



# DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

## RECOMMENDATION REPORT

### CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

**Date:** June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2016  
**Time:** 8:30 a.m.  
**Place:** City Hall, Board of Public Works Room 350  
200 N. Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012  
**Public Hearing:** Required  
**Appeal Status:** Not Applicable

**Case No.:** CPC-2013-910-GPA-  
SP-CA-MS-C-M2  
**CEQA No.:** ENV 2013-0911-EIR-  
ADD2  
**Related Cases:** CPC-2013-0910-GPA-  
SP-CA-MS-C, CPC-  
2013-910-GPA-SP-  
CA-MS-C-M1, ENV  
2013-0911-EIR, ENV  
2013-0911-EIR-ADD1  
**Council No.:** All  
**Applicant:** Department of City  
Planning

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Citywide  
**PROPOSED PROJECT:** Council Changes to the Mobility Plan Amendments  
**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Add Central Avenue between 95th Street and 120th Street on the Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN).

### Background

On February 11, 2016 the City Planning Commission (CPC) acted on several proposed amendments to the Plan. These amendments included revisions to the Plan's text and enhanced networks. CPC approved the amendments and transmitted their Letter of Determination to the Mayor and City Council Committees. On May 11, 2016 the Plan was heard at the Transportation Committee meeting where Councilmember Koretz introduced a motion to revise the recommended amendments to the Plan. These revised recommendations were sent to City Council for consideration. On May 13, 2016 City Council moved to send the proposed changes in Recommendation 4 of the Transportation Committee report (see attached) simultaneously to the Los Angeles City Planning Commission and Mayor for their approval. As per the City's Charter, "if the Council proposes changes to the Plan amendment that differ from the amendment as initiated or the recommendation of the City Planning Commission, the matter shall be returned simultaneously to the City Planning Commission and the Mayor for their recommendations on the proposed changes."

At its June 9, 2016 meeting, the City Planning Commission will have the opportunity to make its recommendations on the City Council's May 13<sup>th</sup> action, which would amend portions of the Mobility Plan to:

- Substitute Gayley Avenue/Midvale Avenue for Westwood Boulevard between Le Conte and Ohio Avenues to the Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN).

- Substitute Avalon Boulevard for Central Avenue between Jefferson Boulevard and Imperial Highway to the BEN.
- Add San Pedro Street between Seventh Street and Jefferson Boulevard to the BEN.
- Amend the Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN) to include 16th Street between San Pedro Avenue and Central Avenue.
- Amend the text under the Network Concept Maps heading on page 153 of Mobility Plan 2035, Chapter 6: Action Plan to add the following: “For example, a north-south corridor identified on the BEN could be substituted with an alternative north-south corridor that is not currently on the BEN if it serves similar constituencies and destinations and is supported with additional, operational studies and community engagement.”

### **Summary and Recommendation**

The proposed amendments approved by the City Council differ from the proposals previously considered by the CPC because they now substitute parallel corridors on the Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN) rather than eliminating corridors altogether. Gayley/Midvale would replace Westwood Boulevard within the Westwood Village area and Avalon Boulevard would be substituted for Central Avenue between Jefferson Boulevard and Imperial Highway.

The BEN, which is the primary focus of the changes, is a concept strategy that highlights the City’s vision of developing a connected network of 300 miles of protected bicycle lanes (Class IV bikeways) by 2035. The corridors identified on the BEN were selected for their role in connecting people who bike to primary transit corridors as well as major employment, educational and recreational destinations. Although Westwood Boulevard and Central Avenue are preferred, the addition of Gayley Avenue/Midvale Avenue and Avalon Boulevard would achieve similar access to regional destinations and maintain the overall integrity of the BEN, as a connected citywide network.

The Department of City Planning reiterates its original recommendations, as reflected in the February 11, 2016 staff report and CPC Letter of Determination, attached to this transmittal. However, the revised text language introduced by Council makes no substantive change to the Plan but simply reinforces the opportunity for the City to identify and explore alternative corridors in the future through a community engagement process.

The proposed Council amendments would not affect the Plan’s far-reaching policies and programs and would make only limited changes to the Plan’s networks; the amendments would therefore not significantly alter Mobility Plan 2035, considered as a whole.

### **Supplemental Recommendation**

One of the Council actions above included amending the Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN) to substitute Avalon Boulevard for Central Avenue between Jefferson Boulevard and Imperial Highway to the BEN. Subsequent discussion with council offices expressed support for adding the length of Central Avenue to the Pedestrian Enhanced Districts and retaining a portion of Central Avenue on the BEN from 95<sup>th</sup> Street to the City boundary at 120<sup>th</sup> Street, if the remaining portion of Central Avenue were to be removed from the BEN. This action would not conflict with the substitution of Avalon Boulevard for Central Avenue on the BEN between Jefferson Boulevard and 95<sup>th</sup> Street. This action would also support the opportunity to provide greater low stress active transportation network benefits in South Los Angeles.

Therefore, if CPC recommends to approve the City Council initiated amendments, City Planning recommends adding Central Avenue on the BEN for the segment between 95<sup>th</sup> Street and 120<sup>th</sup> Street.

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP  
Director of Planning



Ken Bernstein, AICP  
Principal City Planner



Claire J. Bowin  
Senior City Planner



David Somers  
City Planner



**EXHIBIT 1:**  
**February 11, 2016 Mobility Plan Staff Report for CPC**

---

CPC-2013-0910-GPA-SP-CA-MS-C-M2  
June 23, 2016





# DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING RECOMMENDATION REPORT



## CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

**Date:** February 11, 2016  
**Time:** 8:30 a.m.  
**Place:** City Hall, Board of Public Works Room 350  
200 N. Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012  
**Public Hearing:** Required  
**Appeal Status:** Not Applicable

**Case No.:** CPC-2013-910-GPA-  
SP-CA-MSC-M2  
**CEQA No.:** ENV 2013-0911-EIR-  
ADD2  
**Related Cases:** CPC-2013-0910-GPA-  
SP-CA-MSC, CPC-  
2013-910-GPA-SP-  
CA-MSC-M1, ENV  
2013-0911-EIR, ENV  
2013-0911-EIR-ADD1  
**Council No.:** All  
**Applicant:** Department of City  
Planning

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Citywide

**PROPOSED PROJECT:** Amendments to the Mobility Plan 2035

## RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:


1. Conduct a public hearing on the Proposed Project.
2. Approve the staff report as the Commission Report.
3. Recommend that the City Council finds, based on its independent judgment, after consideration of the entire administrative record, including the Mobility Plan EIR, EIR No. 2013-0911-EIR; SCH No. 2013041012, certified on August 11, 2015 ("Final EIR"), First Addendum, No. ENV- 2013-0911-ADD1, and the Second Addendum dated January 28, 2016, No. ENV 2013-0911-ADD2, that the amendments to the Mobility Plan 2035 and the amendments to the Community Plans were environmentally assessed in the Final EIR and that pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 and 15164 and Public Resources Code Section 21166 no subsequent or supplemental EIR is required for approval of the Mobility Plan 2035 and Community Plan amendments.
4. Pursuant to the procedures in LAMC Section 11.5.6 and City Charter Section 555, approve and recommend that the Mayor and City Council approve a resolution that does all of the following:
  - a. Amends the Mobility Plan 2035 (as updated on January 20, 2016), by adopting the amendments (Exhibit A.2-A.3) to the Mobility Plan 2035, including text and map amendments.
  - b. Amends the Land Use Element of the General Plan (consisting of 35 community plans) to emphasize already existing law that the Community Plans' goals, objectives, policies and programs regarding circulation are aspirational and to be implemented only to the extent feasible and appropriate in light of other complementary policies in the GP (Exhibit A.1).

MICHAEL J. LOGRANDE  
Director of Planning



---

Ken Bernstein, AICP  
Principal City Planner



---

Claire J. Bowin  
Senior City Planner



---

My La, City Planning Associate  
213-978-1194

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Project Analysis**.....4

**Project Summary**

**Discussion** .....4

**Summary of Plan Amendments**

**Conclusion**.....8

**CEQA Findings** .....8

**Exhibits:**

- Exhibit A – Resolution
- Exhibit A.1 – General Plan Consistency Table
- Exhibit A.2 – Text Amendments
- Exhibit A.3 – Map Amendments
- Exhibit B – Addendum to Environmental Impact Report
- Exhibit C – Mobility Plan 2035 Document

## PROJECT ANALYSIS

### Project Summary

The Mobility Plan went through a series of adoptions starting in August 2015, with the third and final adoption occurring on January 20, 2016. The newly amended Plan includes amendments to text and technical corrections that were approved by the City Planning Commission on December 17, 2015. While the January 20<sup>th</sup> Plan incorporated most of the amendments that Council had introduced before in August 2015, the January 20<sup>th</sup> Plan did not include any of the Council motions that had been introduced last August relative to any network changes. The amendments discussed here in this staff report include those network related modifications as well as a few other policy and program amendments related to equity and community input and technical corrections that staff have suggested. The environmental impacts of these proposed amendments have been analyzed in the second Addendum to the Final EIR. In order to incorporate the proposed changes to the enhanced networks, a traffic analysis was required to analyze the impacts of the proposed amendments. The results of this analysis can be found in Exhibit B – Addendum to Environmental Impact Report.

### Discussion

The amendments are divided into two categories, text amendments (Exhibit A.2) and map amendments (Exhibit A.3). The following discussion summarizes each of the proposed amendments and describes the intent behind them.

#### **Text Amendments (Exhibit A.2)**

The three text amendments discussed below reinforce previous Plan additions and themes already found in the Plan such as equity, flexibility, and community engagement.

#### **1. Equity**

While a number of text additions regarding the topic of equity were incorporated into the January 20, 2016 edition of the Mobility Plan, subsequent discussions with Council District 8 resulted in the additional revisions to page 13, 14, and Policy 4.6 of the Plan. The revised language further elevates equity as an overarching umbrella through which the City will make future decisions that prioritize investments. When equity is used as a lens citywide, the prioritization of projects can start in areas with the highest needs. The language also further reinforces the importance of equity in the document, as mentioned in other portions of the plan.

#### **2. Policy 3.7: Regional Transit Connections**

In response to discussions with Eco-Rapid Transit, staff added an additional paragraph to the supporting text of Policy 3.7 that highlights the importance of the connection between Union Station and the southeastern areas of the LA County region and furthers the policy's intent and discussion on providing regional transit connections to key areas.

### 3. Chapter 6 - Action Plan Programs

Council District 1 introduced motion 8C in August 2015, which asked to include additional streets on the Neighborhood Enhanced Network that surrounded schools, parks, community gathering spaces, and employment destinations. In response to the motion and the additional conversations with the council office, text changes to *Program PL.4 Network Additions* are recommended. Other text changes to the program include removing the word “designate” since the enhanced networks are not a part of a street’s official classification. Taken as a whole, the revisions made to this program reinforce the flexible and iterative nature of the Neighborhood Enhanced Network, as well as the rest of the enhanced networks.

In response to a motion introduced by Council District 4 on November 25, 2105, a new program, *PL.14: Community Engagement*, was added to the Action Plan programs list. This new program specifically calls out a community engagement process for the Council District 4 area to alleviate concerns regarding the implementation of the Plan’s enhanced networks.

#### Map Amendments (Exhibit A.3)

The following changes to the circulation, Transit Enhanced Network, Neighborhood Enhanced Network, bicycle networks, and Pedestrian Enhanced Districts maps were made in response to a variety of council motions and additional discussions. Amendments to the maps were analyzed as described in the text below.

#### 1. Circulation Map Amendments - Map A4

In response to conversations with Council District 4 regarding their motion 8F, Map A4 of the Citywide General Plan Circulation System was amended to redesignate a portion of Fairfax Ave. Fairfax Ave, between Hollywood Blvd and Fountain Ave was changed to an Ave II (formerly an Ave I) to align the designation of the street with the character of the adjacent community. This change is supported by *Policy 2.14 Street Design* that calls for a street’s functional classification to be based on its current dimensions, land use context, and role that a street serves in its surrounding area. The revised classification of this portion of Fairfax Ave as an Ave II will ensure that the street’s roadway width is not to be further widened and will operate as an Ave II in the future.

#### 2. Transit Enhanced Network (TEN) – Map B

As part of a motion introduced by Council District 14, two streets were added to the TEN. The motion asked to amend the TEN by adding Valley Boulevard onto the comprehensive transit enhancement network from the Alhambra city limit to Soto Street. The motion also added Eastern Avenue onto the moderate transit enhancement network from Huntington Drive to Valley Boulevard. These streets serve as important transit corridors today and are key connections in the Council District 14 area.

### **3. Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN) – Map C2-C4**

#### 3.1 Map C2

In response to discussions with staff from Council Office 7, O'Melveny St/Haddon Ave (from Fox St. to Paxton St) was added to Map C2 in the Pacoima area to fill a needed connection across the Pacoima Wash in order to better facilitate children walking to school in the area.

#### 3.2 Map C3

Channel Rd/Entrada Dr (from Pacific Coast Highway to Adelaide Dr.) was added to Map C3. This is a technical correction since the corridor was included in the 2010 Bicycle Plan but inadvertently left off the NEN as a key street to facilitate the safe movement of slow-moving modes such as walking and biking.

#### 3.3 Map C4

In response to motions from Council District 1 and 14, four streets were added to Map C4. Wilhardt St. and Llewellyn St in CD 1 provide important local connections to the state park and surrounding schools and residential community. Council District 14's motion also asked for the addition of Ave 46 and Hill Drive to the NEN due to their value for local network connectivity.

### **4. Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN) – Map D1**

#### 4.1

In discussions with the Los Angeles Department of Transportation, staff suggested that Grand Ave. and Olive St. from 7<sup>th</sup> St. to Washington Blvd. be added to the BEN as Tier 1 Protected Bicycle Lanes since buffered bicycle lanes already exist on these two streets.

#### 4.2

In response to comments from the Port of LA, Front St and Harbor Blvd were removed from the Tier 1 Protected Bicycle Lanes due to the presence of an existing bicycle path that runs parallel to these streets.

#### 4.3

In response to Council District 14's motion, a number of streets were moved from the Bicycle Lane Network to the Bicycle Enhanced Network. Those streets are: Monterey Road from Via Marisol to Avenue 60, Olympic Boulevard from Lorena Street to Soto Street, and Valley Boulevard from the Alhambra City Limit to Soto Street. The council office felt that these corridors would benefit from the greater enhanced treatments of a fully protected bicycle lane.

#### 4.4

In response to motions from Council Districts 5 and 9, the second Addendum to the Mobility Plan EIR considered the removal of Westwood Boulevard (from Le Conte Ave to Wellworth Ave) and Central Ave (from Washington Boulevard to 95th Street) from the Bicycle Enhanced Network. While the councilpersons expressed their interest in having these segments removed, staff recommends that these segments be retained in the BEN. Both Westwood Blvd. and Central Ave serve as important north-south corridors for persons who bicycle and it would be premature at this time to foreclose the opportunity

of improving these corridors for bicycling in the future. Language has been included in the Mobility Plan (see page 153) which reinforces the conceptual nature of these network assignments and further articulates the opportunities that exist in the future to consider alternative corridors. This level of flexibility is intended to provide opportunity to study such corridors as Westwood and Central along with potential parallel alternatives at whatever point in the future the corridors are prioritized for implementation.

#### Alternative to Westwood Blvd

While at this time staff still recommends that Westwood Blvd be retained on the Bicycle Enhanced Network for the reasons discussed above in section 4.4, it is important to acknowledge that Gayley Ave, from Le Conte Ave to Wellworth Ave, runs parallel to Westwood Blvd and should be considered as an alternative corridor in the future at which time more detailed strategies are being considered.

#### Alternatives to Central Ave.

In light of Council District Nine's request that Central Ave removed from the Bicycle Enhanced Network, a parallel alternative was considered in the second Addendum. The alternative considered upgrading Avalon Blvd, between Slauson Ave to San Pedro St, from the Bicycle Lane Network (BLN) to the Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN), and adding San Pedro St, between Avalon to 7th St, to the Bicycle Enhanced Network. A segment of 16th St, from San Pedro to Central Ave, was considered for the Neighborhood Enhanced Network in order to provide a connection from San Pedro back to Central Ave in the 14th Council District. Staff still recommends that Central Ave, between Washington Blvd to 95th St, be retained for the reasons mentioned above in section 4.4.

### **5. Bicycle Lane Network (BLN) – Map D2**

#### 5.1

In response to a public comment given at the City Planning Commission on May 28, 2015, Zelzah Ave was placed on the Bicycle Lane Network for the gap closure it provides to connect the CSUN community to other bicycle facilities.

#### 5.2

Crescent Ave and Seaside Ave were removed from the Bicycle Lane Network due to the close proximity of the parallel bicycle path in the Port of LA.

#### 5.3

In response to a motion from Council District 14, five streets were added to the bicycle lane network. To the Tier 2 BLN, Mission Rd, Eastern Ave, Marengo Ave, and Verdugo Rd were added. To the Tier 3 BLN, Alhambra Ave was added. These streets provide important connections for the local community.

## 6. Pedestrian Enhanced Districts (PEDs) – Map F

In response to motions from Council District 1 and 14, a number of street segments have been added to the PEDs within each of the respective council district boundaries. The addition of these segments reflect the need to prioritize pedestrian related improvements in order to reduce collisions and further enhance the walking experience on these particular streets.

### 6.1

Within the Council District 1 area, all of the street segments that were either on the Bicycle Enhanced Network and Bicycle Lane Network have been added to the PEDs.

### 6.2

Within Council District 14, the additional segments to the PEDs fall mainly in the Arts District, El Sereno, and Northeast LA areas to fill in the gaps within the council district.

## 7. Map Footnotes

Footnotes were added to the Neighborhood Enhanced Network, Maps C1-C5 and the Pedestrian Enhanced Districts, Map F. The footnotes call for the potential selection of additional streets within disadvantaged communities and make reference to program *PL 4: Network Additions* as the process to further refine the NEN and PEDs. The footnotes emphasize the flexibility of street selection during the implementation process already called out numerous times in the Plan and the further analysis and outreach needed to implement street improvements on a neighborhood level.

## Conclusion

Planning recommends that the Citywide Planning Commission approve the proposed amendments to the Mobility Plan 2035 and recommend adoption of the Mobility Plan amendments to the City Council.

## CEQA Findings

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR), No. ENV 2013-0911-EIR, State Clearinghouse No. 2013041012, dated May 2015 (the “Final EIR”), was prepared for the Mobility Plan 2035, among other approvals. The Final EIR was prepared in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., and the State CEQA Guidelines. The document evaluates the environmental effects that could result from full implementation of the Project.

The City Council of the City of Los Angeles (the “City”) certified the Final EIR for the Proposed Project on August 11, 2015. The amendments to the plan were analyzed in a second Addendum to the EIR. See Exhibit D. The Addendum was appropriate because only minor technical changes or additions to the MP 2035 EIR were warranted; and, as verified by the second Addendum, there are no substantial changes to the project or to the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken, and no new information that was not available at the time the MP 2035 EIR was certified, that would require major revisions to the MP 2035 EIR.

# **EXHIBIT A: Proposed Resolution on Plan**

---

CPC-2013-0910-GPA-SP-CA-MS-C-M2  
February 11, 2016



## RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, on November 25, 2015, the City Council adopted the Mobility Plan 2035 (MP 2035) (Exhibit C), including adopting the Citywide Circulation System Maps as the update to the Highways and Freeways Map, and found the project was assessed in the Mobility Plan 2035 EIR, EIR No. 2013-0911-EIR; SCH No. 2013041012, certified on August 11, 2015 (Final EIR); and

WHEREAS, on January 20, 2016, the City Council adopted the entire Mobility Plan 2035 (including adopting the Citywide Circulation System Maps) with policy amendments related to equity, public safety and implementation (Updated MP 2035), and found pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 and Addendum (First Addendum) No. ENV 2013-0911-EIR-ADD1, the project was assessed in the Final EIR, and no further subsequent or supplemental environmental document is required; and

WHEREAS, the Director of the Department of City Planning initiated a General Plan amendment to amend the Updated Mobility Plan 2035, which include (1) amendments to the text of the plan to reinforce the importance of equity and community and City Council input in implementing the plan and clean-ups and corrections; and (2) amendments to the enhanced network maps (Mobility Plan Amendments); and

WHEREAS, the Director of the Department of City Planning initiated General Plan amendments to the City's 35 Community Plans to emphasize already existing law that the Community Plans' goals, objectives, policies and programs regarding circulation are aspirational and to be implemented only to the extent feasible and appropriate in light of other complementary policies in the GP (Community Plan Amendments); and

WHEREAS, City Planning prepared a second addendum, dated January 28, 2016, No. ENV 2013-0911-EIR-ADD2 ("Second Addendum") to the Final EIR, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15164 to consider the Mobility Plan Amendments and the Community Plan Amendments; and

WHEREAS, a notice of public hearing on the Mobility Plan Amendments and the Community Plan Amendments was published in the Daily Journal on February 1, 2016 in accordance with Section 11.5.6 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, on February 11, 2016 the City Planning Commission conducted a public hearing to consider the Mobility Plan Amendments and the Community Plan Amendments; and

WHEREAS, evidence, both written and oral, was duly presented to and considered by the City Planning Commission at the February 11, 2016 public hearing, including but not limited to a staff report, exhibits, appendices, and public testimony; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the City Charter and ordinance provisions, the Mayor and the City Planning Commission have transmitted their recommendations, recommending approval of the Mobility Plan Amendments and Community Plan Amendments [WITH / WITHOUT] changes [as provided in Attachment A.1]; and

WHEREAS, the City Council held a duly noticed public hearing on the Mobility Plan Amendments and the Community Plan Amendments and considered the recommendations of the Mayor and the City Planning Commission, and all oral and written evidence presented before take action; and

WHEREAS, the City Council considered the Final EIR, the First Addendum, and the Second Addendum before taking action on the Mobility Plan Amendments and the Community Plan Amendments; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds the Second Addendum was appropriate because only minor technical changes or additions to the Final EIR were warranted; and, as verified by the Second Addendum, there are no substantial changes to the project or to the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken, and no new information that was not available at the time the Final EIR was certified, that would require major revisions to the Final EIR.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES AS FOLLOWS:

1. All the above recitals are true and correct and incorporated herein. Exhibits A.1 - A.3-Maps. attached to this Resolution are incorporated herein.
2. The City Council finds, based on its independent judgment, after consideration of the entire administrative record, including the Final EIR, the First Addendum, and the Second Addendum, that the Mobility Plan Amendments and the Community Plan Amendments, attached as Exhibit "A.1-A.3" to this resolution, were environmentally assessed in the Final EIR and that pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 and 15164 and Public Resources Code Section 21166 no subsequent or supplemental EIR is required for approval of the Mobility Plan Amendments and the Community Plan Amendments.
3. Adopt the amendments to the Updated MP 2035 (Mobility Plan Amendments), as they read and are shown in Exhibit "A.2-A.3" to this resolution, including amendments to the Citywide Circulation Systems Map, as they are shown and read in Exhibit A.3 - Maps.
4. Adopt the amendments to the City's Community Plans (Community Plan Amendments), as they read in Exhibit A.1.
5. This resolution shall be effective upon its adoption.

## **EXHIBIT A.1: General Plan Consistency Table**

---

CPC-2013-0910-GPA-SP-CA-MS-C-M2  
February 11, 2016



Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Central City	P. 4-2	Objective 11-2: To Improve freeway movement and <u>capacity</u> adjacent to the Downtown area <b>in a manner consistent with the Mobility Plan.</b>
Central City	Pg. 4-5	"Key Arterial Corridor Improvements, <b>consistent with the Mobility Plan,</b> include:" (in regards to Alameda Street and Olympic Blvd at bottom of page).
Central City North	P. 3-20	First paragraph of Section D (on "TDM"): <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS E. Although most major street intersections in Central City North are in compliance with the City's policy, the level of trips generated by future development in and surrounding the plan area requires the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management Program (TDM) <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility.</b>
Central City North	P. 3-28	Goal 16: A system of highways, freeways, and streets that provides a circulation system which <b>is consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035</b> and <b>that</b> supports existing, approved, and planned land uses while maintaining a desired level of service at <del>all</del> intersections <b>where feasible.</b>
Central City North	P. 3-28	Objective 16-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <del>all</del> new development.
Central City North	P. 3-28	Policy 16-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety,</b> <del>m</del> Maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E", <b>where feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan.</b>

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Central City North	P. 3-29	In the second paragraph on the page (part of the proposal for "1. Street Widening" in Policy 16-1.1): "Below is a list of substandard street segments in the project area where street widening is recommended, <b>to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan:</b> "
Hollywood	4	In second paragraph under "Standards and Criteria": <b>Where feasible, and in a manner consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035</b> adequate highway Improvements shall be assured prior to the approval of zoning permitting intensification of land use <del>in order to avoid congestion and assure proper development.</del>
Wilshire	P. 3-31	In program for policy 13-1.4: " <b>Where feasible, and in a manner consistent with the policies of Mobility Plan 2035,</b> substantially expand peak- hour parking restrictions for more restrictive days and times along <del>all</del> Boulevards II and Avenues, and along <del>all</del> Collector Streets currently operating at a Level of Service (LOS) of "D" or below, to maximize vehicle utilization of all available lanes in all directions.
Wilshire	P. 3-35	Goal 16 text: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY,</b> PROVIDE A COMMUNITY-WIDE CIRCULATION SYSTEM OF FREEWAYS AND STREETS WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING AND PLANNED LAND USES AND ANTICIPATED TRAFFIC FLOW VOLUMES, WHILE MAINTAINING ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF SERVICE AT <del>ALL</del> INTERSECTIONS.
Wilshire	P. 3-35	Objective 16-1 text: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable Levels of Service (LOS) and ensure that necessary Freeway and Street access and improvements are provided to accommodate additional traffic anticipated from Wilshire Community Plan land use changes and/or by new development."
Wilshire	P. 3-35	Policy 16-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety,</b> <del>m</del> Maintain a satisfactory Level of Service (LOS) above LOS "D" for Boulevards II, especially those which serve Regional Commercial Centers and Community Commercial Centers; and above LOS "D" for Avenues and Collector Streets.

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Wilshire	P. 3-37	Second paragraph of Policy 16-2.1: The transportation infrastructure serving the project site and surrounding area, <del>specifically the Freeways, Highways, and Streets,</del> presently serving the affected area within the Wilshire Community Plan, have adequate capacity to accommodate the existing traffic flow volumes, and any additional traffic volume which would be generated from projects enabled by such discretionary actions.
Bel Air-Beverly Crest	P. 3-6	In fourth paragraph from top: No increase in density should be effected by zone change or subdivision unless it is determined that the <del>transportation infrastructure streets and highways</del> serving the property involved can accommodate the traffic generated.
Brentwood-Pacific Palisades	P. 3-24	Goal 13 text: <del>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY,</del> A SYSTEM OF FREEWAYS, HIGHWAYS AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING APPROVED AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ALL INTERSECTIONS.
Brentwood-Pacific Palisades	P. 3-24	Objective 13-1 text: To <del>the extent feasible and consistent with the</del> Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety, comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <del>all</del> new development.
Brentwood-Pacific Palisades	P. 3-24	Policy 13-1.1: <del>To the extent feasible and consistent with the</del> Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, <del>m</del> Maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways not to exceed LOS "D" for secondary arterials, collector streets; not exceed LOS "E" for Major Highways, and not to exceed LOS "E" in the community's major business districts.
Brentwood-Pacific Palisades	P. 3-24	Third program for Policy 13-1.1: Capital Improvement Program <del>(to be implemented where feasible and in a manner consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan)</del>
Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey	P. 3-16	First paragraph of "Transportation Demand Management Strategies": <del>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the</del> Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety, the City's objective is that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system should not exceed LOS E. Although major street intersections in the plan area are in compliance with the City's policy, the level of trips which could be generated by future development in and surrounding the plan area requires the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management Program (TDM) <del>and other improvements to enhance safety and</del> mobility.

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey	P. 3-22	Goal 16: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY</b> , A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS AND STREETS THAT PROVIDE A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT <b>ALL</b> INTERSECTIONS.
Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey	P. 3-22	Objective 16-1 text: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety</b> , comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable Levels of Service (LOS) and ensure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <b>all</b> -new development.
Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey	P. 3-22	Policy 16-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety</b> , <b>m</b> aintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E" <b>-if possible where feasible and consistent with the goals of the Mobility Plan 2035.</b>
Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey	P. 3-22	Under the third program for 16-1.1 ("Capital Improvements"): "The TIMP recommends the following street widening to expand the capacity of the street network along various corridors, <b>to the extent feasible and consistent with the aims of the Mobility Plan:</b> " (specific proposals continue to page 3-23)
Venice	P. 3-23	First paragraph of section on "Transportation Demand Management Strategies": Major street intersections in the plan area are consistent with the City's objective, <b>to the extent feasible and compatible with the Mobility Plan's policies</b> , to maintain a traffic level of service (LOS) of "E." However, the level of trips which could be generated by future development in and surrounding the Plan area requires the implementation of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility.</b>
Venice	P. 3-29	Goal 16: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY</b> , A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS AND STREETS THAT PROVIDE A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT <b>ALL</b> INTERSECTIONS.
Venice	P. 3-29	Objective 16-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety</b> , comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and ensure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <b>all</b> -new development.

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Venice	P. 3-29	Policy 16-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, m</b> Maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for major highways, secondary highways and collector streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E" <b>if possible where feasible and consistent with the goals of the Mobility Plan 2035.</b>
Venice	P. 3-30	The heading for the third program for Policy 16-1.1: "Implement the following capital improvements(Venice Traffic and Parking Study, TIMP) to the extent feasible <b>and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan."</b>
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 1-6	In "Opportunities" section under "Transportation": Utilize the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan, <b>to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan</b> , which provides for transportation improvements, promotes phased development of land uses, promotes methods of reducing peak hour work related trips, and promotes improved Level of Service on streets and interchanges.
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-34	Goal 11: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY</b> , A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF SERVICE AT ALL-INTERSECTIONS <b>WHERE FEASIBLE.</b>
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-34	Objective 11-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety</b> , comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable Levels of Service (LOS) and ensure that necessary Freeway, Highway and Street access and improvements are provided to accommodate additional traffic anticipated from Westchester-Playa del Rey Community Plan land use changes and/or by new development. ☐
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-34	Policy 11-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, s</b> Seek to maintain a satisfactory Level of Service (LOS) <del>to extent possible</del> for Major Highways, Secondary Highways and Collector Streets.
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-34	Second Program for Policy 11-1.1: "Widen Highways and Streets in those roadway segments listed in the Westchester-Playa del Rey Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Plan, <b>where feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan.</b> The TIMP identifies the following specific nonstandard roadway segments for capacity improvement consistent with their roadway classification in response to congestion levels projected for the Year 2025:" (list continues onto Pg. 3-35)

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-35 to 3-36	Program: The TIMP identifies the following segments for additional street improvements in response to congestion levels projected for the Year 2025. <b>These improvements are only to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan.</b>
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-38	Second paragraph of Policy 11-2.1: The transportation infrastructure serving the project site and surrounding area, <del>specifically the Freeways, Highways, and Streets presently serving the affected area within the Westchester-Playa del Rey Community Plan,</del> have adequate capacity to accommodate the existing traffic flow volumes, and any additional traffic volume which would be generated from projects enabled by such discretionary actions.
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-39	Program for Policy 12-1.3: <b>Substantially</b> Where feasible and consistent with the <b>Mobility Plan</b> , expand peak- hour parking restrictions for more restrictive days and times along <del>all</del> Major and Secondary Highways, and along <del>all</del> Collector Streets currently operating at a Level of Service (LOS) of “D” or below, to maximize vehicle utilization of all available lanes in all directions.
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-39	Policy 12-1.4: Identify and implement intersection improvements (channelization, turn lanes, signal modifications) on <del>all</del> Major and Secondary Highways, and <del>along some</del> Collector Streets, throughout the Westchester-Playa del Rey Community Plan Area, <b>as feasible and consistent with the policies and programs of the Mobility Plan 2035 and the Community Plans.</b>
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-44	First paragraph of "Transportation Demand Management" section: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS D. Although studies indicate that most of Westchester-Playa del Rey's major street intersections are in compliance with this City policy, the level of trips generated by future development in Westchester-Playa del Rey and in the surrounding areas require the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility</b> <del>to sustain the current level of service on the street system.</del>
West Los Angeles	P. 3-27	Goal 16: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY,</b> A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS AND STREETS THAT PROVIDE A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE <del>AT ALL</del> INTERSECTIONS.

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
West Los Angeles	P. 3-27 to 3-28	Objective 16-1: To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety, comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable Levels of Service (LOS) and ensure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by new development.
West Los Angeles	P. 3-28	Policy 16-1.1: To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Secondary Highways and Collector Streets; nor LOS "E" for Major Highways or major business districts.
West Los Angeles	P. 3-28	Under the second program for 16-1.1: Street Improvements - The Plan recommends only those street widening already approved in the West Los Angeles Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Specific Plan (Ordinance No. 171,492) and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan (2035). The TIMP identifies the following specific nonstandard roadway segments for capacity improvement consistent with their roadway classification in response to congestion levels projected for the Year 2010.[TIMP]
Westwood	P. 3-25	Goal 15: TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY, A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM SUPPORTING EXISTING AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ALL INTERSECTIONS, WHERE FEASIBLE.
Westwood	P. 3-25	Objective 15-1: To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety, comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable Levels of Service (LOS) and ensure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by new development.
Westwood	P. 3-25	Policy 15-1.1: To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for secondary highways and collector streets; nor LOS "E" for major highways or major business districts.
Westwood	P. 3-27	Objective 15-3 : To ensure that the circulation system is adequate to lessen traffic congestion in the Community, where feasible and appropriate.

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Northeast LA	P. 3-25	GOAL 10: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY</b> , A SYSTEM OF FREEWAYS, HIGHWAYS AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT <del>ALL</del> INTERSECTIONS.
Northeast LA	P. 3-25	<b>Objective 10-1: To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety</b> , comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service and ensure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <del>all</del> new development.
Northeast LA	P. 3-26	Policy 10-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety</b> , <del>m</del> Maintain Levels of Service for streets and highways not to exceed LOS "D" for secondary arterials, collector streets, and local streets; not to exceed LOS "E" on Major Highways or in the community's major business districts.
Northeast LA	P. 3-26	Second program for Policy 10-1.1: Encourage the completion of the following street programs in the City's Capital Improvement Program, <b>where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan</b> .
Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley	Pps. 3-46 to 3-47	In TDM Section: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety</b> , <del>it</del> is the City's objective to maintain acceptable Levels of Service (LOS E and F are considered unsatisfactory) throughout the Plan area as growth occurs. Studies indicate that the majority of the street segments are operating at acceptable Levels of Service. However, the level of trips generated by future development in the Plan area and surrounding communities requires implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility to sustain the current level of service on the street system</b> .
Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley	P. 3-49	Second program for policy 12-2.1: Institute peak hour parking restrictions to add travel lanes on boulevards as long as such measures do not conflict with existing bicycle facilities and Metro Rapid Bus service <b>or the policies of Mobility Plan 2035</b> .
Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley	P. 3-49	GOAL 13: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY</b> , A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES ADEQUATE CIRCULATION TO SUPPORT EXISTING, APPROVED AND PLANNED LAND USES AND MAINTAINS A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT <del>ALL</del> INTERSECTIONS.

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley	P. 3-49	Objective 13-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by all new development.
Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley	P. 3-49	Policy 13-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety,</b> maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways, that should not exceed LOS D for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E" <b>where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan.</b>
Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley	P. 3-50	Second Program for Policy 13-1.1: <b>Where feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan,</b> implement street re-designations that will more accurately reflect the capacity and function of various streets in the Plan area and amend the Mobility Plan, an Element of the General Plan (see Figure 7).
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-17	Under TDM section: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS E. Studies indicate that most of Canoga Park - Winnetka - Woodland Hills - West Hills major street intersections currently meet this standard. However, the level of trips generated by future development in the plan area and surrounding communities requires implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program and <b>other improvements to enhance safety and mobility to sustain the current level of service on the street system.</b>
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-19	Goal 13: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY,</b> A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES ADEQUATE CIRCULATION TO SUPPORT EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES AND MAINTAINS A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ALL INTERSECTIONS.
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-19	Objective 13-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by all-new development.

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-19	Policy 13-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, maintain</b> a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a arterial or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E", <b>where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan.</b>
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-19	In the first program for policy 13-1.1 (bottom): <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan 2035, implement the Warner Center Specific Plan Phase I channelization and striping improvements on Burbank Boulevard from Topanga Canyon Boulevard to Ventura Freeway and Oxnard Street form Topanga Canyon Boulevard to Canoga Avenue.</b>
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-20	Second Program for Policy 13-1.1 (first on page): "Implement the following Warner Center Specific Plan Phase I peak hour parking restrictions or prohibitions, <b>to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies and programs of the Mobility Plan 2035, to provide 6 through lanes of traffic, at least during peak traffic periods [TIMP]:"</b>
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-20	Third program for policy 13-1.1 (second on page): <b>In a manner feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan (2035), implement intersection improvements (including right-of-way acquisition, intersection flaring, and signal improvements) recommended in the Ventura/Cahuenga Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan, Phase I and II. [TIMP].</b>
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-20	Fourth program for policy 13-1.1 (third on page): <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan (2035), implement Warner Center Specific Plan Phase I intersection improvements as growth and traffic warrants [TIMP].</b>
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-20	Fifth Program for policy 13-1.1 (fourth on page): Improve to their designated standard specifications, substandard segments of arterials expected to experience heavy traffic congestion by the year 2010, <b>to the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan.</b> The following streets should be included in the City's Capital Improvement Program.
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	Pg. 3-20	Sixth Program for policy 13-1.1 (bottom of page): "Implement the following Warner Center Specific Plan Phase I street improvements, <b>in a manner feasible and consistent with the policies and programs of the Mobility Plan:"</b>

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-21	Seventh Program for policy 13-1.1 (middle of page): Implement the following street widenings, <b>to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies and programs of the Mobility Plan.</b> [TIMP]
Encino-Tarzana	P. 3-19	Under TDM section: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS D. The level of trips generated by future development in the Encino-Tarzana area and the surrounding communities require the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility</b> <del>to sustain the current levels of service on the street system.</del>
Encino-Tarzana	P. 3-21	In the second program for policy 12-1.1: "2. Peak Parking Restrictions <b>(to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan 2035):</b> "
Encino-Tarzana	P. 3-22	In the second program for Policy 12-1.1 (for TSM strategies): "3. Intersection Improvements <b>(to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan 2035):</b> "
Encino-Tarzana	P. 3-22	Goal 13: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY,</b> A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT <del>ALL</del> INTERSECTIONS.
Encino-Tarzana	P. 3-22	Objective 13-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <del>a</del> new development.
Encino-Tarzana	P. 3-23	Policy 13-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety,</b> <del>m</del> Maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets, wherever possible. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E," <b>where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan</b> <del>if possible.</del>

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Encino-Tarzana	P. 3-23	In the third program for 13-1.1 ("Capital Improvements"): "1. Proposed street widenings (to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan)"
North Hollywood-Valley Village	P. 3-4	Third paragraph of the "Circulation" section: Adequate traffic infrastructure roadway improvements shall be assured prior to the approval of zoning, permitting intensification of land use in order to avoid congestion and assure proper development.
Reseda-West Van Nuys	P. 3-20	Amend the TDM introductory section: To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not to exceed LOS D. Although studies indicate that most of Reseda - West Van Nuys- major street intersections are in compliance with this City policy, the level of trips generated by future development in Reseda - West Van Nuys- and in the surrounding North San Fernando Valley areas require the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility to sustain the current level of service on the street system.
Reseda-West Van Nuys	P. 3-23	GOAL 13: TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY, A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES ADEQUATE CIRCULATION TO SUPPORT EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ALL INTERSECTIONS. "
Reseda-West Van Nuys	P. 3-23	Objective 13-1: To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety, comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by all new development.
Reseda-West Van Nuys	P. 3-23	Policy 13-1.1: To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets, wherever possible. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E," where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan.

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Reseda-West Van Nuys	Pg. 3-24	Second Program under Policy 13-1.1: <i>(Ryland's note, not plan text)</i> In lane addition and widening proposals starting at that for Saticoy Street (from Valjean to Woodley), add phrase "where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan" next to proposals to "improve" or "provide" lanes (first and second at top) or "improve and implement peak (hour) parking restrictions" (third through fifth on the page).
Reseda-West Van Nuys	P. 3-24	Third Program for Policy 13-1.1: Encourage the completion of the following street improvements in the City's Capital Improvement Program (Five Year Program - Pictorial Guide FY 1996-7 to 2000-2001), <b>to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan:</b>
Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass	P. 3-18	Under TDM section: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS E. Although studies indicate that most of Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass major street intersections are in compliance within this City policy, the level of trips generated by future development in the plan area and the surrounding communities require the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility to sustain the current level of service on the street system.</b>
Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass	P. 3-20	Goal 13: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY,</b> A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ALL INTERSECTIONS.
Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass	P. 3-21	Objective 13-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <del>all</del> new development.
Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass	P. 3-21	Policy 13-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety,</b> maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E," <b>where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan.</b>

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass	P. 3-21	First program for policy 13-1.1: Improve, to their designated standard specifications, substandard segments of those arterials which are expected to experience heavy traffic congestion by the year 2010. The following streets should be included in the City's Capital Improvement Program, <b>but only improved to the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan:</b>
Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass	Pg. 3-22	Third program for policy 13-1.1: Capital Improvements <b>(to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan).</b> [TIMP]
Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks	P. 3-20	Under TDM section: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS D. Although studies indicate that most of the Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks' major street intersections are in compliance with this City policy, the level of trips generated by future development in the Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks and in the surrounding San Fernando Valley areas, require the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility</b> <del>to sustain the current level of service on the street system.</del>
Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks	P. 3-23	Goal 14: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY, A SYSTEM OF FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ALL INTERSECTIONS.</b>
Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks	P. 3-23	Objective 14-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and ensure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <del>all</del> new development.
Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks	P. 3-23	Policy 14-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety,</b> maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E" <b>where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's policies.</b>

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks	Pps. 3-23 to 3-24	Under third program for policy 14-1.1 ("Capital Improvements"): "1. Proposed Street Widening [TIMP] <b>(to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan):</b> "
Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks	Pg. 3-24	Under third program for policy 14-1.1 ("Capital Improvements"): "2. Proposed roadway extensions [TIMP] <b>(only to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan):</b> "
Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks	Pg. 3-24	Fourth program for policy 14-1.1: " <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan, e</b> ncourage the completion of the following street improvements in the City's Capital Improvement Program (Five Year Program- Pictorial Guide FY 1996-97 to 2000-2001):"
Chatsworth-Porter Ranch	Pg. 8	Third paragraph of "Standards and Criteria" sub-section of "Circulation" section: Adequate <b>traffic infrastructure highway improvements</b> shall be assured prior to the approval of zoning permitting intensification of land use in order to <u>avoid congestion</u> and assure proper development.
Mission Hills-Panorama City-North Hills	P. 3-19	In first paragraph of the "TDM" Section: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS E. Although studies indicate that most of Mission Hills - Panorama City - North Hills' major street intersections are in compliance with this City policy, the level of trips generated by future development in Mission Hills - Panorama City - North Hills and in the surrounding North San Fernando Valley areas require the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility</b> <del>to sustain the current level of service on the street system.</del>
Mission Hills-Panorama City-North Hills	P. 3-22	Goal 13: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY,</b> A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT <del>ALL</del> INTERSECTIONS.
Mission Hills-Panorama City-North Hills	P. 3-22	Objective 13-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's and Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <del>all</del> new development.

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Mission Hills-Panorama City-North Hills	P. 3-22	Policy 13-1.1: <i>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's and Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g. walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety,</i> maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E", <i>if feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's policies.</i>
Mission Hills-Panorama City-North Hills	P. 3-22	(3rd) Program for Policy 13-1.1: <i>To the extent consistent with the Mobility Plan,</i> construct a new overpass and connect Satcoy Street across the Southern Pacific Railroad property between Woodman Avenue and Van Nuys Boulevard. This development would reduce traffic impacts on other streets and improve circulation. The extension of Arminta Street east of Van Nuys Boulevard should be joined with Satcoy Street as part of this project and the project on the General Motors Site.
Mission Hills-Panorama City-North Hills	Pps. 3-22 to 3-23	Under program on "Capital Improvements" (the fifth program for Policy 13-1.1), add the phrase " <i>to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan</i> " in parentheses after the headers titled "1. Proposed Street Widening" and "2. Proposed roadway extensions".
Northridge	Pg. 3-20	In first paragraph of "TDM" Section: <i>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</i> it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS D. The level of trips generated by future development in Northridge and in the surrounding North San Fernando Valley areas require the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program <i>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility</i> <del>to sustain the current level of service on the street system.</del>
Northridge	Pg. 3-23	Goal 13: <i>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY,</i> A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREE-WAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ALL INTER-SECTIONS.
Northridge	Pg. 3-23	Objective 13-1: <i>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's and Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</i> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by all new development.

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Northridge	Pg. 3-23	Policy 13-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's and Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS F on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E", if possible feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's policies.</b>
Northridge	Pg. 3-24	Under the Program on "Capital Improvements" add the phrase <b>"to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan"</b> in parentheses after the headers for "1. Proposed street widenings", "2. Proposed street extensions" and "3. The following streets are recommended to be restriped with peak hour parking prohibited to provide an additional travel lane in the peak direction during the peak hour [TIMP]."
Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace	Pg. 3-19	In the first paragraph in the section on TDM: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety, it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS E.</b>
Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace	Pg. 3-22	Goal 13: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY, A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USE WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ALL-INTERSECTIONS.</b>
Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace	Pg. 3-22	Objective 13-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety, comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by all-new development.</b>
Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace	Pg. 3-22	Policy 13-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E" if possible feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan.</b>
Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace	Pg. 3-22	Next to the program (second under Policy 13-1.1) for "Highway Improvements (TIMP)," add the parenthetical phrase, <b>"to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan."</b>

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon	Pg. 3-23	Goal 13: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY</b> , A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT <del>ALL</del> INTERSECTIONS.
Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon	Pg. 3-23	Objective 13-1: To <b>the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety</b> , comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <del>all</del> new development.
Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon	Pg. 3-23	Policy 13-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety</b> , <del>m</del> Maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. Whenever possible <b>and in a manner consistent with the Mobility Plan</b> , if existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should not be allowed to further deteriorate.
Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon	Pg. 3-23	2nd Program for Policy 13-1.1: <b>"In a manner consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan</b> , implement the following peak-hour parking restrictions:"
Harbor Gateway	P. 3-4	In third paragraph of "Freeways and Streets" section: No increase in zoning density or intensity shall be effected unless it is determined that the <del>traffic infrastructure</del> <del>Local Streets and the Major and Secondary Highways</del> serving the general area of the property involved, <del>is</del> <b>are</b> adequate to serve traffic needs. <b>Where feasible and warranted</b> , <del>a</del> adequate improvement of abutting highways and streets shall be required in connection with the approval of any such zoning intensification.
Wilmington-Harbor City	P. 3-29	In first paragraph of section on TDM: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety</b> , <del>it</del> is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS E. Although studies indicate that most of Wilmington-Harbor City's major street intersections are in compliance with this City policy, the level of trips generated by future development in Wilmington-Harbor City and in the surrounding South Bay areas require the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility</b> <del>to sustain the current level of service on the street system.</del>

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Wilmington-Harbor City	P. 3-34	Goal 15: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY</b> , A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ALL INTERSECTIONS.
Wilmington-Harbor City	P. 3-34	Objective 15-1: To <b>the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety</b> , comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <del>all</del> new development.
Wilmington-Harbor City	P. 3-34	Policy 15-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety</b> , maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E" <b>where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan.</b>
Wilmington-Harbor City	P. 3-34	Second program (for policy 15-1.1): "Funded Capital Improvements. The following capital improvements are planned for the area, <b>to the extent that they are feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan:</b> "

## **EXHIBIT A.2: Mobility Plan 2035 Text Amendments**

---

CPC-2013-0910-GPA-SP-CA-MS-C-M2  
February 11, 2016



## 1. Equity

page 13

Edit first paragraph, last sentence, to replace the word “diverse” with “varied”

Edit fourth paragraph, second sentence, to replace the phrase “geographic social” with “regional”

Edit last paragraph, first sentence to read: Mobility Plan 2035 includes goals that are equal in weight and define the City’s high-level mobility priorities.

Edit goals list by taking out numbering system and replacing with bullet points. Flip order of World Class Infrastructure and Access for All Angelenos to read:

- Safety First
- Access for All Angelenos
- World Class Infrastructure
- Collaboration, Communication, and Informed Choices
- Clean Environments & Healthy Communities

Add to end of page after discussion of goals:

These goals represent a confluence of transportation and public policy health that can create opportunities to address the historic inequities in the City that have starkly limited quality of life in low-income communities. By placing a citywide emphasis on safety, access, and health the city can begin to equalize the playing field and address socioeconomically disadvantaged areas with the highest need to connect people to more prospects of success through mobility.

Page 14, Key Policy Initiatives

Edit second bullet point to read: Use data to prioritize transportation decisions that strive towards equity in safety, public health, access, social benefits, and/or economic benefits

Policy 4.6 Data-Driven Prioritization of Projects

Amend policy as follows:

Make the most of limited financial resources by utilizing data to prioritize transportation projects based upon achieving equity in safety, public health, access, social benefits, and/or economic benefits.

## 2. Policy 3.7: Regional Transit Connections

Policy 3.7, Chapter 3, page 108

Modify supporting text of policy 3.7 Regional Transit Connections to include information regarding the West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor to read: The West Santa Ana Branch (WSAB) Transit Corridor which is initially funded by Measure R would provide a thirty-four mile corridor connecting Union Station to Downtown Los Angeles with the south/eastern cities of Huntington Park, South Gate, Paramount, Bellflower, Artesia and Cerritos. These connections could improve passenger mobility while providing opportunities for transit oriented development and economic development.

### 3. Chapter 6 – Action Plan Programs

PL4. Network Additions. Identify ~~and designate~~ bicycle, neighborhood, and transit enhanced streets and pedestrian enhanced ~~designation~~ districts in Community Plan updates to provide local complements to the Citywide Transit, Neighborhood, and Bicycle Enhanced Networks, and Pedestrian Enhanced Destinations and increase access to area amenities including medical, schools, parks, major employment centers, and community facilities through continuous, predictable and safe sidewalks, intersections, bikeways, and transit support facilities.

#### **Add to Chapter 6 Action Plan a new program PL 14:**

PL.14: Community Engagement - Conduct extensive community engagement, develop detailed operational studies and design options and undertake additional environmental analysis for the following network segments within the Council District Four boundaries before implementing any street modifications: Melrose Avenue between Highland and Western Avenues; Lankershim between 134 Freeway and Cahuenga Boulevard, 4th Street between Highland and Western and segments of the BEN and/or TEN within the boundaries of the Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council. The Council office and community stakeholders would play a critical role in finalizing any plans or projects for these corridors. Alternative parallel corridors, in lieu of the ones identified here, may be considered as potential network substitutes during this process.

## **EXHIBIT A.3: Mobility Plan 2035 Map Amendments**

---

CPC-2013-0910-GPA-SP-CA-MS-C-M2  
February 11, 2016



## 1. Circulation Map – Map A4

Fairfax Ave, from Hollywood Blvd down to Fountain Ave will be designated an Ave II (formerly an Ave I) to align the designation of the street with the character of the adjacent community.

## 2. Transit Enhanced Network (TEN) – Map B

- Add as a Comprehensive Transit Enhanced Network: Valley Boulevard from the Alhambra city limit to Soto Street.
- Add as a Moderate Transit Enhanced Network on: Eastern Avenue from Huntington Drive to Valley Boulevard.

## 3. Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN) – Map C2-C4

Map C2 – NEN

- Add O'Melveny St/Haddon Ave (Fox St. to Paxton St)

Map C3 – NEN

- Add Channel Rd/Entrada Dr (PCH to Adelaide Dr. ). This is already included in the 2010 Bicycle Plan but was inadvertently left off the NEN.

Map C4 – NEN

- Add Wilhardt St. from Spring St to Main St.
- Add Llewellyn St from Rondout St to Main St.
- Add Avenue 46 from Eagle Rock Boulevard to York Boulevard
- Add Hill Drive from Eagle Vista Drive to Sierra Villa Drive (and extended west to Ellenwood)

## 4. Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN) – Map D1

4.1

- Grand and Olive (Seventh to Washington) were added as Tier 1 Protected Bicycle Lanes.

4.2

- Front St and Harbor Blvd were removed from the Tier 1 Protected Bicycle Lanes.

4.3

- Move from BLN and place on BEN:
  - Monterey Road from Via Marisol to Avenue 60
  - Olympic Boulevard from Lorena Street to Soto Street
  - Valley Boulevard from the Alhambra City Limit to Soto Street

## 5. Bicycle Lane Network (BLN) – Map D2

5.1

- Zelzah Ave (from Lassen to Plummer) was added to the Tier 2 Bicycle Lanes
- Zelzah Ave (from Plummer to Nordhoff) was added to the Tier 3 Bicycle Lanes

5.2

- Crescent Ave was removed from the Tier 2 Bicycle Lanes
- Seaside Ave was removed from the Tier 3 Bicycle Lanes

### 5.3

- Place on Tier 2 BLN:
  - Mission Road from Cesar Chavez Avenue to Jesse Street
  - Eastern Avenue from Huntington Drive to Valley Boulevard
  - Marengo Avenue from Soto Street to Fickett Street
  - Verdugo Road from Eagle Rock Boulevard to the Glendale city limit
- Place on Tier 3 BLN:
  - Alhambra Avenue from Eastern Avenue to the Alhambra city limit

## 6. Pedestrian Enhanced Districts (PEDs) – Map F

### 6.1

- Add to PEDs – all segments within CD 1 that are on the BLN and BEN

### 6.2

- Add to Pedestrian Enhanced District in CD 14:
  1. York Boulevard from Eagle Rock Boulevard to San Pascual Avenue
  2. Santa Fe Avenue between Center Street and 7th Street
  3. Mateo Street between Santa Fe Avenue and 7th Street
  4. Figueroa Street from York Boulevard to Colorado Boulevard
  5. 6th Street from Mateo Street to Mesquit Street
  6. Mesquit Street from 6th Street to Jesse Street
  7. Myers Street from Jesse Street to 7th Street
  8. Jesse Street from Mission Road to Clarence Street
  9. Clarence Street from 4th Street to Jesse Street
  10. Anderson Street from 4th Street to 7th Street
  11. Rio Street from Jesse St to 7th St
  12. 6th Street from Mission Road to Clarence Street
  13. Mission Road from 1st Street to Jesse Street
  14. Colorado Boulevard from Glendale city limit to Pasadena city limit
  15. Huntington Drive from Mission Road to Kendall Avenue
  16. 4th Street from Alameda Street to the County of Los Angeles line

### **Add the following text as a footnote to the Neighborhood Enhanced Network Maps:**


Consider incorporating NEN type improvements to any street that serves a school, park, community gathering place or major employment destination within Cal EPA's SB 535 list of Disadvantaged Communities to ensure a safe and pleasant active transportation option.

This map may further be amended, as described in program PL 4, as a result of future analysis during a community plan update.

### **Add the following text as a footnote to the PED Map:**

Consider incorporating pedestrian type improvements to any street that serves a school, park, community gathering place or major employment destination within Cal EPA's SB 535 list of Disadvantaged Communities to ensure a safe and pleasant active transportation option.

This map may further be amended, as described in program PL 4, as a result of future analysis during a community plan update.




designated change

**CITYWIDE GENERAL PLAN  
CIRCULATION SYSTEM**  
Map A4 - CENTRAL MIDCITY SUBAREA


Boulevard I	Divided Streets	Modified Streets
Boulevard II	Scenic Hwys	100 Modified ROW
Avenue I	Freeways	100 Modified RD
Avenue II	Collector Streets	
Avenue III	Local Streets/Other Streets	
City of Los Angeles Boundary		

Collector, local, and other streets (such as mountain and airport roads) are shown for reference only. Refer to community plan or NavigateLA for more detail.





**DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES**



**TRANSIT ENHANCED NETWORK**

Map B


- Moderate Transit Enhanced Streets
- Moderate Plus Transit Enhanced Streets
- Comprehensive Transit Enhanced Streets
- - - Future Valley/ West Transit Study Corridor
- Existing & Planned Rail/Busway
- Transit Stations
- Arterials
- Freeways
- City of Los Angeles Boundary




# NEIGHBORHOOD ENHANCED NETWORK - VALLEY SUBAREA


Map C2

- Neighborhood Network
- Arterials
- City of Los Angeles Boundary



0 0.5 1 2 3 4 Miles







**NEIGHBORHOOD ENHANCED NETWORK-  
CENTRAL, EAST & SOUTH SUBAREA**  
Map C4

- Neighborhood Network
- Arterials
- City of Los Angeles Boundary

0 1 2 3 Miles



**DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES**




**BICYCLE ENHANCED NETWORK  
(LOW STRESS NETWORK)**


Map D1

- Bicycle Paths
- Tier 1 Protected Bicycle Lanes
- BEN Segments from the Neighborhood Enhanced Network
- Arterials
- Freeways
- City of Los Angeles Boundary





**DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES**



**BICYCLE LANE NETWORK**  
Map D2

- Tier 2 Bicycle Lane
- Tier 3 Bicycle Lane
- Arterials
- Freeways
- City of Los Angeles Boundary





# **EXHIBIT B:**

## **Addendum to Environmental Impact Report**

---

CPC-2013-0910-GPA-SP-CA-MSC-M2  
February 11, 2016





City of Los Angeles  
Department of City Planning

City Hall • 200 N. Spring Street, Room 750 • Los Angeles, CA 90012



*Second Addendum to*  
**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**  
*CITY OF LOS ANGELES*

---

***City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035***  
***Case Number: ENV 2013-0911-EIR-ADD2***  
***RELATED CASE Number CPC-2013-0910-GPA-SP-CA-MS***  
***State Clearinghouse No. 2013041012***

**Project Description:** The Mobility Plan 2035 (MP 2035) is a comprehensive revision of the adopted 1999 City of Los Angeles Transportation Element of the General Plan (GP) that guides mobility decisions in the City through year 2035, coupled with supporting documents and discretionary actions to further align the City's street standards, processes and procedures with the goals of the MP 2035. The MP 2035 was approved by City Council on November 25, 2015, along with certification of EIR No. ENV-2013-0911-EIR; SCH No. 2013041012 (Final EIR). The MP 2035 was fully readopted with policy amendments on January 20, 2016 (Updated MP 2035). The Updated MP 2035 was approved relying on the Final EIR and Addendum No. ENV-2013-0911-EIR-ADD1. Subsequent to the December and January approvals, the Director of Planning initiated the following amendments to the MP2035 and the City's Community Plans (collectively referred to as the Second Updated MP 2035):

1) Text changes to the 35 Community Plans to emphasize already existing law that the Community Plans' goals, objectives, policies and programs regarding circulation are aspirational and to be implemented only to the extent feasible and appropriate in light of other complementary policies in the GP; 2) Minor refinements/clarifications to Plan text; 3) A new program PL 14 has been added to provide for extensive community engagement and development of detailed operational studies for specified network segments in Council District (CD) 4; 4) Addition of footnotes to both the Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN) and Pedestrian Enhanced Districts (PED) maps to address incorporating NEN and other pedestrian improvements to streets that serve schools, parks, community gathering places or major employment destinations in disadvantaged communities; 5) Revised maps reflecting minor changes to networks including additional areas that have been added to the PED map in the CD 1 area.

This addendum considers whether the Second Updated MP 2035 requires a subsequent or supplemental EIR pursuant to Public Resources Section, 21166 and CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15162 and 15164. Additionally, this addendum analyzes and supports a revised impact conclusion with respect to impacts on Emergency Services, from Potentially Significant to Less than Significant based on further consideration, including evaluation of Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) Strategic Plan (April 2015) and coordination with the LAFD staff.

**PREPARED BY:**  
*Sirius Environmental*

**ON BEHALF OF:**  
The City of Los Angeles  
Department of City Planning

**January 2016**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Purpose of Addendum	1
B. CEQA Requirements	1
2. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED SECOND UPDATE TO MP 2035	3
A. Text Changes to Community Plans	3
B. Refinements to Plan Text, Added Program, New Footnotes	4
C. Revised Maps	6
3. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS	10
A. Transportation, Parking and Safety	10
B. Land Use and Planning	19
C. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases	20
D. Noise and Vibration	20
E. Biological Resources	21
F. Other Impacts Addressed in Initial Study	21
4. Conclusion	22

**Page**

**List of Tables** (same numbers as Recirculated Draft EIR)

4.1-19	Summary of AM Peak period Roadway Operating Conditions	11
4.1-20	Summary of PM Peak period Roadway Operating Conditions	12
4.1-28	Vehicle Miles Travelled in the City of Los Angeles	14
4.1-29	Vehicle Miles Travelled Per Capita (Employment plus Population) in the City of Los Angeles	15

**Appendices**

- A. General Plan Consistency Table
- B. Updated Network Maps (figure refers to the original MP 2035 mapping designation -- Map A4, Map B, Map C2, C3 & C4, Map D1 & D2, Map F):
  - City General Plan Circulation System (Map A4 – Central, MidCity Subarea)
  - Transit Enhanced Network (Map B)
  - Neighborhood Enhanced Network – Valley SubArea (Map C2)
  - Neighborhood Enhanced Network – West SubArea (Map C3)
  - Neighborhood Enhanced Network – Central, East and South SubAreas (Map C4)
  - Bicycle Enhanced Network (Low Stress network) (Map D1)
  - Bicycle Lane Network (Map D2)
  - Pedestrian Analysis (Map F)

# 1. INTRODUCTION

This document is the Second Addendum to the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035 (MP 2035) Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR - SCH# **2013041012**, hereafter referred to as the Final EIR).

## A. PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM

The purpose of this Addendum is to evaluate the environmental effects, for purposes of Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15162 and 15164, of the Second Updated MP 2035, which includes: 1) Text changes to the 35 Community Plans to emphasize already existing law that the Community Plans' goals, objectives, policies and programs regarding circulation are aspirational and to be implemented only to the extent feasible and appropriate in light of other complementary policies in the GP; 2) Minor refinements/clarifications to MP 2035 text; 3) A new program PL 14 has been added to provide for extensive community engagement and development of detailed operational studies for specified network segments in Council District (CD) 4; 4) Addition of footnotes to both the Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN) and Pedestrian Enhanced Districts (PED) maps to address incorporating NEN and other pedestrian improvements to streets that serve schools, parks, community gathering places or major employment destinations in disadvantaged communities; and 5) Revised maps reflecting minor changes to networks including additional areas that have been added to the PED map in the CD 1 area.

In addition, this Addendum revises the EIR conclusion with respect to impact on Emergency Services, from Potentially Significant to Less than Significant based on further consideration, including evaluation of Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) Strategic Plan (April 2015) and coordination with the LAFD staff.

## B. CEQA REQUIREMENTS

In accordance with Section 15164 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the Lead Agency shall prepare an Addendum to an EIR if some changes or additions are necessary that will not have significant new impacts or substantially increase previously identified significant impacts. Specifically, the Guidelines state:

- *The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred (Section 15164 (a)).*

Section 15162 provides that, "[w]hen an EIR has been certified ...no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole record, one or more of the following:"

- *Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR ... due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects (Section 15162 (a)(1));*
- *Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR ... due to the*

*involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects (Section 15162 (a)(2)); or*

- *New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:*
  - *The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration (Section 15162 (a)(3)(A));*
  - *Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR (Section 15162 (a)(3)(B));*
  - *Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative (Section 15162 (a)(3)(C)); or*
  - *Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative (Section 15162 (a)(3)(D)).*

The Guidelines also state that:

- *An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration (Section 15164 (c));*
- *The decision-making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project (Section 15164 (d)); and*
- *A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum to an EIR, the lead agency's findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence (Section 15164 (e)).*

This Addendum has been prepared in accordance with relevant provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 (as amended) and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. This Addendum describes the Second Updated MP 2035 and evaluates underlying assumptions to the analysis of impacts that are identified in the Final EIR. The analysis demonstrates that the impact conclusions for the Second Updated MP 2035 are consistent with conclusions of the Final EIR and will not result in new significant impacts or substantially increase the significance of impacts previously identified. As such, this Addendum is the appropriate environmental document under CEQA.

In addition, this document revises the conclusion with respect to Emergency Access. The Los Angeles Fire Department Strategic Plan was published in April 2015 after publication of the Recirculated Draft EIR. That document has been more fully evaluated and discussions with LAFD have helped clarify the impact such that the conclusion is now changed from Potentially Significant to Less than Significant.

## **2. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED SECOND UPDATE TO MP 2035**

The Second Update to the MP 2035 contains three categories of changes to the Updated MP 2035: (1) text changes to the City's 35 Community Plans ("Community Plan Changes"); (2) text changes to the policies, programs and goals of the Updated MP 2035 ("Updated MP 2035 Changes"); and (3) changes to the Enhanced Networks ("Network Changes"). These changes are described below, including their potential for foreseeable impacts.

### **A. COMMUNITY PLANS CHANGES**

The City proposes a number of changes to its Community Plans that is declarative of existing City law, but is intended to emphasize that the Community Plans' goals, objectives, policies and programs regarding circulation are aspirational and to be implemented only to the extent feasible and appropriate in light of other complementary policies in the GP. The proposed changes are reflect applicable State and regional policies and regulations including AB 32 and related legislation, the Complete Streets Act and the 2012 – 2035 RTP/SCS and Draft 2016 RTP/SCS. These changes are listed in Appendix A to this Addendum and Appendix A.1 of the Staff Report.<sup>1</sup>

In general, the Community Plan Changes make express that any contemplated improvements to the roadway network should take into consideration the Mobility Plan 2035's goals, objectives, policies and programs.. Further, they consist of changes to highlight that desirable levels of service are to be maintained "to the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety."

It is not foreseeable that the changes to the text of the community plans identified in Appendix A will result in any new significant impacts or increases to previously identified significant impacts from the Final EIR because, as explained, the Community Plan Changes are declarative and reiterative of existing City law. The current goals, objectives, policies and programs in the various Community Plans, as provided in Appendix A, include various policies and programs calling for street and intersection improvements and for maintenance of certain level of service (LOS) standards for various streets in the City. The goals, objectives, policies, and programs in the City's Community Plans have always been aspirational, and not mandatory. Given that the proposed text amendments simply emphasize the already aspirational nature of the goals, objectives, policies and programs, they would not be expected to change the project assessed in the Final EIR. The added language would not result in physical changes to the MP 2035 enhanced networks as compared to what was evaluated in the Final EIR. Nothing about the Community Plan Changes affects the assumptions in the Final EIR, but would in fact be fully consistent with what was analyzed in the Final EIR. As such, there would be no new or more significant impacts from those analyzed in the Final EIR.

Based on the above, the Community Plan Changes are not further analyzed in Section 3 of this addendum.

---

<sup>1</sup> Staff Report regarding changes to planning documents related to MP 2035, February 11, 2016.

**B. UPDATED MP 2035 CHANGES (PLAN TEXT, ADDED PROGRAM, NEW FOOTNOTE)**

All of the proposed Updated MP 2035 (or Updated Mobility Plan) Changes are provided below.

**Introduction Chapter**

Page 13, amend as follows:

Edit first paragraph, last sentence, to replace the word “diverse” with “varied.”

Edit fourth paragraph, second sentence, to replace the phrase “geographic social” with “regional.”

Edit last paragraph, first sentence to read (new text shown in underline): Mobility Plan 2035 includes goals that are equal in weight and define the City’s high-level mobility priorities.

Edit goals list by taking out numbering system and replacing with bullet points. Flip order of World Class Infrastructure and Access for All Angelenos to read:

- Safety First
- Access for All Angelenos
- World Class Infrastructure
- Collaboration, Communication, and Informed Choices
- Clean Environments & Healthy Communities

Add to end of page after discussion of goals:

These goals represent a confluence of transportation and public policy health that can create opportunities to address the historic inequities in the City that have starkly limited quality of life in low-income communities. By placing a citywide emphasis on safety, access, and health the city can begin to equalize the playing field and first address socioeconomically disadvantaged areas with the highest need to connect people to more prospects of success through mobility.

Page 14, Key Policy Initiatives

Edit second bullet point to read (new text shown in underlined font, deleted text in strikeout):

Use data to prioritize transportation decisions that strive towards equity ~~based upon outcomes of~~ in safety, public health, ~~equity~~, access, social benefits, and/or economic benefits

Policy 4.6 Data-Driven Prioritization of Projects

Amend policy as follows (new text shown in underlined font, deleted text in strikeout):

Make the most of limited financial resources by utilizing data to prioritize transportation projects based upon equity in safety, public health, ~~equity~~, access, ~~vulnerable social characteristics~~, social benefits, and/or economic benefits.

### **Chapter 3**

Policy 3.7, page 108-109, modify supporting text of Policy 3.7 Regional Transit Connections to include information regarding the West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor:

The West Santa Ana Branch (WSAB) Transit Corridor which is initially funded by Measure R would provide a thirty-four mile corridor connecting Union Station to Downtown Los Angeles with the south/eastern cities of Huntington Park, South Gate, Paramount, Bellflower, Artesia and Cerritos. These connections could improve passenger mobility while providing opportunities for transit oriented development and economic development.

### **Chapter 6 - Programs**

Revise PL4 as follows (new text shown in underlined font, deleted text in strikeout):

PL4. Network Additions. Identify ~~and designate~~ bicycle, neighborhood, and transit enhanced streets and pedestrian enhanced ~~designation~~ districts in Community Plan updates to provide local complements to the Citywide Transit, Neighborhood, and Bicycle Enhanced Networks, and Pedestrian Enhanced Destinations and increase access to area amenities including medical, schools, parks, major employment centers, and community facilities through continuous, predictable and safe sidewalks, intersections, bikeways, and transit support facilities.

### **Chapter 6 - Action Plan**

Add a new program PL 14 as follows:

PL14. Conduct extensive community engagement, develop detailed operational studies and design options and undertake additional environmental analysis for the following network segments within the Council District Four boundaries before implementing any street modifications: Melrose Avenue between Highland and Western Avenues; Lankershim between 134 Freeway and Cahuenga Boulevard, 4th Street between Highland and Western and segments of the BEN and/or TEN within the boundaries of the Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council. Alternative parallel corridors, in lieu of those identified here, may be considered as potential network substitutes during this process.

Proposed Changes to the Introduction Chapter are intended to clarify that equity is an overarching lens through which the City will make future decision that prioritize investments in areas of the highest need. This added language further supports existing policy in the Updated MP 2035, including language added in the First Update in item A5, calling on the use of specific tools to analyze socioeconomic data. As concluded in the First Addendum, this added language does not provide enough information to inform how impacts would change as evaluated in the FEIR. There is a high distribution of communities with higher economic hardship throughout the City. Therefore, this change would not affect the assumptions made in the Final EIR about physical changes from the Mobility Plan. This added text would not foreseeably result in any new or increase to impacts identified in the Final EIR. Therefore, these changes are not further assessed in Section 3 of this Addendum.

Proposed Changes to Chapter 3, Policy 3.7, provide additional information regarding the West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor. This language has been added to recognize the important regional connection between Union Station and the southeastern areas of Los Angeles County

provided by the WSAB Transit Corridor. The language further clarifies the existing policy in the Updated Mobility Plan to highlight the importance of providing regional transit connections. This added text would not foreseeably result in any physical changes from the Updated Mobility Plan or the assumptions upon which the Final EIR relied. Based on this, these changes would not foreseeably lead to new impacts or an increase identified impacts from those identified in the FEIR. Therefore, these changes are not assessed in Section 3 of this Addendum.

Proposed Changes to Chapter 6 – Programs, Program PL4 - clarifies language regarding a program to identify future network additions during community plan updates. Specifically, the edits delete the use of the word designate to clarify an inaccuracy. Enhanced networks are not “designated” like streets because they are not part of a streets official classification. Additionally, other types of “amenities” are expressly added. All of these changes are minor corrections for accuracy and further refinement of the existing policy and do not make substantive change to the program. Therefore, this change to Program PL4 would not result in physical changes to the Updated MP 2035 as compared to what was previously evaluated in the FEIR, would not change any assumptions in the FEIR. Based on this, these changes would not foreseeably lead to new impacts or an increase identified impacts from those identified in the FEIR. As such, these changes are not further assessed in Section 3 of this Addendum.

Changes to Chapter 6 – Action Plan, Program PL14 – this change adds to the Updated Mobility Plan a new program to the Update Mobility Plan to provide community engagement and provide additional studies and input by the council office before enhanced networks are made in CD4. This Program PL14 would not result in physical changes to the Updated MP 2035 as compared to what was previously evaluated in the FEIR, would not change any assumptions in the FEIR. Based on this, these changes would not foreseeably lead to new impacts or an increase identified impacts from those identified in the FEIR. Therefore, these changes are not further assessed in Section 3 of this Addendum.

### **C. NETWORK CHANGES**

The following lists the proposed Network Changes. Appendix B provides maps of the locations of roadway network changes. Updated complete network maps are also provided in Appendix C to the Staff Report.

#### **Circulation Map (Map A4 in MP 2035)**

H1 - Fairfax Avenue, from Hollywood Boulevard to Fountain Avenue, to be designated an Avenue II (formerly an Avenue I) to align the designation of the street with the character of the adjacent community.

#### **Transit Enhanced Network (TEN) Updates (Map B in MP 2035)**

T1 - Valley Boulevard from the Alhambra City limit to Soto Street: Designate as a Comprehensive Transit Enhanced Network.

T2 - Eastern Avenue from Huntington Drive to Valley Boulevard: Designate as a Moderate Transit Enhanced Network.

**Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN) Updates**

**(Map C2)**

N1 - O'Melveny St/Haddon Ave (Fox Street to Paxton Street): Add to NEN.

**(Map C3)**

N2 - Channel Road/Entrada Drive (PCH to Adelaide Drive); Add to NEN. (Already included in the 2010 Bicycle Plan but was inadvertently left off the NEN.)

**(Map C4)**

N3 - Wilhardt Street from Spring Street to Main Street: Add to NEN.

N4 - Llewellyn Street from Rondout Street to Main Street: Add to NEN.

N5 - Add Avenue 46 from Eagle Rock Boulevard to York Boulevard: Add to NEN.

N6 - Hill Drive from Eagle Vista Drive to Sierra Villa Drive (and extended west to Ellenwood): Add to NEN.

**Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN) Updates (Map D1 in MP 2035)**

B1 - Grand and Olive (Seventh to Washington): Add as Tier 1 Protected Bicycle Lanes. A bicycle lane has already been installed on these corridors.

B2 - Front St and Harbor Blvd: Remove from the Tier 1 Protected Bicycle Lanes. (They are not necessary as they are parallel to the Port of LA's bicycle path network.)

B3 - Monterey Road from Via Marisol to Avenue 60: Move from BLN and place on BEN.

B4 - Olympic Boulevard from Lorena Street to Soto Street: Move from BLN and place on BEN.

B5-Valley Boulevard from the Alhambra City Limit to Soto Street: Move from BLN and place on BEN.

B6- Remove Westwood Boulevard from Le Conte to Wellworth Avenue from BEN (Gayley Avenue is a potential alternative but is not included in model run so as to provide greatest level of potential impact).

B7 - Central Avenue within CD 9 boundaries from Washington Boulevard to 95th Street: Remove from BEN.

B8 - Avalon from Slauson Boulevard to San Pedro: Add to BEN as alternative.

B9 - San Pedro from Avalon to 7th Street: Add to BEN as alternative.

B10 - 16th Street from San Pedro to Central Avenue: Add to NEN as alternative (no lane removal).

**Bicycle Lane Network (BLN) Updates (Map D2 in MP 2035)**

B11 - Zelzah Ave (Lassen to Plummer): Add to the Tier 2 Bicycle Lanes.

B12 - Zelzah (Plummer to Nordhoff): Add to the Tier 3 Bicycle Lanes.

B13 - Crescent Avenue: Remove from the Tier 2 Bicycle Lanes. (This is redundant as it is parallel to the Port of LA's bicycle path network.)

B14 - Seaside Avenue to be removed from the Tier 3 Bicycle Lanes. (This is redundant as it is parallel to the Port of LA's bicycle path network);

B15 - Mission Road from Cesar Chavez Avenue to Jesse Street: Place on Tier 2 BLN.

B16 - Eastern Avenue from Huntington Drive to Valley Boulevard: Place on Tier 2 BLN.

B17 - Marengo Avenue from Soto Street to Fickett Street: Place on Tier 2 BLN.

B18 - Verdugo Road from Eagle Rock Boulevard to the Glendale city limit: Place on Tier 2 BLN.

B19 - Alhambra Avenue from Eastern Avenue to the Alhambra city limit: Place on Tier 3 BLN.

**Pedestrian Enhanced Districts (PED) Updates (Map F in MP 2035)**

Add to PEDs – all segments within CD 1 that are on the BLN and BEN.

Add to PEDs:

P1 - York Boulevard from Eagle Rock Boulevard to San Pascual Avenue

P2 - Santa Fe Avenue between Center Street and 7th Street

P3 - Mateo Street between Santa Fe Avenue and 7th Street

P4 - Figueroa Street from York Boulevard to Colorado Boulevard

P5 - 6th Street from Mateo Street to Mesquit Street

P6 - Mesquit Street from 6th Street to Jesse Street

P7 - Myers Street from Jesse Street to 7th Street

P8 - Jesse Street from Mission Road to Clarence Street

P9 - Clarence Street from 4th Street to Jesse Street

P10 - Anderson Street from 4th Street to 7th Street k Rio Street from Jesse Street to 7th Street

P11 - 6th Street from Mission Road to Clarence Street

P12 - Mission Road from 1st Street to Jesse Street

Extend existing PEDs on:

P13 - Colorado Boulevard from Glendale city limit to Pasadena city limit.

P14 - Huntington Drive from Mission Road to Kendall Avenue.

P15 - 4th Street from Alameda Street to the County of Los Angeles line.

**Footnotes**

Add the following footnote to the NEN Maps:

Consider incorporating NEN type improvements to any street that serves a school, park, community-gathering place or major employment destination within Cal EPA's SB 535 list of Disadvantaged Communities to ensure a safe and pleasant active transportation option.

This map may further be amended, as described in Program PL 4, as a result of future analysis during a community plan update.

Add the following footnote to the PED Map:

Consider incorporating pedestrian type improvements to any street that serves a school, park, community-gathering place or major employment destination within Cal EPA's SB 535 list of Disadvantaged Communities to ensure a safe and pleasant active transportation option.

This map may further be amended, as described in Program PL 4, as a result of future analysis during a community plan update.

The above listed Network Changes may result in new significant impacts or increases in severity to significant impacts because they would add additional miles to the plan network affecting more roadways. As such they are analyzed in Section 3 of this Addendum.

### 3. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

#### A. TRANSPORTATION, PARKING AND SAFETY

Network Changes in the Second Updated MP 2035 are analyzed using the City of Los Angeles Travel Demand Forecasting (TDF) model (the same model used in the FEIR transportation analysis). The proposed network changes were incorporated into the TDF model to produce updated Level of Service (LOS) and Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) results to compare to the LOS and VMT analysis and results in the Final EIR for the MP 2035. The results are documented below. (The table numbering is the same as that in the Final EIR for ease of comparison.)

#### LOS

The Network Changes proposed as part of the Second Updated MP 2035 were analyzed using the City of Los Angeles TDF model. V/C ratios and LOS calculations were prepared for "Future with Proposed Network Changes" conditions using the same methodology as described in the Transportation, Parking and Safety chapter of the MP 2035 EIR. The AM and PM peak period V/C and corresponding LOS for the roadways in the City of Los Angeles are summarized in Table 4.1-19 and Table 4.1-20 by APC for Existing, Future No Project, Future with Approved Project, and Future with Proposed Network Changes conditions.

As shown in Table 4.1-19, during the AM peak hour future roadway V/C ratios changed by 0.005 or less with the proposed network changes compared to the Approved Project conditions within each APC and for the City as a whole as follows:

1. North Valley APC: V/C increased (worsened) by 0.005
2. South Valley APC: V/C increased (worsened) by 0.001
3. Central APC: V/C increased (worsened) by 0.001
4. East Los Angeles: V/C increased (worsened) by 0.004
5. West Los Angeles: V/C decreased (improved) by 0.001
6. South Los Angeles: V/C decreased (improved) by 0.005
7. Harbor: V/C decreased (improved) by 0.001
8. City of Los Angeles Overall: V/C remained at 0.886 (LOS D)

TABLE 4.1-19: SUMMARY OF AM PEAK PERIOD ROADWAY OPERATING CONDITIONS					
Area Planning Commission	Percent of Segments /a/ Operating at:				Weighted Average V/C Ratio (all segments) /a/
	LOS D or Better	LOS E	LOS F	Unsatisfactory LOS (E or F)	
<b>EXISTING CONDITIONS</b>					
1. North Valley	95.70%	1.60%	2.60%	4.30%	0.583 (LOS A)
2. South Valley	95.10%	2.10%	2.90%	4.90%	0.614 (LOS B)
3. Central	78.80%	8.60%	12.60%	21.20%	0.774 (LOS C)
4. East Los Angeles	79.50%	6.00%	14.50%	20.50%	0.815 (LOS D)
5. West Los Angeles	79.60%	6.70%	13.80%	20.40%	0.791 (LOS C)
6. South Los Angeles	87.20%	5.40%	7.30%	12.80%	0.715 (LOS C)
7. Harbor	94.90%	2.20%	2.90%	5.10%	0.614 (LOS B)
<b>City of Los Angeles</b>	<b>87.20%</b>	<b>4.80%</b>	<b>8.00%</b>	<b>12.80%</b>	<b>0.712 (LOS C)</b>
<b>FUTURE NO PROJECT</b>					
1. North Valley	94.80%	1.70%	3.50%	5.20%	0.664 (LOS B)
2. South Valley	93.10%	3.10%	3.80%	6.90%	0.649 (LOS B)
3. Central	73.30%	9.00%	17.70%	26.70%	0.824 (LOS D)
4. East Los Angeles	77.10%	6.80%	16.10%	22.90%	0.835 (LOS D)
5. West Los Angeles	74.00%	8.10%	17.90%	26.00%	0.849 (LOS D)
6. South Los Angeles	83.80%	6.70%	9.50%	16.20%	0.750 (LOS C)
7. Harbor	93.20%	2.80%	4.10%	6.80%	0.648 (LOS B)
<b>City of Los Angeles</b>	<b>83.90%</b>	<b>5.60%</b>	<b>10.50%</b>	<b>16.10%</b>	<b>0.759 (LOS C)</b>
<b>FUTURE WITH APPROVED PROJECT</b>					
1. North Valley	87.06%	4.70%	8.24%	12.94%	0.747 (LOS C)
2. South Valley	84.57%	6.57%	8.86%	15.43%	0.738 (LOS C)
3. Central	51.58%	10.76%	37.67%	48.42%	1.063 (LOS F)
4. East Los Angeles	66.71%	7.65%	25.64%	33.29%	0.946 (LOS E)
5. West Los Angeles	64.67%	7.58%	27.75%	35.33%	0.932 (LOS E)
6. South Los Angeles	70.91%	9.79%	19.29%	29.09%	0.855 (LOS D)
7. Harbor	85.17%	4.40%	10.43%	14.83%	0.745 (LOS C)
<b>City of Los Angeles</b>	<b>71.43%</b>	<b>7.78%</b>	<b>20.79%</b>	<b>28.57%</b>	<b>0.886 (LOS D)</b>
<b>FUTURE WITH PROPOSED NETWORK CHANGES</b>					
1. North Valley	87.05%	4.69%	8.26%	12.95%	0.749 (LOS C)
2. South Valley	84.45%	6.69%	8.85%	15.55%	0.739 (LOS C)
3. Central	51.16%	11.25%	37.59%	48.84%	1.064 (LOS F)
4. East Los Angeles	66.61%	8.02%	25.37%	33.39%	0.950 (LOS E)
5. West Los Angeles	64.53%	7.83%	27.64%	35.47%	0.931 (LOS E)
6. South Los Angeles	71.45%	9.55%	19.00%	28.55%	0.850 (LOS D)
7. Harbor	85.66%	4.53%	9.81%	14.34%	0.735 (LOS C)
<b>City of Los Angeles</b>	<b>71.42%</b>	<b>7.93%</b>	<b>20.65%</b>	<b>28.58%</b>	<b>0.886 (LOS D)</b>

/a/ Segments include major highways, secondary highways, and collector streets within the City of Los Angeles. Weighted Average V/C Ratios reflect the average V/C ratio of all segments in a given category, weighted proportionally by the volume of vehicular travel that occurs on each segment.  
**SOURCE:** Fehr & Peers, 2016.

TABLE 4.1-20: SUMMARY OF PM PEAK PERIOD ROADWAY OPERATING CONDITIONS					
Area Planning Commission	Percent of Segments /a/ Operating at:				Weighted Average V/C Ratio (all segments) /a/
	LOS D or Better	LOS E	LOS F	Unsatisfactory LOS (E or F)	
<b>EXISTING CONDITIONS</b>					
1. North Valley	94.80%	2.10%	3.10%	5.20%	0.599 (LOS A)
2. South Valley	92.20%	3.90%	3.90%	7.80%	0.649 (LOS B)
3. Central	70.00%	11.00%	19.00%	30.00%	0.814 (LOS D)
4. East Los Angeles	73.80%	8.60%	17.60%	26.20%	0.806 (LOS D)
5. West Los Angeles	70.90%	9.30%	19.80%	29.10%	0.828 (LOS D)
6. South Los Angeles	81.30%	7.50%	11.20%	18.70%	0.769 (LOS C)
7. Harbor	93.50%	3.10%	3.40%	6.50%	0.624 (LOS B)
<b>City of Los Angeles</b>	<b>82.10%</b>	<b>6.70%</b>	<b>11.30%</b>	<b>17.90%</b>	<b>0.743 (LOS C)</b>
<b>FUTURE NO PROJECT</b>					
1. North Valley	92.90%	2.70%	4.40%	7.10%	0.705 (LOS C)
2. South Valley	90.30%	4.00%	5.80%	9.70%	0.712 (LOS C)
3. Central	58.50%	12.90%	28.60%	41.50%	0.917 (LOS E)
4. East Los Angeles	63.50%	9.80%	26.70%	36.50%	0.944 (LOS E)
5. West Los Angeles	71.40%	8.80%	19.80%	28.60%	0.913 (LOS E)
6. South Los Angeles	81.00%	8.00%	11.00%	19.00%	0.855 (LOS D)
7. Harbor	93.10%	3.30%	3.60%	6.90%	0.712 (LOS C)
<b>City of Los Angeles</b>	<b>78.10%</b>	<b>7.30%</b>	<b>14.60%</b>	<b>21.90%</b>	<b>0.839 (LOS D)</b>
<b>FUTURE WITH APPROVED PROJECT</b>					
1. North Valley	82.68%	6.42%	10.90%	17.32%	0.791 (LOS C)
2. South Valley	79.18%	7.99%	12.83%	20.82%	0.805 (LOS D)
3. Central	38.77%	11.31%	49.92%	61.23%	1.154 (LOS F)
4. East Los Angeles	52.91%	9.41%	37.68%	47.09%	1.060 (LOS F)
5. West Los Angeles	59.63%	9.52%	30.84%	40.37%	1.003 (LOS F)
6. South Los Angeles	66.00%	11.11%	22.89%	34.00%	0.967 (LOS E)
7. Harbor	84.76%	3.94%	11.30%	15.24%	0.813 (LOS D)
<b>City of Los Angeles</b>	<b>64.26%</b>	<b>9.04%</b>	<b>26.71%</b>	<b>35.74%</b>	<b>0.971 (LOS E)</b>
<b>FUTURE WITH PROPOSED NETWORK CHANGES</b>					
1. North Valley	82.69%	6.41%	10.89%	17.31%	0.792 (LOS C)
2. South Valley	79.17%	7.90%	12.93%	20.83%	0.806 (LOS D)
3. Central	38.42%	11.81%	49.78%	61.58%	1.157 (LOS F)
4. East Los Angeles	53.63%	9.27%	37.11%	46.37%	1.064 (LOS F)
5. West Los Angeles	59.52%	9.60%	30.88%	40.48%	1.002 (LOS F)
6. South Los Angeles	66.09%	11.32%	22.59%	33.91%	0.962 (LOS E)
7. Harbor	85.25%	3.78%	10.97%	14.75%	0.802 (LOS D)
<b>City of Los Angeles</b>	<b>64.28%</b>	<b>9.15%</b>	<b>26.58%</b>	<b>35.72%</b>	<b>0.970 (LOS E)</b>

/a/ Segments include major highways, secondary highways, and collector streets within the City of Los Angeles.  
SOURCE: Fehr & Peers, 2016.

As shown in Table 4.1-20, during the PM peak hour, future roadway V/C ratios changed by 0.011 or less with the proposed Network Changes compared to the Approved Project conditions within each APC and for the City as a whole as follows:

1. North Valley APC: V/C increased (worsened) by 0.001
2. South Valley APC: V/C increased (worsened) by 0.001
3. Central APC: V/C increased (worsened) by 0.003
4. East Los Angeles: V/C increased (worsened) by 0.004
5. West Los Angeles: V/C decreased (improved) by 0.001
6. South Los Angeles: V/C decreased (improved) by 0.005
7. Harbor: V/C decreased (improved) by 0.011
8. City of Los Angeles Overall: V/C decreased (improved) by 0.001

**VMT**

Table 4.1-28 summarizes changes in vehicle miles travelled (VMT) under the Existing, Future No Project, Future with Approved Project (Updated MP 2035), and Future with proposed Network Changes scenarios on surface streets by APC and for the City as a whole, as well as for mainline freeway segments citywide.

Under Existing conditions, motorists travel over 75 million vehicle miles on roadways within the City of Los Angeles on an average weekday. Under Future No Project conditions, daily VMT increases to 82.6 million, 10 percent above Existing levels. Future with Approved Project conditions reduces daily VMT by 4.3 percent during the peak period and by 2.1 percent on a daily basis in comparison to Future No Project conditions. With the proposed Network Changes, VMT would continue to decrease when compared to Future No Project conditions to levels similar to the Approved Project (4.3 percent decrease during the peak period and 2.1 percent decrease on a daily basis).

Table 4.1-29 summarizes changes in VMT on a per-capita basis by dividing total VMT on roadways in the City of Los Angeles by the total number of people in the City, including both residents and workers.

Under Existing conditions, motorists in the City of Los Angeles travel a daily average of 13.0 miles per capita on Los Angeles roadways. Under Future No Project conditions, daily VMT per capita increases to 13.3 miles, 2.1 percent above Existing levels. Future with Approved Project conditions reduces daily VMT per capita to 13.0 miles, comparable to Existing levels and 2.1 percent lower than Future No Project levels. With the proposed Network Changes, VMT per capita would continue to decrease in comparison to Future No Project conditions (4.3 percent decrease during the peak period and 2.1 percent decrease on a daily basis) to the same levels as the VMT per capita with the Approved Project.

**Summary of Traffic Circulation, Neighborhood Intrusion and CMP Impacts**

The changes in impact to LOS and VMT associated with the proposed Network Changes are negligible and are well within the error margin of the model. Therefore the evaluation of LOS and VMT impacts presented in the Final EIR remains applicable to the MP 2035 with the proposed changes. Mitigation Measures T1 through T4 remain applicable and would reduce impacts to circulation, neighborhood intrusion and the CMP. However, impacts to circulation, neighborhood intrusion and the CMP would remain significant even with these measures, as described in the Final EIR. Based upon the above, for traffic impacts related to LOS there are no new impacts or increases to previously identified significant impacts in the Final EIR from the Second Update to the MP 2035.

**Parking/Safety/Construction**

The Second Updated MP 2035 with the proposed Network Changes would continue to have a less than significant impact to parking and safety. The proposed Network Changes would not alter the amount of on-street parking on City roadways. Public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities would further benefit from the proposed Second Updated MP 2035. Mitigation measure T6 would continue to apply and construction of enhancements would continue to result in a less than significant impact as described in the Final EIR.

<b>TABLE 4.1-28: VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES</b>						
Area Planning Commission	Vehicle Miles Traveled			Percent Change		
	Peak Period (7-Hour)	Off Peak Period (17-Hour)	Daily	Peak Period (7-Hour)	Off Peak Period (17-Hour)	Daily
<b>EXISTING CONDITIONS</b>						
1. North Valley	3,740,800	2,308,300	6,049,100	-	-	-
2. South Valley	4,083,400	2,682,800	6,766,200	-	-	-
3. Central	3,993,500	2,496,000	6,489,500	-	-	-
4. East Los Angeles	1,864,800	1,058,700	2,923,500	-	-	-
5. West Los Angeles	3,182,200	2,305,700	5,487,900	-	-	-
6. South Los Angeles	3,639,000	2,049,800	5,688,800	-	-	-
7. Harbor	1,196,600	807,300	2,003,900	-	-	-
<b>Surface Streets</b>	<b>21,700,300</b>	<b>13,708,600</b>	<b>35,408,900</b>	-	-	-
<b>Freeways (Mainline)</b>	<b>19,978,600</b>	<b>19,878,800</b>	<b>39,857,400</b>	-	-	-
<b>Total, City of Los Angeles</b>	<b>41,678,900</b>	<b>33,587,400</b>	<b>75,266,300</b>	-	-	-
<b>FUTURE NO PROJECT</b>						
				<b>Comparison to Existing</b>		
1. North Valley	4,080,300	2,614,400	6,694,700	9.1%	13.3%	10.7%
2. South Valley	4,341,900	2,930,200	7,272,100	6.3%	9.2%	7.5%
3. Central	4,247,200	2,712,000	6,959,200	6.4%	8.7%	7.2%
4. East Los Angeles	2,008,700	1,162,300	3,171,000	7.7%	9.8%	8.5%
5. West Los Angeles	3,436,200	2,486,000	5,922,200	8.0%	7.8%	7.9%
6. South Los Angeles	3,958,800	2,292,100	6,250,900	8.8%	11.8%	9.9%
7. Harbor	1,287,700	905,900	2,193,600	7.6%	12.2%	9.5%
<b>Surface Streets</b>	<b>23,360,800</b>	<b>15,102,900</b>	<b>38,463,700</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>10.2%</b>	<b>8.6%</b>
<b>Freeways (Mainline)</b>	<b>21,643,500</b>	<b>22,520,500</b>	<b>44,164,000</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>10.8%</b>
<b>Total, City of Los Angeles</b>	<b>45,004,300</b>	<b>37,623,400</b>	<b>82,627,700</b>	<b>8.0%</b>	<b>12.0%</b>	<b>9.8%</b>
<b>FUTURE WITH APPROVED PROJECT</b>						
				<b>Comparison to Future No Project</b>		
1. North Valley	3,708,700	2,474,200	6,182,900	-9.1%	-5.4%	-7.6%
2. South Valley	4,126,300	2,906,700	7,033,000	-5.0%	-0.8%	-3.3%
3. Central	3,664,500	2,537,800	6,202,300	-13.7%	-6.4%	-10.9%
4. East Los Angeles	1,635,600	1,062,100	2,697,700	-18.6%	-8.6%	-14.9%
5. West Los Angeles	3,137,500	2,557,600	5,695,100	-8.7%	2.9%	-3.8%
6. South Los Angeles	3,399,000	2,157,900	5,556,900	-14.1%	-5.9%	-11.1%
7. Harbor	1,088,800	826,100	1,914,900	-15.4%	-8.8%	-12.7%
<b>Surface Streets</b>	<b>20,760,300</b>	<b>14,522,500</b>	<b>35,282,800</b>	<b>-11.1%</b>	<b>-3.8%</b>	<b>-8.3%</b>
<b>Freeways (Mainline)</b>	<b>22,306,100</b>	<b>23,296,100</b>	<b>45,602,200</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>
<b>Total, City of Los Angeles</b>	<b>43,066,300</b>	<b>37,818,700</b>	<b>80,885,000</b>	<b>-4.3%</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>-2.1%</b>
<b>FUTURE WITH PROPOSED NETWORK CHANGES</b>						
				<b>Comparison to Future No Project</b>		
1. North Valley	3,708,700	2,474,900	6,183,600	-9.1%	-5.3%	-7.6%
2. South Valley	4,126,300	2,906,000	7,032,300	-5.0%	-0.8%	-3.3%
3. Central	3,664,500	2,537,700	6,202,200	-13.7%	-6.4%	-10.9%
4. East Los Angeles	1,635,600	1,061,700	2,697,300	-18.6%	-8.7%	-14.9%
5. West Los Angeles	3,137,500	2,559,100	5,696,600	-8.7%	2.9%	-3.8%
6. South Los Angeles	3,399,000	2,167,300	5,566,300	-14.1%	-5.4%	-11.0%
7. Harbor	1,088,800	827,100	1,915,900	-15.4%	-8.7%	-12.7%
<b>Surface Streets</b>	<b>20,760,400</b>	<b>14,533,800</b>	<b>35,294,200</b>	<b>-11.1%</b>	<b>-3.8%</b>	<b>-8.2%</b>
<b>Freeways (Mainline)</b>	<b>22,306,100</b>	<b>23,312,300</b>	<b>45,618,400</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>
<b>Total, City of Los Angeles</b>	<b>43,066,500</b>	<b>37,846,100</b>	<b>80,912,600</b>	<b>-4.3%</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>-2.1%</b>

SOURCE: City of Los Angeles Travel Demand Model, 2016.

<b>TABLE 4.1-29: VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED PER CAPITA (EMPLOYMENT PLUS POPULATION) IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES</b>						
Area Planning Commission	Vehicle Miles Traveled			Percent Change		
	Peak Period (7-Hour)	Off Peak Period (17-Hour)	Daily	Peak Period (7-Hour)	Off Peak Period (17-Hour)	Daily
<b>EXISTING CONDITIONS</b>						
1. North Valley	4.0	2.4	6.4	-	-	-
2. South Valley	3.7	2.4	6.1	-	-	-
3. Central	3.1	1.9	5.0	-	-	-
4. East Los Angeles	3.4	1.9	5.3	-	-	-
5. West Los Angeles	4.3	3.1	7.4	-	-	-
6. South Los Angeles	4.1	2.3	6.5	-	-	-
7. Harbor	4.2	2.9	7.1	-	-	-
<i>Surface Streets</i>	3.7	2.4	6.1	-	-	-
<i>Freeways (Mainline)</i>	3.4	3.4	6.9	-	-	-
<b>Total, City of Los Angeles</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>FUTURE NO PROJECT</b>						
				<b>Comparison to Existing</b>		
1. North Valley	4.1	2.6	6.7	2.8%	6.8%	4.3%
2. South Valley	3.6	2.4	6.0	-2.3%	0.4%	-1.2%
3. Central	3.0	1.9	5.0	-1.6%	0.5%	-0.8%
4. East Los Angeles	3.5	2.0	5.5	2.9%	4.8%	3.6%
5. West Los Angeles	4.2	3.0	7.2	-2.8%	-2.9%	-2.8%
6. South Los Angeles	4.2	2.4	6.6	0.8%	3.6%	1.8%
7. Harbor	4.6	3.2	7.8	8.0%	12.7%	9.9%
<i>Surface Streets</i>	3.7	2.4	6.2	0.1%	2.5%	1.0%
<i>Freeways (Mainline)</i>	3.5	3.6	7.1	0.7%	5.4%	3.0%
<b>Total, City of Los Angeles</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>
<b>FUTURE WITH APPROVED PROJECT</b>						
				<b>Comparison to Future No Project</b>		
1. North Valley	3.7	2.5	6.2	-9.1%	-5.4%	-7.6%
2. South Valley	3.4	2.4	5.8	-5.0%	-0.8%	-3.3%
3. Central	2.6	1.8	4.4	-13.7%	-6.4%	-10.9%
4. East Los Angeles	2.8	1.8	4.7	-18.6%	-8.6%	-14.9%
5. West Los Angeles	3.8	3.1	6.9	-8.7%	2.9%	-3.8%
6. South Los Angeles	3.6	2.3	5.8	-14.1%	-5.9%	-11.1%
7. Harbor	3.9	2.9	6.8	-15.4%	-8.8%	-12.7%
<i>Surface Streets</i>	3.3	2.3	5.7	-11.1%	-3.8%	-8.3%
<i>Freeways (Mainline)</i>	3.6	3.7	7.3	3.1%	3.4%	3.3%
<b>Total, City of Los Angeles</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>-4.3%</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>-2.1%</b>
<b>FUTURE WITH PROPOSED NETWORK CHANGES</b>						
				<b>Comparison to Future No Project</b>		
1. North Valley	3.7	2.5	6.2	-9.1%	-5.3%	-7.6%
2. South Valley	3.4	2.4	5.8	-5.0%	-0.8%	-3.3%
3. Central	2.6	1.8	4.4	-13.7%	-6.4%	-10.9%
4. East Los Angeles	2.8	1.8	4.7	-18.6%	-8.7%	-14.9%
5. West Los Angeles	3.8	3.1	6.9	-8.7%	2.9%	-3.8%
6. South Los Angeles	3.6	2.3	5.9	-14.1%	-5.4%	-11.0%
7. Harbor	3.9	2.9	6.8	-15.4%	-8.7%	-12.7%
<i>Surface Streets</i>	3.3	2.3	5.7	-11.1%	-3.8%	-8.2%
<i>Freeways (Mainline)</i>	3.6	3.7	7.3	3.1%	3.5%	3.3%
<b>Total, City of Los Angeles</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>-4.3%</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>-2.1%</b>

SOURCE: City of Los Angeles Travel Demand Model, 2016.

### **Emergency Access**

Note: The discussion in this section related to Emergency Access is not intended to affect the certification of the Final EIR or the approval of the Second Updated Mobility Plan, including the City's commitment to comply with MM T5. The City provides the finding and analysis below for informational purposes and to rebut any future reliance on the Final EIR as substantial evidence related to its conclusion on emergency access issues.

The Recirculated Draft EIR (RDEIR) concluded that the MP 2035 would have a potential significant impact related to inadequate emergency vehicle access. After further consideration, including the analysis prepared in the Addition to the Final EIR, a review of the LAFD 2015 Strategic Plan and consultation with LAFD staff, the City now finds that there is not a significant impact to emergency access from the Updated Mobility Plan. Ultimately, the conclusion in the Final EIR was made in an effort to take a conservative approach for purposes of identifying CEQA impacts. However, a review of the whole administrative record demonstrates that the City's conclusion was based solely on an assumption of a correlation between congestion and emergency response time:

Where segment-level LOS would be significantly impacted, emergency vehicles may also be significantly impacted due to the project's location in a congested area of Los Angeles. Since the proposed project could contribute to increased delay for drivers in the areas of proposed change, and include design elements that impede emergency access, the proposed project would have a potentially significant impact related to inadequate emergency vehicle access. (See RDEIR at 4.1-44.)

But, the RDEIR also concluded, "there is not a direct relationship between predicted travel delay and response times." (RDEIR at 4.1-44). The RDEIR recognized that a number of factors could affect response times, including the requirement under state law for drivers to yield the right-of-way to emergency vehicles and because the proposed Design Guidelines include roadway configurations that could facilitate emergency access when traffic is congested. The RDEIR included a Mitigation Measure that LADOT, LAFD and DCP coordinate and review design plans involving lane reallocation to ensure that emergency response access is adequately maintained. Ultimately, the Final EIR concluded that after imposition of mitigation measures, "***in the interests of being conservative,***" impacts are considered potentially significant.

As discussed in the June 2015 Addition to the Final EIR, the threshold of significance for public services related to fire and police is:

Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or *physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the above public services:*

- i) Fire protection?
- ii) Police protection?<sup>2</sup>

Further, in the City's Threshold Guidelines, the screening criteria for whether fire service impacts need to be studied more, include whether there will be an increase to the number of

---

<sup>2</sup> See LA CEQA Threshold Guide at 26.

intersections with LOS E or F (among other non-relevant factors, such as, project distance to fire station, brush fire hazards, fire hydrant services, storage of combustible materials).<sup>3</sup> But this screening criterion is not the threshold of significance. This criterion just informs whether further study is required, including possibly preparation of an EIR. The adopted threshold of significance in the City's threshold guidelines is the following:

*A project would normally have a significant impact on fire protection if it requires the addition of a new fire station or the expansion, consolidation or relocation of an existing facility to maintain service.*<sup>4</sup>

As noted in the Recirculated Final EIR, LAFD in collaboration with LADOT has developed a Fire Preemption System (FPS), a system that automatically turns traffic lights to green for emergency vehicles traveling on designated streets in the City. The City of Los Angeles has over 205 miles of routes equipped with FPS.<sup>5</sup>

The June 2015 Addition to the FEIR listed a number of factors that affect the relationship between adequate emergency access and traffic:

- The proximity of Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) (and other) facilities to those they serve.
- The opportunity for LAFD and emergency responders to use alternative routes in an area.
- In accordance with the mitigation measure T5 and the City's practice, LAFD actively participates in the design of specific roadway changes in order to ensure adequate fire/emergency access is maintained. LAFD, in reviewing street and right-of-way projects, comments on particular street configuration designs, and will raise concerns if roadways present particular access challenges, and can recommend no changes be done at all or alternative changes be undertaken if fire and emergency access are particularly impacted. Moreover, many of the roadway configurations as shown in the Complete Streets Design Guide would include continuous center left turn lanes, which facilitate emergency access when the thru lanes experience delays. In some instances, a roadway reconfiguration could improve emergency access where a continuous center left turn lane is introduced where it did not previously exist. Generally, multi-lane roadways allow the emergency vehicles to travel at higher speeds and permit other traffic to maneuver out of the path of the emergency vehicle.

---

<sup>3</sup> See LA CEQA Threshold Guide at K.2-2.

<sup>4</sup> See LA CEQA Threshold Guide at K.2-3. The City rejects the use of a threshold of significance for fire and emergency response services in this EIR that is directly tied to response times based on LOS as has been advocated by commenters on the Final EIR and other City projects. The City is rejecting this threshold on the basis that, as discussed herein and in the Administrative Record, it is not supported by substantial evidence. There is no evidence, including substantial evidence, that has been provided to the City or that the City (including its DCP and LAFD staff and its traffic and environmental consultants) is aware of, or has found with reasonable diligence and inquiry, including searching the relevant academic, professional and trade literature and other agency's EIRs prepared across the State, that can demonstrate to the City's satisfaction that there is a correlation between decreased LOS and decreased response times of fire and emergency response services, or that there is any method to connect LOS and response times for purposes of analyzing a plan adoption or update that covers an area the size of the project area.

<sup>5</sup> Training Bulletin: Traffic Signal Preemption System for Emergency Vehicles, Los Angeles Fire Department, Bulletin No. 133, October, 2008.

- LAFD is responsible for identifying and implementing capital improvements (such as new Fire Stations) as may be needed to respond to anticipated increased demand. LAFD does not have a capital improvement plan that identifies construction of new fire stations in specific locations and therefore it is not possible to forecast or identify any specific impacts associated with any potential new or expanded fire stations. Any impacts from building or expanding fire stations and facilities would be speculative at this point in time.
- As identified in the CEQA Threshold Guide, on any given project review, LAFD can implement project specific mitigation requirements, such as requiring fire retardant landscaping, prohibiting construction in fire hazard areas, requiring design features that reduce fire potential and developing emergency response plans.
- The changing demand for service is complex. For example, with increasing populations there may be more density and more construction, though new buildings are constructed in accordance with increasingly stringent building and fire codes making them safer and more resistant to fires, such as requiring fire sprinklers. The population is aging which may increase demand for service. But the population may be becoming healthier with increased and improved healthcare.
- Future factors that could increase efficiencies in response, including improvements in technology and management, such as changes in deployment of equipment and staff and mutual aid agreements.

Ultimately, the FEIR concluded there was a significant impact related to emergency access because the City was taking a “conservative” approach. However, as is made clear from the whole of the administrative record, there is no substantial evidence that has been presented by any commenters on the Final EIR that demonstrates a direct correlation between congestion and delayed response times. Additionally, the City (inclusive of DCP and LAFD staff and the City’s traffic and environmental consultants) is not aware of and has not found, after reasonable inquiry, any evidence, including academic, trade or professional reports or studies or other agencies’ EIRs, that supports findings a direct correlation between traffic congestion and response times.

As noted in the June 2015 Addition to the FEIR, LAFD is responsible for maintaining adequate response times. LAFD published a Strategic Plan in April 2015.

The Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) Strategic Plan<sup>6</sup> focuses on nine goals and corresponding strategic actions that would guide the LAFD for the next three years. The primary goals that are applicable to the Project include providing exceptional public safety and emergency service and implementing and capitalizing on advanced technologies. Some of the key priorities associated with these goals include the following:

- Improving response times by utilizing data and metrics to identify gaps in LAFD’s response strategies and exploring response time improvements through dialogue, cognitive inquiry, innovation, and follow-up;
- Delivery of emergency medical services by expanding LAFD EMS response capabilities for special events and addressing periods of high vehicle traffic; and

---

<sup>6</sup> LAFD Strategic Plan 2015-2017; <http://www.lafd.org/news/lafd-chief-unveils-departments-strategic-plan>.

- Identifying and implementing advanced technologies to support and improve performance metrics, tracking standards, data collection, analysis and reporting procedures (FireStatLA).

The Strategic Plan also focuses on the development of an even more professional workforce and promotion of a positive work environment to address risk management issues and strengthening community relationships to improve preparedness and enhance resiliency during emergency events.

Planning Department Staff have discussed the LAFD Strategic Plan and its relationship to growth and traffic with LAFD Staff in order to understand how LAFD responds to growth and changes in traffic. LAFD advised that while increasing congestion is a factor in how they address emergency response, their ongoing planning efforts, including the LAFD Strategic Plan take in to account such increases in congestion and LAFD continues to plan for and maintain public safety and emergency service as required. LAFD will continue to monitor any impact on-the-ground implementation of the Mobility Plan may have on response times and make adjustments as necessary. These adjustments may or may not include redeploying resources, adding staff or building new fire stations.

In light of all of the above, the City now concludes that while the Project would increase congestion, it is not reasonably foreseeable at this time that this will result in a significant impact to emergency access. The LAFD Strategic Plan addresses maintaining service including access. The steps that LAFD would have to take to maintain public safety are not reasonably foreseeable at this time. Options available to LAFD include increased staffing levels and new fire stations(s) in underserved areas. LAFD has not identified the need for any new fire stations or fire or emergency facilities from the Mobility Plan (including its updates). Therefore, any construction impacts associated with new fire protection facilities would be speculative.

## **B. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

As described in the Final EIR, construction activities associated with implementation of the enhanced networks could result in temporary access disruptions to adjacent uses. Impacts and disruptions to access during construction would be temporary. Construction resulting from improvements related to the Network Changes would be similar to those identified and analyzed in the Final EIR. That is, impacts would occur within or adjacent to existing transportation right-of-ways and would not isolate communities, or alter the existing land use conditions in the community. Therefore, as described in the Final EIR construction impacts would not divide a community or affect land use compatibility, and impacts would continue to be less than significant. This conclusion is not changed by the Network Changes. The Network Changes would not foreseeably create new or more severe impacts related to dividing a community or affecting land use compatibility from construction than those impacts identified in the Final EIR.

As described in the Final EIR, any roadway widening associated with the Network Changes would not occur without the redevelopment of individual parcels. Therefore, any widenings from the Network Changes would not result in incompatibility with adjacent land uses. Any roadway widenings near designated historic structures or districts would be subject to local historic resource regulations and requirements that ensure that the features and attributes of historic resources are protected. Therefore, impacts to land use resulting from any roadway widenings was identified as less than significant in the Final EIR. The proposed Network Changes will not result in new or more severe impacts associated with roadway widenings than those identified in the Final EIR.

The Network Changes in the Second Update to the MP 2035 (with its additional miles/locations added to the enhanced networks and PEDs) further support the strong link between land use and transportation and would continue to accommodate the wide variety of land uses located throughout the City.

The proposed Community Plan, Network and Updated MP 2035 Changes would further strengthen MP 2035 as a plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets, roads, and highways, defined to include motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, children, persons with disabilities, seniors, movers of commercial goods, and users of public transportation, in a manner that is suitable to the rural, suburban, or urban context of the General Plan. The Second Updated MP 2035 would continue to be consistent with the General Plan Framework Element.

The proposed changes would continue to balance demand for off-street parking with other transportation and land-use objectives that result in fewer vehicle trips. The Network Changes in the Second Updated MP 2035 provide greater proximity and access to neighborhood services and greater access to alternative modes of transportation (other than cars) for residents, students, and employees as a result of additional miles/locations added to the enhanced networks and PEDs.

Overall, the Second Updated MP 2035 would continue to be consistent with applicable plans and policies because of the large number of policies encouraging alternative transportation, sustainability and in general responding to State and regional sustainability requirements. In the long run, it is anticipated that a more robust multi-modal network as would occur under the proposed Second Updated Mobility Plan (as a result of additional miles/locations added to the enhanced networks and PEDs) could be more beneficial as mode shift choices continue to evolve, i.e. as more people choose alternative modes to vehicles, greater choice would be provided. Alternative modes (transit, bicycles, and pedestrian) would have more interconnected networks potentially accelerating mode shifts to modes other than vehicles.

In summary, the operational impacts of the added enhancements would not conflict with regional plans and policies, and would result in a less-than-significant impact to land use. Land use impacts would continue to be less than significant.

Based on all of the above, the Second Updated MP 2035 would not foreseeably result in new or more significant land use impacts from those identified in the Final EIR.

#### **C. AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GASES**

Changes in impacts related to air quality and greenhouse gases are correlated with changes in traffic impacts. The traffic modeling of the revised MP 2035 shows a negligible change in traffic impacts as compared to those analyzed in the Final EIR (well within the error margins of the models). Based on this, air quality impacts would remain as described in the Final EIR. Air quality and greenhouse gas impacts would continue to be less than significant.

Based on all of the above, the Second Updated MP 2035 would not foreseeably result in new or more significant air impacts from those identified in the Final EIR.

#### **D. NOISE AND VIBRATION**

As for air quality, changes in impacts related to noise are correlated with changes in traffic impacts. The traffic modeling of the Second Updated MP 2035 shows a negligible change in

traffic impacts as compared to those analyzed in the Final EIR (well within the error margins of the models). These negligible changes would not affect the noise impacts identified in the Final EIR. Therefore, noise impacts would remain as described in the Final EIR. Noise impacts from buses would continue to be significant on the TEN. Depending on specific roadway designs, a bus only lane could increase noise levels by more than 3 dBA at sensitive land uses. Noise impacts associated with other enhancements would continue to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures N1 and N2 would remain applicable and would reduce construction noise and vibration impacts, continuing to result in a less than significant impact after mitigation.

Based on all of the above, the Second Updated MP 2035 would not foreseeably result in new or more significant noise impacts from those identified in the Final EIR.

#### **E. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

The enhancements proposed to be added to MP 2035 would not increase the potential for impacts to biological resources; the added enhancements would not have the potential to newly impact a biologically sensitive area (such as a wetland or Sensitive Ecological Area [SEA]) or increase the severity of an impact to such an area. Since details of the projects are unknown (and unknowable) impacts to biological resources remain potentially significant (and are therefore treated as significant). Mitigation measures BR-1 and BR-2 would continue to apply and would reduce impacts to special status species and habitats, including wetlands. Mitigation measure BR-3 would continue to apply and would reduce impacts to migratory birds.

Impacts to migratory birds, wildlife corridors, tree preservation and habitat conservation would remain less than significant.

Based on all of the above, the Second Updated MP 2035 would not foreseeably result in new or more significant biological impacts from those identified in the Final EIR.

#### **F. OTHER IMPACTS ADDRESSED IN INITIAL STUDY**

The Initial Study addressed all of the remaining CEQA topics. None of the proposed changes to the Second Updated MP 2035, would change the analyses of issues presented in the Initial Study. All of the proposed Community Plan, Updated MP 2035, and Network Changes either clarify MP 2035, or are minor and would not substantially affect any of these other issues/resource areas. No substantial changes are proposed that would change the conclusions in the Final EIR (including the Initial Study). Substantial evidence supports that all of the proposed amendments are (1) consistent with existing policies found in the MP 2035 and elsewhere in the General Plan as well as applicable State and regional plans and regulations, or make clean up changes; and (2) would not foreseeably result in new significant impacts in impact areas not previously identified.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Based on entirety of the administrative record, including all of the analysis found herein, there is no basis to find that any of the following has occurred:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the Final EIR project which will require major revisions of the Final EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the Final EIR project is being undertaken which will require major revisions of the Final EIR due to involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance which was not known could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the Final EIR was certified, shows the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR.

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than previously shown in the Final EIR.

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the Final EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponent decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Based on a review of all proposed amendments in the Second Updated MP 2035 discussed herein, no substantial changes are proposed that would change the conclusions in the Final EIR.

The revised text does not change the assumptions about the physical changes as evaluated in the Final EIR and is consistent with language and policies evaluated in the Final EIR. The revised physical changes to the networks would have a negligible impact on the analyses presented in the Final EIR (ie., the changes to traffic impacts discussed above are well within the error margins of the models).

Substantial evidence supports that Second Updated MP 2035 would not foreseeably result in new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of any previously identified

significant effects. Additionally, no new information is available that was not available at the time the Final EIR was certified, that would require a major revision to the MP 2035 or the Final EIR.

Appendix A  
General Plan Consistency Table

## Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table

(Note: new text is shown in red font, deleted text in strike out font.)

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Central City	P. 4-2	Objective 11-2: To Improve freeway movement and <u>capacity</u> adjacent to the Downtown area <b>in a manner consistent with the Mobility Plan.</b>
Central City	Pg. 4-5	"Key Arterial Corridor Improvements, <b>consistent with the Mobility Plan,</b> include:" (in regards to Alameda Street and Olympic Blvd at bottom of page).
Central City North	P. 3-20	First paragraph of Section D (on "TDM"): <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> <del>It</del> is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS E. Although most major street intersections in Central City North are in compliance with the City's policy, the level of trips generated by future development in and surrounding the plan area requires the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management Program (TDM) <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility.</b>
Central City North	P. 3-28	Goal 16: A system of highways, freeways, and streets that provides a circulation system which <b>is consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035</b> and <del>that</del> supports existing, approved, and planned land uses while maintaining a desired level of service at <del>all</del> intersections <b>where feasible.</b>
Central City North	P. 3-28	Objective 16-1: To <b>the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <del>all</del> new development.
Central City North	P. 3-28	Policy 16-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety,</b> <del>m</del> Maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E", <b>where feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan.</b>

Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Central City North	P. 3-29	In the second paragraph on the page (part of the proposal for "1. Street Widening" in Policy 16-1.1): "Below is a list of substandard street segments in the project area where street widening is recommended, <b>to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan:</b> "
Hollywood	4	In second paragraph under "Standards and Criteria": <b>Where feasible, and in a manner consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035</b> adequate highway Improvements shall be assured prior to the approval of zoning permitting intensification of land use <del>in order to avoid congestion and assure proper development.</del>
Wilshire	P. 3-31	In program for policy 13-1.4: " <b>Where feasible, and in a manner consistent with the policies of Mobility Plan 2035,</b> substantially expand peak- hour parking restrictions for more restrictive days and times along <del>all</del> Boulevards II and Avenues, and along <del>all</del> Collector Streets currently operating at a Level of Service (LOS) of "D" or below, to maximize vehicle utilization of all available lanes in all directions.
Wilshire	P. 3-35	Goal 16 text: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY,</b> PROVIDE A COMMUNITY-WIDE CIRCULATION SYSTEM OF FREEWAYS AND STREETS WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING AND PLANNED LAND USES AND ANTICIPATED TRAFFIC FLOW VOLUMES, WHILE MAINTAINING ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF SERVICE AT <del>ALL</del> INTERSECTIONS.
Wilshire	P. 3-35	Objective 16-1 text: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable Levels of Service (LOS) and ensure that necessary Freeway and Street access and improvements are provided to accommodate additional traffic anticipated from Wilshire Community Plan land use changes and/or by new development."
Wilshire	P. 3-35	Policy 16-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, m</b> Maintain a satisfactory Level of Service (LOS) above LOS "D" for Boulevards II, especially those which serve Regional Commercial Centers and Community Commercial Centers; and above LOS "D" for Avenues and Collector Streets.

## Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Wilshire	P. 3-37	Second paragraph of Policy 16-2.1: The transportation infrastructure serving the project site and surrounding area, <del>specifically the Freeways, Highways, and Streets,</del> presently serving the affected area within the Wilshire Community Plan, have adequate capacity to accommodate the existing traffic flow volumes, and any additional traffic volume which would be generated from projects enabled by such discretionary actions.
Bel Air-Beverly Crest	P. 3-6	In fourth paragraph from top: No increase in density should be effected by zone change or subdivision unless it is determined that the <del>transportation infrastructure streets and highways</del> serving the property involved can accommodate the traffic generated.
Brentwood-Pacific Palisades	P. 3-24	Goal 13 text: <del>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY,</del> A SYSTEM OF FREEWAYS, HIGHWAYS AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING APPROVED AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ALL-INTERSECTIONS.
Brentwood-Pacific Palisades	P. 3-24	Objective 13-1 text: To <del>the extent feasible and consistent with the</del> Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety, comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <del>all</del> new development.
Brentwood-Pacific Palisades	P. 3-24	Policy 13-1.1: <del>To the extent feasible and consistent with the</del> Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, <del>m</del> Maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways not to exceed LOS "D" for secondary arterials, collector streets; not exceed LOS "E" for Major Highways, and not to exceed LOS "E" in the community's major business districts.
Brentwood-Pacific Palisades	P. 3-24	Third program for Policy 13-1.1: Capital Improvement Program <del>(to be implemented where feasible and in a manner consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan)</del>
Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey	P. 3-16	First paragraph of "Transportation Demand Management Strategies": <del>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the</del> Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety, the City's objective is that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system should not exceed LOS E. Although major street intersections in the plan area are in compliance with the City's policy, the level of trips which could be generated by future development in and surrounding the plan area requires the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management Program (TDM) <del>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility.</del>

## Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey	P. 3-22	Goal 16: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY</b> , A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS AND STREETS THAT PROVIDE A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT <b>ALL</b> INTERSECTIONS.
Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey	P. 3-22	Objective 16-1 text: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety</b> , comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable Levels of Service (LOS) and ensure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <b>all</b> -new development.
Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey	P. 3-22	Policy 16-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety</b> , <b>m</b> aintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E" <b>if possible where feasible and consistent with the goals of the Mobility Plan 2035.</b>
Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey	P. 3-22	Under the third program for 16-1.1 ("Capital Improvements"): "The TIMP recommends the following street widening to expand the capacity of the street network along various corridors, <b>to the extent feasible and consistent with the aims of the Mobility Plan:</b> " (specific proposals continue to page 3-23)
Venice	P. 3-23	First paragraph of section on "Transportation Demand Management Strategies": Major street intersections in the plan area are consistent with the City's objective, <b>to the extent feasible and compatible with the Mobility Plan's policies</b> , to maintain a traffic level of service (LOS) of "E." However, the level of trips which could be generated by future development in and surrounding the Plan area requires the implementation of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility.</b>
Venice	P. 3-29	Goal 16: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY</b> , A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS AND STREETS THAT PROVIDE A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT <b>ALL</b> INTERSECTIONS.
Venice	P. 3-29	Objective 16-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety</b> , comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and ensure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <b>all</b> -new development.

Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Venice	P. 3-29	Policy 16-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, maintain a satisfactory LOS</b> for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for major highways, secondary highways and collector streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E" <b>if possible where feasible and consistent with the goals of the Mobility Plan 2035.</b>
Venice	P. 3-30	The heading for the third program for Policy 16-1.1: "Implement the following capital improvements(Venice Traffic and Parking Study, TIMP) to the extent feasible <b>and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan."</b>
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 1-6	In "Opportunities" section under "Transportation": Utilize the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan, <b>to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan</b> , which provides for transportation improvements, promotes phased development of land uses, promotes methods of reducing peak hour work related trips, and promotes improved Level of Service on streets and interchanges.
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-34	Goal 11: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY</b> , A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF SERVICE AT ALL-INTERSECTIONS <b>WHERE FEASIBLE.</b>
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-34	Objective 11-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety</b> , comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable Levels of Service (LOS) and ensure that necessary Freeway, Highway and Street access and improvements are provided to accommodate additional traffic anticipated from Westchester-Playa del Rey Community Plan land use changes and/or by new development. ☐
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-34	Policy 11-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, seek to maintain a satisfactory Level of Service (LOS) to extent possible</b> for Major Highways, Secondary Highways and Collector Streets.
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-34	Second Program for Policy 11-1.1: "Widen Highways and Streets in those roadway segments listed in the Westchester-Playa del Rey Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Plan, <b>where feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan.</b> The TIMP identifies the following specific nonstandard roadway segments for capacity improvement consistent with their roadway classification in response to congestion levels projected for the Year 2025:" (list continues onto Pg. 3-35)

Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-35 to 3-36	Program: The TIMP identifies the following segments for additional street improvements in response to congestion levels projected for the Year 2025. <b>These improvements are only to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan.</b>
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-38	Second paragraph of Policy 11-2.1: The transportation infrastructure serving the project site and surrounding area, <u>specifically the Freeways, Highways, and Streets presently serving the affected area within the Westchester-Playa del Rey Community Plan,</u> have adequate capacity to accommodate the existing traffic flow volumes, and any additional traffic volume which would be generated from projects enabled by such discretionary actions.
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-39	Program for Policy 12-1.3: <b>Substantially Where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan,</b> expand peak- hour parking restrictions for more restrictive days and times along <del>all</del> Major and Secondary Highways, and along <del>all</del> Collector Streets currently operating at a Level of Service (LOS) of “D” or below, to maximize vehicle utilization of all available lanes in all directions.
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-39	Policy 12-1.4: Identify and implement intersection improvements (channelization, turn lanes, signal modifications) on <del>all</del> Major and Secondary Highways, and <del>along some</del> Collector Streets, throughout the Westchester-Playa del Rey Community Plan Area, <b>as feasible and consistent with the policies and programs of the Mobility Plan 2035 and the Community Plans.</b>
Westchester-Playa del Rey	P. 3-44	First paragraph of "Transportation Demand Management" section: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS D. Although studies indicate that most of Westchester-Playa del Rey's major street intersections are in compliance with this City policy, the level of trips generated by future development in Westchester-Playa del Rey and in the surrounding areas require the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility</b> <del>to sustain the current level of service on the street system.</del>
West Los Angeles	P. 3-27	Goal 16: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY,</b> A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS AND STREETS THAT PROVIDE A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT <del>ALL</del> INTERSECTIONS.

Exhibit A.1: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
West Los Angeles	P. 3-27 to 3-28	Objective 16-1: To <b>the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable Levels of Service (LOS) and ensure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by new development.
West Los Angeles	P. 3-28	Policy 16-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, m</b> Maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Secondary Highways and Collector Streets; nor LOS "E" for Major Highways or major business districts.
West Los Angeles	P. 3-28	Under the second program for 16-1.1: Street Improvements - The Plan recommends only those street widening already approved in the West Los Angeles Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Specific Plan (Ordinance No. 171,492) <b>and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan (2035).</b> The TIMP identifies the following specific nonstandard roadway segments for capacity improvement consistent with their roadway classification in response to congestion levels projected for the Year 2010.[TIMP]
Westwood	P. 3-25	Goal 15: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY,</b> A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM SUPPORTING EXISTING AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT <del>ALL</del> INTERSECTIONS, <b>WHERE FEASIBLE.</b>
Westwood	P. 3-25	Objective 15-1: To <b>the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable Levels of Service (LOS) and ensure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by new development.
Westwood	P. 3-25	Policy 15-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, m</b> Maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for secondary highways and collector streets; nor LOS "E" for major highways or major business districts.
Westwood	P. 3-27	Objective 15-3 : To ensure that the circulation system is adequate to lessen traffic congestion in the Community, <b>where feasible and appropriate.</b>

Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Northeast LA	P. 3-25	GOAL 10: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY</b> , A SYSTEM OF FREEWAYS, HIGHWAYS AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT <del>ALL</del> INTERSECTIONS.
Northeast LA	P. 3-25	<b>Objective 10-1: To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety</b> , comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service and ensure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <del>all</del> new development.
Northeast LA	P. 3-26	Policy 10-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety</b> , <del>m</del> Maintain Levels of Service for streets and highways not to exceed LOS "D" for secondary arterials, collector streets, and local streets; not to exceed LOS "E" on Major Highways or in the community's major business districts.
Northeast LA	P. 3-26	Second program for Policy 10-1.1: Encourage the completion of the following street programs in the City's Capital Improvement Program, <b>where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan</b> .
Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley	Pps. 3-46 to 3-47	In TDM Section: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety</b> , <del>it</del> is the City's objective to maintain acceptable Levels of Service (LOS E and F are considered unsatisfactory) throughout the Plan area as growth occurs. Studies indicate that the majority of the street segments are operating at acceptable Levels of Service. However, the level of trips generated by future development in the Plan area and surrounding communities requires implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility to sustain the current level of service on the street system</b> .
Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley	P. 3-49	Second program for policy 12-2.1: Institute peak hour parking restrictions to add travel lanes on boulevards as long as such measures do not conflict with existing bicycle facilities and Metro Rapid Bus service <b>or the policies of Mobility Plan 2035</b> .
Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley	P. 3-49	GOAL 13: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY</b> , A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES ADEQUATE CIRCULATION TO SUPPORT EXISTING, APPROVED AND PLANNED LAND USES AND MAINTAINS A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT <del>ALL</del> INTERSECTIONS.

## Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley	P. 3-49	Objective 13-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by all new development.
Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley	P. 3-49	Policy 13-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety,</b> maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways, that should not exceed LOS D for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E" <b>where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan.</b>
Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley	P. 3-50	Second Program for Policy 13-1.1: <b>Where feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan,</b> implement street re-designations that will more accurately reflect the capacity and function of various streets in the Plan area and amend the Mobility Plan, an Element of the General Plan (see Figure 7).
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-17	Under TDM section: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS E. Studies indicate that most of Canoga Park - Winnetka - Woodland Hills - West Hills major street intersections currently meet this standard. However, the level of trips generated by future development in the plan area and surrounding communities requires implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program and <b>other improvements to enhance safety and mobility</b> to sustain the current level of service on the street system.
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-19	Goal 13: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY,</b> A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES ADEQUATE CIRCULATION TO SUPPORT EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES AND MAINTAINS A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ALL INTERSECTIONS.
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-19	Objective 13-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by all new development.

## Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-19	Policy 13-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of an arterial or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E", where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan.</b>
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-19	In the first program for policy 13-1.1 (bottom): <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan 2035, implement the Warner Center Specific Plan Phase I channelization and striping improvements on Burbank Boulevard from Topanga Canyon Boulevard to Ventura Freeway and Oxnard Street from Topanga Canyon Boulevard to Canoga Avenue.</b>
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-20	Second Program for Policy 13-1.1 (first on page): "Implement the following Warner Center Specific Plan Phase I peak hour parking restrictions or prohibitions, <b>to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies and programs of the Mobility Plan 2035, to provide 6 through lanes of traffic, at least during peak traffic periods [TIMP]:"</b>
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-20	Third program for policy 13-1.1 (second on page): <b>In a manner feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan (2035), implement intersection improvements (including right-of-way acquisition, intersection flaring, and signal improvements) recommended in the Ventura/Cahuenga Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan, Phase I and II. [TIMP].</b>
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-20	Fourth program for policy 13-1.1 (third on page): <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan (2035), implement Warner Center Specific Plan Phase I intersection improvements as growth and traffic warrants [TIMP].</b>
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-20	Fifth Program for policy 13-1.1 (fourth on page): Improve to their designated standard specifications, substandard segments of arterials expected to experience heavy traffic congestion by the year 2010, <b>to the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan.</b> The following streets should be included in the City's Capital Improvement Program.
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	Pg. 3-20	Sixth Program for policy 13-1.1 (bottom of page): "Implement the following Warner Center Specific Plan Phase I street improvements, <b>in a manner feasible and consistent with the policies and programs of the Mobility Plan:"</b>

Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills	P. 3-21	Seventh Program for policy 13-1.1 (middle of page): Implement the following street widenings, <b>to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies and programs of the Mobility Plan.</b> [TIMP]
Encino-Tarzana	P. 3-19	Under TDM section: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS D. The level of trips generated by future development in the Encino-Tarzana area and the surrounding communities require the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility</b> <del>to sustain the current levels of service on the street system.</del>
Encino-Tarzana	P. 3-21	In the second program for policy 12-1.1: "2. Peak Parking Restrictions <b>(to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan 2035):"</b>
Encino-Tarzana	P. 3-22	In the second program for Policy 12-1.1 (for TSM strategies): "3. Intersection Improvements <b>(to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan 2035):"</b>
Encino-Tarzana	P. 3-22	Goal 13: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY,</b> A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT <del>ALL</del> INTERSECTIONS.
Encino-Tarzana	P. 3-22	Objective 13-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <del>all</del> new development.
Encino-Tarzana	P. 3-23	Policy 13-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety,</b> <del>m</del> Maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets, wherever possible. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E," <b>where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan</b> <del>if possible.</del>

## Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Encino-Tarzana	P. 3-23	In the third program for 13-1.1 ("Capital Improvements"): "1. Proposed street widenings (to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan)"
North Hollywood-Valley Village	P. 3-4	Third paragraph of the "Circulation" section: Adequate traffic infrastructure roadway improvements shall be assured prior to the approval of zoning, permitting intensification of land use in order to avoid congestion and assure proper development.
Reseda-West Van Nuys	P. 3-20	Amend the TDM introductory section: To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not to exceed LOS D. Although studies indicate that most of Reseda - West Van Nuys- major street intersections are in compliance with this City policy, the level of trips generated by future development in Reseda - West Van Nuys- and in the surrounding North San Fernando Valley areas require the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility to sustain the current level of service on the street system.
Reseda-West Van Nuys	P. 3-23	GOAL 13: TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY, A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES ADEQUATE CIRCULATION TO SUPPORT EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ALL INTERSECTIONS. "
Reseda-West Van Nuys	P. 3-23	Objective 13-1: To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety, comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by all new development.
Reseda-West Van Nuys	P. 3-23	Policy 13-1.1: To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets, wherever possible. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E," where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan.

## Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Reseda-West Van Nuys	Pg. 3-24	Second Program under Policy 13-1.1: <i>(Ryland's note, not plan text)</i> In lane addition and widening proposals starting at that for Saticoy Street (from Valjean to Woodley), add phrase "where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan" next to proposals to "improve" or "provide" lanes (first and second at top) or "improve and implement peak (hour) parking restrictions" (third through fifth on the page).
Reseda-West Van Nuys	P. 3-24	Third Program for Policy 13-1.1: Encourage the completion of the following street improvements in the City's Capital Improvement Program (Five Year Program - Pictorial Guide FY 1996-7 to 2000-2001), <b>to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan:</b>
Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass	P. 3-18	Under TDM section: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety, it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS E.</b> Although studies indicate that most of Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass major street intersections are in compliance within this City policy, the level of trips generated by future development in the plan area and the surrounding communities require the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility to sustain the current level of service on the street system.</b>
Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass	P. 3-20	Goal 13: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY, A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ALL INTERSECTIONS.</b>
Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass	P. 3-21	Objective 13-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <del>all</del> new development.
Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass	P. 3-21	Policy 13-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety,</b> maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E," <b>where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan.</b>

## Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass	P. 3-21	First program for policy 13-1.1: Improve, to their designated standard specifications, substandard segments of those arterials which are expected to experience heavy traffic congestion by the year 2010. The following streets should be included in the City's Capital Improvement Program, <b>but only improved to the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan:</b>
Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass	Pg. 3-22	Third program for policy 13-1.1: Capital Improvements ( <b>to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan</b> ). [TIMP]
Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks	P. 3-20	Under TDM section: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS D. Although studies indicate that most of the Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks' major street intersections are in compliance with this City policy, the level of trips generated by future development in the Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks and in the surrounding San Fernando Valley areas, require the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility</b> to sustain the current level of service on the street system.
Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks	P. 3-23	Goal 14: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY, A SYSTEM OF FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ALL INTERSECTIONS.</b>
Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks	P. 3-23	Objective 14-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and ensure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by all-new development.
Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks	P. 3-23	Policy 14-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety,</b> maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E" <b>where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's policies.</b>

Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks	Pps. 3-23 to 3-24	Under third program for policy 14-1.1 ("Capital Improvements"): "1. Proposed Street Widening [TIMP] <b>(to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan):</b> "
Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks	Pg. 3-24	Under third program for policy 14-1.1 ("Capital Improvements"): "2. Proposed roadway extensions [TIMP] <b>(only to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan):</b> "
Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks	Pg. 3-24	Fourth program for policy 14-1.1: " <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan, e</b> ncourage the completion of the following street improvements in the City's Capital Improvement Program (Five Year Program- Pictorial Guide FY 1996-97 to 2000-2001):"
Chatsworth-Porter Ranch	Pg. 8	Third paragraph of "Standards and Criteria" sub-section of "Circulation" section: Adequate <b>traffic infrastructure highway improvements</b> shall be assured prior to the approval of zoning permitting intensification of land use in order to <u>avoid congestion</u> and assure proper development.
Mission Hills-Panorama City-North Hills	P. 3-19	In first paragraph of the "TDM" Section: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS E. Although studies indicate that most of Mission Hills - Panorama City - North Hills' major street intersections are in compliance with this City policy, the level of trips generated by future development in Mission Hills - Panorama City - North Hills and in the surrounding North San Fernando Valley areas require the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility</b> <del>to sustain the current level of service on the street system.</del>
Mission Hills-Panorama City-North Hills	P. 3-22	<b>Goal 13: TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY,</b> A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT <del>ALL</del> INTERSECTIONS.
Mission Hills-Panorama City-North Hills	P. 3-22	Objective 13-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's and Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <del>all</del> new development.

## Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Mission Hills-Panorama City-North Hills	P. 3-22	Policy 13-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's and Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g. walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety,</b> maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E", <b>if feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's policies.</b>
Mission Hills-Panorama City-North Hills	P. 3-22	(3rd) Program for Policy 13-1.1: <b>To the extent consistent with the Mobility Plan,</b> construct a new overpass and connect Satcoy Street across the Southern Pacific Railroad property between Woodman Avenue and Van Nuys Boulevard. This development would reduce traffic impacts on other streets and improve circulation. The extension of Arminta Street east of Van Nuys Boulevard should be joined with Satcoy Street as part of this project and the project on the General Motors Site.
Mission Hills-Panorama City-North Hills	Pps. 3-22 to 3-23	Under program on "Capital Improvements" (the fifth program for Policy 13-1.1), add the phrase " <b>to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan</b> " in parentheses after the headers titled "1. Proposed Street Widening" and "2. Proposed roadway extensions".
Northridge	Pg. 3-20	In first paragraph of "TDM" Section: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS D. The level of trips generated by future development in Northridge and in the surrounding North San Fernando Valley areas require the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility</b> <del>to sustain the current level of service on the street system.</del>
Northridge	Pg. 3-23	Goal 13: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY,</b> A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREE-WAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ALL INTER-SECTIONS.
Northridge	Pg. 3-23	Objective 13-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's and Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by all new development.

## Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Northridge	Pg. 3-23	Policy 13-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's and Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS F on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E", if possible feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan's policies.</b>
Northridge	Pg. 3-24	Under the Program on "Capital Improvements" add the phrase " <b>to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan</b> " in parentheses after the headers for "1. Proposed street widenings", "2. Proposed street extensions" and "3. The following streets are recommended to be restriped with peak hour parking prohibited to provide an additional travel lane in the peak direction during the peak hour [TIMP]."
Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace	Pg. 3-19	In the first paragraph in the section on TDM: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety, it is the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS E.</b>
Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace	Pg. 3-22	Goal 13: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY, A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USE WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ALL INTERSECTIONS.</b>
Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace	Pg. 3-22	Objective 13-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety, comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by all new development.</b>
Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace	Pg. 3-22	Policy 13-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E" if possible feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan.</b>
Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace	Pg. 3-22	Next to the program (second under Policy 13-1.1) for "Highway Improvements (TIMP)," add the parenthetical phrase, " <b>to be implemented to the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan.</b> "

## Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table


Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon	Pg. 3-23	Goal 13: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY,</b> A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT <del>ALL</del> INTERSECTIONS.
Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon	Pg. 3-23	Objective 13-1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <del>all</del> new development.
Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon	Pg. 3-23	Policy 13-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, m</b> aintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. Whenever possible <b>and in a manner consistent with the Mobility Plan,</b> if existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should not be allowed to further deteriorate.
Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon	Pg. 3-23	2nd Program for Policy 13-1.1: <b>"In a manner consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan, implement the following peak-hour parking restrictions:"</b>
Harbor Gateway	P. 3-4	In third paragraph of "Freeways and Streets" section: No increase in zoning density or intensity shall be effected unless it is determined that the <del>traffic infrastructure local</del> <b>Streets and the Major and Secondary Highways</b> serving the general area of the property involved, <del>is</del> <b>are</b> adequate to serve traffic needs. <b>Where feasible and warranted,</b> adequate improvement of abutting highways and streets shall be required in connection with the approval of any such zoning intensification.
Wilmington-Harbor City	P. 3-29	In first paragraph of section on TDM: <b>To the extent feasible and appropriate in light of the Mobility Plan's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety,</b> <del>it</del> <b>is</b> the City's objective that the traffic level of service (LOS) on the street system in the community not exceed LOS E. Although studies indicate that most of Wilmington-Harbor City's major street intersections are in compliance with this City policy, the level of trips generated by future development in Wilmington-Harbor City and in the surrounding South Bay areas require the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program <b>and other improvements to enhance safety and mobility</b> <del>to sustain the current level of service on the street system.</del>

Appendix A: General Plan Consistency Table

Community Plan	Page #	Comment
Wilmington-Harbor City	P. 3-34	Goal 15: <b>TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MOBILITY PLAN 2035'S AND COMMUNITY PLANS' POLICIES PROMOTING MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY</b> , A SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS, FREEWAYS, AND STREETS THAT PROVIDES A CIRCULATION SYSTEM WHICH SUPPORTS EXISTING, APPROVED, AND PLANNED LAND USES WHILE MAINTAINING A DESIRED LEVEL OF SERVICE AT <del>ALL</del> INTERSECTIONS.
Wilmington-Harbor City	P. 3-34	Objective 15-1: To <b>the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation and safety</b> , comply with Citywide performance standards for acceptable levels of service (LOS) and insure that necessary road access and street improvements are provided to accommodate traffic generated by <del>all</del> new development.
Wilmington-Harbor City	P. 3-34	Policy 15-1.1: <b>To the extent feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035's and the Community Plans' policies promoting multi-modal transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, driving, and taking public transit) and safety, m</b> Maintain a satisfactory LOS for streets and highways that should not exceed LOS "D" for Major Highways, Secondary Highways, and Collector Streets. If existing levels of service are LOS "E" or LOS "F" on a portion of a highway or collector street, then the level of service for future growth should be maintained at LOS "E" <b>where feasible and consistent with the Mobility Plan.</b>
Wilmington-Harbor City	P. 3-34	Second program (for policy 15-1.1): "Funded Capital Improvements. The following capital improvements are planned for the area, <b>to the extent that they are feasible and consistent with the policies of the Mobility Plan:</b> "

## Appendix B

### Updated Network Maps



H1 designation change

**CITYWIDE GENERAL PLAN  
CIRCULATION SYSTEM**  
Map A4 - CENTRAL, MIDCITY SUBAREA

Boulevard I	Divided Streets	Modified Streets
Boulevard II	Scenic Hwys	100 Modified ROW
Avenue I	Freeways	100 Modified RD
Avenue II	Collector Streets	
Avenue III	Local Streets/Other Streets	


City of Los Angeles Boundary

Collector, local, and other streets (such as mountain and airport roads) are shown for reference only. Refer to community plan of NavigateLA for more detail.





**DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES**



**TRANSIT ENHANCED NETWORK**



Map B


- Moderate Transit Enhanced Streets
- Moderate Plus Transit Enhanced Streets
- Comprehensive Transit Enhanced Streets
- Future Valley/ West Transit Study Corridor
- Existing & Planned Rail/Busway
- Transit Stations
- Arterials
- Freeways
- City of Los Angeles Boundary



**NEIGHBORHOOD ENHANCED NETWORK - VALLEY SUBAREA**  
**Map C2**

- Neighborhood Network
- Arterials
- City of Los Angeles Boundary






**NEIGHBORHOOD ENHANCED NETWORK-  
WEST SUBAREA**  
Map C3

- Neighborhood Network
- Arterials
- City of Los Angeles Boundary


0 1.5 3 4.5  
Miles




**NEIGHBORHOOD ENHANCED NETWORK-  
CENTRAL, EAST & SOUTH SUBAREA**  
Map C4

- Neighborhood Network
- Arterials
- City of Los Angeles Boundary

0 1 2 3 Miles



**DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES**




**BICYCLE ENHANCED NETWORK  
(LOW STRESS NETWORK)**


Map D1

-  Bicycle Paths
-  Tier 1 Protected Bicycle Lanes
-  BEN Segments from the Neighborhood Enhanced Network
-  Arterials
-  Freeways
-  City of Los Angeles Boundary






**DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES**




**BICYCLE LANE NETWORK**  
Map D2

- Tier 2 Bicycle Lane
- Tier 3 Bicycle Lane
- Arterials
- Freeways
- City of Los Angeles Boundary



**DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES**



**PEDESTRIAN ANALYSIS**

Map F

- Pedestrian Segments
- Arterials
- Freeways
- City of Los Angeles Boundary



# **EXHIBIT C:**

## **Mobility Plan 2035 Document**

---

CPC-2013-0910-GPA-SP-CA-MS-C-M2  
February 11, 2016

See separate document for Mobility Plan 2035, dated January 20, 2016

**EXHIBIT 2:**  
**February 2016 CPC Letter of Determination**

---

CPC-2013-0910-GPA-SP-CA-MSC-M2  
June 23, 2016





# LOS ANGELES CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

200 N. Spring Street, Room 532, Los Angeles, California, 90012-4801  
(213) 978-1300; <http://planning.lacity.org/>

## LETTER OF DETERMINATION

**Mailing Date:** FEB 26 2016

**CASE NO.:** CPC-2013-910-GPA-SP-A-MS-C-M2  
**CEQA:** ENV-2013-911-EIR-ADD2

**Location:** City Wide  
**Council Districts:** All  
**Plan Areas:** All  
**Request:** Amendment to the Mobility plan

**Applicant:** City of Los Angeles

**At its meeting of February 11, 2016, the Los Angeles City Planning Commission took the following action:**

1. **Conducted** a Public Hearing on the proposed project.
2. **Approved** the staff report as the City Planning Commission's Report.
3. **Approved**, pursuant to the procedures in LAMC Section 11.5.6 and City Charter Section 555, a **Resolution** that does all of the following:
  - a. Amends the Mobility Plan 2035 (as updated on January 20, 2016), by adopting the amendments (Exhibit A.2-A.3) to the Mobility Plan 2035, including text and map amendments.
  - b. Amends the Land Use Element of the General Plan (consisting of 35 community plans) to emphasize already existing law that the Community Plans' goals, objectives, policies and programs regarding circulation are aspirational and to be implemented only to the extent feasible and appropriate in light of other complementary policies in the GP (Exhibit A.1).
4. **Approved** the proposed amendments, introduced by Commission at the February 11, 2016 public hearing, as part of the Mobility Plan 2035 amendments and direct staff to incorporate the text changes before transmitting to the Mayor's office.

### **Recommendations to City Council:**

1. **Recommend** the City Council adopt, pursuant to the procedures in LAMC Section 11.5.6 and City Charter Section 555, a **Resolution** that does all of the following:
  - a. Amends the Mobility Plan 2035 (as updated on January 20, 2016), by adopting the amendments (Exhibit A.2-A.3) to the Mobility Plan 2035, including text and map amendments.
  - b. Amends the Land Use Element of the General Plan (consisting of 35 community plans) to emphasize already existing law that the Community Plans' goals, objectives, policies and programs regarding circulation are aspirational and to be implemented only to the extent feasible and appropriate in light of other complementary policies in the GP (Exhibit A.1).
2. **Recommend** the City Council Find, based on its independent judgment, after consideration of the entire administrative record, including the Mobility Plan EIR, EIR No. 2013-911-EIR; SCH No. 2013041012, certified on August 11, 2015 ("Final EIR"), First Addendum, No. ENV- 2013-911-ADD1, and the Second Addendum dated January 28, 2016, No. **ENV 2013-911-ADD2**, that the amendments to the Mobility Plan 2035 and the amendments to the Community Plans were environmentally assessed in the Final EIR and that pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 and 15164 and Public Resources Code Section 21166 no subsequent or supplemental EIR is required for approval of the Mobility Plan 2035 and Community Plan amendments.

**This action was taken by the following vote:**

**Moved:** Dake-Wilson  
**Seconded:** Perlman  
**Ayes:** Ambroz, Choe, Katz, Mack, Millman, Padilla  
**Absent:** Ahn  
  
**Vote:** 8 - 0



---

**James K. Williams, Commission Executive Assistant II  
Los Angeles City Planning Commission**

If you seek judicial review of any decision of the City pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, the petition for writ of mandate pursuant to that section must be filed no later than the 90th day following the date on which the City's decision became final pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. There may be other time limits which also affect your ability to seek judicial review.

Attachment: Resolution, Amended Language, Maps,  
City Planning Staff: Claire Bowin, My La

For more information on Mobility Plan 2035 view it or download it here:

[https://losangeles2b.files.wordpress.com/2012/12/mobilityplan\\_web\\_jan\\_2016v61.pdf](https://losangeles2b.files.wordpress.com/2012/12/mobilityplan_web_jan_2016v61.pdf)

## **EXHIBIT 3:**

# **May 2016 Transportation Committee Report**

---

CPC-2013-0910-GPA-SP-CA-MS-C-M2  
June 23, 2016



FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (FEIR) ADDENDUM,  
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE REPORT, and RESOLUTION relative to proposed  
amendments to Mobility Plan 2035.

Recommendations for Council action:

1. FIND, based on its independent judgment and after consideration of the entire administrative record to include the Mobility Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR), EIR No. 2013-911-EIR; SCH No. 2013041012, certified on August 11, 2015 (FEIR), First Addendum, No. ENV- 2013-911-ADD1, and the Second Addendum dated January 28, 2016, No. ENV 2013-911-ADD2, all attached to the Council file, that the amendments to the Mobility Plan 2035 and the amendments to the Community Plans were environmentally assessed in the FEIR and that pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15162 and 15164 and Public Resources Code Section 21166 no subsequent or supplemental EIR is required for approval of the Mobility Plan 2035 and Community Plan amendments.
2. CONCUR with the February 11, 2016 action of the Los Angeles City Planning Commission (City Plan Case No. CPC-2013-910-GPA-SP-CA-MSC) as amended, attached to the Council file, approving the proposed General Plan Amendment, as amended, as detailed in the February 26, 2016 Los Angeles City Planning Commission (CPC) report, attached to the Council file.
3. ADOPT the accompanying RESOLUTION, to be effective upon its adoption, to:
  - a. Certify that the recitals contained in the Resolution are true and correct and incorporated in said Resolution and to incorporate Exhibits A.1-A.3 - Maps attached to the Resolution, February 26, 2016 CPC report, and Council file.
  - b. Make findings, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 and 15164 and Public Resources Code Section 21166 as described above in Recommendation No. 1.
  - c. Adopt the amendments to the Updated Mobility Plan 2035 as they read and shown in Exhibit A.2-A.3, attached to the Resolution, February 26, 2016 CPC report, and Council file, to include amendments to the Citywide Circulation Systems Map, as they are shown and read in Exhibit A.3 of the February 26, 2016 CPC report, attached to the Council file.
  - d. Adopt the amendments to the City's Community Plans as they read in Exhibit A.1 of the February 26, 2016 CPC report, Resolution, and attached to the Council file.
4. AMEND the relevant portions of the Mobility Plan 2035 to:
  - a. Substitute Gayley Avenue/Midvale Avenue for Westwood Boulevard between LeConte and Ohio Avenues.
  - b. Substitute Avalon Boulevard for Central Avenue between Jefferson Boulevard. and

Imperial Highway.

- c. Add San Pedro Street between Seventh Street and Jefferson Boulevard to the Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN).
- d. Amend the Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN) to include 16th Street between San Pedro Avenue and Central Avenue.
- e. Amend the text under the Network Concept Maps heading on page 153 of Mobility Plan 2035, Chapter 6: Action Plan to add the following:

For example, a north-south corridor identified on the BEN could be substituted with an alternative north-south corridor that is not currently on the BEN if it serves similar constituencies and destinations and is supported with additional, operational studies and community engagement.

Fiscal Impact Statement Submitted: None submitted by the Department of City Planning. Neither the City Administrative Officer nor the Chief Legislative Analyst has completed a financial analysis of this report.

Community Impact Statement: Yes

For:  
Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council

Against:  
West Los Angeles Neighborhood Council

**TIME LIMIT FILE - MAY 17, 2016**

**(LAST DAY FOR COUNCIL ACTION - MAY 17, 2016)**

**(Planning and Land Use Management Committee has waived the above matter)**

Summary:

On May 11, 2016, your Committee considered a February 26, 2016 CPC and City Planning Department reports, March 3, 2016 Communication from the Mayor, and Resolution relative to proposed amendments to Mobility Plan 2035. According to the City Planning Department, on February 11, 2016, the CPC approved a number of proposed amendments to the Mobility Plan 2035. Specifically, the CPC approved, pursuant to procedures set forth in Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 11.5.6 and Charter Section 555 a Resolution that:

- a. Amends the Mobility Plan 2035 (as updated on January 20, 2016), by adopting the amendments detailed in Exhibit A.2-A.3 of the Mobility Plan 2035, including text and map amendments, attached to the Council file.
- b. Amends the Land Use Element of the General Plan (consisting of 35 community plans) to emphasize already existing law that the Community Plans' goals, objectives,

policies and programs regarding circulation are aspirational and to be implemented only to the extent feasible and appropriate in light of other complementary policies in the General Plan (Exhibit A.1 of the Mobility Plan 2035, including text and map amendments, attached to the Council file).

Additionally, the CPC approved its proposed amendments to the Mobility Plan 2035 that were introduced at its February 11, 2016 public hearing and directed staff to incorporate said amendments prior to transmittal to the Mayor.

Representatives from the City Planning Department gave an overview of the proposed changes and answered questions from the Committee members. After consideration and having provided an opportunity for public comment, the Committee moved to approve the proposed amendments. Additionally, the Committee moved to add a recommendation to make further amendments to Mobility Plan 2035 and are detailed above in Recommendation No. 4. A roll call vote was taken and there were four aye votes, one no vote, and one absence. This matter is now submitted to Council for its consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE



<u>MEMBER</u>	<u>VOTE</u>
BONIN:	NO
KORETZ:	YES
HUIZAR:	YES
MARTINEZ:	ABSENT
RYU:	YES

ARL  
5/11/16

**-NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL COUNCIL ACTS-**

