

**SUMMARY RESPONSE TO FEBRUARY 18, 2008 MINAGAR & ASSOCIATES REVIEW
OF AUTRY NATIONAL CENTER (ANC)
TRAFFIC STUDY**

The Minagar review raised 19 items taking issue with the Fehr & Peers (F&P) Traffic Study performed for the Autry National Center as contained in the Draft EIR. These items generally fall into three categories: (1) the official process; (2) the methods for generating the base conditions and trip data; and (3) asserted omissions of related projects. The responses by these categories are as follows:

Comments under Category 1 (1,2)

Response

F & P coordinated with LADOT throughout the process, including development of an approved memorandum of understanding (MOU) outlining the study approach and review and approval of the Traffic Study. Thus, the study is in full compliance with LADOT Traffic Study Policies and Procedures including intersections evaluated, trip generation guidelines and related projects. Further, LADOT sent a memorandum to the Planning Department approving the Traffic Study.

Comments under Category 2 (3,4,5,6,10,11&12)

Response

We disagree with the assertion that the ANC-specific trip generation rates are not appropriate. Trip generation rates for any land use, including a museum, vary due to a host of factors, including regional and local setting context (rural, suburban, central city), the availability and quality of the transit service serving the site, as well as the likely nature and scale of the area from which prospective patrons and visitors are drawn. In particular for a museum, the vehicle trip generation is highly dependent on several other issues including the percentage of the patrons that arrive as groups in buses, the age distribution of the typical patrons (i.e., children tend to arrive in large groups), and the relationship between the size of the facility as compared to the scale of the patronage (i.e., the Peterson Auto Museum needs much more space per exhibit and therefore per patron than an art museum).

It appears that these comments have identified a series of relatively minor issues associated with the approach used in this study, each of which is consistent with and has been accepted and approved for use in this study by LADOT. None of these issues results in errors or inaccuracies in the traffic volumes used in the study as contended by the comments, and none would result in an incorrect conclusion or result, as implied in the comments. Therefore, there is no reason to have any doubts about the accuracy or validity of the results or about the official acceptability of the findings and conclusions.

Comments under Category 3 (13-19)

Response to Comments 13-19

Per LADOT procedures, the official City of Los Angeles related projects are prepared on a Citywide basis, and project-specific related projects are provided by LADOT. None of the projects mentioned in comments 13-19 are on the City's related projects list. However, in addition to the related project trips, as part of the traffic study, a one percent annual growth rate was applied to existing traffic.