3.16 Transportation

This section addresses the potential impacts to transportation associated with implementation of the proposed Project. This section includes: a description of the existing circulation system in the proposed Project area; a summary of applicable regulations related to transportation; and an evaluation of the potential impacts of the proposed Project related to transportation. Project design features related to transportation include: PDF-TRA-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan, PDF-TRA-2: Construction Staging Plan, PDF-TRA-3: Construction Traffic, PDF-TRA-4: Access to Parcels, PDF-TRA-5: Site-Specific Traffic Control and Transit Plan for Large Events, and PDF-TRA-6: Expand Public Transit Connections. Impacts to transportation are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

The analysis of in this section is based on the Silver Lake Reservoir Complex Master Plan Project Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) prepared by Jano Baghdanian & Associates in February 2022. The TIA is included as Appendix K of this Draft EIR. The analysis is further informed by a City of Los Angeles Inter-Departmental Memorandum prepared by the Department of Transportation dated June 1, 2022 that evaluates the proposed Project’s impacts to transportation and traffic.

3.16.1 Environmental Setting

The proposed Project site and surrounding areas (within a quarter-mile buffer) has a dense street network including local city streets and nearby freeways. Primary roadways in the Project site and surrounding areas are listed in Table 3.16-1 as described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Lane Configuration</th>
<th>Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silver Lake Blvd</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>Avenue II</td>
<td>1 lane in each direction</td>
<td>On-street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Lake Dr</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>1 lane in each direction</td>
<td>On-street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Ave</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>1 lane in each direction</td>
<td>On-street (residential side only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesla Ave</td>
<td>E/W</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1 lane in each direction</td>
<td>On-street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood Ave</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1 lane in each direction</td>
<td>On-street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Pelt Pl</td>
<td>E/W</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1 lane in each direction</td>
<td>On-street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: JBA 2022

**Silver Lake Boulevard** is classified as an Avenue II with a roadway width of 50 feet. In the vicinity of the Project, Silver Lake Boulevard has 1 travel lane and a Class II bike lane for each direction separated by a double yellow centerline. A dirt trail with traffic barriers is provided on the east west side of Silver Lake Boulevard adjacent to the reservoir and a concrete sidewalk is provided on the west east side. Silver Lake Boulevard has a 35 miles per hour (mph) speed limit.
Armstrong Avenue is a two-lane Collector. For the most part of Armstrong Avenue, the roadway width is 30 feet with the exception of a small portion just north of Edgewater Terrance, where the width increases to 35 feet. There is a double yellow centerline on the street. Armstrong Avenue has a concrete sidewalk on the residential (northeast) side and a dirt trail on the side adjacent to the project (southwest). Armstrong Avenue has a 25 mph speed limit.

Tesla Avenue is a one-way westbound local street with 1 travel lane. The street width is 24 feet. There is a concrete sidewalk on the south side of the roadway adjacent to the reservoir and a discontinuous sidewalk on the north. Tesla Avenue has a 25 mph speed limit.

West Silver Lake Drive is classified as a Collector. For the most part of West Silver Lake Boulevard adjacent to the reservoir, the roadway width is approximately 36 feet with one lane in each direction separated by a double yellow centerline. A concrete sidewalk is provided on the west side and a dirt trail is present on the east, adjacent to the reservoir. At the south end of the reservoir, where West Silver Lake Drive intersects Redesdale Avenue, the street width widens to approximately 50 feet. There are Metro Line 201 bus stops for north and southbound West Silver Lake Boulevard. Metro Line 201 provides services between the City of Glendale north of the SR 134 Freeway and Wilshire Boulevard in the Westlake North district of the City of Los Angeles. West Silver Lake Drive has a 25 mph speed limit.

Van Pelt Place has a roadway classification of Local Street. The street is about 30 feet wide with one lane in each direction. Van Pelt Place has a 25 mph speed limit.

Public Transit Connections

The SLRC is currently connected to the County Metro bus system via lines #201 that runs West Silver Lake Drive with multiple stops adjacent to the Complex and #92 which runs on Glendale Boulevard with multiple stops which are a short walking distance from the SLRC (Figure 3.16-1). Line #92 connects to Burbank, Glendale and downtown LA. According to LA Metro’s NextGen Bus Plan, Line # 201 will be discontinued (LA Metro 2020). Portions of Line #182 and #603 will stop in the project vicinity and connect to Hollywood and Echo Park. The Vermont/Sunset Metro Station is approximately 1.45 mile west of the Project Site and the Vermont/Santa Monica Metro Station is approximately 1.42 miles southwest of the Project Site.

3.16.2 Regulatory Framework

Federal

Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990

Titles I, II, III, and V of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) have been codified in Title 42 of the United States Code (USC), beginning at Section 12101. Title III prohibits discrimination based on disability in “places of public accommodation” (businesses and non-profit agencies that serve the public) and “commercial facilities” (other businesses). The regulation includes Appendix A through Part 36 (Standards for Accessible Design), establishing minimum standards for ensuring accessibility when designing and constructing a new facility or altering an existing facility. Examples of key guidelines include detectable warnings for pedestrians entering traffic where there is no curb, a clear zone of 48 inches for the pedestrian travel way, and a vibration-free zone for pedestrians.
Figure 3.16-1
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State

Complete Streets Act

Assembly Bill (AB) 1358, the Complete Streets Act (Government Code Sections 65040.2 and 65302), was signed into law by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger in September 2008. As of January 1, 2011, the law requires cities and counties, when updating the part of a local general plan that addresses roadways and traffic flows, to ensure that those plans account for the needs of all roadway users. Specifically, the legislation requires cities and counties to ensure that local roads and streets adequately accommodate the needs of bicyclists, pedestrians and transit riders, as well as motorists.

At the same time, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), which administers transportation programming for the State, unveiled a revised version of Deputy Directive 64 (DD-64-R1 October 2008), an internal policy document that now explicitly embraces Complete Streets as the policy covering all phases of State highway projects, from planning to construction to maintenance and repair.

Senate Bill 743

On September 27, 2013, Governor Jerry Brown signed SB 743, which went into effect in January 2014. SB 743 directed the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop revisions to the CEQA Guidelines by July 1, 2014 to establish new criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts and define alternative metrics for traffic LOS. This started a process that changes transportation impact analysis under CEQA. These changes include elimination of auto delay, LOS, and other similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion as a basis for determining significant impacts for land use projects and plans in California. Additionally, as discussed further below, as part of SB 743, parking impacts for particular types of development projects in areas well served by transit are not considered significant impacts on the environment. According to the legislative intent contained in SB 743, these changes to current practice were necessary to “more appropriately balance the needs of congestion management with statewide goals related to infill development, promotion of public health through active transportation, and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.”

On January 20, 2016, OPR released the Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, which was an update to Updating Transportation Impacts Analysis in the CEQA Guidelines, Preliminary Discussion Draft of Updates to the CEQA Guidelines Implementing Senate Bill 743, which was released on August 6, 2014. Of particular relevance was the updated text of the proposed new CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 that relates to the determination of the significance of transportation impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures. Specifically, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, which is discussed further below, establishes VMT as the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. In November 2018, the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) finalized the updates to the CEQA Guidelines and the updated guidelines became effective on December 28, 2018.

Based on these changes, on July 30, 2019, the City of Los Angeles City Council adopted the CEQA Transportation Analysis Update, which sets forth the revised thresholds of significance for
evaluating transportation impacts as well as screening and evaluation criteria for determining impacts. The CEQA Transportation Analysis Update establishes VMT as the City’s formal method of evaluating a project’s transportation impacts. In conjunction with this update, LADOT adopted its Transportation Assessment Guidelines (TAG) in July 2019 and updated in July 2020, which defines the methodology for analyzing a project’s transportation impacts in accordance with SB 743.

**CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3**

As discussed above, recent changes to the CEQA Guidelines include the adoption of Section 15064.3, Determining the Significance of Transportation Impacts. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 establishes VMT as the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. Generally, land use projects within 0.5 miles of either an existing major transit stop\(^1\) or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor\(^2\) should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. Projects that decrease VMT in the project area compared to existing conditions should be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact. A lead agency has discretion to choose the most appropriate methodology to evaluate VMT, including whether to express the change in absolute terms, per capita, per household or in any other measure. A lead agency may also use models to estimate VMT, and may revise those estimates to reflect professional judgment based on substantial evidence. As discussed further below, LADOT developed City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Version 1.3 (May 2020) (VMT Calculator) (LADOT 2020) to estimate project-specific daily household VMT per capita and daily work VMT per employee for developments within City limits. The methodology for determining VMT based on the VMT Calculator is consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 and the TAG.

**Regional**

**Southern California Association of Governments 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy**

In compliance with SB 375, on September 3, 2020, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Council adopted the 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2020-2045 RTP/SCS), a long-range visioning plan that incorporates land use and transportation strategies to increase mobility options and achieve a more sustainable growth pattern while meeting GHG reduction targets set by CARB. The 2020-2045 RTP/SCS contains baseline socioeconomic projections that are used as the basis for SCAG’s transportation planning, as well as the provision of services by the six-county region of Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura counties. SCAG policies are directed towards the development of regional land use patterns that contribute to reductions in vehicle miles and improvements to the transportation system.

---

1. “Major transit stop” is defined in Public Resources Code Section (PRC) 21064.3 as a site containing an existing rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.

2. “High-quality transit corridors” are defined in (PRC) Section 21155 as a corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours.
The 2020-2045 RTP/SCS builds on the long-range vision of SCAG’s prior 2016-2040 RTP/SCS to balance future mobility and housing needs with economic, environmental and public health goals. A substantial concentration and share of growth is directed to Priority Growth Areas (PGAs), which include high quality transit areas (HQTAs), Transit Priority Areas (TPAs), job centers, Neighborhood Mobility Areas (NMAs) and Livable Corridors. These areas account for four percent of SCAG’s total land area but the majority of directed growth. HQTAs are corridor-focused PGAs within one 0.5 mile of an existing or planned fixed guideway transit stop or a bus transit corridor where buses pick up passengers at a frequency of every 15 minutes (or less) during peak commuting hours. TPAs are PGAs that are within a 0.5 of a major transit stop that is existing or planned. Job centers are defined as areas with significant higher employment density than surrounding areas which capture density peaks and locally significant job centers throughout all six counties in the region. NMAs are PGAs with robust residential to non-residential land use connections, high roadway intersection densities, and low-to-moderate traffic speeds. Livable Corridors are arterial roadways, where local jurisdictions may plan for a combination of the following elements: high-quality bus frequency; higher density residential and employment at key intersections; and increased active transportation through dedicated bikeways.

The 2020-2045 RTP/SCS’ “Core Vision” prioritizes the maintenance and management of the region’s transportation network, expanding mobility choices by co-locating housing, jobs, and transit, and increasing investment in transit and complete streets. Strategies to achieve the “Core Vision” include, but are not limited to, Smart Cities and Job Centers, Housing Supportive Infrastructure, Go Zones, and Shared Mobility. The 2020-2045 RTP/SCS intends to create benefits for the SCAG region by achieving regional goals for sustainability, transportation equity, improved public health and safety, and enhancement of the regions’ overall quality of life. These benefits include, but are not limited to, a five percent reduction in VMT per capita, nine percent reduction in vehicle hours traveled, and a two percent increase in work-related transit trips.

**Local**

**City of Los Angeles General Plan**

As required by the State of California, the City’s General Plan addresses goals, policies, and standards related to land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety (City of Los Angeles, 2001). To address goals that meet the unique needs of the City, the General Plan also includes elements related to health and wellness, air quality, historic preservation and cultural resources, and public facilities and services. Several of the General Plan elements are currently being updated.

**City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035**

In August 2015, the City Council adopted Mobility Plan 2035 (Mobility Plan), which serves as the City’s General Plan circulation element. The City Council has adopted several amendments to the Mobility Plan since its initial adoption, including the most recent amendment on September 7, 2016. The Mobility Plan incorporates “complete streets” principles and lays the policy foundation for how the City’s residents interact with their streets. The Mobility Plan includes five main goals that define the City’s high-level mobility priorities:

(1) Safety First;
(2) World Class Infrastructure;
(3) Access for All Angelenos;
(4) Collaboration, Communication, and Informed Choices; and
(5) Clean Environments and Healthy Communities.

Each of the goals contains objectives and policies to support the achievement of those goals.

Street classifications are designated in the Mobility Plan, and may be amended by a Community Plan, and are intended to create a balance between traffic flow and other important street functions, including transit routes and stops, pedestrian environments, bicycle routes, building design and site access, etc. The Complete Streets Design Guide, which was adopted by the City Council alongside the Mobility Plan, defines the street classifications as follows:

- **Arterial Streets**: Major streets that serve through traffic and provide access to major commercial activity centers. Arterials are divided into two categories:
  - **Boulevards** represent the widest streets that typically provide regional access to major destinations and include two further categories, Boulevard I and Boulevard II.
  - **Avenues** pass through both residential and commercial areas and include three further categories, Avenue I, Avenue II, and Avenue III.

- **Collector Streets**: Generally located in residential neighborhoods and provide access to and from arterial streets for local traffic and are not intended for cut-through traffic.

- **Local Streets**: Intended to accommodate lower volumes of vehicle traffic and provide parking on both sides of the street.
  - Continuous local streets that connect to other streets at both ends, and/or
  - Non-Continuous local streets that lead to a dead-end.

The Mobility Plan also identifies enhanced networks of major and neighborhood streets that facilitate multi-modal mobility within the citywide transportation system. This layered approach to complete streets selects a subset of the City's streets to prioritize travel for specific transportation modes. In all, there are four enhanced networks: the Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN), Transit Enhanced Network (TEN), Vehicle Enhanced Network (VEN), and Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN). In addition to these networks, many areas that could benefit from additional pedestrian features are identified as Pedestrian Enhanced Districts (PED). These networks and PED are defined as follows:

- The NEN is a selection of streets that provide comfortable and safe routes for localized travel of slower-moving modes, such as walking, bicycling, or other slow speed motorized means of travel.
- The TEN is the network of arterial streets prioritized to improve existing and future bus service for transit riders.
- The BEN is a network of streets to receive treatments that prioritize bicyclists. Tier 1 Protected Bicycle Lanes are bicycle facilities that are separated from vehicular traffic. Tier 2 and Tier 3 Bicycle Lanes are facilities on roadways with striped separation. Tier 2 Bicycle Lanes are those more likely to be built by 2035.
• The VEN identifies streets that prioritize vehicular movement and offer safe, consistent travel speeds and reliable travel times.

• The PEDs identify where pedestrian improvements on arterial streets could be prioritized to provide better walking connections to and from the major destinations within communities.

Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley Community Plan

The Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley Community Plan Area is located approximately 2 miles north of Downtown Los Angeles and is generally separated from Downtown Los Angeles by Chinatown. The Community Plan Area’s 4,579 acres (7 square miles) is bordered by the Hollywood and Wilshire Community Plan Areas to the west, Westlake Community Plan Area to the southwest, Central City North Community Plan Area to the south and the Northeast Community Plan Area to the north and east. The Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley Community Plan (2004) includes the following issues and opportunities related to transportation (City of Los Angeles, 2004):

Issues

• Residential neighborhood streets are being used to avoid traffic on congested major thoroughfares, disturbing quality of life and making neighborhood streets unsafe for children and pedestrians.

• Traffic congestion and circulation issues in the Plan area that reflect regional transportation problems and Citywide deficiencies in multi-modal transit options.

• Limited access to mass transportation.

• Narrow and substandard residential streets in the hillsides that hinder circulation and create problems for parking and access by safety vehicles.

Opportunities

• Identify and encourage the implementation of regional transportation solutions that will minimize the impact of commuter traffic on the Plan area.

• Establish non-motorized transportation alternatives which build on an existing network of bike paths

• Identify and recommend additional commuter bus routes such as DASH service to underserved areas such as Elysian Valley and to connect hillside residential neighborhoods to commercial centers, downtown and public transit systems including the Red Line and Gold Line.

Los Angeles Municipal Code

With regard to construction traffic, Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 41.40 limits construction activities to the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. on weekdays and from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays and national holidays. No construction is permitted on Sundays.

LAMC Section 12.37 sets forth requirements for street dedications and improvements for new development projects. Specifically, LAMC Section 12.37 states that no building or structure shall be erected or enlarged on any property, and no building permit shall be issued therefore, on any R3 or less restrictive zone, or in any lot in the RD1.5, RD2, or R3 Zones, if the lot abuts a major
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or secondary highway or collector street unless one-half of the street adjacent to the subject property has been dedicated and improved to the full width to meet the standards for a highway or collector street as provided in the LAMC. While LAMC Section 12.37 generally applies to projects meeting the above criteria, the authority to require right-of-way dedications and improvements for discretionary projects that involve zone changes or divisions of land falls under LAMC Sections 12.32 G.1 and 17.05.

**LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines**

As discussed above, on July 30, 2019, LADOT updated its Transportation Impact Study Guidelines, travel demand model and transportation impact thresholds based on VMT, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, of the 2019 CEQA Updates that implement SB 743. The City established the Transportation Assessment Guidelines (TAG) that includes both CEQA thresholds (and screening criteria) and non-CEQA thresholds (and screening criteria). LADOT most recently updated the TAG in July 2020. The CEQA thresholds provide the methodology for analyzing the Appendix G transportation thresholds, including providing the City’s adopted VMT thresholds. The non-CEQA thresholds provide a method to analyze projects for purposes of entitlement review and making necessary findings to ensure the project is consistent with adopted plans and policies including the Mobility Plan. Specifically, the TAG is intended to effectuate a review process that advances the City’s vision of developing a safe, accessible, well-maintained, and well-connected multimodal transportation network. The TAG has been developed to identify land use development and transportation projects that may impact the transportation system; to ensure proposed land use development projects achieve site access design requirements and on-site circulation best practices; to define whether off-site improvements are needed; and to provide step-by-step guidance for assessing impacts and preparing Transportation Assessment Studies.

**NextGen Bus Plan**

The NextGen Bus Plan was approved by the Metro Board of Directors in October 2020, to be implemented with a 3-phased roll-out beginning in December 2020. The NextGen Bus Plan was developed to implement a new competitive bus system in Los Angeles County that provides fast, frequent, reliable, and accessible service. The NextGen Bus Plan, implemented by Metro includes a comprehensive marketing campaign to promote public awareness of the new routes, schedules and other system changes.

**Vision Zero**

The Vision Zero Los Angeles program, implemented by LADOT, represents a citywide effort to eliminate traffic deaths in the City by 2025. Vision Zero has two goals: a 20-percent reduction in traffic deaths by 2017 and zero traffic deaths by 2025. In order to achieve these goals, LADOT has identified a network of streets, called the High Injury Network, which has a higher incidence of severe and fatal collisions. The High Injury Network, which was last updated in 2018, represents 6 percent of the City’s street miles but accounts for approximately two thirds (64 percent) of all fatalities and serious injury collisions involving people walking and biking.
Citywide Design Guidelines

The Citywide Design Guidelines serve to implement the Framework Element’s urban design principles and are intended to be used by City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning staff, developers, architects, engineers, and community members in evaluating project applications, along with relevant policies from the Framework Element and Community Plans. The Citywide Design Guidelines were updated in October 2019 and include guidelines pertaining to pedestrian-first design which serves to reduce VMT.

Complete Street Design Guide

The Complete Streets Design Guide provides design concepts and best practices to promote safe and accessible streets for all transportation users (i.e., pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and motorists) within the City (City of Los Angeles, n.d.). The purpose of the guide is to supplement existing engineering practices and requirements in order to meet the goals of California’s Complete Streets Act (AB 1358). The guide accompanies Mobility Plan 2035 and provides a framework for stakeholders to plan for, implement, and maintain complete streets.

3.16.3 Significance Thresholds and Criteria

On July 30, 2019, pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 743 and Section 15064.7 of the State's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the Los Angeles City Council adopted the LADOT TAG as the criteria by which to determine transportation impacts under CEQA, and authorized LADOT to make any necessary updates. Therefore, the CEQA thresholds set forth in the LADOT TAG will apply to the proposed Project. The proposed Project would have a significant impact if it would:

- T-1: Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. (Refer to Impact 3.16-1)
- T-2: Would the project cause substantial vehicle miles traveled in conflict or inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). (Refer to Impact 3.16-2)
- T-3: Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) (Refer to Impact 3.16-3)
- Result in inadequate emergency access. (Refer to Impact 3.16-4)

Methodology

There are two categories of transportation impact analysis required by the LADOT’s TAG. The first category, in Section 2 of the TAG, relates to potential transportation impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Should a project exceed thresholds identified in the TAG, its impact would be considered significant under CEQA and thus would require any feasible mitigation measures be implemented to reduce the impact below the threshold of significance, to the extent feasible. The CEQA thresholds identified in the TAG are consistent with City adopted thresholds and with State CEQA guidance.

The second category of analysis, non-CEQA transportation impact analysis found in Section 3 of the TAG, analyzes transportation issues relating to safety, access, and circulation as they may be
the result of the construction or operation of a project. The TAG identifies specific screening criteria in Sections 2 and 3 to determine whether each type of CEQA and non-CEQA transportation analysis is required depending on the size, use and daily vehicular trip generation of the project.

3.16.4 Project Design Features

The following Project Design Features (PDFs) related to transportation would be implemented as part of the Project:

**PDF-TRA-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan.** A Construction Traffic Management Plan will be prepared for the phases of the proposed Project that affect offsite components or require increased vehicle access consistent with the LADOT Construction Traffic Control Guidelines. This plan will address the planned Project construction phasing, sequence of construction activities, access, and circulation. In addition, the plan would include planned detour routes and BMPs, as well as coordination with and advance notice to local emergency providers.

**PDF-TRA-2: Construction Staging Plan.** A construction staging plan shall be developed to reduce impacts related to noise, dust, traffic, and other health hazards. In addition, construction site BMPs (e.g., fencing, signs, and detours) shall be implemented to minimize hazards and prevent safety issues on the roadways and sidewalks surrounding the construction site.

**PDF-TRA-3: Construction Traffic.** Construction-related trips shall be scheduled with increased frequency during off-peak hours to minimize impacts to commuters.

**PDF-TRA-4: Access to Parcels.** It is not anticipated that access to existing parcels outside of the proposed Project impact areas would be impacted. However, if access to any existing parcels is removed during proposed construction activities, temporary access shall be provided, and/or new points of access shall be constructed.

**PDF-TRA-5: Site-Specific Traffic Control and Transit Plan for Large Events.** Large event permittees shall develop a site-specific traffic control plan to provide information on parking and circulation and highlight transit options for event attendees to minimize congestion and vehicle miles traveled. Traffic control strategies for events will include inbound/outbound flex lanes and sheriff-controlled intersections. Traffic control plans will also identify nearby public parking facilities and identify passenger pick-up/drop-off locations. Permittees will be required to consider the cumulative traffic impacts of their event in relation to other events in the Project Area. The traffic control plans will also identify emergency services egress and access.

**PDF-TRA-6: Expand Public Transit Connections.** The future site operator and relevant City departments (LADOT, Recreation and Parks Department, City Planning, etc.) shall work together to explore options for expanding public transit connections to the Project site to expand community access and reduce VMT.
3.16.5 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Program Plan, Ordinance, or Policy

Impact 3.16-1: Would the proposed Project conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Construction / Operation

According to the City’s TAG, the City has adopted programs, plans, ordinances, and policies that establish the transportation planning regulatory framework for all travel modes. The overall goals of these policies are to achieve a safe, accessible, and sustainable transportation system for all users. The TAG requires the completion of the Plan Consistency Worksheet to determine whether the Project conflicts with any City circulation system policy. According to the TAG, a mere conflict with adopted transportation related policies, or standards that requires administrative relief or legislative change does not in itself constitute an impact. The Plan Consistency Worksheet is provided in Appendix K, and in Table 3.16-2 below. As shown in Table 3.16-2, the proposed Project would be subject to the provisions of LAMC 12.37, the Mobility Plan 2035, Healthy LA, Vision Zero, and the Sustainability Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Questions</th>
<th>Relevant Plans, Policies, and Programs</th>
<th>Supporting/Complementary City Plans, Policies, and Programs to consult</th>
<th>Is the Guiding Question Applicable to the Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the Project include additions or new construction along a street designated as a Boulevard I, and II, and/or Avenue I, II, or III on property zoned for R3 or less restrictive zone? (screening question)</td>
<td>LAMC Section 12.37</td>
<td>LAMC Section 12.37</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Project Site along any network identified in the City’s Mobility Plan?</td>
<td>Mobility Plan 2035</td>
<td>MP 2035 – Neighborhood Enhanced Network; Bicycle Lane Network; Pedestrian Enhanced Districts.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are dedications or improvements needed to serve long-term mobility needs identified in the Mobility Plan 2035?</td>
<td>Mobility Plan 2035</td>
<td>MP 2035 - 2.17 Street Widenings</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the Project require placement of transit furniture in accordance with City’s Coordinated Street Furniture and Bus Bench Program?</td>
<td>City Coordinated Street Furniture Program</td>
<td>City Coordinated Street Furniture Program</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Project Site in an identified Transit Oriented Community (TOC)?</td>
<td>ZIMAS</td>
<td>ZIMAS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Project Site on a roadway identified in City’s High Injury Network?</td>
<td>Vision Zero</td>
<td>Vision Zero - High Injury Network (HIN) Map</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does project propose narrowing or shifting existing sidewalk placement?</td>
<td>Mobility Plan 2035</td>
<td>Healthy LA; Vision Zero; Sustainability Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Guiding Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Questions</th>
<th>Relevant Plans, Policies, and Programs</th>
<th>Supporting/Complementary City Plans, Policies, and Programs to consult</th>
<th>Is the Guiding Question Applicable to the Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does project propose paving, narrowing, shifting, or removing an existing parkway?</td>
<td>Mobility Plan 2035</td>
<td>MP 2035 – 3.9 Increased Neighborhood Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does project propose modifying, removing, or otherwise affect existing bicycle infrastructure? (ex: driveway proposed along street with bicycle facility)</td>
<td>Mobility Plan 2035</td>
<td>Vision Zero; Complete Streets Design Guide – Section</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is project site adjacent to an alley? If yes, will project make use of, modify, or restrict alley access?</td>
<td>Mobility Plan 2035</td>
<td>Complete Streets Design Guide – Section 6.9: Driveways</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does project create a cul-de-sac or is project site located adjacent to existing cul-de-sac? If yes, is cul-de-sac consistent with design goal in Mobility Plan 2035 (maintain through bicycle and pedestrian access)?</td>
<td>Mobility Plan 2035</td>
<td>MP 2035 – 3.10 Cul-de-sacs</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access: Driveway and Loading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Questions</th>
<th>Relevant Plans, Policies, and Programs</th>
<th>Supporting/Complementary City Plans, Policies, and Programs to consult</th>
<th>Is the Guiding Question Applicable to the Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does project site introduce a new driveway or loading access along an arterial (Avenue or Boulevard)?</td>
<td>Mobility Plan 2035</td>
<td>MP 2035 – 2.10 Loading Areas; Vision Zero</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes to 13, Is a non-arterial frontage or alley access available to serve the driveway or loading access needs?</td>
<td>Mobility Plan 2035</td>
<td>MP 2035 – 2.10 Loading Areas; Vision Zero</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does project site include a corner lot? (avoid driveways too close to intersections)</td>
<td>CDG 4.1.01</td>
<td>Complete Streets Design Guide – Section 6.9 Driveways</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does project propose driveway width in excess of City standard?</td>
<td>MPP Sec. 321, LAMC 16.16.060</td>
<td>LAMC 16.16.060</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does project propose more driveways than required by City maximum standard?</td>
<td>MPP - Sec No. 321 Driveway Design</td>
<td>Vision Zero, MP, Healthy LA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are loading zones proposed as a part of the project?</td>
<td>Mobility Plan 2035</td>
<td>MP 2035 – 2.10 Loading Areas</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does project include &quot;drop-off&quot; zones or areas? If yes, are such areas located to the side or rear of the building?</td>
<td>Mobility Plan 2035</td>
<td>MP 2035 – 2.10 Loading Areas</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does project propose modifying, limiting/ restricting, or removing public access to a public right-of-way (e.g., vacating public right-of-way?)</td>
<td>Mobility Plan 2035</td>
<td>MP 2035 – 3.9 Increased Neighborhood Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: JBA, 2022

In consultation with City Planning, the Project would be consistent with the LAMC 12.37 and Mobility Plan 2035. (BOE 2022). The Project would include short- and long-term bicycle parking and proposes to provide internal pedestrian walkways. The addition of new parking for the project may induce driving, which may increase VMT and may result in impacts to bicycle...
safety by adding new conflict points (such as opening doors from parked cars, cars crossing the bike lane to park or re-enter traffic, and cars waiting in bike lanes to park their car). Increased parking and conflict points may be incompatible with relevant plans, policies, and programs, such as the Mobility Plan 2035, that aim to reduce driving, promote active transportation, and reduce related emissions and traffic collisions. (LADOT 2022)

However, adding the limited parking proposed by the Project would not increase visitorship at the park, since projected visitors far exceed current parking capacity. Rather, the additional parking spaces would improve congestion by accommodating existing visitorship and reduce parking within the neighboring residential streets. The parking would not increase VMT or conflict with bus or bicycle access. As noted below in Impact 3.16-2, the proposed Project would not result in a significant impact related to VMT. (LADOT 2022)

To minimize conflict points and address this potential incompatibility, the proposed Project would improve the bike lanes within Silver Lake Boulevard, including the use of lane buffers to create protected bike lanes consistent with LADOT design recommendations. Offsite improvements would occur along Silver Lake Boulevard, between Armstrong Avenue and Duane Street for a length of approximately 3,000 feet. As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, two design options for improvement are proposed along this portion of the proposed Project (see Figure 2-16). Option 1 would include an improved bike lane on the west side of the road, closest to the SLRC, buffered by a 2-foot sidewalk running the length of this segment, followed by the addition of parallel parking on the west side of the road. Option 2 would include restriping along Silver Lake Boulevard to with improvements to the bike lane only and no addition of parking. Both options would result in protected bike lanes which would protect cyclists from conflict points. In addition, Option 1 would increase pedestrian safety by providing parking opportunities adjacent to the site, avoiding the need to cross Silver Lake Boulevard. With these project improvements, the Project would not conflict with a program plan, (including the Mobility Plan 2035), ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**
- None Required

**Significance Determination:**
- Less than Significant Impact

**Conflict with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)**

**Impact 3.16-2: Would the proposed Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?**

**Construction / Operation**

As described in the TIA prepared for the Project and in consultation with LADOT (LADOT 2022), the City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Documentation Version 1.3 was consulted to evaluate the Project’s VMT and compare it to the VMT impact criteria (Appendix K). The land use categories included in VMT Calculator tool are based on the land uses identified in the ITE
Trip Generation manual (except where otherwise identified in Section 3.1 of the VMT Guidelines). Table 1 of the City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator does not have parks and recreational uses as a land use. In addition, the VMT Calculator is intended for evaluation of residential and office projects in accordance with the TAG and reports daily vehicle trips, daily VMT, daily household VMT per capita, and daily work VMT per employee.

As shown in Figure 3.15-1, there are 42 local and regional parks located within a 2-mile radius of the SLRC. Specifically, Griffith Park, one of the largest municipal parks in the United States and the largest regional open space within the City, totals over 4,511 acres and provides lots of active and passive recreation opportunities. Other major parks include Elysian Park (600 acres), Rio de Los Angeles State Park (40 acres), and Echo Park (29 acres). As a result, the Project’s VMT impacts would be less than significant due to the presence of many nearby parks within a 2-mile radius and general lack of regionally attracting amenities as part of the proposed Project. Even with the proposed addition of a 151 parking spaces, VMT is not anticipated to substantively increase as a result of the proposed Project, based on the LADOT VMT estimation methods utilized in the TIA, which relies on land uses to determine VMT. The availability of many nearby parks, including several major parks, and lack of regional recreational uses to generate traffic supports the assumption that the park users would be based locally. The addition of street parking would provide safe access to the facilities for users who may not live within walking distance, who may need to transport families or pets, who don’t have easily accessible public transit options, and who may have previously traveled further to access such amenities, based on the location of vehicle parking. While the addition of parking could result in additional project-related trips, the VMT per capita of project users may be lessened as a result of the project.

The Education Center would potentially be considered a regional use, serving as a field trip destination for schools. However, trips to these facilities would typically consist of school bus trips. In addition, the majority of the new or renovated amenities are local serving, such as the basketball court; meadows area; shade pavilions; Multi-Purpose Facility; and Recreation Center.

Based on the discussion above, calculating the household VMT per capita and work VMT per employee is not applicable considering the Project’s local serving nature as it would not generate substantial additional vehicle miles. As stated in recent communications from LADOT, based on the VMT Analysis report submitted, the proposed Project is considered to be local serving with no applicable VMT. Therefore, it is concluded the Project would result in no significant Household or Work VMT impact.

The Project is considered to be primarily a locally-serving use since it is located in a densely populated residential and commercial area. There are no major regional serving amenities planned such as golf courses, athletic fields complexes (multiple soccer fields and baseball diamonds), boating and fishing. Although the Project would support periodic special events within the SLRC such as concerts or movie nights that would have a larger draw, these events would be subject to PDF-TRA-5: Site-Specific Traffic Control and Transit Plan for Large Events. As a result, the proposed Project would not result in a significant impact regarding VMT and no mitigation measures are required.
In addition, the proposed Project includes enhancements to the street infrastructure surrounding the SLRC including pedestrian paths and trails, and protected bicycle lanes. Although the addition of on-street parking spaces would increase the number of trips generated by the Project, it would not be a substantial increase and it would discourage park visitors who are not able to walk, bike, or take public transit to the Project site from circulating among narrow residential streets searching for parking. In addition, to reduce VMT and provide access opportunities to community residents who do not live within walking distance of the Project site, PDF-TRA-6: Expand Public Transit Options requires the future site operator to work with the relevant City departments to increase public transit connections. One option might be working with LA Metro to expand Metro Micro service areas to include the Project site. As a result, the proposed Project would accommodate all travel modes and result in a less than significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures:**
None Required

**Significance Determination:**
Less than Significant Impact

**Geometric Design Features**

**Impact 3.16-3: Would the proposed Project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

**Construction / Operation**

Traffic hazards can be related to vehicle/vehicle, vehicle/bicycle, or vehicle/pedestrian conflicts as well as to operational delays caused by vehicles slowing and/or queuing to access a project site. In consultation with LADOT (LADOT 2022), an analysis was conducted to evaluate the potential for the proposed Project to result in traffic hazards (see TIA in Appendix K). The analysis concludes that the Project would not increase hazards due to geometric design features since most of the Project improvements are on-site within the SLRC.

The analysis identifies that existing access points to the SLRC will remain intact. Currently, the Project site has twelve access points for vehicular and pedestrian traffic. The locations of these access points are identified in Appendix K. The proposed Project would not affect these access points. The existing curbs, slopes, sidewalks, and walking trails around the perimeter of the Project site consist of a combination of concrete sidewalks and dirt. The intersections are controlled by stop signs and have handicap ramps. There is a Class II bicycle facility located on Silver Lake Boulevard.

The existing LADWP maintenance and operation vehicular access driveways would remain to provide access to LADWP’s facilities and structures. In addition, there are no additional vehicular access driveways planned within the proposed Project. The main vehicular access driveway to the Project site is located at the intersection of Armstrong Avenue and Tesla Avenue. This driveway is currently used by LADWP for maintenance of fleet vehicles.
The analysis concludes that the proposed Project would not adversely affect access to the site via public transportation or bicycle. The SLRC is connected to the County Metro bus system via lines #201 that runs West Silver Lake Drive with multiple stops adjacent to the Complex and #92 which runs on Glendale Boulevard with multiple stops which are a short walking distance from the SLRC.

To enhance safety in the area, the proposed Project would include improvements to two local intersections to enhance safety for pedestrians and vehicles. These enhancements would include installing flashing beacons at the Silver Lake Boulevard and Armstrong Avenue intersection (JBA, 2022; Section 3.6.3.1) and at the West Silver Lake Drive and Hawick Street intersection (JBA, 2022; Section 3.6.3.2). These improvements are included in the Project description and are described in Appendix K.

PDF-TRA-1 and PDF-TRA-2 would require the preparation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan and a Construction Staging Plan to reduce impacts of construction to local streets and sidewalks surrounding the SLRC and construction site. The Construction Traffic Management Plan would be consistent with the LADOT Construction Traffic Control Guidelines. In addition, PDF-TRA-4 would ensure that access to parcels and driveways are maintained throughout construction activities.

The TIA also included an analysis on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access (JBA, 2022; Section 4.1); safety and circulation (JBA, 2022; Section 4.2); project construction (JBA, 2022; Section 4.3); residential street cut through analysis (JBA, 2022; Section 4.4); and parking inventory and demand analysis (JBA, 2022; Section 4.2.3.5). The TIA concludes that with implementation of the off-site improvements and PDFs described above, impacts would be minimized and the Project would not result in new hazards.

Finally, the TIA also evaluates the potential impacts of providing new parking on Silver Lake Boulevard by creating new conflict points with the existing bike lane (such as opening doors from parked cars, cars crossing bike lanes to park or re-enter traffic, and cars waiting in bike lanes to park their car). The introduction of new parking would potentially strain the existing bike lanes on Rowena Avenue that connect to Silver Lake Drive and bike lanes on Sunset Boulevard that connect to Silver Lake Boulevard. However, the analysis concludes that there are adequate markings and signage to minimize the potential for conflict along Silver Lake Boulevard. Furthermore, offsite improvements are recommended along Silver Lake Boulevard, between Armstrong Avenue and Duane Street for a length of approximately 3,000 feet. As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, two design options for improvement are proposed along this portion of the proposed Project (see Figure 2-16). Option 1 would include an improved bike lane on the west side of the road, closest to the SLRC, buffered by a 2-foot sidewalk running the length of this segment, followed by the addition of parallel parking on the west side of the road. Option 2 would include restriping along Silver Lake Boulevard to with improvements to the bike lane only and no addition of parking. Both options would result in protected bike lanes which would protect cyclists from conflict points.
During operation of the proposed Project site, PDF-TRA-5 would require that a Site-Specific Traffic Control and Transit Plan be implemented for large special events, in order to ensure that information on parking, circulation, and transit options are available for event attendees to minimize congestion and vehicle miles traveled.

With implementation of these off-site improvements, the proposed Project would not increase hazards due to geometric design features. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

None Required

**Significance Determination:**

Less than Significant Impact

### Emergency Access

**Impact 3.16-4: Would the proposed Project result in inadequate emergency access?**

In consultation with LADOT (LADOT 2022), an emergency access analysis for the proposed Project was performed.

**Construction**

Construction activities would be confined primarily to within the perimeter of the SLRC and would not impact surrounding roadways or restrict access for emergency vehicles. It is not anticipated that roadway users would experience temporary delays that could impair emergency access. During construction of offsite improvements, such as restriping along Silver Lake Boulevard for the addition of bike lanes and/or parking, partial road closures would be required. These closures would be temporary, lasting approximately 2.5 weeks. The proposed Project would include implementation of PDF-TRA-1 and PDF-TRA-2, requiring the implementation of a traffic management plan and construction staging plan which would include detour routes and BMPs, as well as coordination with and advance notice to local emergency providers. In addition, PDF-TRA-3 would require construction trips to be scheduled during off-peak hours, and PDF-TRA-4 would ensure that temporary access shall be provided to any parcels that may be impacted by construction. Impacts during construction would be considered less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

None Required

**Significance Determination:**

Less than Significant Impact

### Operation

As part of the Operations and Maintenance Plan to support operations, an Evacuation Plan would be prepared. Ingress and egress within the Project site would continue to operate similar to existing conditions, and no changes to emergency access would occur. During public events PDF-TRA-5 would ensure that event permittees develop a site-specific traffic control plan to minimize
congestion and vehicle miles traveled. Traffic control strategies for events will include inbound/outbound flex lanes and sheriff-controlled intersections. Traffic control plans will also identify nearby public parking facilities and identify passenger pick-up/drop-off locations. Permittees will be required to consider the cumulative traffic impacts of their event in relation to other events in the Project Area. The traffic control plans will also identify emergency services egress and access. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access, and impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**
None Required

**Significance Determination:**
Less than Significant Impact

### Cumulative Impact

**Impact 3.16-5:** Would the proposed Project construction and operation, when considered with related projects in the geographic scope, result in a cumulatively considerable impact to transportation?

In consultation with LADOT (2022), cumulative impacts on transportation could result when past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects combine to increase VMT, create hazards, or impede emergency access. Table 3-2 identifies nine related projects that are planned or are under construction within the Project area, including mixed-use developments, a childcare facility, and commercial uses. Seven of these projects would generate new trips and were considered in the TIA “related future project” analysis.

The related projects would cumulatively generate additional trips and increase VMT affecting the local and regional roadway network. The increase in cumulative development, which includes a net increase in 405 dwelling units, 28,802 square feet of commercial/retail uses and other non-residential uses, would generate additional traffic. The TIA concludes in Section 4.2.3.5 based on the location of the related projects and access to area street network, the potential traffic trips generated from the cumulative projects would not impact the study intersections. As a result, the proposed Project’s contribution to local trips combined with foreseeable future project trips would not cause a cumulatively considerable impact to VMT, hazards or emergency access. As such, cumulative impacts on transportation would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**
None Required

**Significance Determination:**
Less than Significant Impact

### 3.16.6 Summary of Impacts

Table 3.16-3 summarizes the impact significance determinations and lists mitigation measures related to transportation.
TABLE 3.16-3
SUMMARY OF PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS TO TRANSPORTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.16-1: Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedestrian facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16-2: Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15064.3, subdivision (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16-3: Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16-4: Result in inadequate emergency access</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16-5: Cumulative</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
NI = No Impact, no mitigation proposed
LTS = Less than Significant, no mitigation proposed
LTSM = Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
SU = Significant and Unavoidable
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