

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 7, REGIONAL PLANNING
IGR/CEQA BRANCH
120 SO. SPRING ST.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
PHONE (213) 897-6536
FAX (213) 897-1337



RECEIVED
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
OCT 15 2003
ENVIRONMENTAL
UNIT

*Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!*

Ms. Maya Zaitzevsky, Project Coordinator
Office of Planning
City of Los Angeles
200 N. Spring St., Room 763
Los Angeles, CA. 90012

IGR/CEQA# 031016NY
Canyon Hills Project/280 Units
SCH#2002091018
LA/210/14.17

October 8, 2003

Dear Ms. Zaitzevsky:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the Canyon Hills Project in the City of Los Angeles.

The Department as a responsible agency under CEQA has jurisdiction superceding that of MTA in identifying the freeway analysis needed for this project. Caltrans is responsible for obtaining measures that will off-set project vehicle trip generation that worsens Caltrans facilities and hence, it does not adhere to the CMP guide of 150 or more vehicle trips added before freeway analysis is needed. MTA's Congestion Management Program in acknowledging the Department's role, stipulates that Caltrans must be consulted to identify specific locations to be analyzed on the State Highway System.

1-1

Therefore, please reference the Department's **Traffic Impact Study Guideline** on the Internet at:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/developserv/operationalsystems/reports/tisguide.pdf>

1. Presentations of assumptions and methods used to develop trip generation, trip distribution, choice of travel mode, and assignments of trips to State Route 210.

1-2

Ms. Zaitzevsky

October 8, 2003

- 2. Consistency of project travel modeling with other regional and local modeling forecasts and with travel data. The IGR/CEQA office may use indices to check results. Differences or inconsistencies must be thoroughly explained. 1-3

- 3. Analysis of ADT, AM, and PM peak-hour volumes for both existing and future conditions in the affected area. This should include freeways, interchanges, and intersections, and all HOV facilities. Interchange Level of Service should be specified (HCM2000 method requested). Utilization of transit lines and vehicles, and of all facilities, should be realistically estimated. Future conditions would include build-out of all projects (see next item) and any plan-horizon years. 1-4

- 4. Inclusion of all appropriate traffic volumes. Analysis should include traffic from the project, cumulative traffic generated from all specific approved developments in the area, and traffic growth other than from the project and developments. That is, include: existing + project + other projects + other growth. 1-5

- 5. Discussion of mitigation measures appropriate to alleviate anticipated traffic impacts. These mitigation discussions should include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - description of transportation infrastructure improvements
 - financial costs, funding sources and financing
 - sequence and scheduling considerations
 - implementation responsibilities, controls and monitoring

Any mitigation involving transit, HOV, or TDM must be rigorously justified and its effects conservatively estimated. Improvements involving dedication of land or physical construction may be favorably considered.

1-6

- 6. Specification of developer's percent share of the cost, as well as a plan of realistic mitigation measures under the control of the developer. The ratio should be estimated, of additional traffic due to the project, to that amount of increase in traffic for which real mitigation must be provided (see Traffic Impact Study Guidelines). We note for purposes of determining project share of costs, the number of trips from the project on each traveling segment or element is estimated in the context of forecasted traffic volumes which include build-out of all approved and not yet approved projects, and other sources of growth. Analytical methods such as select-zone travel forecast modeling might be used. 1-7

We look forward to reviewing the **updated Traffic Study**. We expect to receive a copy from the State Clearinghouse. However, to expedite the review process, you may send two copies in advance to the undersigned at the following address: 1-8

Stephen Buswell
 IGR/CEQA Branch Chief
 Caltrans District 07
 Regional Transportation Planning Office
 120 S. Spring St., Los Angeles, CA 90012

Ms. Zaitzevsky

October 8, 2003

If you have any questions regarding this response, please call the Project Engineer/Coordinator Mr. Yerjanian at (213) 897-6536 and refer to IGR/CEQA # 031016NY.

Sincerely,



STEPHEN J. BUSWELL
IGR/CEQA Branch Chief
Transportation Planning Office

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"