	12%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	200	11	211	5.5%	25%	NO	12%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	253	10	263	4.0%	25%	NO	12%	NO
SAT ADT	1,725	123	1,848	7.1%	25%	NO	16%	NO
SAT PEAK (12PM-2PM)	160	10	170	6.3%	25%	NO	16%	NO
SUN ADT	1,505	105	1,610	7.0%	25%	NO	16%	NO

200 SOUTH
MAPLE

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	1,839	40	1,879	2.2%	25%	NO	16%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	140	2	142	1.4%	25%	NO	16%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	185	4	189	2.2%	25%	NO	16%	NO
SAT ADT	1,261	39	1,300	3.1%	25%	NO	16%	NO
SAT PEAK (12PM-2PM)	126	4	130	3.2%	25%	NO	16%	NO
SUN ADT	1,098	33	1,131	3.0%	25%	NO	16%	NO

300 SOUTH
MAPLE

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
--	----------	-----------------------------	----------------	------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

TRAFFIC THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE
RESIDENTIAL STREET ANALYSIS

	Existing		Proposed	
	TIER 1	0-3,750 ADT	25%	0-2,000 ADT
TIER 2	3,750-6,750	12.50%	2,000-4,000	12.0%
TIER 3	6,750+	6.25%	4,000-6,750	8.0%
TIER 4			6,750+	6.25%

	Existing	Traffic Added by Project	ADT w. Project	% Increase	Existing Threshold	Significant Impact	Proposed Threshold	Significant Impact
WEEKDAY ADT	3,690	40	3,730	1.1%	25%	NO	12%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	190	2	192	1.1%	25%	NO	12%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	305	4	309	1.3%	25%	NO	12%	NO
SAT ADT	2,327	39	2,366	1.7%	25%	NO	12%	NO
SAT PEAK (12PM-2PM)	184	4	188	2.2%	25%	NO	12%	NO
SUN ADT	2,309	34	2,343	1.5%	25%	NO	12%	NO

100 SOUTH PALM

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	1,812	241	2,053	13.3%	25%	NO	16%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	135	8	143	5.9%	25%	NO	16%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	145	20	165	13.8%	25%	NO	16%	NO
SAT ADT	1,352	261	1,613	19.3%	25%	NO	16%	YES
SAT PEAK (12PM-2PM)	124	27	151	21.8%	25%	NO	16%	YES
SUN ADT	1,149	181	1,330	15.8%	25%	NO	16%	NO

200 SOUTH PALM

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	1,689	73	1,762	4.3%	25%	NO	16%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	107	2	109	1.9%	25%	NO	16%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	164	6	170	3.7%	25%	NO	16%	NO
SAT ADT	742	79	821	10.6%	25%	NO	16%	NO
SAT PEAK (12PM-2PM)	154	9	163	5.8%	25%	NO	16%	NO
SUN ADT	770	55	825	7.1%	25%	NO	16%	NO

300 SOUTH PALM

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	1,193	73	1,266	6.1%	25%	NO	16%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	74	2	76	2.7%	25%	NO	16%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	97	6	103	6.2%	25%	NO	16%	NO
SAT ADT	734	78	812	10.6%	25%	NO	16%	NO
SAT PEAK (12PM-2PM)	61	8	69	13.1%	25%	NO	16%	NO
SUN ADT	474	55	529	11.6%	25%	NO	16%	NO

CHARLEVILLE
btw REXFORD &
MAPLE

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	4,331	159	4,490	3.7%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	242	11	253	4.5%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	355	12	367	3.4%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
SAT ADT	2,738	165	2,903	6.0%	25%	NO	12%	NO
SAT PEAK (12PM-2PM)	297	16	313	5.4%	25%	NO	12%	NO
SUN ADT	3,393	123	3,516	3.6%	25%	NO	12%	NO

TRAFFIC THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE
RESIDENTIAL STREET ANALYSIS

	Existing		Proposed	
TIER 1	0-3,750 ADT	25%	0-2,000 ADT	16.0%
TIER 2	3,750-6,750	12.50%	2,000-4,000	12.0%
TIER 3	6,750+	6.25%	4,000-6,750	8.0%
TIER 4			6,750+	6.25%

CHARLEVILLE btw MAPLE & PALM					EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE				
WEEKDAY ADT	5,434	119	5,553	2.2%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	359	9	368	2.5%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	476	9	485	1.9%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
SAT ADT	2,908	126	3,034	4.3%	25%	NO	12%	NO
SAT PEAK (12PM-2PM)	298	12	310	4.0%	25%	NO	12%	NO
SUN ADT	2,086	91	2,177	4.4%	25%	NO	12%	NO

CHARLEVILLE btw PALM & OAKHURST					EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE				
WEEKDAY ADT	7,802	97	7,899	1.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	497	6	503	1.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	758	7	765	0.9%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
SAT ADT	4,173	102	4,275	2.4%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
SAT PEAK (12PM-2PM)	428	10	438	2.3%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
SUN ADT	3,095	72	3,167	2.3%	25%	NO	12%	NO

231-265 North Beverly Drive (William Morris Agency), July 2007

CAMDEN btw CHARLEVILLE & GREGORY					EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE				
WEEKDAY ADT	3,146	204	3,350	6.5%	25%	NO	12%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	283	8	291	2.8%	25%	NO	12%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK (1PM-3PM)	283	33	316	11.7%	25%	NO	12%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	226	33	259	14.6%	25%	NO	12%	NO
WEEKEND ADT	2,104	134	2,238	6.4%	25%	NO	12%	NO
W-END PEAK (12PM-2PM)	213	19	232	8.9%	25%	NO	12%	NO

CAMDEN btw GREGORY & OLYMPIC					EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE				
WEEKDAY ADT	4,149	204	4,353	4.9%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	353	8	361	2.3%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK (1PM-3PM)	323	33	356	10.2%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	426	33	459	7.7%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
WEEKEND ADT	2,268	134	2,402	5.9%	25%	NO	12%	NO
W-END PEAK (12PM-2PM)	229	19	248	8.3%	25%	NO	12%	NO

RODEO btw CHARLEVILLE & GREGORY					EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE				
WEEKDAY ADT	3,888	0	3,888	0.0%	12.5%	NO	12%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	287	0	287	0.0%	12.5%	NO	12%	NO

**TRAFFIC THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE
RESIDENTIAL STREET ANALYSIS**

	Existing		Proposed	
TIER 1	0-3,750 ADT	25%	0-2,000 ADT	16.0%
TIER 2	3,750-6,750	12.50%	2,000-4,000	12.0%
TIER 3	6,750+	6.25%	4,000-6,750	8.0%
TIER 4			6,750+	6.25%

MIDDAY PEAK (1PM-3PM)	354	0	354	0.0%	12.5%	NO	12%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	269	0	269	0.0%	12.5%	NO	12%	NO
WEEKEND ADT	4,482	0	4,482	0.0%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
W-END PEAK (12PM-2PM)	359	0	359	0.0%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO

RODEO btw N.SMB & CARMELITA		EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT		8,472	102	8,574	1.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)		543	17	560	3.1%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK (1PM-3PM)		683	18	701	2.6%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)		635	6	641	0.9%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
WEEKEND ADT		7,555	67	7,622	0.9%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
W-END PEAK (12PM-2PM)		664	12	676	1.8%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO

BEVERLY btw N.SMB & CARMELITA		EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT		21,073	102	21,175	0.5%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)		1,569	4	1,573	0.3%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK (1PM-3PM)		1,485	16	1,501	1.1%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)		1,544	17	1,561	1.1%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
WEEKEND ADT		18,231	67	18,298	0.4%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
W-END PEAK (12PM-2PM)		1,365	10	1,375	0.7%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO

CANON btw N.SMB & CARMELITA		EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT		11,521	0	11,521	0.0%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)		811	0	811	0.0%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK (1PM-3PM)		746	0	746	0.0%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)		876	0	876	0.0%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
WEEKEND ADT		10,525	0	10,525	0.0%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
W-END PEAK (12PM-2PM)		809	0	809	0.0%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO

DAYTON btw CRESCENT & REXFORD		EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT		4,176	102	4,278	2.4%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)		351	4	355	1.1%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK (1PM-3PM)		352	16	368	4.5%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)		316	17	333	5.4%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
WEEKEND ADT		2,010	67	2,077	3.3%	25%	NO	12%	NO
W-END PEAK (12PM-2PM)		152	10	162	6.6%	25%	NO	12%	NO

**TRAFFIC THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE
RESIDENTIAL STREET ANALYSIS**

	Existing		Proposed	
TIER 1	0-3,750 ADT	25%	0-2,000 ADT	16.0%
TIER 2	3,750-6,750	12.50%	2,000-4,000	12.0%
TIER 3	6,750+	6.25%	4,000-6,750	8.0%
TIER 4			6,750+	6.25%

DAYTON btw REXFORD & FOOTHILL	Existing				Proposed			
	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	2,105	102	2,207	4.8%	25%	NO	12%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	216	4	220	1.9%	25%	NO	12%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK (1PM-3PM)	153	16	169	10.5%	25%	NO	12%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	143	17	160	11.9%	25%	NO	12%	NO
WEEKEND ADT	1,821	67	1,888	3.7%	25%	NO	16%	NO
W-END PEAK (12PM-2PM)	175	10	185	5.7%	25%	NO	16%	NO

FOOTHILL btw BURTON & DAYTON	Existing				Proposed			
	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	4,298	102	4,400	2.4%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	349	4	353	1.1%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK (1PM-3PM)	394	16	410	4.1%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	333	17	350	5.1%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
WEEKEND ADT	2,969	67	3,036	2.3%	25%	NO	12%	NO
W-END PEAK (12PM-2PM)	305	10	315	3.3%	25%	NO	12%	NO

CHARLEVILLE btw CAMDEN & RODEO	Existing				Proposed			
	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	6,404	102	6,506	1.6%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	585	17	602	2.9%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK (1PM-3PM)	569	18	587	3.2%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	473	6	479	1.3%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
WEEKEND ADT	4,114	67	4,181	1.6%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
W-END PEAK (12PM-2PM)	348	12	360	3.4%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO

GREGORY btw CAMDEN & RODEO	Existing				Proposed			
	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	4,220	0	4,220	0.0%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
AM PEAK (7AM-9AM)	405	0	405	0.0%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK (1PM-3PM)	312	0	312	0.0%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
PM PEAK (4PM-6PM)	306	0	306	0.0%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
WEEKEND ADT	1,847	0	1,847	0.0%	25%	NO	16%	NO
W-END PEAK (12PM-2PM)	160	0	160	0.0%	25%	NO	16%	NO

Beverly Hills Garden and Montage Hotel, FIR, May 2004

BEVERLY north of SMB	Existing				Proposed			
	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

**TRAFFIC THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE
RESIDENTIAL STREET ANALYSIS**

	Existing		Proposed	
TIER 1	0-3,750 ADT	25%	0-2,000 ADT	16.0%
TIER 2	3,750-6,750	12.50%	2,000-4,000	12.0%
TIER 3	6,750+	6.25%	4,000-6,750	8.0%
TIER 4			6,750+	6.25%

WEEKDAY ADT	17,750	100	17,850	0.6%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
AM PEAK	1,210	10	1,220	0.8%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK	1,180	17	1,197	1.4%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK	1,410	12	1,422	0.9%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
SAT PEAK	1,130	12	1,142	1.1%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO

CANON north of SMB

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	11,580	20	11,600	0.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
AM PEAK	710	1	711	0.1%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK	625	1	626	0.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK	900	1	901	0.1%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
SAT PEAK	710	1	711	0.1%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO

CLIFTON east of REXFORD

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	3,050	20	3,070	0.7%	25%	NO	12%	NO
AM PEAK	250	1	251	0.4%	25%	NO	12%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK	110	1	111	0.9%	25%	NO	12%	NO
PM PEAK	290	1	291	0.3%	25%	NO	12%	NO
SAT PEAK	110	1	111	0.9%	25%	NO	12%	NO

CANON south of WILSHIRE

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	2,260	50	2,310	2.2%	25%	NO	12%	NO
AM PEAK	160	3	163	1.9%	25%	NO	12%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK	210	14	224	6.7%	25%	NO	12%	NO
PM PEAK	180	5	185	2.8%	25%	NO	12%	NO
SAT PEAK	130	6	136	4.6%	25%	NO	12%	NO

FOOTHILL south of BURTON

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	3,600	100	3,700	2.8%	25%	NO	12%	NO
AM PEAK	370	7	377	1.9%	25%	NO	12%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK	300	17	317	5.7%	25%	NO	12%	NO
PM PEAK	310	12	322	3.9%	25%	NO	12%	NO
SAT PEAK	260	13	273	5.0%	25%	NO	12%	NO

FOOTHILL south of DAYTON

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	2,770	100	2,870	3.6%	25%	NO	12%	NO
AM PEAK	280	7	287	2.5%	25%	NO	12%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK	240	17	257	7.1%	25%	NO	12%	NO
PM PEAK	230	12	242	5.2%	25%	NO	12%	NO
SAT PEAK	200	13	213	6.5%	25%	NO	12%	NO

8767 Wilshire Blvd., Supplemental Updated Traffic Impact Analysis, July 15, 2009 - MEDICAL USE

November 5, 2008

CLIFTON east of ROBERTSON

	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
WEEKDAY ADT	5,510	453	5,963	8.2%	12.5%	NO	8%	YES
AM PEAK	349	14	363	4.0%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
PM PEAK	532	47	579	8.8%	12.5%	NO	8%	YES
MIDDAY PEAK (12PM-4PM)	485	54	539	11.1%	12.5%	NO	8%	YES

**TRAFFIC THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE
RESIDENTIAL STREET ANALYSIS**

	Existing		Proposed	
TIER 1	0-3,750 ADT	25%	0-2,000 ADT	16.0%
TIER 2	3,750-6,750	12.50%	2,000-4,000	12.0%
TIER 3	6,750+	6.25%	4,000-6,750	8.0%
TIER 4			6,750+	6.25%

CLIFTON west of ROBERTSON	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	WEEKDAY ADT	5,593	151	5,744	2.7%	12.5%	NO	8%
AM PEAK	355	(2)	353	-0.6%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
PM PEAK	514	14	528	2.7%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK (12PM-4PM)	476	19	495	4.0%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO

LA PEER north of WILSHIRE	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	WEEKDAY ADT	8,690	45	8,735	0.5%	6.25%	NO	6.25%
AM PEAK	648	1	649	0.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK	881	5	886	0.6%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK (12PM-4PM)	744	6	750	0.8%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO

LA PEER south of WILSHIRE	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	WEEKDAY ADT	9,170	151	9,321	1.6%	6.25%	NO	6.25%
AM PEAK	856	9	865	1.1%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK	894	13	907	1.5%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK (12PM-4PM)	898	17	915	1.9%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO

CLARK north of WILSHIRE	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	WEEKDAY ADT	3,755	106	3,861	2.8%	12.5%	NO	12%
AM PEAK	157	(3)	154	-1.9%	12.5%	NO	12%	NO
PM PEAK	380	9	389	2.4%	12.5%	NO	12%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK (12PM-4PM)	362	13	375	3.6%	12.5%	NO	12%	NO

ARNAZ north of WILSHIRE	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	WEEKDAY ADT	2,160	75	2,235	3.5%	25%	NO	12%
AM PEAK	118	7	125	5.9%	25%	NO	12%	NO
PM PEAK	206	5	211	2.4%	25%	NO	12%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK (12PM-4PM)	181	8	189	4.4%	25%	NO	12%	NO

WILLAMAN south of CLIFTON	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	WEEKDAY ADT	6,843	151	6,994	2.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%
AM PEAK	611	13	624	2.1%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK	652	9	661	1.4%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
MIDDAY PEAK (12PM-4PM)	644	16	660	2.5%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO

8767 Wilshire Blvd., Traffic Study, May 2006 - GENERAL OFFICE

CLIFTON east of ROBERTSON	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	WEEKDAY ADT	5,510	457	5,967	8.3%	12.5%	NO	8%
AM PEAK	349	24	373	6.9%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
PM PEAK	532	52	584	9.8%	12.5%	NO	8%	YES

TRAFFIC THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE
RESIDENTIAL STREET ANALYSIS

	Existing		Proposed	
TIER 1	0-3,750 ADT	25%	0-2,000 ADT	16.0%
TIER 2	3,750-6,750	12.50%	2,000-4,000	12.0%
TIER 3	6,750+	6.25%	4,000-6,750	8.0%
TIER 4			6,750+	6.25%

CLIFTON west of ROBERTSON	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	WEEKDAY ADT	5,593	76	5,669	1.4%	12.5%	NO	8%
AM PEAK	355	(4)	351	-1.1%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO
PM PEAK	514	7	521	1.4%	12.5%	NO	8%	NO

LA PEER north of WILSHIRE	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	WEEKDAY ADT	8,690	53	8,743	0.6%	6.25%	NO	6.25%
AM PEAK	648	1	649	0.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK	881	7	888	0.8%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO

LA PEER south of WILSHIRE	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	WEEKDAY ADT	9,170	76	9,246	0.8%	6.25%	NO	6.25%
AM PEAK	856	7	863	0.8%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK	894	7	901	0.8%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO

CLARK north of WILSHIRE	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	WEEKDAY ADT	3,755	23	3,778	0.6%	25%	NO	12%
AM PEAK	157	(5)	152	-3.2%	25%	NO	12%	NO
PM PEAK	380	-	380	0.0%	25%	NO	12%	NO

ARNAZ north of WILSHIRE	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	WEEKDAY ADT	2,160	190	2,350	8.8%	25%	NO	12%
AM PEAK	118	17	135	14.4%	25%	NO	12%	YES
PM PEAK	206	15	221	7.3%	25%	NO	12%	NO

WILLAMAN south of CLIFTON	EXISTING	TRAFFIC ADDED BY PROJECT	ADT W. PROJECT	% INCREASE	EXISTING THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	PROPOSED THRESHOLD	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
	WEEKDAY ADT	6,843	38	6,881	0.6%	6.25%	NO	6.25%
AM PEAK	611	1	612	0.2%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO
PM PEAK	652	5	657	0.8%	6.25%	NO	6.25%	NO

Attachment 5

LOS "E" and "F" 1% vs. 2% Project Analysis

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE
1% vs. 2% COMPARISON ANALYSIS**

Testing threshold of significant for signalized intersections with 0.01 increase of v/c versus the existing 0.02 v/c increase for 18 projects reviewed the past 5 years.

	Project	Significant impact if Threshold was 0.01 v/c at LOS OF "E" and "F"?	Significant impact with the Existing threshold= 0.02 v/c at LOS "E" and "F"
1	Annenberg	Yes at 9 additional intersections (0.015-0.011-0.012-0.015-0.019-0.013).	Yes with 3 intersection
2	Hilton	Yes at 1 additional intersection (0.015)	Yes at 1 intersection
3	9200 Wilshire	No significant impact	No significant impact
4	8767 Wilshire-09	Yes at 2 additional intersections(0.014-0.016)	Yes at 1 intersection
	8687 Wilshire-06	No significant impact	Yes at 1 intersection
5	257 N. Canon	Yes at 2 additional intersections (0.012-0.014)	No significant impact
6	9900 Wilshire	No significant impact	No significant impact
7	121 San Vicente	Yes at 1 intersection (1.097)	No significant impact
8	Gateway	Yes at 2 additional intersections (0.017-0.016)	Yes at 1 intersection
9	Gateway- Parcel 2 only	Yes at 2 additional intersections (0.015-0.011)	No significant impact
10	WMA	Yes at 9 additional intersections	Yes at 4 intersections

	Project	Significant impact if Threshold was 0.01 v/c at LOS OF "E" and "F"?	Significant impact with the Existing threshold= 0.02 v/c at LOS "E" and "F"
11	The Crescent project	Yes at one intersection	No significant impact
12	Montage	Yes at 3 additional intersections (0.014-0.011-0.015)	Yes at 2 intersection
13	8600 Wilshire	No significant impact	No significant impact
14	101 La Cienega	Yes at 2 intersections (0.011-0.013)	No significant impact
15	8536 Wilshire	Yes at 1 intersection	No significant impact
16	9091 Wilshire	Yes at 1 intersection	No significant impact
17	320 Rodeo	Yes at 1 intersection (0.015)	No significant impact
18	8800 Burton Way	Yes at 1 intersection (0.014)	No significant impact

Attachment 6

LOS "D" 4% vs. 2% Project Analysis

**Test of Threshold of Significant
 LOS "D"**
Signalized Intersections
2% v/c versus the existing 0.04 v/c increase

	Project	Significant impact If LOS "D" at 0.02 v/c	Significant impact with the Existing threshold of 0.04 v/c at LOS "D"
1	Annenberg	NO	NO
2	Hilton	NO	NO
3	9200 Wilshire	NO	NO
4	8767 Wilshire	NO	NO
5	257 N. Canon	NO	NO
6	9900 Wilshire	NO	NO
7	121 San Vicente	NO	NO
8	9091 Wilshire	NO	NO
9	8800 Burton Way	NO	NO