V.M Traffic

This section is based upon the Traffic Study prepared for the project by Katz, Okitsu & Associates, dated June 2003 (**Appendix 8**). A summary of the analysis is provided below.

Existing Conditions

The proposed project is located in west Los Angeles County, adjacent to Culver City, in a predominantly developed, urbanized setting. The surrounding area is a mixture of residential, commercial, industrial, institutional, and recreational uses. While the campus is in a predominantly urbanized setting, it is located at the base of the Baldwin Hills, which is a large open space area. It is situated at the eastern edge of development, with Baldwin Hills located immediately to the east. The campus is located not far from both downtown Los Angeles to the east and the Pacific Ocean to the west. **Figure V.M-1** shows the local roadway network as well as identifies intersections studied in the project traffic analysis.

Three roadways border the campus: Freshman Drive, Sophomore Drive and Stocker Street. Connecting these roads to the rest of the campus is a series of internal roads that include Albert Vera Street, and lettered streets from B Street through F Street. Albert Vera Street and D Street are the primary east-west roads and serve to connect Freshman Drive to the interior of the Campus. B Street is the primary north-south road and connects to Sophomore Drive. Many of the campus roadways allow only one-way travel. Among these are Stocker Street, Sophomore Drive from Stocker to Freshman Drive, B Street and F Street.

Parking is provided by 11 surface parking lots of varying size scattered around the site and on many of the internal roadways. The existing on-site parking supply consists of 1,859 spaces. Of these, 1,502 spaces are available to students and visitors. With the exception of metered parking spaces and parking on the perimeter County Streets, parking on campus is by permit only. The cost of a parking permit for students ranges from $20 to $27 per semester.

Area Roadways

Freeways

Regional access to the site is provided by nearby freeways consisting of the Santa Monica (I-10) Freeway, approximately one and three-quarter miles to the north; the San Diego (Route 405) Freeway, located about one and one-quarter miles to the west; and the Marina (State Hwy 90) Freeway.

The San Diego Freeway (I-405) is primarily a north-south freeway that begins at Interstate 5 in Orange County and rejoins Interstate 5 north of Los Angeles. Interstate 405 is the primary north-south roadway through West Los Angeles and provides access to the South Bay and Los Angeles International Airport south of the project site and Santa Monica and Westwood north of the project site.

The Santa Monica Freeway (I-10) is the primary east-west freeway across the Los Angeles Basin and is located north of the project site. I-10 would be used by trips that have origins or destinations in Santa Monica, the San Gabriel Valley or areas along the coast north of Santa Monica.

The Marina Freeway (SR-90) is a freeway that travels only a short distance between Slauson Boulevard, south of the project site, and Culver Boulevard to the west. The Marina Freeway provides a connection between Marina del Rey and the Santa Monica Freeway.

Figure V.M-1 Traffic Study Intersection

Major Highways

Washington Boulevard generally has four travel lanes and a 35 MPH speed limit. There are left turn pockets at all intersections. Parking regulations and the availability of on-street parking vary by roadway segment.

Jefferson Boulevard generally has four travel lanes and a 35 MPH speed limit. There are left turn pockets at all intersections. Parking regulations and the availability of on-street parking vary by roadway segment.

Sepulveda Boulevard has a varying cross-section. Between Culver Boulevard and Jefferson Boulevard, it has four travel lanes. Between Jefferson Boulevard and Playa Street it has a six lanes. South of Playa Street, it has a five-lane cross-section with three northbound and two southbound lanes. There are left turn pockets at all intersections. Parking regulations and the availability of on-street parking vary by roadway segment. There are left-turn pockets at all intersections.

La Cienega Boulevard has a varying cross-section. Between Blackwelder Street and Rodeo Road, there are six travel lanes from 7AM to 7PM, when there is no stopping anytime. Outside these hours, on-street parking is permitted and the roadway cross-section is four travel lanes. Between Rodeo Road and Slauson Avenue, there are six travel lanes at all times. There are left turn pockets at all intersections.

Overland Avenue generally has four travel lanes and a 35 MPH speed limit. Parking regulations and the availability of on-street parking vary by roadway segment.

Slauson Avenue generally has six travel lanes and a 35 MPH speed limit. The segment between Jefferson Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard had four travel lanes. There are left turn pockets at all intersections. Parking is not permitted on any roadway segments.

Secondary Highways

Sawtelle Boulevard generally has two to four travel lanes and a 35 MPH speed limit. There are left turn pockets at all intersections. Parking regulations and the availability of on-street parking vary by roadway segment.

Playa Street generally has four travel lanes and a 35 MPH speed limit. There are left turn pockets at all intersections. Parking regulations and the availability of on-street parking vary by roadway segment.

Culver Boulevard generally has four travel lanes and a 35 MPH speed limit. Parking regulations and the availability of on-street parking vary by roadway segment.

Duquesne Avenue generally has two travel lanes. Parking regulations and the availability of on-street parking vary by roadway segment.

Public Transit

The WLAC campus is served directly and indirectly via transfer by a number of Culver City Bus and Los Angles County MTA bus lines. Culver City Bus serves the Westside communities of Century City, Culver City, Mar Vista, Marina Del Rey, Palms, Rancho Park, Venice, West Los Angeles, Westchester, and Westwood. There are 6 routes with 4 radiating from the Fox Hills Mall Transit Center on Sepulveda Boulevard and Slauson Avenue, including 3 line-haul services and 3 community circulators. The system connects with the MTA Green Line to the south, to UCLA to the north, from Fairfax Ave. to the east, to Venice Beach to the west. Culver City Buses also connect with the MTA and Santa Monica's Big Blue & Torrance Transit. Culver City Bus operates 7 days a week from approximately 5:30am to 11:30pm. WLAC has a bus stop on campus and is directly served by Line 3, which runs from Century City in the north to Fox Hills Mall in the south, and by Line 4, which runs between Washington Boulevard and Fairfax Avenue to West Los Angeles College and Fox Hills Mall.

According to Culver City Bus authority approximately 600 boardings and alightings occur at the WLAC stop on a weekday.

Level of Service Methodology

The methodology used for the analysis and evaluation of traffic operations at each signalized study intersection is based on procedures outlined in the Transportation Research Board Critical Movement Analysis (CMA) Circular 212, Planning Method for signalized intersections. The TRAFFIX computer model was used to perform the analysis.The CMA method for evaluating signalized intersections involves the computation of volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratios for each critical movement. Capacity is defined as the maximum rate of flow that can pass through a given intersection approach under prevailing traffic and roadway conditions. The sum of all critical movements on a critical lane basis is used to determine the total intersection volume to capacity ratio. As shown in **Table V.M-1**, once the V/C ratio is defined, the applicable Level of Service (LOS) for the intersection can be determined.

Unsignalized intersections and all-way stop controlled intersections are subject to separate capacity analysis methodology which calculates a delay value for each approach to the intersection. As shown in **Table V.M-1**, once the delay is known, the applicable Level of Service (LOS) for the intersection can be determined.

Level of Service describes the quality of traffic flow. Levels of Service A to C denote conditions in which traffic operations are proceeding quite well, with no interruptions in traffic flow due to traffic volumes. Level D, a more constrained condition, with substantial delays during portions of the peak hour. Level E represents volumes at or near roadway capacity, which may result in long lines of waiting vehicles. Level F is a forced-flow condition, occurring when a facility is overloaded and vehicles experience stop-and-go traffic with delays of long duration.

Table V.M-1

Definitions of Level of Service

Level of Service	Description of Operating Characteristics	Volume/Capacity Ratio (signalized)	Delay in Seconds (unsignalized)
A	Excellent. No Vehicle waits longer than one red light and no approach phase is fully used.	< 0.60	< 10
B	Very Good. An occasional approach phase is fully utilized; many drivers begin to feel somewhat restricted within groups of vehicles.	0.60 - 0.70	10 - 15
C	Good. Occasionally, drivers may have to wait through more than one red light; backups may develop behind turning vehicles.	0.70 - 0.80	15-25
D	Fair. Delays may be substantial during portions of the rush hours, but enough lower volume periods occur to permit clearing of developing lines, preventing excessive backups.	0.80 - 0.90	25 - 35

Table V.M-1 (Cont.)

Definitions of Level of Service

Level of Service	Description of Operating Characteristics	Volume/Capacity Ratio (signalized)	Delay in Seconds (unsignalized)
E	Poor. Represents the most vehicles that intersection approaches can accommodate; may be long lines of waiting vehicles through several signal cycles.	0.90 - 1.00	35-50
F	Failure. Backups from nearby intersections or on cross streets may restrict or prevent movement of vehicles out of the intersection approaches. Tremendous delays with continuously increasing queue lengths.	1.00+	50+

Sources: City of Los Angeles Traffic Studies Policies and Procedures, November 1993; and 2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C.

Study Hours of Analysis

The Analysis focuses on the weekday AM and PM peak hour conditions in the study area. In order to capture the peak hours during the peak periods, traffic counts were performed weekdays between 8 and 10 AM, and 4 to 7:30 PM The hours were selected to coincide with traditional weekday travel periods and periods when the College would be expected to have the most potential traffic impact to the local street system.

Existing Traffic Conditions

Traffic volume data was obtained from manual traffic counts. Summaries of the daily and peak hour traffic counts are provided in the appendix to the Traffic Study. In 2002, the College generated an average of 13,851 daily trips, 950 AM peak hour trips and 915 PM peak hour trips. **Figures V.M-2** and **V.M-3** depict the existing (2002) AM and PM peak-hour traffic volumes at the thirty-one study intersections. **Table V.M-2** provides the V/C ratio and level of service for each intersection.

Detailed traffic analyses of existing traffic conditions were performed at thirty-one study intersections. The intersections were selected in consultation with the City of Culver City and Los Angeles Department of Public Works. Three intersections are located in the City of Los Angeles, six are located in Los Angeles County, and 22 are in Culver City. The thirty-one intersections analyzed are as follows:

1. La Cienega Boulevard at Venice Boulevard (City of Los Angeles)
2. Hughes Avenue at Venice Boulevard (City of Los Angeles)
3. Overland Avenue at Venice Boulevard (City of Los Angeles)
4. La Cienega Boulevard at Washington Boulevard
5. National Boulevard at Washington Boulevard
6. Robertson Bl at Higuera St at Washington Bl
7. Hughes Av at Duquesne Av at Washington Bl

Figure V.M-2 – Existing (Year 2002) Weekday AM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Figure V.M-3 – Existing (Year 2002) Weekday PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

8. Overland Avenue at Washington Boulevard
9. Duquesne Avenue at Culver Boulevard
10. Overland Avenue at Culver Boulevard
11. La Cienega Boulevard at Fairfax Avenue
12. La Cienega Boulevard at Jefferson Boulevard
13. La Cienega Boulevard at Rodeo Road
14. Jefferson Boulevard at Higuera Street
15. Jefferson Boulevard at Duquesne Avenue
16. Overland Avenue at Jefferson Boulevard
17. Jefferson Bl at Sepulveda Bl (north intersection)
18. Jefferson Bl at Sepulveda Bl at Sawtelle Bl
19. Overland Avenue at Freshman Dr at Clarmon Pl
20. Overland Avenue at Sawtelle Boulevard
21. Hannum Avenue at Playa Street
22. Sepulveda Bl at Jefferson Bl at Playa Street
23. Jefferson Boulevard at Slauson Avenue
24. Sepulveda Boulevard at Slauson Avenue
25. Buckingham Parkway at Slauson Avenue

26A. La Cienega Bl at Slauson Av (SB Ramps) (Los Angeles County)

26B. La Cienega Bl at Slauson Av (NB Ramps) (Los Angeles County)

27. La Tijera Boulevard at Slauson Avenue (Los Angeles County)
28. Fairfax Avenue at Slauson Avenue (Los Angeles County)
29. La Brea Avenue at Slauson Avenue (Los Angeles County)
30. La Cienega Boulevard at Stocker Street (Los Angeles County)
31. Fairfax Avenue at Stocker Street (Los Angeles County)

Table V.M-2
Summary of Peak Hour Intersection Performance Existing (Year 2002) Conditions

Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
	V/C - LOS	V/C - LOS
1. La Cienega Boulevard/Venice Boulevard	1.266 F	1.150 F
2. Hughes Avenue/Venice Boulevard	0.884 D	0.827 D
3. Overland Avenue/Venice Boulevard	1.130 F	1.056 F
4. La Cienega Boulevard/Washington Boulevard	0.896 D	0.868 D
5. National Boulevard/Washington Boulevard	0.942 E	0.854 D
6. Robertson Bl/Higuera St/Washington Bl	0.661 B	0.616 B
7. Hughes Av/Duquesne Av/Washington Bl	0.634 B	0.796 C
8. Overland Avenue/Washington Boulevard	0.931 E	1.005 F
9. Duquesne Avenue/Culver Boulevard	0.635 B	0.670 B
10. Overland Avenue/Culver Boulevard	1.073 F	1.033 F
11. La Cienega Boulevard/Fairfax Avenue	0.608 B	0.738 C
12. La Cienega Boulevard/Jefferson Boulevard	0.909 E	1.198 F
13. La Cienega Boulevard/Rodeo Road	0.968 E	1.089 F
14. Jefferson Boulevard/Higuera Street	0.766 C	0.908 E
15. Jefferson Boulevard/Duquesne Avenue	0.789 C	0.801 D
16. Overland Avenue/Jefferson Boulevard	1.002 F	1.015 F
17. Jefferson Bl/Sepulveda Bl (north intersection)	0.668 B	1.117 F
18. Jefferson Bl/Sepulveda Bl/Sawtelle Bl	0.728 C	0.774 C
19. Overland Avenue/Freshman Dr/Clarmon Pl	0.496 A	0.097 A
20. Overland Avenue/Sawtelle Boulevard	21.3 sec- C	75.8 sec - F
21. Hannum Avenue/Playa Street	0.780 C	0.983 E
22. Sepulveda Bl/Jefferson Bl/Playa Street	0.852 D	0.852 D
23. Jefferson Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.455 A	1.015 F
24. Sepulveda Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.667 B	1.071 F
25. Buckingham Parkway/Slauson Avenue	0.628 B	0.766 C
26A. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (SB Ramps)	0.704 C	0.942 E
26B. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (NB Ramps)	0.720 C	1.195 F
27. La Tijera Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.629 B	0.606 B
28. Fairfax Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.656 B	0.711 C
29. La Brea Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.773 C	1.116 F
30. La Cienega Boulevard/Stocker Street	1.192 F	1.186 F
31. Fairfax Avenue/Stocker Street	0.539 A	0.691 B

As shown on Table V.M-2, there are nine intersections that operate at poor levels of service during the AM peak hour and seventeen during the PM peak hour.

Threshold of Significance

The traffic study prepared for the project analyzed thirty-one intersections located in three separate jurisdictions, Culver City, City of Los Angeles, and Los Angeles County. Both Culver City and the City of Los Angeles criteria for determining project significance is the same. Both jurisdictions compare the project-generated trips against a baseline consisting of existing traffic plus ambient growth plus related project trips. For intersections within the County of Los Angeles, the process for determining significant impacts is slightly different. The numerical criteria are the same as the City of Culver City and the City of Los Angeles, but the baseline is different. The County uses as its baseline the existing traffic plus ambient growth, but not related project trips. In practice, however, since most of the intersections around the College are expected to operate at LOS E or F, with or without related project trips, the determination of significance is essentially the same in unincorporated County as for the two cities. An increase in the volume-to-capacity ratio of more than 0.010 for a congested intersection is considered significant in the County, just as it is in the two cities. In this section, County intersections will be evaluated as if they were in the City of Culver City for significant impacts. Later in this section, further analysis is conducted to determine whether the different baselines alter that determination.

The Cities of Culver City and Los Angeles Guidelines for determining a significant transportation impact at an intersection is provided in **Table V.M-3**. The County's criteria is presented in **Table V.M-4**.

Table V.M-3

Significant Impact Criteria - Culver City and City of Los Angeles

Final V/C Ratio	Level of Service	Project-Related Increase in V/C
0.701 - 0.800	C	equal to or greater than 0.040
0.801 - 0.900	D	equal to or greater than 0.020
0.900+	E, F	equal to or greater than 0.010

Table V.M-4

Significant Impact Criteria - County of Los Angeles

Final V/C Ratio*	Level of Service	Project-Related Increase in V/C
0.701 - 0.800	C	equal to or greater than 0.040
0.801 - 0.900	D	equal to or greater than 0.020
0.900+	E, F	equal to or greater than 0.010
*Final v/c shall mean the v/c ratio at an intersection considering impacts with the project and without proposed traffic mitigation.		

Project Impacts

Traffic Growth and Related Projects

Based on input from City of Culver City staff, a 1% compound annual growth rate was used to account for ambient traffic growth. The growth rate was interpolated from rates used by the City of Los Angeles for parts of that city surrounding Culver City. This 1% ambient growth rate is generally compatible with rates derived from the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan. The compounded ambient growth rate also accounts for the additional traffic that Culver City's street system may realize as Playa Del Rey and LAX continue to grow.

Also included in the future year analysis were related projects proposed or under construction. Information regarding related projects was obtained from the City of Culver City. The expected traffic generation of these related projects was calculated and is included in Appendix 8. The distribution of trips for the related projects was prepared by Katz, Okitsu & Associates based on local knowledge of project area traffic patterns.

2015 No Project Conditions

To determine the 2015 No Project traffic volumes, the related projects traffic was combined with the existing peak-hour traffic volumes increased by 1% per year. The resulting 2015 No Project intersection traffic volume estimates are shown in **Figures V.M -4** and **V.M-5** for the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. Shown in **Table V.M-5**, these are the baseline values used in analyzing project related traffic impacts for Phase I development. They represent a conservative condition due to several factors, including: some projects may implement traffic reduction programs, transit usage may increase, the effect of internal trip linkages and pass-by/diverted trips may not have been credited for all projects; and the possibility that not all of the related projects would be built as designed or at all.

Figure V.M-4 – 2015 No Project Weekday AM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Figure V.M-5 – 2015 No Project Weekday PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Table V.M-5
Summary of Peak Hour Intersection Performance for Year 2015 No Project Conditions

Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
	V/C - LOS	V/C - LOS
1. La Cienega Boulevard/Venice Boulevard	1.507 F	1.377 F
2. Hughes Avenue/Venice Boulevard	1.018 F	0.959 E
3. Overland Avenue/Venice Boulevard	1.301 F	1.213 F
4. La Cienega Boulevard/Washington Boulevard	1.064 F	1.045 F
5. National Boulevard/Washington Boulevard	1.100 F	0.999 E
6. Robertson Bl/Higuera St/Washington Bl	0.761 C	0.741 C
7. Hughes Av/Duquesne Av/Washington Bl	0.730 C	0.914 E
8. Overland Avenue/Washington Boulevard	1.070 F	1.156 F
9. Duquesne Avenue/Culver Boulevard	0.824 D	0.974 E
10. Overland Avenue/Culver Boulevard	1.429 F	1.601 F
11. La Cienega Boulevard/Fairfax Avenue	0.716 C	0.856 D
12. La Cienega Boulevard/Jefferson Boulevard	1.177 F	1.529 F
13. La Cienega Boulevard/Rodeo Road	1.153 F	1.298 F
14. Jefferson Boulevard/Higuera Street	1.035 F	1.369 F
15. Jefferson Boulevard/Duquesne Avenue	1.043 F	1.166 F
16. Overland Avenue/Jefferson Boulevard	1.440 F	1.694 F
17. Jefferson Bl/Sepulveda Bl (north intersection)	0.763 C	1.217 F
18. Jefferson Bl/Sepulveda Bl/Sawtelle Bl	0.982 E	1.148 F
19. Overland Avenue/Freshman Dr/Clarmon Pl	0.565 A	0.110 A
20. Overland Avenue/Sawtelle Boulevard	F	F
21. Hannum Avenue/Playa Street	0.896 D	1.133 F
22. Sepulveda Bl/Jefferson Bl/Playa Street	1.213 F	1.611 F
23. Jefferson Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.730 C	1.548 F
24. Sepulveda Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.827 D	1.420 F
25. Buckingham Parkway/Slauson Avenue	0.746 C	0.964 E
26A. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (SB Ramps)	0.837 D	1.024 F
26B. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (NB Ramps)	0.890 D	1.549 F
27. La Tijera Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.736 C	0.760 C
28. Fairfax Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.765 C	0.878 D
29. La Brea Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.904 E	1.352 F
30. La Cienega Boulevard/Stocker Street	1.384 F	1.391 F
31. Fairfax Avenue/Stocker Street	0.615 B	0.787 C

The results of the level-of-service calculations show that there are seventeen intersections that will operate at poor levels of service during the AM peak hour and twenty-five during the PM peak hour in the year 2015 because of the increased traffic resulting from ambient traffic growth and the development of related projects.

Project Trip Generation

During the preliminary environmental assessment prepared for the project, empirical data was collected to document trip generation at the College based on enrollment during the Spring 2002 semester. The collected data was adjusted to estimate the College's trip generation during the third week of the semester.[1] Using this data as a basis, trip generation was calculated for the actual Fall 2002 enrollment and for the anticipated enrollment for future years. The College improvements specified under both Phase I and Phase II of the Master Plan are designed to accommodate the anticipated increase in student enrollment, and the supporting additions that will come with the student increase. These supporting uses include the future ice rink, athletic fields and associated improvements. It is anticipated that there may be an increase in non-curricular uses, such as high school sports, commensurate with the increase in the College enrollment. Therefore, forecasted project trips for the horizon years identified in this study, the Year 2015 and the Year 2022, are a function of student enrollment at those times. Trip generation rates and forecast volumes for the future horizon years are provided in **Table V.M-6**.

Table V.M-6
WLAC Weekday Trip Generation

Year (Fall Semester)	Total Campus Population*	Average Daily Trips**	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
			Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
2002	9,803	13,851	950	880	90	915	633	282
2015	16,077	23,885	1,637	1,484	155	1,579	1,093	486
2022	20,152	29,939	2,052	1,860	194	1,979	1,369	609

*Sum of student and staff headcount.
** Each trip is the one directional travel either to or from the campus. Therefore, in order to calculate the number of roundtrips generated by the College, these values would be reduced by one-half.
Source: Kaku Associates, 2002

2015 With Project Conditions

In the year 2015, the College is anticipated to generate 23,885 average daily trips (ADT), 1,637 AM peak hour trips, and 1,579 PM peak hour trips. This represents an increase of 10,034 ADT, 687 AM peak hour trips, and 664 PM peak hour trips. To determine the 2015 With Project traffic volumes, the project traffic generation was combined with the 2015 No Project conditions discussed previously. Katz, Okitsu & Associates developed project trip distribution forecasts based on area knowledge and student address zip code data provided by the College. The resulting 2015 With Project intersection traffic volume estimates are shown in **Figures V.M-6** and **V.M-7** for the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. **Table V.M-7** compares the v/c and LOS for the 2015 No Project and With Project condition.

[1] Activity on college campuses is typically highest during the first two weeks of a semester and gradually declines from the third week through the end of the semester. Thus, data collected is adjusted to reflect the "worst-case" trip generation.

Figure V.M-6 – 2015 With Project Weekday AM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Figure V.M-7 – 2015 With Project Weekday PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Table V.M-7

Summary of Peak Hour Intersection Performance for Year 2015 With Project

	AM Peak Hour						PM Peak Hour					
	2015 No Project		2015 With Project		V/C Change	Impact	2015 No Project		2015 With Project		V/C Change	Impact
Intersection	**V/C-LOS**		**V/C-LOS**				**V/C-LOS**		**V/C-LOS**			
1. La Cienega Boulevard/Venice Boulevard	1.507	F	1.510	F	0.003	LTS	1.377	F	1.380	F	0.003	LTS
2. Hughes Avenue/Venice Boulevard	1.018	F	1.018	F	0.000	LTS	0.959	E	0.959	E	0.000	LTS
3. Overland Avenue/Venice Boulevard	1.301	F	1.306	F	0.005	LTS	1.213	F	1.221	F	0.008	LTS
4. La Cienega Boulevard/Washington Boulevard	1.064	F	1.064	F	0.000	LTS	1.045	F	1.045	F	0.000	LTS
5. National Boulevard/Washington Boulevard	1.100	F	1.100	F	0.000	LTS	0.999	E	0.999	E	0.000	LTS
6. Robertson Bl/Higuera St/Washington Bl	0.761	C	0.761	C	0.000	LTS	0.741	C	0.741	C	0.000	LTS
7. Hughes Av/Duquesne Av/Washington Bl	0.730	C	0.730	C	0.000	LTS	0.914	E	0.914	E	0.000	LTS
8. Overland Avenue/Washington Boulevard	1.070	F	1.107	F	0.037	**SI**	1.156	F	1.160	F	0.004	LTS
9. Duquesne Avenue/Culver Boulevard	0.824	D	0.835	D	0.011	LTS	0.974	E	0.978	E	0.004	LTS
10. Overland Avenue/Culver Boulevard	1.429	F	1.454	F	0.025	**SI**	1.601	F	1.629	F	0.028	**SI**
11. La Cienega Boulevard/Fairfax Avenue	0.716	C	0.716	C	0.000	LTS	0.856	D	0.856	D	0.000	LTS
12. La Cienega Boulevard/Jefferson Boulevard	1.177	F	1.199	F	0.022	**SI**	1.529	F	1.536	F	0.007	LTS
13. La Cienega Boulevard/Rodeo Road	1.153	F	1.153	F	0.000	LTS	1.298	F	1.305	F	0.007	LTS
14. Jefferson Boulevard/Higuera Street	1.035	F	1.120	F	0.085	**SI**	1.369	F	1.398	F	0.029	**SI**
15. Jefferson Boulevard/Duquesne Avenue	1.043	F	1.149	F	0.106	**SI**	1.166	F	1.201	F	0.035	**SI**
16. Overland Avenue/Jefferson Boulevard	1.440	F	1.444	F	0.004	LTS	1.694	F	1.699	F	0.005	LTS
17. Jefferson Bl/Sepulveda Bl (north intersection)	0.763	C	0.763	C	0.000	LTS	1.217	F	1.217	F	0.000	LTS

Table V.M-7 (Cont.)

Summary of Peak Hour Intersection Performance for Year 2015 With Project

	AM Peak Hour						PM Peak Hour					
	2015 No Project		2015 With Project		V/C Change	Impact	2015 No Project		2015 With Project		V/C Change	Impact
Intersection	**V/C-LOS**		**V/C-LOS**				**V/C-LOS**		**V/C-LOS**			
18. Jefferson Bl/Sepulveda Bl/Sawtelle Bl	0.982	E	0.982	E	0.000	LTS	1.148	F	1.148	F	0.000	LTS
19. Overland Avenue/Freshman Dr/Clarmon Pl	0.565	A	0.736	C	0.171	LTS	0.110	A	0.319	A	0.209	LTS
20. Overland Avenue/Sawtelle Boulevard	*	F	*	F	n/a	LTS	*	F	*	F	n/a	LTS
21. Hannum Avenue/Playa Street	0.896	D	1.018	F	0.122	**SI**	1.133	F	1.238	F	0.105	**SI**
22. Sepulveda Bl/Jefferson Bl/Playa Street	1.213	F	1.228	F	0.015	**SI**	1.611	F	1.611	F	0.000	LTS
23. Jefferson Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.730	C	0.731	C	0.001	LTS	1.548	F	1.553	F	0.005	LTS
24. Sepulveda Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.827	D	0.842	D	0.015	LTS	1.420	F	1.427	F	0.007	LTS
25. Buckingham Parkway/Slauson Avenue	0.746	C	0.761	C	0.015	LTS	0.964	E	0.969	E	0.005	LTS
26A. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (SB Ramps)	0.837	D	0.838	D	0.001	LTS	1.024	F	1.029	F	0.005	LTS
26B. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (NB Ramps)	0.890	D	0.913	E	0.023	**SI**	1.549	F	1.567	F	0.018	**SI**
27. La Tijera Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.736	C	0.736	C	0.000	LTS	0.760	C	0.760	C	0.000	LTS
28. Fairfax Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.765	C	0.765	C	0.000	LTS	0.878	D	0.878	D	0.000	LTS
29. La Brea Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.904	E	0.904	E	0.000	LTS	1.352	F	1.352	F	0.000	LTS
30. La Cienega Boulevard/Stocker Street	1.384	F	1.384	F	0.000	LTS	1.391	F	1.391	F	0.000	LTS
31. Fairfax Avenue/Stocker Street	0.615	B	0.615	B	0.000	LTS	0.787	C	0.787	C	0.000	LTS

LTS - Less than Significant Impact
SI - Significant Impact
* unsignalized intersection

The results of the calculations show that Phase I of the proposed project results in potentially significant impacts at 8 intersections during the AM peak hour and 5 during the PM peak hour. This is due in part to the amount of congestion anticipated for the study intersections. When an intersection is operating at a more congested LOS, it takes less of a project contribution to trigger a significant impact conclusion. For example, 1% project-related increase in traffic would be considered a significant impact at an intersection operating at LOS E or F, but would be less than significant at an intersection operating at LOS D.

2022 No Project Conditions

To determine the 2022 No Project traffic volumes, the related projects traffic was combined with the existing peak-hour traffic volumes increased by 1% per year. The resulting 2022 No Project intersection traffic volume estimates are shown in **Figures V.M-8** and **V.M-9** for the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. Shown in **Table V.M-8**, these are the baseline values used in analyzing project related traffic impacts for Phase I and II development in the year 2022. They represent a conservative condition due to several factors, including: some projects may implement traffic reduction programs, transit usage may increase, the effect of internal trip linkages and pass-by/diverted trips may not have been credited for all projects; and the possibility that not all of the related projects would be built as designed or at all.

Figure V.M-8 – 2022 No Project Weekday AM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Figure V.M-9 – 2022 No Project Weekday PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Table V.M-8

Summary of Peak Hour Intersection Performance for Year 2022 No Project Conditions

Intersection	**AM Peak Hour**	**PM Peak Hour**
	V/C - LOS	**V/C - LOS**
1. La Cienega Boulevard/Venice Boulevard	1.621 F	1.480 F
2. Hughes Avenue/Venice Boulevard	1.094 F	1.026 F
3. Overland Avenue/Venice Boulevard	1.403 F	1.308 F
4. La Cienega Boulevard/Washington Boulevard	1.145 F	1.123 F
5. National Boulevard/Washington Boulevard	1.185 F	1.076 F
6. Robertson Bl/Higuera St/Washington Bl	0.821 D	0.795 C
7. Hughes Av/Duquesne Av/Washington Bl	0.787 C	0.986 E
8. Overland Avenue/Washington Boulevard	1.154 F	1.247 F
9. Duquesne Avenue/Culver Boulevard	0.888 D	1.033 F
10. Overland Avenue/Culver Boulevard	1.520 F	1.690 F
11. La Cienega Boulevard/Fairfax Avenue	0.771 C	0.922 E
12. La Cienega Boulevard/Jefferson Boulevard	1.258 F	1.637 F
13. La Cienega Boulevard/Rodeo Road	1.240 F	1.396 F
14. Jefferson Boulevard/Higuera Street	1.104 F	1.451 F
15. Jefferson Boulevard/Duquesne Avenue	1.114 F	1.234 F
16. Overland Avenue/Jefferson Boulevard	1.530 F	1.757 F
17. Jefferson Bl/Sepulveda Bl (north intersection)	0.823 D	1.278 F
18. Jefferson Bl/Sepulveda Bl/Sawtelle Bl	1.046 F	1.218 F
19. Overland Avenue/Freshman Dr/Clarmon Pl	0.609 B	0.119 A
20. Overland Avenue/Sawtelle Boulevard	F	F
21. Hannum Avenue/Playa Street	0.967 E	1.222 F
22. Sepulveda Bl/Jefferson Bl/Playa Street	1.290 F	1.688 F
23. Jefferson Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.771 C	1.639 F
24. Sepulveda Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.887 D	1.516 F
25. Buckingham Parkway/Slauson Avenue	0.803 D	1.033 F
26A. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (SB Ramps)	0.990 E	1.287 F
26B. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (NB Ramps)	0.955 E	1.657 F
27. La Tijera Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.787 C	0.812 D
28. Fairfax Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.816 D	0.936 E
29. La Brea Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.974 E	1.452 F
30. La Cienega Boulevard/Stocker Street	1.491 F	1.498 F
31. Fairfax Avenue/Stocker Street	0.663 B	0.849 D

The results of the level-of-service calculations show that there are 20 intersections that will operate at poor levels of service during the AM peak hour and 28 during the PM peak hour in the year 2022 because of the increased traffic resulting from ambient traffic growth and the development of related projects.

2022 With Project Conditions (No Second Access Road)

In the year 2022, the College is anticipated to generate 29,939 average daily trips (ADT), 2,052 AM peak hour trips, and 1,979 PM peak hour trips. This represents an increase of 16,088 ADT, 1,102 AM peak hour trips, and 1,064 PM peak hour trips. To determine the 2022 With Project (No Second Access) traffic volumes, the project traffic generation was combined with the 2022 No Project conditions discussed previously. Katz, Okitsu & Associates developed project trip distribution forecasts based on area knowledge and student address zip code data provided by the College. This section is provided in order to compare the effects that the three potential locations for the Phase II second access road would have on area traffic. The resulting 2022 With Project (No Second Access) intersection traffic volume estimates are shown in **Figures V.M-10** and **V.M-11** for the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. **Table V.M-9** compares the v/c and LOS for the 2015 No Project and With Project condition.

Figure V.M-10 – 2022 With Project (No Second Access) Weekday AM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Figure V.M-11 – 2022 With Project (No Second Access) Weekday PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Table V.M-9

Summary of Peak Hour Intersection Performance for Year 2022 With Project (No Second Access Road)

	AM Peak Hour						**PM Peak Hour**					
	2022 No Project		**2022 With Project (No Second Access)**		**V/C Change**	**Impact**	**2022 No Project**		**2022 With Project (No Second Access)**		**V/C Change**	**Impact**
Intersection	**V/C-LOS**		**V/C-LOS**				**V/C-LOS**		**V/C-LOS**			
1. La Cienega Boulevard/Venice Boulevard	1.621	F	1.626	F	0.005	LTS	1.480	F	1.486	F	0.006	LTS
2. Hughes Avenue/Venice Boulevard	1.094	F	1.094	F	0.000	LTS	1.026	F	1.026	F	0.000	LTS
3. Overland Avenue/Venice Boulevard	1.403	F	1.411	F	0.008	LTS	1.308	F	1.321	F	0.013	LTS
4. La Cienega Boulevard/Washington Boulevard	1.145	F	1.145	F	0.000	LTS	1.123	F	1.123	F	0.000	LTS
5. National Boulevard/Washington Boulevard	1.185	F	1.185	F	0.000	LTS	1.076	F	1.076	F	0.000	LTS
6. Robertson Bl/Higuera St/Washington Bl	0.821	D	0.821	D	0.000	LTS	0.795	C	0.795	C	0.000	LTS
7. Hughes Av/Duquesne Av/Washington Bl	0.787	C	0.787	C	0.000	LTS	0.986	E	0.986	E	0.000	LTS
8. Overland Avenue/Washington Boulevard	1.154	F	1.215	F	0.060	**SI**	1.247	F	1.252	F	0.005	LTS
9. Duquesne Avenue/Culver Boulevard	0.888	D	0.906	E	0.018	**SI**	1.033	F	1.036	F	0.003	LTS
10. Overland Avenue/Culver Boulevard	1.520	F	1.561	F	0.041	**SI**	1.690	F	1.734	F	0.044	**SI**
11. La Cienega Boulevard/Fairfax Avenue	0.771	C	0.771	C	0.000	LTS	0.922	E	0.922	E	0.000	LTS
12. La Cienega Boulevard/Jefferson Boulevard	1.258	F	1.294	F	0.036	**SI**	1.637	F	1.648	F	0.011	**SI**
13. La Cienega Boulevard/Rodeo Road	1.240	F	1.240	F	0.000	LTS	1.396	F	1.407	F	0.011	**SI**
14. Jefferson Boulevard/Higuera Street	1.104	F	1.242	F	0.150	**SI**	1.451	F	1.501	F	0.050	**SI**
15. Jefferson Boulevard/Duquesne Avenue	1.114	F	1.286	F	0.172	**SI**	1.234	F	1.292	F	0.058	**SI**

Table V.M-9 (Cont.)

Summary of Peak Hour Intersection Performance for Year 2022 With Project (No Second Access Road)

	AM Peak Hour						PM Peak Hour					
	2022 No Project		2022 With Project (No Second Access)		V/C Change	Impact	2022 No Project		2022 With Project (No Second Access)		V/C Change	Impact
Intersection	**V/C-LOS**		**V/C-LOS**				**V/C-LOS**		**V/C-LOS**			
16. Overland Avenue/Jefferson Boulevard	1.530	F	1.608	F	0.078	**SI**	1.757	F	1.863	F	0.106	**SI**
17. Jefferson Bl/Sepulveda Bl (north intersection)	0.823	D	0.823	D	0.000	LTS	1.278	F	1.278	F	0.000	LTS
18. Jefferson Bl/Sepulveda Bl/Sawtelle Bl	1.046	F	1.046	F	0.000	LTS	1.218	F	1.218	F	0.000	LTS
19. Overland Avenue/Freshman Dr/Clarmon Pl	0.609	B	0.892	D	0.283	**SI**	0.119	A	0.453	A	0.334	LTS
20. Overland Avenue/Sawtelle Boulevard	*	F	*	F	n/a	LTS	*	F	*	F	n/a	LTS
21. Hannum Avenue/Playa Street	0.967	E	1.164	F	0.197	**SI**	1.222	F	1.389	F	0.167	**SI**
22. Sepulveda Bl/Jefferson Bl/Playa Street	1.290	F	1.314	F	0.024	**SI**	1.688	F	1.688	F	0.000	LTS
23. Jefferson Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.771	C	0.772	C	0.001	LTS	1.639	F	1.648	F	0.009	LTS
24. Sepulveda Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.887	D	0.911	E	0.024	**SI**	1.516	F	1.528	F	0.012	**SI**
25. Buckingham Parkway/Slauson Avenue	0.803	D	0.826	D	0.023	**SI**	1.033	F	1.041	F	0.008	LTS
26A. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (SB Ramps)	0.990	E	0.990	E	0.000	LTS	1.287	F	1.295	F	0.008	LTS
26B. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (NB Ramps)	0.955	E	0.992	E	0.037	**SI**	1.657	F	1.685	F	0.028	**SI**
27. La Tijera Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.787	C	0.787	C	0.000	LTS	0.812	D	0.812	D	0.000	LTS
28. Fairfax Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.816	D	0.816	D	0.000	LTS	0.936	E	0.936	E	0.000	LTS
29. La Brea Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.974	E	0.974	E	0.000	LTS	1.452	F	1.452	F	0.000	LTS

Table V.M-9 (Cont.)

Summary of Peak Hour Intersection Performance for Year 2022 With Project (No Second Access Road)

	AM Peak Hour						PM Peak Hour					
	2022 No Project		2022 With Project (No Second Access)		V/C Change	Impact	2022 No Project		2022 With Project (No Second Access)		V/C Change	Impact
Intersection	V/C-LOS		V/C-LOS				V/C-LOS		V/C-LOS			
30. La Cienega Boulevard/Stocker Street	1.491	F	1.491	F	0.000	LTS	1.498	F	1.498	F	0.000	LTS
31. Fairfax Avenue/Stocker Street	0.663	B	0.663	B	0.000	LTS	0.849	D	0.849	D	0.000	LTS

LTS - Less than Significant Impact
SI - Significant Impact
* unsignalized intersection

The results of the calculations show that without construction of a second access road, the proposed project results in potentially significant impacts at thirteen intersections during the AM peak hour and nine during the PM peak hour. This is due in part to the amount of congestion anticipated for the study intersections. When an intersection is operating at a more congested LOS, it takes less of a project contribution to trigger a significant impact conclusion. For example, 1% project-related increase in traffic would be considered a significant impact at an intersection operating at LOS E or F, but would be less than significant at an intersection operating at LOS D.

2022 With Project Conditions (Second Access Road)

The proposed project includes the construction of a second access road during Phase II. At the time the College was founded, the Los Angeles County Highway Plan, a sub-element of the Transportation Element of the County General Plan, indicated for Stocker Street to provide an intermediate route for east-west traffic. While some of the route was constructed much remained undeveloped. In 1997, the County Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution Plan Amendment 96164-(2) which amended the County Highway Plan to delete the proposed extension of Stocker Street between La Cienega Boulevard westerly to Culver City. At the time this amendment was being considered, the College expressed concerns about a need for a second means of access to the campus. In response to this concern, Resolution Plan Amendment 96164-(2) amended the Transportation Element of the General Plan, adding Policy 13.1 which states "In coordination with Culver City, consider provision of secondary and emergency access to West Los Angeles College when developing plans for open space or other use of adjacent areas of the Baldwin Hills". The FMP identifies three potential routes all generally to the north for the location of the second access road. No particular alignment has been selected or approved, and neither the LACCD nor the WLAC has committed to the acquisition of any property for any roadway alignment. Therefore, this section discusses and compares the effect the Project plus each of the three potential road alignments would have on future 2022 No Project conditions. **Table V.M-10** provides this comparison for the AM peak hour, while **Table V.M-11** compares the PM peak hour. In all cases, it is anticipated that the road would serve the College and is not intended to provide through traffic. The three conceptual access alternatives are listed below and shown on Figure III-6 in the Project Description.

Alternative A provides a northerly connection to the intersection of Jefferson Boulevard and Duquesne Avenue through the Culver City Park. This alternative would result in the diversion of College trips to the north and to the east, away from the existing project entrance on Freshman Drive.

Alternative B provides a northerly connection through the Baldwin Hills oil fields to Jefferson Boulevard via Hetzler Road. Alternative B would have similar diversion characteristics to Alternative A except that the diverted trips would not travel through the existing Jefferson Boulevard/Duquesne Avenue intersection.

Alternatives C provides access from the north via Sophomore Drive eastward to La Cienega Boulevard. Alternative C would provide for diversion of trips with origins and destination similar to those diverted for Alternative B. The diverted trips, however, would bypass congested intersections north and northeast of the project site.

Table V.M-10

2022 AM Peak Hour Impact Comparison of Second Access Roads

	2022 No Project	2022 With Project							
		No Second Access		Access Road A		Access Road B		Access Road C	
INTERSECTION	**V/C - LOS**	**V/C - LOS**	**Impact**	**V/C - LOS**	**Impact**	**V/C - LOS**	**Impact**	**V/C - LOS**	**Impact**
1. La Cienega Boulevard/Venice Boulevard	1.621 F	1.626 F	LTS	1.626 F	LTS	1.626 F	LTS	1.626 F	LTS
2. Hughes Avenue/Venice Boulevard	1.094 F	1.094 F	LTS	1.094 F	LTS	1.094 F	LTS	1.094 F	LTS
3. Overland Avenue/Venice Boulevard	1.403 F	1.411 F	LTS	1.411 F	LTS	1.411 F	LTS	1.411 F	LTS
4. La Cienega Boulevard/Washington Boulevard	1.145 F	1.145 F	LTS	1.147 F	LTS	1.147 F	LTS	1.147 F	LTS
5. National Boulevard/Washington Boulevard	1.185 F	1.185 F	LTS	1.185 F	LTS	1.185 F	LTS	1.185 F	LTS
6. Roberston Bl/Higuera St/Washington Bl	0.821 D	0.821 D	LTS	0.821 D	LTS	0.821 D	LTS	0.821 D	LTS
7. Hughes Av/Duquesne Av/Washinton Bl	0.787 C	0.787 C	LTS	0.787 C	LTS	0.787 C	LTS	0.787 C	LTS
8. Overland Avenue/Washington Boulevard	1.154 F	1.215 F	**SI**	1.215 F	**SI**	1.215 F	**SI**	1.215 F	**SI**
9. Duquesne Avenue/Culver Boulevard	0.888 D	0.906 E	SI	0.902 E	SI	0.902 E	SI	0.902 D	SI
10. Overland Avenue/Culver Boulevard	1.520 F	1.561 F	SI	1.553 F	SI	1.553 F	SI	1.553 F	SI
11. La Cienega Boulevard/Fairfax Avenue	0.771 C	0.771 C	LTS	0.773 C	LTS	0.773 C	LTS	0.773 C	LTS
12. La Cienega Boulevard/Jefferson Boulevard	1.258 F	1.294 F	SI	1.269 F	SI	1.269 F	SI	1.269 F	SI
13. La Cienega Boulevard/Rodeo Road	1.240 F	1.240 F	LTS	1.240 F	LTS	1.269 F	SI	1.337 F	SI
14. Jefferson Boulevard/Higuera Street	1.104 F	1.242 F	SI	1.114 F	SI	1.114 F	SI	1.104 F	LTS
15. Jefferson Boulevard/Duquesne Avenue	1.114 F	1.286 F	SI	1.125 F	SI	1.117 F	LTS	1.114 F	LTS
16. Overland Avenue/Jefferson Boulevard	1.530 F	1.608 F	SI	1.536 F	LTS	1.536 F	LTS	1.536 F	LTS
17. Jefferson B//Sepulveda Bl (north intersection)	0.823 D	0.823 D	LTS	0.823 D	LTS	0.823 D	LTS	0.823 D	LTS
18. Jefferson Bl/Sepulveda Bl/Sawtelle Bl	1.046 F	1.046 F	LTS	1.046 F	LTS	1.046 F	LTS	1.046 F	LTS
19. Overland Avenue/Freshman Dr/Clarmon Pl	0.609 B	0.892 D	SI	0.688 B	LTS	0.679 B	LTS	0.676 B	LTS
20. Overland Avenue/Sawtelle Boulevard	F	F	LTS	F	LTS	F	LTS	F	LTS
21. Hannum Avenue/Playa Street	0.967 E	1.164 F	SI	1.164 F	SI	1.164 F	SI	1.164 F	SI
22. Sepulveda Bl/Jefferson Bl/Playa Street	1.290 F	1.314 F	SI	1.314 F	SI	1.314 F	SI	1.314 F	SI
23. Jefferson Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.771 C	0.772 C	LTS	0.772 C	LTS	0.772 C	LTS	0.772 C	LTS
24. Sepulveda Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.887 D	0.911 E	SI	0.911 E	SI	0.911 E	SI	0.911 E	SI
25. Buckingham Parkway/Slauson Avenue	0.803 D	0.826 D	SI	0.826 D	SI	0.826 D	SI	0.826 D	SI

Table V.M-10 (Cont.)

2022 AM Peak Hour Impact Comparison of Second Access Roads

	2022 No Project	2022 With Project							
		No Second Access		Access Road A		Access Road B		Access Road C	
INTERSECTION	V/C - LOS	V/C - LOS	Impact	V/C - LOS	Impact	V/C - LOS	Impact	V/C - LOS	Impact
26A. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (SB Ramps)	0.990 E	0.990 E	LTS	0.990 E	LTS	0.990 E	LTS	0.990 E	LTS
26B. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (NB Ramps)	0.955 E	0.992 E	SI	0.992 E	SI	0.992 E	SI	0.992 E	SI
27. La Tijera Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.787 C	0.787 C	LTS	0.787 C	LTS	0.787 C	LTS	0.787 C	LTS
28. Fairfax Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.816 D	0.816 D	LTS	0.816 D	LTS	0.816 D	LTS	0.816 D	LTS
29. La Brea Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.974 E	0.974 E	LTS	0.974 E	LTS	0.974 E	LTS	0.974 E	LTS
30. La Cienega Boulevard/Stocker Street	1.491 F	1.491 F	LTS	1.491 F	LTS	1.491 F	LTS	1.491 F	LTS
31. Fairfax Avenue/Stocker Street	0.663 B	0.663 B	LTS	0.663 B	LTS	0.663 B	LTS	0.663 B	LTS

LTS - Less than Significant
SI - Significant Impact

Table V.M-11

2022 PM Peak Hour Impact Comparison of Second Access Roads

	2022 No Project	2022 With Project							
		No Second Access		Access Road A		Access Road B		Access Road C	
INTERSECTION	V/C - LOS	V/C - LOS	Impact	V/C - LOS	Impact	V/C - LOS	Impact	V/C - LOS	Impact
1. La Cienega Boulevard/Venice Boulevard	1.480 F	1.487 F	LTS	1.485 F	LTS	1.485 F	LTS	1.485 F	LTS
2. Hughes Avenue/Venice Boulevard	1.026 F	1.026 F	LTS	1.026 F	LTS	1.026 F	LTS	1.026 F	LTS
3. Overland Avenue/Venice Boulevard	1.308 F	1.321 F	LTS	1.321 F	LTS	1.321 F	LTS	1.321 F	LTS
4. La Cienega Boulevard/Washington Boulevard	1.123 F	1.123 F	LTS	1.124 F	LTS	1.124 F	LTS	1.124 F	LTS
5. National Boulevard/Washington Boulevard	1.076 F	1.076 F	LTS	1.076 F	LTS	1.076 F	LTS	1.076 F	LTS
6. Roberston Bl/Higuera St/Washington Bl	0.795 C	0.795 C	LTS	0.795 C	LTS	0.795 C	LTS	0.795 C	LTS
7. Hughes Av/Duquesne Av/Washinton Bl	0.986 E	0.986 E	LTS	0.986 E	LTS	0.986 E	LTS	0.986 E	LTS
8. Overland Avenue/Washington Boulevard	1.247 F	1.252 F	LTS	1.252 F	LTS	1.252 F	LTS	1.252 F	LTS
9. Duquesne Avenue/Culver Boulevard	1.033 F	1.036 F	LTS	1.037 F	LTS	1.037 F	LTS	1.037 F	LTS
10. Overland Avenue/Culver Boulevard	1.690 F	1.734 F	SI	1.728 F	SI	1.728 F	SI	1.728 F	SI
11. La Cienega Boulevard/Fairfax Avenue	0.922 E	0.922 E	LTS	0.924 E	LTS	0.924 E	LTS	0.924 E	LTS

Table V.M-11(Cont.)

2022 PM Peak Hour Impact Comparison of Second Access Roads

	2022 No Project	2022 With Project							
		No Second Access		Access Road A		Access Road B		Access Road C	
INTERSECTION	**V/C - LOS**	**V/C - LOS**	**Impact**	**V/C - LOS**	**Impact**	**V/C - LOS**	**Impact**	**V/C - LOS**	**Impact**
12. La Cienega Boulevard/Jefferson Boulevard	1.637 F	1.648 F	SI	1.695 F	SI	1.695 F	SI	1.695 F	SI
13. La Cienega Boulevard/Rodeo Road	1.396 F	1.407 F	SI	1.407 F	SI	1.407 F	SI	1.500 F	SI
14. Jefferson Boulevard/Higuera Street	1.451 F	1.501 F	SI	1.510 F	SI	1.510 F	SI	1.451 F	LTS
15. Jefferson Boulevard/Duquesne Avenue	1.234 F	1.292 F	SI	1.599 F	SI	1.235 F	LTS	1.234 F	LTS
16. Overland Avenue/Jefferson Boulevard	1.757 F	1.863 F	SI	1.793 F	SI	1.793 F	SI	1.793 F	SI
17. Jefferson B//Sepulveda Bl (north intersection)	1.278 F	1.278 F	LTS	1.278 F	LTS	1.278 F	LTS	1.278 F	LTS
18. Jefferson Bl/Sepulveda Bl/Sawtelle Bl	1.218 F	1.218 F	LTS	1.218 F	LTS	1.218 F	LTS	1.218 F	LTS
19. Overland Avenue/Freshman Dr/Clarmon Pl	0.119 A	0.453 A	LTS	0.207 A	LTS	0.195 A	LTS	0.191 A	LTS
20. Overland Avenue/Sawtelle Boulevard	F	F	LTS	F	LTS	F	LTS	F	LTS
21. Hannum Avenue/Playa Street	1.222 F	1.389 F	SI	1.389 F	SI	1.389 F	SI	1.389 F	SI
22. Sepulveda Bl/Jefferson Bl/Playa Street	1.688 F	1.688 F	LTS	1.688 F	LTS	1.688 F	LTS	1.688 F	LTS
23. Jefferson Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	1.639 F	1.648 F	SI	1.648 F	LTS	1.648 F	LTS	1.648 F	LTS
24. Sepulveda Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	1.516 F	1.528 F	SI	1.528 F	SI	1.528 F	SI	1.528 F	SI
25. Buckingham Parkway/Slauson Avenue	1.033 F	1.041 F	LTS	1.041 F	LTS	1.041 F	LTS	1.041 F	LTS
26A. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (SB Ramps)	1.287 F	1.295 F	LTS	1.295 F	LTS	1.295 F	LTS	1.295 F	LTS
26B. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (NB Ramps)	1.657 F	1.685 F	SI	1.685 F	SI	1.688 F	SI	1.685 F	SI
27. La Tijera Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.812 D	0.812 D	LTS	0.812 D	LTS	0.812 D	LTS	0.812 D	LTS
28. Fairfax Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.936 E	0.936 E	LTS	0.936 E	LTS	0.936 E	LTS	0.936 E	LTS
29. La Brea Avenue/Slauson Avenue	1.452 F	1.452 F	LTS	1.452 F	LTS	1.452 F	LTS	1.452 F	LTS
30. La Cienega Boulevard/Stocker Street	1.498 F	1.498 F	LTS	1.498 F	LTS	1.498 F	LTS	1.498 F	LTS
31. Fairfax Avenue/Stocker Street	0.849 D	0.849 D	LTS	0.849 D	LTS	0.849 D	LTS	0.849 D	LTS

LTS - Less than Significant
SI - Significant Impact

The tables show that the construction of the second access road reduces project impacts on the study intersections. The reduced impacts are the result of diversion of traffic from the congested intersections located just west and north of the project site.

During the AM peak hour the number of impacted intersections drops from thirteen to twelve under Alternative A, to eleven under Alternative B, and to ten under Alternative C. During the PM peak hour, the number of impacted intersections remains at nine under Alternative A, drops to eight under Alternative B, and drops to seven under Alternative C.

Los Angeles County Supplemental Analysis

Since several of the intersections identified for analysis are located within the jurisdiction of the County of Los Angeles, the County requested that a supplemental analysis of those intersections be conducted based on the traffic study guidelines of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

The following intersections were identified for supplemental analysis.

26A. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (SB Ramps)
26B. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (NB Ramps)
27. La Tijera Boulevard/Slauson Avenue
28. Fairfax Avenue/Slauson Avenue
29. La Brea Avenue/Slauson Avenue
30. La Cienega Boulevard/Stocker Street
31. Fairfax Avenue/Stocker Street

This section of the report presents that analysis. The County analysis methodology requires that project impacts be determined for the horizon year scenarios with the addition of forecast ambient growth and forecast traffic only. Subsequently, traffic impacts should be identified with the addition of both project and related project traffic and fair share calculations be performed to determine the project's contribution to identified improvements are impacted intersections. The results of this analysis is shown in **Tables V.M-12** and **V.M-13** for year 2015 and **Tables V.M-14** and **V.M-15** for year 2022.

To comply with Los Angeles County guidelines, the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) methodology was used in the level of service calculations. The same ambient growth and related project and project trip generation assumptions that were used in the primary analysis were utilized in the supplemental analysis.

Table V.M-12
2015 AM Peak Hour Analysis Summary - Los Angeles County Guidelines

	Year 2015 + Ambient Growth	Year 2015 + Ambient Growth + Project	Impact	Year 2015 + Ambient Growth + Project + Related Project	Impact	Fair Share Percentage
	V/C - LOS	V/C - LOS		V/C - LOS		
26A. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (SB Ramps)	0.793 C	0.795 C	LTS	0.825 D	LTS	20%
26B. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (NB Ramps)	0.703 C	0.722 C	LTS	0.783 C	SI	15%
27. La Tijera Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.772 C	0.772 C	LTS	0.799 C	LTS	0%
28. Fairfax Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.833 D	0.833 D	LTS	0.860 D	SI	0%
29. La Brea Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.857 D	0.857 D	LTS	0.877 D	SI	0%
30. La Cienega Boulevard/Stocker Street	1.193 F	1.193 F	LTS	1.215 F	SI	0%
31. Fairfax Avenue/Stocker Street	0.676 B	0.676 B	LTS	0.676 B	LTS	0%

LTS - Less than Significant Impact
SI - Significant Impact

Table V.M-13
2015 PM Peak Hour Analysis Summary - Los Angeles County Guidelines

	Year 2015 + Ambient Growth	Year 2015 + Ambient Growth + Project	Impact	Year 2015 + Ambient Growth + Project + Related Project	Impact	Fair Share Percentage
	V/C - LOS	V/C - LOS		V/C - LOS		
26A. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (SB Ramps)	1.041 F	1.045 F	LTS	1.159 F	SI	8%
26B. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (NB Ramps)	1.189 F	1.204 F	SI	1.369 F	SI	7%
27. La Tijera Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.748 C	0.748 C	LTS	0.816 F	SI	0%
28. Fairfax Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.927 E	0.927 E	LTS	0.996 E	SI	0%
29. La Brea Avenue/Slauson Avenue	1.193 F	1.193 F	LTS	1.262 F	SI	0%
30. La Cienega Boulevard/Stocker Street	1.202 F	1.202 F	LTS	1.236 F	SI	0%
31. Fairfax Avenue/Stocker Street	0.839 D	0.839 D	LTS	0.839 D	LTS	0%

LTS - Less than Significant Impact
SI - Significant Impact

With the addition of Phase I project traffic to existing + ambient growth traffic in the Phase I horizon year (2015), project traffic will only impact the La Cienega Boulevard/Slauson Avenue northbound ramps intersection. These ramps are impacted by College-related trips from the south the use the intersection to exit La Cienega and then use Slauson Avenue to travel to and from the College at the start of the school day or in the evening to attend night classes.

With the addition of traffic from all the identified area related projects, numerous intersections become impacted based on county guidelines. However, fair share calculations show that the College project only contributes a significant share at the La Cienega Boulevard/Slauson Avenue intersections.

Table V.M-14

2022 AM Peak Hour Analysis Summary - Los Angeles County Guidelines

	Year 2022 + Ambient Growth	**Year 2022 + Ambient Growth + Project**	**Impact**	**Fair Share Percentage**
	V/C - LOS	**V/C - LOS**		
26A. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (SB Ramps)	0.880 D	0.880 D	LTS	0%
26B. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (NB Ramps)	0.819 D	0.850 D	SI	100%
27. La Tijera Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.852 D	0.852 D	LTS	0%
28. Fairfax Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.918 E	0.918 E	LTS	0%
29. La Brea Avenue/Slauson Avenue	0.937 E	0.937 E	LTS	0%
30. La Cienega Boulevard/Stocker Street	1.304 F	1.304 F	LTS	0%
31. Fairfax Avenue/Stocker Street	0.722 V	0.722 C	LTS	0%
LTS - Less than Significant SI - Significant Impact				

Table V.M-15

2022 PM Peak Hour Analysis Summary - Los Angeles County Guidelines

	Year 2022 + Ambient Growth	**Year 2022 + Ambient Growth + Project**	**Impact**	**Fair Share Percentage**
	V/C - LOS	**V/C - LOS**		
26A. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (SB Ramps)	1.229 F	1.236 F	LTS	0%
26B. La Cienega Bl/Slauson Av (NB Ramps)	1.449 F	1.472 F	SI	100%
27. La Tijera Boulevard/Slauson Avenue	0.868 D	0.868 D	LTS	0%
28. Fairfax Avenue/Slauson Avenue	1.061 F	1.061 F	LTS	0%
29. La Brea Avenue/Slauson Avenue	1.348 F	1.348 F	LTS	0%
30. La Cienega Boulevard/Stocker Street	1.325 F	1.325 F	LTS	0%
31. Fairfax Avenue/Stocker Street	0.897 D	0.897 D	LTS	0%
LTS - Less than Significant SI - Significant Impact				

Since it was assumed that all identified related projects would be completed by the 2022, the project is the only identified source of additional traffic, above the ambient traffic growth included in the analysis. The addition of project traffic during the AM and PM peak hours results in traffic impacts at the La Cienega Boulevard/Slauson Avenue (northbound ramps) intersection. Since there are no other identified related projects for such a distant timeframe, the Los Angeles County guidelines would require the project to be 100% responsible for the impact.

On-Site Circulation and Parking

The project goals for circulation on the WLAC campus are to clarify and distinguish desired circulation patterns and entry points, while providing a pedestrian-oriented campus. The FMP strives to maintain as much convenience as possible while focusing on creating a vehicle-free campus core. The primary circulation route for the campus begins at the southwest corner, at the Overland Avenue and Stocker Street intersection, and proceeds counter-clockwise around the edge of the campus utilizing Stocker Street, Sophomore Drive and Freshman Drive (**Figure V.M-12**. The goal to incorporate all of the Campus Core within the campus perimeter led to the desire to maintain this circulation pattern for vehicular traffic and to locate most parking facilities along this perimeter loop. The County streets surrounding the West Los Angeles College form a campus loop street system (Freshman Drive, Sophomore Drive and Stocker Street). Freshman Drive, Albert Vera Street, D Street and Sophomore Drive (between Freshman Drive and B Streets) will remain two-way streets. F Street is proposed to be widened to accommodate two-way traffic. Sophomore Drive will remain a one way street between Stocker Street and B Street. C Street is proposed to be extended to become a one-way street flowing westward between Sophomore Drive and Stocker Street. East of the C Street and Stocker Street intersection, Stocker is proposed to provide two directions of travel. This will allow vehicles exiting the parking area via C Street to connect to Stocker and exit the campus via the proposed synchronized intersection at Freshman Drive. Stocker Street will remain a one-way street going east from the proposed intersection with C Street.

The FMP had proposed the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Freshman Drive and Stocker Street in association with the conversion of Stocker Street to two-way traffic. However, signalization of this intersection would create operational problems at the nearby intersection of Overland Avenue, Freshman Drive, and Clarmon Place. Traffic queues from one intersection could extend into the other. A potential interlocking condition could occur between left turn movements from Overland Avenue entering the campus and left turn movements from Stocker Street out of the campus. Since the expected traffic volumes exiting the parking area via C Street are unlikely to be sufficiently high to warrant a traffic signal at Stocker Street and Freshman Drive, and since there are alternative routes for motorists to exit the campus besides Stocker Street, the installation of a traffic signal at Stocker Street and Freshman Drive is not recommended. For this reason the project has been modified to install a stop sign facing westbound Stocker Street at Freshman Drive. This would provide sufficient control for that movement.

The FMP also proposed the installation of another traffic signal at the intersection of Albert Vera Street and Freshman Drive. A signal at this intersection is sufficiently far from Overland Avenue to remove concerns about traffic queues from one intersection extending into another, especially if no traffic signal is installed at Stocker Street and Freshman Drive.

The proposed on-campus transportation improvements include the improvement to a bus plaza, pedestrian trails, and new traffic signals at the intersections of Stocker Street at Freshman Drive and Albert Vera Street at Freshman Drive. All proposed transportation improvements constructed within the site as part of FMP improvements will be designed to meet the applicable standards of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. During construction activities, the work areas may pose a hazard to pedestrians if they are allowed near the work areas. Hazards could include holes, falling debris, moving equipment and construction vehicles. The project shall incorporate mitigation measure T-1 to reduce the risk to pedestrians in the work areas.

Figure V.M-12 On-Campus Circulation Comparison

Parking is provided by 11 surface parking lots of varying size scattered around the site and on many of the internal roadways. With the exception of metered parking spaces and parking on the perimeter County Streets, parking on campus is by permit only. The cost of a parking permit for students ranges from $20 to $27 per semester. Some comments received during the NOP review period indicate that students park off-site and create nuisance issues, (such as littering and loud stereos) for the surrounding neighborhood. However, it is believed that relatively few students choose to park off-site because the on-site parking supply is adequate, on-campus parking fees are modest and off-site parking is relatively remote from campus activity centers.

A parking demand study was prepared as part of the initial WLAC master planning efforts. In that study effort parking, occupancy and demand estimates were analyzed for students and faculty throughout the day. The study estimated the peak parking needs to be one space for every 7.3 students and one space per 1.7 faculty/staff. Applying these factors to the proposed campus populations for 2015 and 2022 yields a parking requirement of about 2,631 spaces in 2015 and 3,324 spaces in 2022. In Phase I, the proposed project would replace the paved parking Lot 8 with a 1,000 space parking structure. In all about 2,881 spaces would be provided in 2015. In Phase II, the proposed project would replace the paved parking Lots 1 & 2 with a 1,700 space parking structure. About 4,210 spaces would be available in 2022. In both scenarios, the supply is projected to exceed the anticipated need. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant parking impact.

Regional Traffic Impacts

The Congestion Management Program (CMP) for the County of Los Angeles requires that traffic studies be prepared to document impacts to all CMP monitoring intersections where the proposed project will add 50 or more peak hour trips. CMP freeway stations require analysis when the proposed project will add 150 or more peak hour trips.

The following intersections and freeway segments were identified as potentially impacted CMP sites.

Potentially Impacted CMP Intersections

Venice Boulevard/Overland Boulevard (Culver City)
Venice Boulevard/La Cienega Boulevard (City of Los Angeles)
La Cienega Boulevard/Stocker Boulevard (City of Los Angeles)

Potentially Impacted Freeway Segments

I-10 East of Overland Avenue
I-10 East of La Brea Avenue
I-405 north of Venice Boulevard

Phase I Impact

As shown in **Table V.M-16**, the number of Phase I trips added to area CMP intersections is not sufficient to warrant a CMP analysis. However, all of these intersections were included in the analysis performed in the traffic study.

Table V.M-16
Phase I Trips Added to CMP Intersections

CMP Intersection	Added AM Peak Hour Trips	Added PM Peak Hour Trips
La Cienega Boulevard/Venice Boulevard	13	13
Venice Boulevard/Overland Boulevard	18	29
La Cienega Boulevard/Stocker Boulevard	0	0

The project trip distribution for the Project's Phase I resulted in 20% of the project trips using Interstate 10 east of the project site and Interstate 405 north of the project site. Since the AM and PM peak hour trips forecast for Phase I of the project are 687 and 664 respectively, the project is not forecast to add more than 150 peak hour trips to the area CMP freeway monitoring stations.

No further Phase I freeway analysis is required under CMP guidelines.

Phase II Impact

As shown in **Table V.M-17**, the number of Phase II trips added to area CMP intersections is not sufficient to warrant a CMP analysis. However, all of these intersections were included in the analysis performed in the traffic study.

Table V.M-17
Phase II Trips Added to CMP Intersections

CMP Intersection	Added AM Peak Hour Trips	Added PM Peak Hour Trips
La Cienega Boulevard/Venice Boulevard	9	18
Venice Boulevard/Overland Boulevard	12	18
La Cienega Boulevard/Stocker Boulevard	0	0

The project trip distribution for the Project's Phase II resulted in 20% of the project trips using Interstate 10 east of the project site and Interstate 405 north of the project site. Since the AM and PM peak hour trips forecast for phase two of the project are 415 and 400 respectively, the project is not forecast to add more than 150 peak hour trips to the area CMP freeway monitoring stations.

No further freeway analysis is required under CMP guidelines.

Construction Impacts

Construction of the Phase I and II projects will require demolition of some temporary structures, and construction of new facilities. Traffic during construction activities would be generated by construction equipment, crew vehicles, haul trucks, and trucks delivering materials. Currently the campus does not have a designated route for deliveries. It is assumed that vehicles make their way to the site via the local freeway and major highway routes identified earlier in this section. Since the project phases will stretch over a period of years, construction impacts for the various construction projects associated with Phases I and II of the project can be addressed through construction staging plans and construction routing plans that are developed during the permit phases of each aspect of the project and then implemented during construction.

It is likely that there will be short-term adverse traffic and parking impacts in the area during construction of the project components. It is the policy and procedure of the responsible agency(s) that project developers submit a formal construction staging and traffic plans for review and approval prior to the issuance of any construction permits. The plans generally include a staging and local haul route plan to be submitted prior to construction, identifying the routes to be used by construction-related traffic to minimize the potential impacts upon the surrounding neighborhoods. The project shall incorporate this requirement as mitigation measure T-2 for on-campus construction and T-3 for construction of the second access road, to insure that traffic and parking impacts related to construction activities would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Trips generated as a result of development of projects included under the related projects list were estimated by using trip generation formulas where applicable, or were obtained from previous traffic studies. The estimated trips were distributed and analyzed as part of the future 2015 and 2022 With and Without Project conditions. As shown above, the proposed Project would result in a significant traffic impact and would contribute to a significant cumulative traffic impact.

Mitigation Measures

Construction Stage

The proposed project shall incorporate mitigation measures T-1 to T-3 to reduce impacts related to project construction.

T-1 The College shall incorporate safety measures around construction sites to reduce the risk to pedestrians near the work areas. Measures may included access restrictions, covered walkways, and designating alternative pedestrian routes.

T-2 Prior to construction of new facilities on-campus the College shall prepare a construction traffic and parking management plan. This plan shall be provided to the City of Culver City for comments. The College shall incorporate such comments to the extent feasible. At a minimum the plan shall include:

- Identification of the designated haul route to be used by construction trucks.
- Provide an estimate of the number of trucks, and anticipated trips.
- Identification of traffic control procedures, emergency access provisions, and construction crew parking locations.
- Prohibit construction employees commuting to the site from parking off-campus.
- Identify the on-campus location for vehicle and equipment staging.
- Provide a schedule of construction activities.

T-3 Prior to construction of the second access road the College shall prepare a construction traffic and parking management plan. For access roads A, this plan shall be provided to the City of Culver City; for access road B, this plan shall be provided to the Cities of Culver City and Los Angeles; and for access road C, this plan shall be provided to the City of Culver City and County of Los Angeles for comments. The College shall incorporate such comments to the extent feasible. At a minimum the plan shall include:

- Identification of the designated haul route to be used by construction trucks.
- Provide an estimate of the number of trucks, and anticipated trips.
- Identification of traffic control procedures, emergency access provisions, and construction crew parking locations.
- Prohibit construction employees commuting to the site from parking off-campus.
- Identify the on-campus location for vehicle and equipment staging.
- Provide a schedule of construction activities.

Operation Phases I & II

The traffic study performed an analysis to identify the types of roadway improvements that would be required to mitigate project impacts. While the analysis identifies such improvements, it is unlikely that the necessary improvements are feasible due to right-of-way constraints and the magnitude of the construction and land acquisition costs associated with the improvements.

Table V.M-18 shows improvements that would reduce the significant impacts of the project by Phase. The second access road would reduce the number of intersections requiring mitigation. Alternative A would eliminate the significant impact to intersections 16 (AM only) and 19, Alternative B would eliminate the significant impact to intersections 15 and 19. Alternative C would eliminate the significant impact to intersections 14, 15, 16 (AM only), and 19.

Table V.M-18

Project Phase I & II Potential Roadway Improvements

	Peak Hour Impact	Impact Phase	Phase I Improvement	Phase II Improvement
8. Overland Avenue/Washington Blvd	AM	Phase I & 2	Add EB/WB LT land and make E/W phasing protected only.	Phase I Improvement sufficient
	PM	Phase I & 2		
9. Duquesne Avenue/Culver Blvd	AM	Phase II		Add WB RT land
10. Overland Avenue/Culver Blvd	AM	Phase I & 2	Add EB/WB LT land and make E/W phasing protected only.	Phase I Improvement sufficient
	PM	Phase I & 2		
12. La Cienega Blvd/Jefferson Blvd	AM	Phase I & II	Add a northbound right-turn lane	Phase I Improvement sufficient
	PM	Phase II		
13. La Cienega Blvd/Rodeo Rd	PM	Phase II		Add NB RT lane
14. Jefferson Blvd/Higuera St. Rodeo Rd	AM	Phase I & II	Add 3rd WB LT lane. Widen westbound Jefferson to provide lane to Hetzler, then taper to existing width	Phase I Improvement sufficient
	PM	Phase I & II		
15. Jefferson Blvd/Duquesne Ave	AM	Phase I & II	Add EB RT lane and RT Overlap.	Add EB RT lane and RT Overlap
	PM	Phase I & II	Add 2nd SB LT lane from Duquesne onto Jefferson.	Add 2nd EB LT lane and modify the signal for E-W split phasing.
16. Overland Ave/Jefferson Blvd	AM	Phase I & II		Add 2nd EB/WB LT lane
	PM	Phase I & II		
19. Overland Ave/ Freshman Dr/ Clarmon Pl	AM	Phase II		Add 3rd SB LT lane
21. Hannum Ave/ Playa St	AM	Phase I & II	Add 2nd NB RT lane	Phase I Improvement sufficient
	PM	Phase I & II		
22. Sepulveda Blvd / Jefferson Blvd/ Playa St	AM	Phase I & II	Add 2nd NB and SB LT lanes	Phase I Improvement Sufficient
24. Sepulveda Blvd/ Slauson Ave	AM	Phase II		Add SB RT lane
	PM			
25. Buckingham Pkwy/ Slauson Ave	AM	Phase II		Add WB RT lane
26B. La Cienega Blvd/ Slauson Av NB Ramp	AM	Phase I & II	Add 2nd NB LT lane	Phase I Improvement sufficient

The traffic analysis shows that the number of significantly impacted intersections will be eight after Phase I is completed, twelve if Phase II is constructed with Access A, twelve if Phase II is constructed with Access B, and eleven if Phase II is constructed with Access C. **Table V.M-18** summarizes the improvements that would be needed to mitigate these impacts. However, field surveys of each site reveals that, with one exception, right-of-way acquisition would be required at all intersections in order to provide additional lanes. Lane additions typically require additional right-of-way to twelve feet at the intersection and right-of-way takes for several hundred feet if not more, to provide the necessary lane transitions to accommodate these lanes. The acquisition of right-of-way would likely require demolition of structures, either residential or commercial depending upon the specific intersection location. Furthermore, in a few cases, relocation of major utilities such as overhead electric transmission lines would be necessary. For these reasons, implementation of roadway and intersection improvements at all but one location is considered economically infeasible.

The one exception is the intersection of Overland Avenue, Freshman Drive, and Clarmon Place. At that location, the existing dual left turn lanes from Overland Avenue into the College would need to be replaced with a triple left turn to partially mitigate impacts of the project after completion of Phase II. This improvement would be needed only if no second access is provided by the project. This widening would also require right-of-way acquisition, but since the adjacent property is the College campus itself, construction of this mitigation measure cannot be considered economically infeasible. Furthermore, since the student headcount at the end of Phase II would be more than double the existing headcount, the College should consider means to improve traffic capacity at the only existing access point, if no second access is constructed.

Even this improvement at Overland Avenue and Freshman Drive is insufficient to fully mitigate the impacts of the project after Phase II. The intersection would operate at LOS "B" for the "No Project" condition, LOS "D" for the project without any mitigation, and LOS "C" with the triple left turn lanes. To fully mitigate the impact of the project, even more lanes would need to be added along Overland Avenue between Freshman Drive and Jefferson Boulevard. That level of improvement would require extensive right-of-way acquisition, and is considered economically infeasible. Since the triple left turns would provide a reasonably acceptable level of service, (LOS C), further improvement was not considered at this intersection.

Although full mitigation of project impacts is not economically feasible, the College is in dialogue with Culver City to establish a monetary contribution towards improvement of local traffic conditions. However, even with such a contribution, impacts would remain significant.

Cumulative Mitigation Measures

Regional programs such as the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) prepared by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP) prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) prepared by the California Department of Transportation are all intended to address the cumulative mobility needs of Los Angeles County. The LRTP recommends highway, HOV, bus, rail, and demand management improvements and identifies funding sources and implementation schedules. The RTP forecasts long-term transportation demands for the five-county SCAG region and identifies policies, actions, and funding sources to accommodate these demands, including construction of new transportation facilities, transportation systems management strategies, transportation demand management strategies, and land use strategies. The RTIP and STIP are programming documents listing all of the funded/programmed regional improvements.

Additional measures to address significant cumulative conditions are beyond the ability of any individual project to implement and, as such, the project's incremental impacts on poor cumulative conditions would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Significant Project Impacts After Mitigation

After Phase I is completed, the project would result in significant unavoidable traffic impacts at eight intersections. After Phase II is completed the project would result in significant unavoidable traffic impacts at thirteen intersections. In the event that Access Road A is constructed the project would result in significant unavoidable traffic impacts at twelve intersections. In the event that Access Road B is constructed the project would result in significant unavoidable traffic impacts at twelve intersections. In the event that Access Road C is constructed the project would result in significant unavoidable traffic impacts at eleven intersections.

The results of the analysis indicate that the project would result in significant adverse traffic impacts to as many as 13 intersections and that construction of a second access to the College would not reduce impacts at more than three intersections. This is partially due to the amount of congestion anticipated in the area. When an intersection is operating at a more congested level of service it takes less of a project contribution to trigger a significant impact. For example, 1% project-related increase in traffic would be considered a significant impact at an intersection operating at LOS E or F, but would be less than significant at an intersection operating at LOS D. It should be noted that for intersections operating at LOS E or F, as few as 15 trips generated by the College could trigger a significant impact, if those trips were to use a single critical lane (using 1,500 vehicles per hour per lane as capacity). On the other hand, it is also possible for a congested intersection to handle over a hundred trips without being significantly impacted, if those trips were spread over several lanes in a direction opposite the peak flow of traffic. As shown in the analysis, adding the ambient growth assumed for the area, results in 28 of the 31 study intersections operating at poor levels of service or worse in the year 2022 even without the project.