

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE**

8040 Foothill Boulevard & 10355 Woodward Avenue  
DOT Case No. SFV 08-105

Date: September 16, 2008

To: Maya Zaitzevsky, City Planner  
Department of City Planning

From: Sergio D. Valdez, Transportation Engineer  
Department of Transportation

Subject: **TRAFFIC ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED HOME DEPOT LOCATED AT 8040 FOOTHILL BOULEVARD AND 10355 WOODWARD AVENUE, SUNLAND ENV2005-319**

The Department of Transportation (DOT) has completed the traffic assessment for the proposed 99,857 square-foot home improvement store to be built in place of the existing 120,400 square-foot discount department store located at 8040 Foothill Boulevard, Sunland. This traffic assessment is based on a traffic study prepared by Overland Traffic Consultants, Inc. dated June 2008. After a careful review of the pertinent data, DOT has determined that the traffic study adequately describes the project related traffic impacts of the proposed development.

**DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS**

The traffic study looked at two scenarios: Scenario No.1 assumed existing use trip credit for the existing discount store located on the site (The K-Mart Store), Scenario No.2 assumed no existing use trip credit for the site.

In Scenario No.1 the proposed project consists of a 99,857 square-foot home improvement store located at 8040 Foothill Boulevard, Sunland. The project is going to be located on a lot, which currently has a 120,400 square-foot discount department store. The proposed project will generate the following trips:

LAND USE	SQUARE FT.	DAILY TRIPS	AM HOUR	PEAK	PM HOUR	PEAK
Home Improvement Store	99,857	2,976	120		244	
Discount Department Store	120,400	3,074	61		298	
Net Adjacent Trips		-98	59		-54	
Truck PCE		54	18		18	
Net Adjacent PCE		-44	77		-36	
Home Improvement	99,857	2,381	96		195	

Store (pass by credit 20%)				
Discount Department Store (pass by credit 30%)	120,400	2,152	43	208
Truck PCE		54	18	18
Net New Trips		283	71	5

The trip generation estimates are based on independent studies and formulas published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation, 7th Edition, 2003.

In Scenario No. 2 the proposed project was assumed to Generate the following trips:

Land Use	Square Ft.	Daily Trips	Am Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Home Improvement Store	99,857	2,976	120	244
Truck PCE Trips		54	18	18
Pass by Trip Credit (non-truck)		(595)	(24)	(49)
Total Net Adjacent Traffic		3,030	138	262
Total Non-adjacent Traffic		2,435	114	213

The Department of Transportation has reviewed Scenario No.1 and Scenario No.2 and determined that neither will have a significant traffic impact (see Attachment A).

In addition to the traffic study submitted by the applicant, Murthy Transportation Consultants, Inc.(MTC) submitted a review of the applicants traffic study (see Attachment B) . MTC had several questions and comments about the applicants traffic study and I will attempt to address those comments.

Part 1.1 Existing Land Use – MTC claims that the K-mart ceased operation prior to the application for the Home Depot.

Response: The existing land use issue credit should be addressed by the Department of City Planning, nevertheless the traffic study included Scenario No.2 which takes no credit for any existing land use so whether existing use credit is given or not the study covers this scenario.

Part 1.2 Trip Generation – The trip generation credit given for the existing project traffic is different than those used by ITE.

Response: The traffic study used the lower range of ITE trip generation for the existing use credit given the K-Mart in order to be more conservative in the Scenario No.1. If the median range was used as advocated by MTC, the result would be less net new trips being generated by the Home Depot project. The point however does not apply to Scenario No. 2 which takes no existing use trip

credit.

**Part 1.3 – Pass-by-Trip Credit –** MTC claims that the applicants 30% pass by trip credit for the K-Mart is too high.

**Response:** Since we are talking about the pass by trip rate for an existing using the City of Los Angeles pass-by-trip credit of 30% instead of the ITE 17% pass-by-trip credit actually results in fewer trip credits and a more conservative study. In addition the City of Los Angeles has established pass-by-trip credits which are used consistently in all traffic studies sometimes the rate is a little higher than ITE sometimes it is a little lower, but we believe these rates more accurately reflect the traffic patterns in Los Angeles. The point however does not apply to Scenario No. 2, which takes no existing use trip credit.

**Part 2. 1 – Existing Conditions -** MTC claims that project traffic will be coming down Apperson Street; and, that McVine Avenue and Foothill Boulevard should have been studied; and, that the No Right-Turn sign at the Woodward driveway is not enforceable and therefore the trip distribution should be modified; and, the Sunland and I-210 ramps should have been studied.

**Response:** Apperson was not studied because it is a residential street and we don't want to encourage traffic to use that street and Apperson has speed bumps installed to discourage cut through traffic and we therefore do not believe that Apperson is a viable alternative to Foothill Boulevard except for residents who live off of Apperson Street.

The level of service at McVine Street and Foothill Boulevard is probably at an A or B level and therefore project traffic that is going through on Foothill Boulevard would not have any significant impact since the project related turning movements at this intersection would be minimal.

No-Right-Turn signs are routinely used to prohibit turn movements throughout the City of Los Angeles and they are found to be effective. In any case if the rate violation rate is perceived to be high by residents in the area police enforcement can be requested.

Although typically not required an additional traffic analysis has been submitted by the applicant's traffic engineer for these ramps, assuming that the trucks going to from the project site use these offramps, and the analysis shows that no significant traffic impact will exist at these offramps.

**Part 2.2A – Trip Generation –** The project should of studied the Saturday trip generation rates.

**Response:** The Department does not require projects to conduct weekend trip generation traffic analysis for retail projects. To require this in this case would result in disparate requirements for this project and would not be fair. Notwithstanding, the existing K-mart would have generated 8,571 daily trips on Saturday, which is more than the expected 4,560 daily trips for a the proposed home improvement store.

**Part 2.2B – Driveway Volumes –** Driveway volumes not provided in the traffic study.

Response: The applicant traffic engineer has submitted a driveway analysis of the projects driveways and it shows that all the driveways for this project will be operating at a level of service of "C" or better, which is acceptable.

Part 2.3 – Trip Distribution – The assumption that 100% of the project traffic using Foothill Boulevard is incorrect.

Response: As mentioned before the No-Right-Turn signage at the Woodward driveway will prohibit project traffic from using residential streets to the south and Apperson Street has speed bumps already installed on it to discourage its traffic use. This makes Foothill Boulevard the preferred alternative and the project trip distribution is therefore correct.

Part 2.4 – Trip Distribution of Project Related Traffic- MTC claims that the related project trip distribution diagrams are incomplete and missing.,

Response: The applicant's traffic engineer has submitted the requested information data on the related project trip distribution.

Part 2.5 – Pass-by-trips – MTC claims that 20% pass by trip credit is too high.

Response: The city of Los Angeles gives a pass by trip credit of 20% for this type of project and most project sites are not located at the intersection of two major highways, so it is consistent with LADOT policy to give 20% pass by trip credit in this occasion. In addition if the ITE pass-by-trip credit was used for this project it would result in a pass-by-trip credit of between 44% and 54%, which is substantially higher than the 20% trip credit that LADOT uses.

Part 2.6 – Level of Service Analysis – The intersection of Foothill Boulevard and Tujunga Canyon Road exceed the LADOT criteria for impact.

Response: The am peak hour impact at this intersection is 0.005, which is below the 0.01 criteria for the intersection level of service of E. The pm peak hour impact at this intersection is 0.001, which is below the 0.02 criteria for the intersection level of service D that occurs during study period.

Part 2.7 – Project Site Access for Truck Traffic – MTC claims that current site plan will not be able to accommodate truck traffic; and, that the effect of truck traffic on Apperson Street has not been studied.

Response: Apperson Street has speed bumps on it and large trucks will not be able to use this street due to the speed bumps. In addition the No-Right-Turn Sign at Woodward Street will prohibit the trucks from accessing Apperson Street. Therefore truck traffic will be not be using the residential streets south of the proposed project.

Part 2.8 – Truck Traffic Generation – MTC claims that the number of trucks assumed in this traffic study is too low and that empirical data exists, which show it to be higher.

**Response:** The existing K-mart also had numerous truck deliveries to stock its merchandise and no credit was taken for these deliveries, so the traffic study in both Scenario No. 1 and Scenario No. 2 is extremely conservative when it comes to truck traffic. In addition the Newbury Park study assumes between 12 to 14 semi-trailer deliveries, which is not very different from the 12-18 assumed in this traffic study. In addition these trucks will be using Foothill Boulevard for access to and from the site, not residential streets as claimed by MTC.

**Part 2.9 – Driveway Locations and Pedestrian Movements –** MTC claims that the study did not address pedestrian movement and access to the site.

**Response:** Pedestrian Traffic Counts taken at the intersection of Woodward Street and Foothill Boulevard show extremely low pedestrian activity at this intersection and therefore pedestrian conflict will not be an issue at this site. In addition the pedestrians accessing the site for shopping purposes is expected to be extremely low.

**Part 2.10 – Freeway Impacts –** MTC claims that the on and off ramps for the I-210 freeway were not studied and therefore unknown traffic impacts may result at these locations.

**Response:** Although not required, an additional traffic analysis has been submitted by the applicant's traffic engineer for these ramps, assuming that the trucks going to and from the project site using these on and off ramps, and the analysis shows that no significant traffic impact will exist at these off-ramps. All of these ramps are currently operating at level of service B or better and are not expected to get to a level of service any worse than C in the future. The analysis shows that the ramps do not even come close to triggering a significant traffic impact.

**Part 2.11 – Summary of Comments –**

**Response:** All of the issues that MTC brings up have been adequately addressed by the Overland Traffic Study along with supplemental information that they have submitted.

In addition there has been some concern raised about the Level of Service as it relates to Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. The level of service for "with project" column ends up higher in Scenario 1 than in Scenario 2, which is counterintuitive, since in Scenario 1 the study takes credit for the K-Mart. But the reason for this is that when the traffic counts were updated the K-Mart was closed and the traffic that the K-Mart would have been generating were added into the background traffic of the base condition. This would result in a more conservative analysis and is correct. In Scenario 2 no credit is taken for the K-Mart so its traffic was not added into the background traffic.

The Department of Transportation recommends that the following Project Requirements be adopted as conditions of project approval to address potential access and circulation along the project's frontage

**PROJECT REQUIREMENTS**

**A. Highway Dedication and Improvements**

Foothill Boulevard is a designated Major Highway in the Streets and Highways Element of \*the City's General Plan. Foothill Boulevard currently consists of a 50-foot half right-of-way with a 40-foot half roadway and 10-foot sidewalk. Standard Plan S-470-0, effective November 10, 1999, dictates that the standard cross section for a Major Highway is a 40-foot half-roadway on a 52-foot half-right-of-way. The applicant should contact the Bureau of Engineering, Department of Public Works, to discuss this requirement.

Woodward Avenue is designated a collector street in the Streets and Highways Element of the City's General Plan. Woodward Avenue currently consists of a 32-foot half-right-of-way with and 20 foot roadway and a 12-foot sidewalk. Standard Plan S-470-0, effective November 10, 1999, dictates that the standard cross section for a collector street is 32-foot half-right-of-way with a 22 foot roadway and an 8 foot sidewalk. The applicant should also contact the Bureau of Engineering, Department of Public Works to discuss this requirement.

**B. Site Access and Internal Circulation**

This determination does not include approval of the project's driveways, internal circulation, and parking scheme.

Final DOT approval shall be obtained prior to issuance of any building permits. This should be accomplished by submitting detailed site/driveway plans, with a minimum scale of 1"=40', to DOT's Valley Development Review Section at 6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Van Nuys, 91401, prior to submittal of building plans for plan check to the Department of Building and Safety.

**Attachments**

- c: Councilmember Wendy Greuel, Second Council District
- Brian Gallagher, DOT East Valley District
- Mati Laan, BOE Valley District
- Jerry Overland, Overland Traffic Consultants, Inc.

**ATTACHMENT A**

**Home Depot 8040 Foothill Boulevard  
Scenario No. 1  
DOT Case No: SFV08-105**

Summary of Volume to Capacity Ratios (V/C) and Levels of Service (LOS)

Intersection	Peak Hour	Year 2008 Existing		Year 2010 w/o Project		Year 2010 w/ Project		Project Impact Δ V/C
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	
Foothill Blvd. & Sunland Blvd.	AM	0.492	A	0.556	A	0.564	A	0.008
	PM	0.569	A	0.643	B	0.643	B	0.000
Foothill Blvd. & Oro Vista Ave.	AM	0.743	C	0.834	D	0.842	D	0.008
	PM	0.674	B	0.760	C	0.760	C	0.000
Foothill Blvd. & Woodward Ave.	AM	0.664	B	0.721	C	0.729	C	0.008
	PM	0.553	A	0.618	B	0.618	B	0.000
Foothill Blvd. & Mt. Gleason Ave.	AM	0.604	B	0.631	B	0.636	B	0.005
	PM	0.610	B	0.658	B	0.658	B	0.000
Foothill Blvd. & Commerce Ave.	AM	0.655	B	0.693	B	0.697	C	0.004
	PM	0.742	C	0.818	D	0.818	D	0.000
Foothill Blvd. & Tujunga Cyn. Rd.	AM	0.913	E	0.981	E	0.986	E	0.005
	PM	0.778	C	0.850	D	0.851	D	0.001

No Project-Related Significant Impact

**Home Depot 8040 Foothill Boulevard  
Scenario No. 2  
DOT Case No: SFV08-105**

Summary of Volume to Capacity Ratios (V/C) and Levels of Service (LOS)

Intersection	Peak Hour	Year 2008 Existing		Year 2010 w/o Project		Year 2010 w/ Project		Project Impact
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	Δ V/C
Foothill Blvd. & Sunland Blvd.	AM	0.487	A	0.551	A	0.562	A	0.011
	PM	0.541	A	0.615	B	0.634	B	0.019
Foothill Blvd. & Oro Vista Ave.	AM	0.739	C	0.830	D	0.841	D	0.011
	PM	0.643	B	0.728	C	0.750	C	0.022
Foothill Blvd. & Woodward Ave.	AM	0.660	B	0.717	C	0.729	C	0.012
	PM	0.528	A	0.593	B	0.625	B	0.032
Foothill Blvd. & Mt. Gleason Ave.	AM	0.599	B	0.626	B	0.634	B	0.008
	PM	0.590	B	0.637	B	0.651	B	0.014
Foothill Blvd. & Commerce Ave.	AM	0.652	B	0.690	B	0.697	C	0.007
	PM	0.725	C	0.800	C	0.812	D	0.012
Foothill Blvd. & Tujunga Cyn. Rd.	AM	0.910	E	0.978	E	0.985	E	0.007
	PM	0.760	C	0.831	D	0.845	D	0.014

No Project-Related Significant Impact

**Table 2: Significant Transportation Impact Thresholds**

Level of Service	Projected Future Volume to Capacity Ratio (V/C), Including Project	Project-Related Impact (Δ V/C)
C	between 0.701 and 0.800	≥ 0.040
D	between 0.801 and 0.900	≥ 0.020
E, F	≥ 0.901	≥ 0.010