C-3 Supplemental Transportation Analysis

C-3a Supplemental Modified Alternative 2 Analysis

From: Wes Pringle < wes.pringle@lacity.org > Sent: Monday, July 27, 2020 1:44 PM

To: Emily Wong < ewong@gibsontrans.com>

Cc: Jonathan Chambers < <u>jchambers@gibsontrans.com</u>>

Subject: Re: 6220 Yucca - Modified Alt 2 - Supplemental Memo

Hi Emily,

DOT has reviewed the analysis, dated July 8, 2020, for the Modified Alternative 2 scenario contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the mixed-use project located at 6220 West Yucca Street. Modified Alternative 2 of the project would construct 269 apartment units and 7,760 square-feet of commercial space (analyzed as high-turnover restaurant). This represents 2 less residential units and 2,640 square-feet more of restaurant space than Alternative 2 as it appears in the DEIR. On February 7, 2020, an analysis was submitted in compliance with Senate Bill 743 and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to estimate the significance of the project's impact in regard to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) to be measured against the VMT thresholds established in DOT's Transportation Assessment Guidelines (TAG). The study was the subject of a DOT letter, dated March 3, 2020, which found that with the application of transportation demand management strategies (TDM), the proposed project would not have a significant VMT impact. DOT concurs with the July 8, 2020 analysis of the Modified Alternative 2 scenario in the DEIR that changes to the project description would not create any new impacts and does not change the findings of DOT's March 3, 2020 letter.

Wes



MEMORANDUM

TO: Wes Pringle, Los Angeles Department of Transportation

CC: Mike Harden, ESA

FROM: Jonathan Chambers, P.E.

DATE: July 8, 2020

RE: Modified Alternative 2 Analysis for the

6220 Yucca Street Mixed-Use Project

Hollywood, California **Ref**: J1372

This memorandum provides transportation analysis for a modified version of Alternative 2 (Modified Alternative 2) identified in Draft Environmental Impact Report: 6220 W. Yucca Project (ESA, April 2020) (Draft EIR). The Modified Alternative 2 proposes 269 residential apartment units and 7,760 square feet (sf) of commercial space (conservatively assumed to be high-turnover restaurant space) in a single building located at 6220 West Yucca Street (Project Site). Compared with Alternative 2 as described in the Draft EIR, the Modified Alternative 2 represents a decrease of two residential units and an increase of 2,640 sf of restaurant space. The primary project analyzed in the Draft EIR included 210 apartment units, a 136-room hotel, and approximately 12,570 sf of commercial space in two buildings (Project). The Modified Alternative 2 eliminates the proposed four-story residential building fronting Vista Del Mar Avenue and instead retains the existing residential buildings on that portion of the Project Site.

The analysis herein updates the analysis provided in Draft EIR Section IV.L and Appendix L to the Draft EIR. It includes the four California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) thresholds identified in the Los Angeles Department of Transportation's (LADOT's) Transportation Assessment Guidelines (July 2019) (TAG) and an assessment of the trips generated by the Modified Alternative 2 compared to those generated by the Project analyzed in the Draft EIR.

CEQA THRESHOLDS

The TAG identifies three CEQA thresholds applicable to the Modified Alternative 21. Should a project exceed thresholds identified in the TAG, its impact would be considered significant under CEQA and would require any feasible mitigation measures be implemented to reduce the impact below the threshold of significance, to the extent feasible. The following CEQA thresholds identified in the TAG are consistent with City thresholds and with CEQA guidance:

¹ A fourth threshold, Threshold T-2.2: Substantially Inducing Additional Automobile Travel, is intended for projects that increase vehicular capacity on roadways. The Modified Alternative 2 does not meet the screening criteria for Threshold T-2.2 and Threshold T-2.2 does not apply to the Modified Alternative 2.

- Threshold T-1: Conflicting with Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies
- Threshold T-2.1: Causing Substantial Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
- Threshold T-3: Substantially Increasing Hazards Due to a Geometric Design Feature or Incompatible Use

The Modified Alternative 2 meets the TAG screening criteria for analysis under each of these three thresholds.

In May 2020, following publication of the Draft EIR, LADOT released *Interim Guidance for Freeway Safety Analysis* (LADOT, May 1, 2020) (City Freeway Guidance) identifying City requirements for a CEQA safety analysis for California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) facilities. The Modified Alternative 2 would not add 25 or more peak hour trips to any freeway offramp, and therefore, according to the City Freeway Guidance, no analysis is required.

THRESHOLD T-1: CONFLICTING WITH PLANS, PROGRAMS, ORDINANCES, OR POLICIES

Threshold T-1 states that a project would result in an impact if it conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Generally, the Modified Alternative 2 is not substantially different from the Project as it pertains to conflicts with programs, plans, ordinances, or policies. The Project was fully analyzed in the Draft EIR and found not to result in any significant impacts. Therefore, the discussion below highlights the areas in which the Modified Alternative 2 differs in its consistency with programs, plans, ordinances, and policies. These changes primarily relate to the Modified Alternative 2's single access point (rather than the three identified for the Project), lack of a hotel component, and elimination of the residential building and access the Project proposed on Vista Del Mar Avenue.

Mobility Plan 2035

The Modified Alternative 2 would differ in its consistency with *Mobility Plan 2035: An Element of the General Plan* (Los Angeles Department of City Planning [LADCP], January 2016) (Mobility Plan) from the Project in that it would not widen sidewalks on Vista Del Mar Avenue and would not include a hotel component.

South of the Project Site, Vista Del Mar Avenue is part of the Vista Del Mar – Carlos Historic District, and it is not reasonably foreseeable that the street and sidewalk would ever be widened to meet Mobility Plan Standards. As such, the Modified Alternative 2 would request a waiver of dedication and improvement under Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 12.37.

The Modified Alternative 2 is consistent with Policy 3.3, Land Use Access and Mix, and Program PL.3, Mixed-Use, though to a lesser extent than the Project because it does not include a hotel component.

The Modified Alternative 2 is not inconsistent with any relevant policies or programs of the Mobility Plan as analyzed in the Draft EIR Section IV.L and Appendix L to the Draft EIR for the same reasons as the Project.

Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles

The Modified Alternative 2 does not differ from the Project in its consistency with *Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles: A Health and Wellness Element of the General Plan* (LADCP, March 2015). Like the Project, the Modified Alternative 2 is not inconsistent with this plan for the same reasons.

Land Use Element of the General Plan (Hollywood Community Plan)

The Modified Alternative 2 differs slightly from the Project in its consistency with the *Hollywood Community Plan* (LADCP, December 1998) (the Community Plan) regarding the elimination of the hotel use and the addition of affordable dwelling units and more units subject to the City's Rent Stabilization Ordinance. However, it remains consistent with the Community Plan in largely the same manner as previously analyzed for the Project, as it continues to provide housing and jobs in a transit priority area, in addition to better meeting goals consistent with the provision of affordable housing and rent-controlled housing. Like the Project, the Modified Alternative 2 is not inconsistent with the Hollywood Community Plan for the same reasons as the Project.

LAMC Section 12.21.A.16 (Bicycle Parking)

The Modified Alternative 2, like the Project, would meet LAMC Section 12.21.A.16 requirements for bicycle parking. Like the Project, the Modified Alternative 2 is not inconsistent with LAMC Section 12.21.A.16 for the same reasons as the Project.

LAMC Section 12.26J (TDM Ordinance)

LAMC Section 12.26J, the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance (1993), does not apply to the Modified Alternative 2, just as it does not apply to the Project.

LAMC Section 12.37 (Waivers of Dedications and Improvement)

Under LAMC Section 12.37, a project must dedicate and improve adjacent streets to half-right-of-way standards consistent with street designations from the Mobility Plan or request a waiver of dedication or improvement supported by findings. As noted above, the Modified Alternative 2's entitlement request includes a request for waiver of dedication on Vista Del Mar Avenue, as it would retain existing residential buildings on that street and make no further changes. Other waivers of dedication and improvements that are requested for the Project on Argyle Avenue and Yucca Street would also apply to the Modified Alternative 2. Like the Project, with the approval of requested waivers, the Modified Alternative 2 is not inconsistent with LAMC Section 12.37 for the same reasons as the Project.

<u>Vision Zero Action Plan / Vision Zero Corridor Plans</u>

The Modified Alternative 2 would not differ from the Project with respect to consistency with Vision Zero.

Streetscape Plans

There are no streetscape plans near the Project Site and, therefore, streetscape plans do not apply to the Modified Alternative 2.

Citywide Design Guidelines

The Modified Alternative 2 differs from the Project with respect to consistency with *Citywide Design Guidelines* (LADCP Urban Design Studio, October 2019) (Citywide Design Guidelines) insomuch as the Modified Alternative 2 eliminates proposed vehicular access points on Yucca Street and Vista Del Mar Avenue, thereby improving pedestrian facilities on those streets by reducing conflicts with vehicles. The Modified Alternative 2 is, thus, more consistent with the Citywide Design Guidelines than the Project and, therefore, also does not conflict with the Citywide Design Guidelines.

Walkability Checklist

The Modified Alternative 2 differs from the Project with respect to consistency with *Walkability Checklist – Guidance for Entitlement Review* (LADCP, November 2008) (Walkability Checklist) only insomuch as the Modified Alternative 2 eliminates access on Yucca Street and Vista Del Mar Avenue, thereby improving pedestrian facilities on those streets by reducing conflicts with vehicles. The Modified Alternative 2 is, thus, more consistent with the Walkability Checklist than the Project and, therefore, also does not conflict with the Walkability Checklist.

LADOT Transportation Technology Strategy - Urban Mobility in a Digital Age

The Modified Alternative 2 does not differ from the Project with respect to consistency with the LADOT transportation technology strategy. Like the Project, the Modified Alternative 2 is not inconsistent with this strategy for the same reasons as the Project.

Mobility Hub Reader's Guide

The Modified Alternative 2 does not differ from the Project with respect to consistency with *Mobility Hubs: A Reader's Guide* (LADCP, 2016) (Mobility Hub Reader's Guide). Like the Project, the Modified Alternative 2 is not inconsistent with the Mobility Hub Reader's Guide for the same reasons as the Project.

LADOT Manual of Policies and Procedures (Design Standards)

The Modified Alternative 2 does not differ from the Project with respect to consistency with *Manual of Policies and Procedures* (LADOT, December 2008). Like the Project, the Modified Alternative 2 is not inconsistent with the Manual of Policies and Procedures for the same reasons as the Project.

Cumulative Consistency

The Modified Alternative 2 does not differ from the Project with respect to cumulative consistency with City programs, plans, policies, or ordinances. Like the Project, the Modified Alternative 2 is not cumulatively inconsistent with the identified programs, plans, policies, or ordinances for the same reasons as the Project.

THRESHOLD T-2.1: CAUSING SUBSTANTIAL VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED

The Modified Alternative 2 was analyzed for potential vehicle miles traveled (VMT) impacts using the same methodology as in the Draft EIR. The VMT analysis used the VMT Calculator version 1.2, a software tool developed by LADOT. Table 1 summarizes the results of the VMT analysis, without and with the proposed TDM measures identified in Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-1 in the Draft EIR. As shown, the Modified Alternative 2 would generate average household VMT per resident of 7.5 prior to mitigation, which exceeds the Central Area Planning Commission impact threshold of 6.0 and, therefore, would result in a significant VMT impact.

Following implementation of mitigation, the Modified Alternative 2 would generate average household VMT per resident of 5.9, which is under the impact threshold and, therefore, would reduce the VMT impact below the level of significance. However, to achieve this result, it would be necessary to modify the proposed TDM program by increasing the cost to residents of an unbundled parking space from a per-unit average of \$150 per month (as assumed in MM-TRAF-1) to \$175 per month.

The VMT Calculator estimates that the Modified Alternative 2 would generate only 31 employees. Based on the home-based work attraction VMT shown in Table 1, the work VMT per employee was calculated to be 5.0, before and after implementation of mitigation. This is below the impact threshold of 7.6 and, therefore, the Project would result in a less-than-significant impact with respect to work VMT per employee.

The version 1.2 VMT Calculator analysis is provided in Attachment A.

VMT Calculator Version 1.3

Subsequent to the April 2020 release of the Draft EIR, in May 2020 LADOT released version 1.3 of the VMT Calculator. The update incorporated the latest available substantiated information, and included adjustments to trip length averaging, transit mode splits, and trip purpose splits to better match the VMT Calculator with the City's Travel Demand Forecasting Model on which it is based. When analyzing the Modified Alternative 2 using version 1.3 of the VMT Calculator, as shown in Table 2, the Modified Alternative 2 would have household VMT per capita of 5.2 and work VMT per capita of 5.3, both under the significance thresholds without the need for mitigation, including with the implementation of the Modified Alternative 2's TDM program. Based on this new information, MM-TRAF-1 would not be required to reduce VMT impacts below the level of significance. Nonetheless, the Modified Alternative 2 continues to propose to implement MM-TRAF-1 to reduce the effects of Modified Alternative 2 VMT and help meet City goals regarding VMT reduction, emissions, and multi-modal transportation. However, notably, under this analysis

utilizing the latest updated version of the VMT Calculator (Version 1.3), mitigation is not required to reduce Modified Alternative 2 impacts to a less-than-significant level. The version 1.3 VMT Calculator analysis is provided in Attachment B.

Supplemental VMT Analysis Using Alternative Resident Population

If the residential VMT analysis utilized an assumption of 2.43 residents per residential unit (resulting in a total of 654 residents for the Modified Alternative 2) rather than the rate of 2.25 persons per unit used by the VMT Calculator as determined to be appropriate by LADOT based on Census data (resulting in a total of 606 residents, as shown in Tables 1 and 2), the results would be as shown in Table 3. As shown, the household VMT per capita would be reduced, before and after mitigation, under both VMT Calculator versions 1.2 and 1.3 compared to the analyses in Tables 1 and 2 using the VMT Calculator resident population estimate. Therefore, the analysis from the VMT Calculator is conservative and appropriate.

THRESHOLD T-3: SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASING HAZARDS DUE TO A GEOMETRIC DESIGN FEATURE OR INCOMPATIBLE USE

Threshold T-3 requires that a project undergo further evaluation if it proposes new access points or modifications along the public right-of-way (i.e., street dedications). A review of project access points, internal circulation, and parking access would determine if the Modified Alternative 2 would substantially increase hazards due to geometric design features, including safety, operational, or capacity impacts.

The Modified Alternative 2 proposes a single access point on Argyle Avenue at the same location as proposed for the Project. While the traffic volume using this driveway would be somewhat higher than the volumes under the Project (which were spread across three driveways and two new buildings), the proposed Modified Alternative 2 driveway does not present any geometric design hazards related to traffic movement, mobility, or pedestrian accessibility, as this primary driveway opens up onto Argyle Avenue, a local street with no visual or physical obstructions at that access point. Further, the design of the driveway would comply with all applicable building code and LADOT standards and policies as to its design and location, and no significant impact would occur with respect to Threshold T-3.

NON-CEQA ANALYSIS

Appendix L-2 to the Draft EIR provided a detailed analysis of intersection operations with the Project based on level of service (LOS) as required for non-CEQA analysis by the TAG. The Project was found to generate a net total of 199 trips during the morning peak hour and 215 trips during the afternoon peak hour. Using the same trip generation rates and credits, as shown in Table 4, the Modified Alternative 2 would generate a net total of 151 trips during the morning peak hour and 167 trips during the afternoon peak hour, prior to the effects of the TDM program. Because it would generate fewer peak hour trips, the Modified Alternative 2 would have a lesser effect on intersection operations as compared with the Project. Therefore, the non-CEQA analysis provided in Appendix L-2 is more conservative than an equivalent analysis of the Modified Alternative 2 would be, and no new analysis was conducted.

TABLE 1 MODIFIED ALTERNATIVE 2 VMT ANALYSIS VMT CALCULATOR VERSION 1.2

Land Use Information		
Land Use Information	_	
Multi-Family Housing	269	units
Restaurant	7,76	60 sf
VMT Analysis [a]		
Resident Population	60	06
Employee Population	3	1
Project Area Planning Commission	Cer	ntral
Project Travel Behavior Zone	Compact Infill (Zone 3)	
	Modified Alternative 2 before Mitigation	Modified Alternative 2 with Mitigation
Total Daily VMT [b]	8,460	7,476
Home-Based Production VMT [c]	4,541	3,573
Home-Based Work Attraction VMT [c]	155	154
Household VMT per Capita	7.5	5.9
Impact Threshold	6.0	6.0
Significant Impact	YES	NO
Work VMT per Employee [d]	5.0	5.0
Impact Threshold	7.6	7.6
Significant Impact	NO	NO

Notes:

- [a] Analysis is from VMT Calculator output reports provided in the Attachment.
- [b] See Attachment, Report 1.
- [c] See Attachment, Report 4.
- [d] Total population or trip count below VMT Calculator screening criteria. Result was manually calculated using component VMT and population data above.

TABLE 2 MODIFIED ALTERNATIVE 2 VMT ANALYSIS VMT CALCULATOR VERSION 1.3

Land Use Information			
	200		
Multi-Family Housing		units	
Restaurant	7,76	60 sf	
VMT Analysis [a]			
Resident Population	60	06	
Employee Population	3	1	
Project Area Planning Commission	Cer	ntral	
Project Travel Behavior Zone	Compact Infill (Zone 3)		
	Modified Alternative 2 before Mitigation	Modified Alternative 2 with Mitigation	
Total Daily VMT [b]	9,971	9,275	
Home-Based Production VMT [c]	3,135	2,466	
Home-Based Work Attraction VMT [c]	165	164	
Household VMT per Capita	5.2	4.1	
Impact Threshold	6.0	6.0	
Significant Impact	NO	NO	
Work VMT per Employee [d]	5.3	5.3	
Impact Threshold	7.6	7.6	
Significant Impact	NO	NO	

Notes:

- [a] Analysis is from VMT Calculator output reports provided in the Attachment.
- [b] See Attachment, Report 1.
- [c] See Attachment, Report 4.
- [d] Total population or trip count below VMT Calculator screening criteria. Result was manually calculated using component VMT and population data above.

TABLE 3
MODIFIED ALTERNATIVE 2 VMT ANALYSIS
USING ALTERNATIVE RESIDENT POPULATION

Data	VMT Calculate	or Version 1.2	VMT Calculator Version 1.3		
Data	Before Mitigation	After Mitigation	Before Mitigation	After Mitigation	
Home-Based Production VMT [b]	4,541	3,573	3,135	2,466	
Resident Population [a]	654	654	654	654	
Household VMT per Capita [c]	6.9	5.5	4.8	3.8	
Impact Threshold	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	
Significant Impact	YES	NO	NO	NO	
Household VMT per Capita Using VMT Calculator Resident Population [b]	7.5	5.9	5.2	4.1	

Notes:

- [a] Resident population calculated based on 269 residential units x 2.43 persons per unit.
- [b] From Table 1 (VMT Calculator Version 1.2) and Table 2 (VMT Calculator Version 1.3).
- [c] Calculated as Home-Based Production VMT / Resident Population.

TABLE 4
MODIFIED ALTERNATIVE 2 TRIP GENERATION ESTIMATES

Landilla	ITE	Data au Cina	Morr	ning Peak	Hour	Aftern	noon Peal	(Hour
Land Use	Land Use	Rate or Size	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Trip Generation Rates								
Single-Family House	210	per du	25%	75%	0.75	63%	37%	1.00
Apartments	220	per du	20%	80%	0.51	65%	35%	0.62
Restaurant	932	per 1,000 sf	55%	45%	10.81	60%	40%	9.85
Trip Generation Estimates								
Residential Uses								
Apartments	220	269 du	27	110	137	109	58	167
Transit/Walk Adjustment - 15%	220	209 du	-4	-17	-21	-16	-9	-25
			•			, ,		
Residential Subtotal			23	93	116	93	49	142
Commercial Uses								
Restaurant	932	7,760 sf	46	38	84	46	30	76
Internal Capture Adjustment - 10%			-4	-4	-8	-5	-3	-8
Transit/Walk Adjustment - 15%			-6	-5	-11	-6	-4	-10
Pass-by Adjustment - 20%			-7	-6	-13	-7	-5	-12
Commercial Subtotal			29	23	52	28	18	46
GROSS TOTAL - MOD	IFIED AL	TERNATIVE 2	52	116	168	121	67	188
Existing Uses to be Removed								
Anartment	220	40 du	4	16	20	16	_	25
Apartment <i>Transit/Walk Adjustment - 15%</i>	220	40 au	4 -1	16 -2	20 -3	16 -3	9 -1	25 <i>-4</i>
Transit vvalit rajustinont 1070			,	_		ŭ	,	,
Existing Subtotal			3	14	17	13	8	21
NET TOTAL - MOD	IFIED AL	TERNATIVE 2	49	102	151	108	59	167
Residential Trips Reduced by TDM			-2	-9	-12	-9	-5	-14
NET TOTAL - MODIFIED ALTE	RNATIVE	2 WITH TDM	47	93	139	99	54	153

Notes:

All trip generation rates are from *Trip Generation*, 9th Edition (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2012).

Transit/walk adjustment of up to 15% is allowed for developments within 1/4 mile of a Metro Rail station (site is approximately 700 feet from Hollywood & Vine station).

sf = square feet; du = dwelling units;

Attachment A

Modified Alternative 2 VMT Calculator Output Version 1.2

Report 1: Project & Analysis Overview

Date: July 8, 2020 Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St

Project Scenario: Modified Alternative 2
Project Address: 6220 W YUCCA ST, 90028



Project Information				
Land	l Use Type	Value	Units	
	Single Family	0	DU	
	Multi Family	269	DU	
Housing	Land Use Type Single Family Multi Family Townhouse Hotel Motel Family Senior Special Needs Permanent Supportive General Retail Furniture Store Pharmacy/Drugstore Supermarket Bank Health Club High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant Quality Restaurant Quality Restaurant Auto Repair Home Improvement Free-Standing Discount Movie Theater General Office Medical Office Light Industrial Manufacturing Warehousing/Self-Storage University	0	DU	
	Hotel	0	Rooms	
	Motel	0	Rooms	
	Family	0	DU	
Affordable Housing	Senior	0	DU	
Ajjoruuble nousing	Special Needs	0	DU	
	Permanent Supportive	Value 0 269 0 </td <td>DU</td>	DU	
	General Retail	0.000	ksf	
	Furniture Store	0.000	ksf	
	Pharmacy/Drugstore	0.000	ksf	
	Supermarket	0.000	ksf	
	Bank	0.000	ksf	
	Health Club	0.000	ksf	
Retail	High-Turnover Sit-Down	7.700	ksf	
Ketali	Restaurant	7.760	KSI	
	Fast-Food Restaurant	0.000	ksf	
	Quality Restaurant	0.000	ksf	
	Auto Repair	0.000	ksf	
	Home Improvement	0.000	ksf	
	Free-Standing Discount	0.000	ksf	
	Movie Theater	0	Seats	
Office	General Office	0.000	ksf	
Office	Medical Office	0.000	ksf	
	Light Industrial	0.000	ksf	
Industrial	Manufacturing	0.000	ksf	
	Warehousing/Self-Storage	0.000 0.000 7.760 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000	ksf	
	University	0	Students	
	High School	0	Students	
School	Middle School	0	Students	
	Elementary	0	Students	
	Private School (K-12)	0	Students	
Other		0	Trips	

Report 1: Project & Analysis Overview

Date: July 8, 2020

Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St Project Scenario: Modified Alternative 2

Project Address: 6220 W YUCCA ST, 90028



	Analysis Res	sults	
	Total Employees:	31	
	Total Population:	606	
Propos	ed Project	With M	itigation
1,347	Daily Vehicle Trips	1,188	Daily Vehicle Trips
8,460	Daily VMT	7,476	Daily VMT
7.5	Household VMT per Capita	5.9	Household VMT per Capita
N/A	Work VMT per Employee	N/A	Work VMT per Employee
	Significant VMT	Impact?	
	APC: Centr	al	
	Impact Threshold: 15% Belo	ow APC Average	
	Household = 6	5.0	
	Work = 7.6		
Propos	ed Project	With M	itigation
VMT Threshold	Impact	VMT Threshold	Impact
Household > 6.0	Yes	Household > 6.0	No
Work > 7.6	N/A	Work > 7.6	N/A

Report 2: TDM Inputs

parking

Residential area parking permits

Date: July 8, 2020
Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St
Project Scenario: Modified Alternative 2

Project Address: 6220 W YUCCA ST, 90028

0%



TDM Strategy Inputs					
Stra	tegy Type	Description	Proposed Project	Mitigations	
		City code parking	0	0	
	Reduce parking supply	provision (spaces)	U		
	Reduce parking supply	Actual parking	0	0	
		provision (spaces)			
	Unbundle parking	Monthly cost for	\$0	\$175	
	Official Control of the Control of t	parking (\$)		Ψ173	
	Parking cash-out	Employees eligible	0%	0%	
Parking	- urking casir-out	(%)		070	
		Daily parking charge	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	Price workplace	(\$)	Ş0.00	Ş0.00	

Employees subject to

priced parking (%)

0%

(cont. on following page)

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: July 8, 2020
Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St
Project Scenario: Modified Alternative 2

Project Address: 6220 W YUCCA ST, 90028



Strategy Type		Description	Proposed Project	Mitigations
		Reduction in headways (increase in frequency) (%)	0%	0%
	Reduce transit headways	Existing transit mode share (as a percent of total daily trips) (%)	0%	0%
		Lines within project site improved (<50%, >=50%)	0	0
Transit	Implement neighborhood shuttle	Degree of implementation (low, medium, high)	0	0
		Employees and residents eligible (%)	0%	0%
		Employees and residents eligible (%)	0%	0%
	Transit subsidies	Amount of transit subsidy per passenger (daily equivalent) (\$)	\$0.00	\$0.00
Education &	Voluntary travel behavior change program	Employees and residents participating (%)	0%	0%
Encouragement	Promotions and marketing	Employees and residents participating (%)	0%	10%

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: July 8, 2020
Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St
Project Scenario: Modified Alternative 2

Project Address: 6220 W YUCCA ST, 90028



Strate	еду Туре	Description	Proposed Project	Mitigations
	Required commute trip reduction program	Employees participating (%)	0%	0%
	Alternative Work Schedules and	Employees participating (%)	0%	0%
	Telecommute	Type of program	0	0
Commute Trip Reductions		Degree of implementation (low, medium, high)	0	0
Reductions	Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle	Employees eligible (%)	0%	0%
		Employer size (small, medium, large)	0	0
	Ride-share program	Employees eligible (%)	0%	0%
	Car share	Car share project setting (Urban, Suburban, All Other)	0	0
Shared Mobility	Bike share	Within 600 feet of existing bike share station - OR-implementing new bike share station (Yes/No)	0	0
	School carpool program	Level of implementation (Low, Medium, High)	0	0

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: July 8, 2020
Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St
Project Scenario: Modified Alternative 2
Project Address: 6220 W YUCCA ST, 90028



TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont.							
Strate	еду Туре	Description	Proposed Project	Mitigations			
	Implement/Improve on-street bicycle facility	Provide bicycle facility along site (Yes/No)	0	0			
Bicycle Infrastructure	Include Bike parking per LAMC	Meets City Bike Parking Code (Yes/No)	Yes	Yes			
	Include secure bike parking and showers	Includes indoor bike parking/lockers, showers, & repair station (Yes/No)	0	0			
Neighborhood Enhancement	Traffic calming	Streets with traffic calming improvements (%)	0%	0%			
	improvements	Intersections with traffic calming improvements (%)	0%	0%			
	Pedestrian network improvements	Included (within project and connecting offsite/within project only)	0	0			

Report 3: TDM Outputs

Date: July 8, 2020 Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St Project Scenario: Modified Alternative 2



Project Address: 6220 W YUCCA ST, 90028

TDM Adjustments by Trip Purpose & Strategy

						Place type	: Compact	Infill						
			ased Work duction		ased Work action		ased Other luction		ased Other action		Based Other		Based Other	Source
		Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	_
	Reduce parking supply	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Unbundle parking	0%	21%	0%	0%	0%	21%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	TDM Strategy Appendix, Parking sections 1 - 5
Parking	Parking cash-out	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Price workplace parking	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Residential area parking permits	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
	Reduce transit headways	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	TDM Strategy Appendix, Transit sections 1 - 3
Transit	Implement neighborhood shuttle	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Transit subsidies	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Education &	Voluntary travel behavior change program	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	TDM Strategy Appendix, Education & Encouragement sections 1 - 2
Encouragement	Promotions and marketing	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Required commute trip reduction program	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	TDM Strategy Appendix, Commute Trip Reductions sections 1 - 4
Commute Trip Reductions	Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute Program	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Ride-share program	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Car-share	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	TDM Strategy
Shared Mobility	Bike share	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Appendix, Shared Mobility sections 1 - 3
,	School carpool program	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	

Report 3: TDM Outputs

Date: July 8, 2020

Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St Project Scenario: Modified Alternative 2 Project Address: 6220 W YUCCA ST, 90028



TDM Adjustments by Trip Purpose & Strategy, Cont.

Place t	ype: Com	pact Infill
---------	----------	-------------

						Place type	: Compact	INTIII						
			ased Work duction		ased Work action		ased Other luction		ased Other action		Based Other duction		Based Other action	Source
		Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	
	Implement/ Improve on-street bicycle facility	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	TDM Strategy
Bicycle Infrastructure	Include Bike parking per LAMC	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	Appendix, Bicyc Infrastructure
	Include secure bike parking and showers	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	sections 1 - 3
Neighborhood	Traffic calming improvements	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	TDM Strategy Appendix,
Enhancement	Pedestrian network improvements	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Neighborhood Enhancement sections 1 - 2

Final Combined & Maximum TDM Effect												
	Home Based Work Production			Home Based Work Attraction		Home Based Other Production		Home Based Other Attraction		Based Other uction	Non-Home Based Other Attraction	
	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated
COMBINED TOTAL	1%	22%	1%	1%	1%	22%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
MAX. TDM EFFECT	1%	22%	1%	1%	1%	22%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%

= Minimum (X%, 1-[(1-A)*(1-B)])							
where X%=							
PLACE	urban	75%					
TYPE	compact infill	40%					
MAX:	suburban center	20%					
	suburban	15%					

Note: (1-[(1-A)*(1-B)...]) reflects the dampened combined effectiveness of TDM Strategies (e.g., A, B,...). See the TDM Strategy Appendix (*Transportation Assessment Guidelines Attachment G*) for further discussion of dampening.

Date: July 8, 2020

Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St





Version 1.2

R	leport	t 4:	MXD	Meth	nodo	logy
---	--------	-------------	-----	------	------	------

MXD Methodology - Project Without TDM									
	Unadjusted Trips	MXD Adjustment	MXD Trips	Average Trip Length	Unadjusted VMT	MXD VMT			
Home Based Work Production	364	-35.2%	236	8.0	2,912	1,888			
Home Based Other Production	975	-48.1%	506	5.3	5,168	2,682			
Non-Home Based Other Production	144	-13.9%	124	7.3	1,051	905			
Home-Based Work Attraction	45	-57.8%	19	8.2	369	156			
Home-Based Other Attraction	506	-48.6%	260	6.0	3,036	1,560			
Non-Home Based Other Attraction	242	-13.2%	210	6.3	1,525	1,323			

MXD Methodology with TDM Measures								
		Proposed Project		Project with Mitigation Measures				
	TDM Adjustment	Project Trips	Project VMT	TDM Adjustment	Mitigated Trips	Mitigated VMT		
Home Based Work Production	-0.6%	235	1,876	-21.8%	185	1,476		
Home Based Other Production	-0.6%	503	2,665	-21.8%	396	2,097		
Non-Home Based Other Production	-0.6%	123	899	-1.0%	123	896		
Home-Based Work Attraction	-0.6%	19	155	-1.0%	19	154		
Home-Based Other Attraction	-0.6%	258	1,550	-1.0%	257	1,544		
Non-Home Based Other Attraction	-0.6%	209	1,315	-1.0%	208	1,309		

MXD VMT Methodology Per Capita & Per Employee								
	Total Population: 606 Total Employees: 31 APC: Central							
	Proposed Project	Project with Mitigation Measures						
Total Home Based Production VMT	4,541	3,573						
Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT	155	154						
Total Home Based VMT Per Capita	7.5 5.9							
Total Work Based VMT Per Employee	N/A N/A							

Attachment B

Modified Alternative 2 VMT Calculator Output Version 1.3 (Released May 2020)

Report 1: Project & Analysis Overview

Date: July 8, 2020 Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St

Project Scenario: Modified Alternative 2

Project Address: 6220 W YUCCA ST, 90028



	Project Informa	tion		
Land	l Use Type	Value	Units	
	Single Family	0	DU	
	Multi Family	269	DU	
Housing	Townhouse	0	DU	
	Hotel	0	Rooms	
	Motel	0	Rooms	
	Family	0	DU	
Affordable Housing	Senior	0	DU	
Afforduble Housing	Special Needs	0	DU	
	Permanent Supportive	0	DU	
	General Retail	0.000	ksf	
	Furniture Store	0.000	ksf	
	Pharmacy/Drugstore	0.000	ksf	
	Supermarket	0.000	ksf	
	Bank	0.000	ksf	
	Health Club	0.000	ksf	
Retail	High-Turnover Sit-Down	7.700	ksf	
Ketali	Restaurant	7.760	KSI	
	Fast-Food Restaurant	0.000	ksf	
	Quality Restaurant	0.000	ksf	
	Auto Repair	0.000	ksf	
	Home Improvement	0.000	ksf	
	Free-Standing Discount	0.000	ksf	
	Movie Theater	0	Seats	
Office	General Office	0.000	ksf	
Office	Medical Office	0.000	ksf	
	Light Industrial	0.000	ksf	
Industrial	Manufacturing	0.000	ksf	
	Warehousing/Self-Storage	0.000	ksf	
	University	0	Students	
	High School	0	Students	
School	Middle School	0	Students	
	Elementary	0	Students	
	Private School (K-12)	0	Students	
Other		0	Trips	

Report 1: Project & Analysis Overview

Date: July 8, 2020 Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St

Project Scenario: Modified Alternative 2





	Analysis Res	sults			
	Total Employees:	31			
	Total Population:	606			
Propos	ed Project	With M	itigation		
1,520	Daily Vehicle Trips	1,407	Daily Vehicle Trips		
9,971	Daily VMT	9,275	Daily Vehicle Trips Daily VMT Household VMT per Capita Work VMT per Employee		
5.2	Household VMT per Capita	4.1	Household VMT per Capita		
N/A	Work VMT per Employee	N/A	Work VMT per		
	Significant VMT	Impact?			
	APC: Centr	al			
	Impact Threshold: 15% Belo	ow APC Average			
	Household = 6	5.0			
	Work = 7.6				
Propos	ed Project	With M	itigation		
VMT Threshold	Impact	VMT Threshold	Impact		
Household > 6.0	No	Household > 6.0	No		
Work > 7.6	N/A	Work > 7.6	N/A		

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: July 8, 2020
Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St
Project Scenario: Modified Alternative 2

Project Address: 6220 W YUCCA ST, 90028



TDM Strategy Inputs									
Stra	Strategy Type Description Proposed Project Mitigations								
	Daduca analina augula	City code parking provision (spaces)	0	0					
	Reduce parking supply	Actual parking provision (spaces)	0	0					
	Unbundle parking	Monthly cost for parking (\$)	\$0	\$175					
Parking	Parking cash-out	Employees eligible (%)	0%	0%					
	Price workplace	Daily parking charge (\$)	\$0.00	\$0.00					
	parking	Employees subject to priced parking (%)		0%					
	Residential area parking permits	Cost of annual permit (\$)	\$0	<i>\$0</i>					

(cont. on following page)

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: July 8, 2020
Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St
Project Scenario: Modified Alternative 2

Project Address: 6220 W YUCCA ST, 90028



Strate	gy Туре	Description	Proposed Project	Mitigations
		Reduction in headways (increase in frequency) (%)	0%	0%
	Reduce transit headways	Existing transit mode share (as a percent of total daily trips) (%)	0%	0%
		Lines within project site improved (<50%, >=50%)	0	0
Transit	Implement	Degree of implementation (low, medium, high)	0	0
	neighborhood shuttle	Employees and residents eligible (%)	0%	0%
		Employees and residents eligible (%)	0%	0%
	Transit subsidies	Amount of transit subsidy per passenger (daily equivalent) (\$)	\$0.00	\$0.00
Education &	Voluntary travel behavior change program	residents participating (%)	0%	0%
Encouragement	Promotions and marketing	Employees and residents participating (%)	0%	10%

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: July 8, 2020
Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St
Project Scenario: Modified Alternative 2

Project Address: 6220 W YUCCA ST, 90028

Version 1.3

TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont. Strategy Type Proposed Project Mitigations Description trip reduction participating (%) Alternative Work 0% participating (%) 0 0 Type of program Degree of **Commute Trip** implementation (low, medium, high) Reductions vanpool or shuttle Employer size (small, medium, large) Employees eligible Ride-share program Car share project 0 0 Car share Suburban, All Other) existing bike share station - OR-**Shared Mobility** Bike share implementing new Level of program (Low, Medium, High) (cont. on following page)

Report 2: TDM Inputs 5 of 9

Report 2: TDM Inputs

Date: July 8, 2020
Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St
Project Scenario: Modified Alternative 2

Project Address: 6220 W YUCCA ST, 90028



TDM Strategy Inputs, Cont.									
Strategy Type Description Proposed Project Mitigations									
	Implement/Improve on-street bicycle facility	Provide bicycle facility along site (Yes/No)	0	0					
Bicycle Infrastructure	Include Bike parking per LAMC	Meets City Bike Parking Code (Yes/No)	Yes	Yes					
	Include secure bike parking and showers	Includes indoor bike parking/lockers, showers, & repair station (Yes/No)	0	0					
Neighborhood Enhancement	Traffic calming	Streets with traffic calming improvements (%)	0%	0%					
	improvements	Intersections with traffic calming improvements (%)	0%	0%					
	Pedestrian network improvements	Included (within project and connecting offsite/within project only)	0	0					

Report 3: TDM Outputs

Date: July 8, 2020
Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St
oject Scenario: Modified Alternative 2

Project Scenario: Modified Alternative 2
Project Address: 6220 W YUCCA ST, 90028



TDM Adjustments by Trip Purpose & Strategy

						Place type	: Compact	Infill						
			ased Work		ased Work		ased Other		sed Other		Based Other		Based Other	
			duction		action		luction		action		duction		raction	Source
		Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	
	Reduce parking supply	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Unbundle parking	0%	21%	0%	0%	0%	21%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	TDM Strategy
Parking	Parking cash-out	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	Appendix, Parking sections
	Price workplace parking	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1 - 5
	Residential area parking permits	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
	Reduce transit headways	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	TDM Strategy
Transit	Implement neighborhood shuttle	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	Appendix, Transit sections 1 - 3
	Transit subsidies	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Education &	Voluntary travel behavior change program	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	TDM Strategy Appendix, Education & Encouragement sections 1 - 2
Encouragement	Promotions and marketing	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Required commute trip reduction program	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	TDM Strategy Appendix, Commute Trip Reductions sections 1 - 4
Commute Trip Reductions	Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommute Program	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Employer sponsored vanpool or shuttle	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Ride-share program	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Car-share	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	TDM Strategy
Shared Mobility	Bike share	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Appendix, Shared
onarca mobility	School carpool program	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Mobility sections 1 - 3

Report 3: TDM Outputs

Date: July 8, 2020 Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St

Project Scenario: Modified Alternative 2
Project Address: 6220 W YUCCA ST, 90028



TDM Adjustments by Trip Purpose & Strategy, Cont.

						riace type	Compact							
			ased Work luction		ased Work action		used Other action		ased Other action		Based Other luction		Based Other action	Source
		Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	
	Implement/ Improve on-street bicycle facility	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	TDM Strategy
Bicycle Infrastructure	Include Bike parking per LAMC	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	Appendix, Bicycle Infrastructure
	Include secure bike parking and showers	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	sections 1 - 3
Neighborhood	Traffic calming improvements	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	TDM Strategy Appendix,
Enhancement	Pedestrian network improvements	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Neighborhood Enhancement sections 1 - 2

Final Combined & Maximum TDM Effect												
	Home Bas Produ		Home Ba Attra			Home Based Other Home Based Other Non-Home Based Other Production Attraction Production				Non-Home Based Other Attraction		
	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated	Proposed	Mitigated
COMBINED TOTAL	1%	22%	1%	1%	1%	22%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
MAX. TDM EFFECT	1%	22%	1%	1%	1%	22%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%

= Min	imum (X%, 1-[(1-A)*(1-	·B)])
	where X%=	
PLACE	urban	75%
TYPE	compact infill	40%
MAX:	suburban center	20%
	suburban	15%

Note: (1-[(1-A)*(1-B)...]) reflects the dampened combined effectiveness of TDM Strategies (e.g., A, B,...). See the TDM Strategy Appendix (*Transportation Assessment Guidelines Attachment G*) for further discussion of dampening.

Date: July 8, 2020

Project Name: 6220 W. Yucca St





Version 1.3

Report 4: MXD Methodology	y
---------------------------	---

MXD Methodology - Project Without TDM											
Unadjusted Trips MXD Adjustment MXD Trips Average Trip Length Unadjusted VMT MXD VMT											
Home Based Work Production	241	-29.5%	170	8.0	1,928	1,360					
Home Based Other Production	668	-48.4%	345	5.2	3,474	1,794					
Non-Home Based Other Production	455	-5.9%	428	7.4	3,367	3,167					
Home-Based Work Attraction	45	-55.6%	20	8.3	374	166					
Home-Based Other Attraction	648	-44.1%	362	6.3	4,082	2,281					
Non-Home Based Other Attraction	219	-6.8%	204	6.2	1,358	1,265					

MXD Methodology with TDM Measures							
	Proposed Project			Project with Mitigation Measures			
	TDM Adjustment	Project Trips	Project VMT	TDM Adjustment	Mitigated Trips	Mitigated VMT	
Home Based Work Production	-0.6%	169	1,352	-21.8%	133	1,063	
Home Based Other Production	-0.6%	343	1,783	-21.8%	270	1,403	
Non-Home Based Other Production	-0.6%	425	3,147	-1.0%	424	3,135	
Home-Based Work Attraction	-0.6%	20	165	-1.0%	20	164	
Home-Based Other Attraction	-0.6%	360	2,267	-1.0%	358	2,258	
Non-Home Based Other Attraction	-0.6%	203	1,257	-1.0%	202	1,252	

MXD VMT Methodology Per Capita & Per Employee						
Total Population: 606 Total Employees: 31						
	APC: Proposed Project	C: Central Project with Mitigation Measures				
Total Home Based Production VMT	3,135	2,466				
Total Home Based Work Attraction VMT	165	164				
Total Home Based VMT Per Capita	5.2	4.1				
Total Work Based VMT Per Employee	N/A	N/A				