



**MEMORANDUM**

Date: September 8, 2016  
To: Christopher Koontz, City of Long Beach  
From: Jason D. Pack, P.E.  
**Subject: SEASP Public Records Request**

OC13-0279

---

This memorandum provides information related to the public records request submitted by Kerrie Aey for the SEASP study. The requested information is described below:

Request 1 The reduced intensity alternative traffic analysis is completely missing from section 5.16 and Appendix J. Please provide.

Response 1 The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires alternatives to be evaluated from a qualitative basis and does not require the alternative to be evaluated at the same level of detail as the proposed project. As such, no detailed assessment of the reduced intensity alternative was completed as part of the traffic study and the alternative was addressed in the Alternatives section of the EIR (see Section 7 of the EIR).

Request 2 Long Beach Southeast Area Development and Improvement Plan (SEADIP) Multimodal Existing Conditions, Constraints, and Opportunities Assessment, Fehr & Peers, March 2014. The above document is referenced on page 1, 5.16 Transportation and Traffic (DEIR SEASP) but is not included in Appendix J TIA or the DEIR.

Response 2 The document is attached to this memorandum. Please note that this information was ultimately incorporated into the Opportunities and Constraints workbook (Section 4.0 Mobility) prepared as part of the specific plan process and presented to the Community Advisory Committee. A copy of the workbook was incorporated as Appendix B to the Specific plan can found on the City's website ([http://www.lbds.info/seadip\\_update/documents\\_and\\_reference\\_materials.asp](http://www.lbds.info/seadip_update/documents_and_reference_materials.asp)).

Request 3a A breakdown of Project Trip Generation Estimates by ITE land use type and ksf. (Existing conditions, Reduced, and Proposed project).

Response 3a The traffic analysis used ITE trip generation as one input of several inputs in the MXD Model to determine trip generation. This methodology and inputs are explained on Pages 26-32 of the Transportation Impact Analysis (Pages J-32 – J-38 of Appendix J of the DEIR). The trip generation by ITE land use type and ksf is presented below for your requested scenarios:

# FEHR & PEERS

ITE Trip Generation by Land Use – Existing Conditions											
FP Category	ITE Land Use	ITE Code	Units	Quantity	Daily Total	AM In	AM Out	AM Total	PM In	PM Out	PM Total
Residential	(210) - Single-Family Detached Housing (Adj Streets, 7-9A, 4-6P)	210	Dwelling Units	1,750	16,660	328	985	1,313	1,103	648	1,750
Residential	(230) - Residential Condominium/Townhouse(Pk Adj Streets, 7-9A, 4-6P)	230	Dwelling Units	2,329	13,531	174	851	1,025	811	400	1,211
Retail	(820) - Shopping Center (Adj Streets, 7-9A, 4-6P)	820	1,000 sq ft leasable area	637.347	27,215	379	233	612	1,135	1,230	2,365
Office	(710) - General Office Building (Pk Hr, AM & PM)	710	1,000 sq ft gross floor area	199.34	2,199	274	37	311	50	247	297

Hotel	(310) - Hotel (Adj Streets, 7-9A, 4-6P)	310	Rooms	375	3,064	117	82	199	115	110	225
Cinema	(443) - Movie Theatre without Matinee (Adj Streets, 7-9A, 4-6P)	443	Seats	4,504	7,927	27	18	45	236	79	315
School	(520) - Elementary School (Adj. Streets, 4-6P)	520	Students	341	440	0	0	0	25	26	51
TOTAL					71,036	1,299	2,206	3,505	3,475	2,740	6,214
Note - School AM trips do not change between scenarios and were not included. This was to minimize internalization of morning school trips in the study area - a conservative approach for identifying impacts. Also not included are the industrial trips. ITE 9 <sup>th</sup> edition used in the assessment.											

ITE Trip Generation by Land Use – Proposed Project (Buildout)											
FP Category	ITE Land Use	ITE Code	Units	Quantity	Daily Total	AM In	AM Out	AM Total	PM In	PM Out	PM Total
Residential	(210) - Single-Family Detached Housing (Adj Streets, 7-9A, 4-6P)	210	Dwelling Units	1,750	16,660	328	985	1,313	1,103	648	1,750
Residential	(230) - Residential Condominium/Townhouse(Pk Adj Streets, 7-9A, 4-6P)	230	Dwelling Units	7,768	45,132	581	2,837	3,418	2,706	1,333	4,039
Office	(710) - General Office Building (Pk Hr, AM & PM)	710	1,000 sq ft gross floor area	109.771	1,211	150	21	171	28	136	164
Hotel	(310) - Hotel (Adj Streets, 7-9A, 4-6P)	310	Rooms	425	3,472	133	92	225	130	125	255
School	(520) - Elementary School (Adj. Streets, 4-6P)	520	Students	341	440	0	0	0	25	26	51

Retail	(820) - Shopping Center (Adj Streets, 7-9A, 4-6P)	820	1,000 sq ft leasable area	1,338.60	57,158	797	488	1,285	2,384	2,582	4,966
TOTAL					124,073	1,989	4,423	6,412	6,376	4,850	11,225
Note - School AM trips do not change between scenarios and were not included. This was to minimize internalization of morning school trips in the study area - a conservative approach for identifying impacts. Also not included are the industrial trips. ITE 9 <sup>th</sup> edition used in the assessment.											

ITE Trip Generation by Land Use – Reduced Intensity (Buildout)											
FP Category	ITE Land Use	ITE Code	Units	Quantity	Daily Total	AM In	AM Out	AM Total	PM In	PM Out	PM Total
Residential	(210) - Single-Family Detached Housing (Adj Streets, 7-9A, 4-6P)	210	Dwelling Units	1,750	16,660	328	985	1,313	1,103	648	1,750
Residential	(220) - Residential Apartment(Pk Adj Streets, 7-9A, 4-6P)	220	Dwelling Units	4,913	32,671	501	2005	2,506	1,980	1066	3,046
Office	(710) - General Office Building (Pk Hr, AM & PM)	710	1,000 sq ft gross floor area	97.604	1,077	134	18	152	25	120	145
Hotel	(310) - Hotel (Adj Streets, 7-9A, 4-6P)	310	Rooms	375	3,064	117	82	199	115	110	225
School	(520) - Elementary School (Adj. Streets, 4-6P)	520	Students	341	440	0	0	0	25	26	51

Retail	(820) - Shopping Center (Adj Streets, 7-9A, 4-6P)	820	1,000 sq ft leasable area	1,190.23	50,823	709	434	1,143	2,120	2296	4,416
TOTAL					104,735	1,789	3,524	5,313	5,368	4,266	9,633
Note - School AM trips do not change between scenarios and were not included. This was to minimize internalization of morning school trips in the study area - a conservative approach for identifying impacts. Also not included are the industrial trips. ITE 9 <sup>th</sup> edition used in the assessment											

**Request 3b** DEIR Page 29, Table 5.16-5 Project Trip Generation Estimates only show "Total" Daily/AM Peak/PM peak trips for existing and proposed. There is a note that states "Source; Fehr & Peers 2016a." but no information other than that. If the information I am requesting is in the document noted please provide.

**Response 3b** The information was developed by Fehr & Peers and the cited references are provided at the end of each topical section and the references section of the EIR. For example, the document refereeing to Fehr & Peers, 2016a is listed on Page 5.16-64 and 13-7 of the DEIR. Here, the citation is referencing the Transportation Impact Analysis that was included in its entirety in Appendix J of the DEIR.

**Request 3c** Table 5.16-5 fails to provide any trip generation estimates for the reduced intensity alternative even though the DEIR provides summary information.

Typically the trip generations would be broken down by usage. For example ITE: Multi-Family - ITE 220, General Retail ITE 820, Hotel ITE 100. The ITE factors would then be multiplied by the ksf. The calculation would be presented in simple table showing estimated trips generated by land use.

**Response 3c** The buildout trip generation estimates for the reduced intensity alternative is summarized below. Please see Response 3a above regarding the ITE rates that were applied in the technical assessment.

<b>MXD+ External Vehicle Trip In/Out Summary – Reduced Intensity Alternative</b>							
	Daily	AM In	AM Out	AM Total	PM In	PM Out	PM Total
Vehicle Trips	85,964	1,332	2,659	4,008	3,860	3,069	6,928

**Request 4a** Documents containing the data on how project trip generation estimates were calculated (existing, reduced and proposed project) in a table by land use, (ITE) and sq ft. This is a standard calculation provided in a typical EIR traffic analysis.

**Response 4a** Please see Response 3a related to trip generation rates used in the traffic assessment.

**Request 4b** It is my understanding that the trip generation numbers by land use are then used by Fehrs and Peers in their MXD model to factor for mixed use internalization trip reductions.

**Response 4b** This is correct. The MXD model was utilized to factor mixed-use internalization trip reductions. It should be noted that the Proposed Project also applied a supplemental reduction to account for the added bicycle infrastructure associated with the project using the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) methodology.

Request 5 If the EIR does not use standard ITE trip generation calculations could you please send a document showing the method and calculations used.

Response 5 Please see Response 3a. The traffic analysis used ITE trip generation as one input of several inputs in the MXD Model to determine trip generation. This methodology and inputs are explained on Pages 26-32 of the Transportation Impact Analysis (Pages J-32 – J-38 of Appendix J of the DEIR). Below is a summary of the trip generation used in the Transportation Impact Analysis to determine project impacts:

<b>Trip Generation Comparison After Internalization and Bicycle Reductions</b>			
	Daily	AM Total	PM Total
Existing Conditions	62,146	2,789	5,144
Proposed Project	94,404	4,506	7,356

Request 6 Page 29 5.16 Environmental Analysis Transportation and Traffic states that "this methodology is described in detail on pages 26 to 31 of the TIA ". (see Appendix J). I believe the page numbers are a typo. There information on page 34 talking about trip generation pertaining to the ITE internalization methodology versus MDX model but no information is provided on how the actual trip generation totals were obtained. Please provide the analysis.

Response 6 The traffic study does describe the MXD methodology and input parameters used in the assessment on the referenced pages. See also Response 3a and 5.

Request 7 Please provide any documents containing empirical data or the technical basis for the use of 0.505 percent per year growth rate used in the SEASP cumulative traffic growth impacts analysis / LOS evaluation. The city has used a 1 percent a year growth rate prior to this EIR.

Response 7 Growth rates used in this assessment were derived from the Metro Congestion Management Program Exhibit D-1 for the City of Long Beach. Specifically, the growth difference between Year 2035 (1.177) and Year 2015 (1.076) was divided by 20 years to identify a linear growth per year of 0.00505 (0.505 percent) which was utilized in the assessment.