

Stephen J. Donell, CCIM, CPM

From: cigardenia@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2023 11:12 AM
To: Stephen J. Donell, CCIM, CPM
Subject: Fw: This is an email I sent regarding Pep Boys. Check Out The Trip Data. This is crucial on our arteries as the airport grows

****CAUTION** External Email**

More data from Lisa Haines.
Julie

[Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS](#)

Begin forwarded message:

On Wednesday, September 27, 2023, 8:08 PM, Lisa GAINES <luckynla@mac.com> wrote:

Please note some important last minute findings for PLUM at the intersection of Manchester and Sepulveda:

1. Jiffy Lube project (p.40 of report) projected 1272 trips/day and 226 peak trips for only 86 units
2. Pep Boys project projected only 1159 trips (should be 6518 trips) even though it is 5 times larger with 441 units. It only projected 142 peak hour trips. Something is very wrong with their data.
3. There is a threshold for freeway impact access study of 25 additional trips. Ironically, the max amount of trips estimated was 24 and they said no northbound La Tijera trips were estimated. What?
4. Since the average family in Westchester/Playa is 2.1, 441 units will yield 926 people, most of which driving age. Add 100 employees of the restaurant and commercial businesses, there are well over 1100 people needing to park. Then add, the customers of the restaurant, the businesses and the deliveries: Amazon, UPS, Instacart, GrubHub, etc, 5 spots seems too little
5. SCAG says 8.7% of adults have no car or 35 out of the 441 units, they only have 195 parking spots so that means 221 - 442 tenants will be parking on our neighborhood streets if only one car per unit....
6. SCAG says on 3.8% of adults use transit for work, that means only 17 people will use public transportation
7. SCAG says 17% of adults work from home, that means only 75 people work from home. 75 work from home plus 17 taking buses = 92 people not on the road, or 349 - 834 renters driving to work (could double if more than one person lives in each dwelling)

Their assumptions were so wrong and I believe dishonest.

In summary, they underreported the impact on the arteries and the on/off ramps to the freeway

On Sep 27, 2023, at 6:20 PM, cigardenia@aol.com wrote:

Hi Lisa;

Thanks for the work you did on this. I've cc'd Steve Donell on this. He's the new PLUC Chair and the applicants representative will be making a presentation on this project to PLUC in October.

I don't have the date handy but it won't be at the regularly scheduled Committee time, it will be a Special meeting.

Julie

[Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS](#)

On Wednesday, September 27, 2023, 8:46 AM, Lisa GAINES <luckynla@mac.com> wrote:

Begin forwarded message:

From: Lisa GAINES <luckynla@me.com>
Subject: I Object to the Overbuilding of 6136 Manchester Using EIR Data
Date: September 26, 2023 at 9:50:16 PM PDT
To: alexander.truong@lacity.org,
michelle.carter@lacity.org
Cc: Jeff Khau <jeff.khau@lacity.org>

I object to the overbuilding of 6136 Manchester Blvd. It shouldn't even be built there due to the excess cars traveling near our airport arteries. I did read the trip study report and it has so many holes in it that it can be sold as Swiss cheese, stinky too. They used trip data when the volume is the lowest on a Wednesday and during low peak times before 6pm. Our heaviest traffic begins after 6pm and ramps up on Thursdays and next high volume day is Sunday. Why study obviously low volume days and times unless you want to skew the data.... Which was done here.

1. You have upzoned to add additional housing without offering parking for the "affordable units" due the (mis)concept that they would be walking, biking or taking a bus. Your own study anticipates that they will be adding to the trips. How can they contribute to the trips without a vehicle? So they will have vehicles and where will they park? Yup, in our neighbors streets, further blocking their driveways, and wreaking havoc on this poor community.

<Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 4.11.54 PM.png>

2. This excerpt claims that 441 units, 962 people would only produce 4 more vehicles in the Manchester/Sepulveda intersection. Just let that sink in... 962 people (avg number of people in a household in our community is 2.1) only changes the intersection by up to 4. This is hard to consider it as realistic.

<Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 4.27.08 PM.png>

3. This excerpt claims that during “peak” times (not reality on peak times but what they claimed) 962 people, 55 employees and customers will NOT use the La Tijera (north) on/off ramp at all (really? In whose alternative reality?),
It claims that out of 962 people, 55 employees and X customers, only 12 would use the north Manchester on/off ramp
It claims that out of 962 people, 55 employees and X customers, only 24 would use the south La Tijera on/off ramp (Oh missed the magic number by 1 to need a onramp impact study)
It claims that out of 962 people, 55 employees and X customers, only 12 would use the south La Cienega on/off ramp
So summed up, only 48 cars would drive onto the 405 freeway on Manchester, La Tijera (south) and La Cienega during “peak hour” out of 962 adults, 55 employees and X customers. Not valid or even remotely believable.

<Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 5.51.36 PM.png>

4. No evaluation of on/off ramp study was performed due to a faulty estimation that less than 25 cars would travel to an on/off ramp. 962 people living there and added restaurant and other business trips should well exceed 25 cars. This is harmful to underestimate this.<Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 8.07.45 PM.png>

5. The gateway to the airport is expected to increase trips by 30% in the next ten years with Sepulveda and Manchester being the most heavily traveled airport route, followed by La Tijera/Manchester. Here, during non real peak hours it is rated a “D, E and F”. Should we be clapping? It can’t get much worse than this yet you believe that additional traffic will not impact this intersection. ANY housing close to the arteries will impact these critical intersections. Shame on you for you smoke and mirrors and fuzzy math. This will adversely impact us with real traffic and pollution. You have no regard to people actually living here only on making your money off of our lives. Equally important, bad decisions like these will clog these airport arteries

and slow down commerce which will cost Los Angeles businesses. This is happening now, during non-peak times. You need to pay attention to this.

<Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 8.43.41 PM.png><Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 8.52.46 PM.png>

<Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 8.42.13 PM.png>
6. The city purposely is shorting the number of parking spaces by 160 from its already reduced number. Exactly where will these people park? They will encroach on the neighbors. Every single day. These cars, plus airport parkers, and airport workers consuming every inch of public parking space in front of homes that, until recently, have enjoyed their peace.

<Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 8.24.29 PM.png>

7. So they estimate 1052 people per day: the numbers don't add up: 55 employees, 962 renters, plus customers far exceeds the 1052 people per day. Exactly where will they park? On the neighborhood street?

8. So using their 1052 people (which is grossly low) and they are supposed to be walking, riding a bike and using the bus, how can they make 3589 trips and 26,521 vehicle miles traveled per day? How can 3589 trips per day not have more than 25 trips on a freeway onramp requiring impact study? How can 3589 trips per day not increase the number of trips in Sepulveda/Manchester and La Tijera/Manchester intersections? Exactly, it can't. Fuzzy math meets reality.

<Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 7.53.29 PM.png>

You have faulty assumptions:
renters will not have cars
renters will drive bikes, walk or take the bus
renters will not drive on La Tijera/405 on ramp
less than 25 of 962 renters, 150 clientele, 55 employees will use freeway onramp at peak times

renters/employees will not park on neighboring streets
there will be no net increase in trips

You have faulty studies:
you pick the slowest volume day and times to study the traffic patterns (Wed 7-9 and 3-5) thereby skewing low data
you projected only 142 new morning peak hour trips and 166 net new afternoon peak hour trips: how can

you justify that with 5500 sq ft retail, 16,600 sq ft commercial and 11,100 sq ft of all new business employee and customer trips
you used the old model for trip generation: 9th edition instead of the 11th edition

This is a catastrophic example of changing assumptions to get the right outcome. Are you willing to support your decisions in front of the news cameras? This is so egregiously created AND approved by city leaders that each and every one will be outed if you let this proceed.

I await your decision to do the right thing for our community.

Lisa Gaines
Westchester Resident

<Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 4.27.08 PM.png><Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 4.11.54 PM.png><Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 8.07.45 PM.png><Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 7.53.29 PM.png><Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 5.51.36 PM.png><Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 8.52.46 PM.png><Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 8.43.41 PM.png><Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 8.24.29 PM.png><Screenshot 2023-09-26 at 8.42.13 PM.png>