

Metro Orange Line Sepulveda Station Transit Oriented Development Capstone Studio

Project Client: Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority, Joint Development Department UP 217 Capstone Studio- Winter/Spring 2010 Instructors: Katherine Aguilar Perez & Jose Antonio Perez UCLA Urban Planning, School of Public Affairs

CAPSTONE STUDIO STUDENTS

Haila Adamo	Scott John	
Jeremy Cogan	Kevin Kahn	
Dante Doberneck	Andrew Lee	
Eric Douglas	Lugo Raul	
Lauren Finkel	Steven Mateer	
Kevin Finkel	Jacqueline Torres	

Ruby Horta

CAPSTONE STUDIO INSTRUCTORS

Katherine Aguilar Perez Executive Director Urban Land Institute, Los Angeles

Jose Antonio Perez Principal Director of Southern California Operations Raimi + Associates

CAPSTONE STUDIO ASSISTANT

Stephen Sampson

SPECIAL THANKS

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authorty

Roger Moliere, *Chief, Real Property & Economic Development, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.*

Alexander Kalamaros, Joint Development Program Manager, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Nelia Custudio, *Transportation Planning Manager at Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority*

DISCLAIMER:

Neither the University of California, Nor the School of Public Affairs either supports or disavows the findings in any project, report, paper, or research listed herein. University affiliations are for identification only; the University is not involved in or responsible for the project.

Metro Orange Line Sepulveda Station Transit Oriented Development Capstone Studio

A comprehensive project submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Urban Planning

Project Client: Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority, Joint Development Department UP 217 Capstone Studio- Winter/Spring 2010 Instructors: Katherine Aguilar Perez & Jose Antonio Perez UCLA Urban Planning, School of Public Affairs

Table of Contents

I.	Existing Conditions Report	6
II.	Market Analysis	26
III.	Final Design Presentations	
	Group 1- (Cogan, Doberneck, L. Finkel, John, Lee, Lugo, Mateer)	31
	Group 2- (Adamo, Douglas, K. Finkel, Horta, Kahn, Torres)	57
IV.	Appendix A- Financial Pro Formas	XX
V.	Appendix B- Student Resumes	ХХ



Images from the class' first visit to the Sepulveda Station

${\sf Executive} \ {\sf Summary}$

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) has embarked on a comprehensive approach to better managing traffic in Los Angeles County. In support of this approach, Metro is redeveloping many of its parking lots to facilitate infill development with the aim of increasing transit ridership and better utilization of Metro's real estate portfolio.

Metro has asked our team to formulate a development proposal for the Orange Line Sepulveda Station in the San Fernando Valley. Located in the Van Nuys neighborhood of Los Angeles, the Sepulveda Orange Line Station sits at the middle of one of Metro's most successful mass transit projects. Our site is the parking lot adjacent to the Sepulveda Station. The site is bounded on the north by Erwin Street to the east by Sepulveda Boulevard to the west by Interstate 405 and to the south by the Orange Line Busway.

From our research here are our key findings:

- The surrounding neighborhood as average to high density for the San Fernando Valley
- Current zoning regulations allow for low to medium density development of the parking lot
- Surrounding land uses have made Sepulveda Boulevard unattractive from an aesthetic standpoint
- The site currently lacks adequate access to Sepulveda Boulevard
- The Orange Line will continue to see increasing ridership

This report will detail the existing conditions not just at the site but also in the surrounding community. The purpose of this report is to assess the development potential for the site by taking into account what is around the site. We feel that understanding the neighborhood will yield the best possible project for Metro and the community.

To create the best project for both Metro and the community we recommend the following:

- Development of the site must be in scale with the existing built environment
- Access to Sepulveda Boulevard should be a high priority for any development proposal
- Programming should serve the existing communities needs
- Traffic on Erwin Street should be minimized to the furthest extent possible
- Project should be profitable for Metro and add ridership to the Orange Line

Redeveloping the Sepulveda Station's parking lot offers an excellent opportunity to improve the quality of life for residents in the community, better utilize Metro's real estate portfolio, and increase ridership on public transportation.

SECTION I. URBAN FORM FRAMEWORK

This section will illustrate what the neighborhood looks like both demographically and physically. This section will help formulate what the appropriate density and programming of any development proposal ought to be for the Sepulveda Station. The physical and demographic data will help show that Sepulveda Station parking lot is ripe for a high quality development project.

$P_{\text{EDESTRIAN}} \; S_{\text{HED}}$

The pedestrian shed is the area within a ½-mile diameter of the site. It is assumed that this is the maximum distance the average pedestrian is willing to walk. As the pedestrian shed map in the report shows, the pedestrian shed for the Sepulveda Station extends from the south side of Victory Boulevard to the north side of Califa Street. To the east, the pedestrian shed nearly reaches Noble Avenue. The I-405 prevents any pedestrians from easily accessing destinations to the west.

Within the pedestrian there are a variety of commercial, recreational, and housing opportunities for residents and visitors. Some key land marks include the Costco across from the Sepulveda Station, the Delano Recreation Center, and numerous eateries and markets. The concentration of activity centers means residents have the ability to reach a number of amenities by foot.

However as we will show consistently through this report, the low quality urban design of Sepulveda Boulevard creates a significant barrier to walking in the community. A large parking lot in front of Costco creates a large inconvenience for pedestrians attempting to access the store. Moreover many of the uses along Sepulveda lack coherence and are autocentric in their design. This will create a challenge for our project.

Ideally our project will be a catalyst to remake Sepulveda into a more pedestrian-friendly street with development and urban design that respects the pedestrian.

COMMUNITY DEMOGRAPHICS

The Sepulveda Orange Line Station is located within the Nan Nuys Community of the City of Los Angeles. The Community of Van Nuys has a population of approximately 160,000 residents according to the 2000 Census. Nan Nuys is nearly 50% Latino and 36% White with remaining ethnic groups comprising the remaining 14%.

Looking at the Pedestrian Shed community we used data from the 2000 Census at the block level. We found that the population is 5,133 residents. Most of the residents live either to the south or to east of the site. The neighborhood to the north of the site contains the least number of residents.

For household data, the highest numbers of households are found in the housing to the east (694 households) and the south (476 households). The housing to the north had the smallest number of households at 235 which is largely due to the single-family detached housing stock in this area. In terms of household size the housing to the east has the highest number at roughly 3 people per household and the housing to the north had the second largest household size at 2.74 people per household. Not surprisingly the housing to the east had

the highest number of children and the housing the south had the second most. The housing to the north of the site has the least amount of children which suggests an older population.

In terms of income, median income ranges from a little \$30,000 to nearly under \$69,000. The lower bound of the income distribution is found in the housing to the east of the site with the middle ranges to the south and southeast. The



houses to the north were the upper bound of the income distribution in the community. The distribution of people in poverty also follows this geographic distribution. Education level is more mixed. The housing to the southeast has the highest level of residents with at least some college education while the housing the south has the second most. The housing the east has the lowest educational attainment of the four census blocks.

The employment and commuting data also reveals interesting facts about the community. The housing to the east has the highest number of workers at 816 and the housing to the

south has the second highest at 561. The housing to the southeast had the third highest at 494 and the housing to the north the fewest at 395. The commuting data tracks nicely with the worker data. The most drivers and carpoolers come from the housing to the east while the highest numbers of transit riders are from the housing to the south with the housing in the east coming in second.



Subject Site and Study Area

The combination of income, density, and commuting patterns are fairly consistent along the four census blocks. The housing to the north is largely upper income and stable which will mean development will need to be sensitive to that particular community's needs. As for the lower income neighborhoods, they tend to have higher proportions of workers and therefore would likely benefit from an improved Orange Line Station with ancillary development. These demographics will be critical to understanding what programming is appropriate for the site and what an acceptable level of density will be.

BUILDING HEIGHT

Most of the buildings mass along the major streets. For example Sepulveda Boulevard has the tallest buildings in the project area ranging from the fivestorv office buildina near the corner of the busway and Sepulveda Boulevard. Victory Boulevard also has consistent density along the southern part of the street. Erwin Street



heading east away from the site has similar density to Victory Boulevard.

What is most striking about the building height map is the mixing if various building heights in close proximity to each other. This suggests that spot zoning likely occurred on obsolete industrial land. This has created a mismatched quilt of land uses that is difficult to untangle. This may prove a significant challenge to our development if the surrounding land uses to do not interact and support our project.

CHARACTERIZATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD BLOCKS

In this section we present three typologies to describe the physical qualities of the different blocks within the project area. We identified three types of blocks: maintenance (needs little changes), infill/land assembly (needs change but within established patterns), and regeneration (needs substantial improvements). This characterization scheme will help us identify which aspects of the project will aid our project and which ones might present challenges to a successful project.

For the most part we found that many of the blocks in the project area qualified as maintenance which means that they need little to no improvement in the streetscape, land use, or programming. Most of the single-family neighborhoods fell into this category as they are well maintained and would likely not benefit from significant development within these areas.

Equally split between maintenance were the blocks where infill/land assembly are needed to either improve the economic potential of a site or make it compatible with surrounding land uses. The blocks we identified as infill/land assembly were primarily along Sepulveda Boulevard, Erwin Street (eastern portion), and along the busway. We feel that more comprehensive land use planning and incentives for land assembly will help attract better development and programming to the community.

The last category is termed regenerative because it needs the most attention. There were only three areas identified as regenerative. The first is our site which is a parking lot isolated from the main street. The large contiguous size of the parcel means it offers a unique opportunity to create a win-win development that meets the standard of "highest and best" use of the land. We also identified the Chevron petroleum facility to the south of the site as regenerative because it is not clear how long such an operation can last with encroaching residential and retail development. We also identified a third parcel which currently is a vacant lot. Clearly there are better uses for this parcel.



SECTION II. PUBLIC REALM FRAMEWORK

In this section we detail the availability of open space, the circulation network, streetscape sizes, and the available infrastructure. This section will lay out some of the public amenities present within our project area and help guide development.

OPEN SPACE AND CIRCULATION

If it were not for the I-405 freeway our site would have excellent access to the adjacent Woodley Avenue Park. The



Open space and street circulation in project area

park is approximately 130 acres and features barbeque pits, baseball diamond, children's play area, picnic tables, public restrooms, wildlife reservation area, archery range, and a cricket field. To the north of the park is the Japanese Garden. To the east is the Delano Recreation Center which offers a wide variety of athletic, recreational, and educational programs for City residents.

The circulation in the project area features every type of road. The I-405 functions as the western boundary and is one of the busiest freeways in Southern California. The major arterials are Sepulveda Boulevard which extends into West Los Angeles and the South Bay, Victory and Burbank Boulevards which both travel nearly the entire length of the San Fernando Valley. The collector streets are Hatteras Street, Delano Street, and Noble Avenue. Secondary streets include Kester Avenue and Oxnard Street. There is also a whole host of residential streets. Lastly the busway cuts through the center of the project area.

Despite the wall effect caused by the I-405, the Orange Line offers a decent connection to the

Woodley Avenue Park as the Woodley Station is located on the north side of the park. Also the variety of activities provided by the Delano Recreation Center provides a place for community building in this neighborhood and is an asset that should be fully used.

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE ACCESS

The major streets in the project area all have sidewalks and provide adequate pedestrian access to various businesses and residences in the project area. Some of the smaller streets lack sidewalks



Bikeway and pedestrian paths in project area

which is likely a result of the housing being built during the 1950's and 60's.

In terms of bicycle access, the Orange Line for most of its route has an adjoining bike lane. Also the Woodley Avenue Park features a bike path running through the middle of the park.

STREETSCAPE CROSS-SECTIONS

In our study we identified three major types of streetscapes in the project area. The first type is the arterial typified by Sepulveda Boulevard. It features three 10-foot lanes in each direction with an 8-foot parking lane on both sides. There is usually a 12-foot median or turn lane. Taken together the total street width is 88 feet. The sidewalks are 12-feet wide.

The next streetscape we identified is the busway and the station access from Sepulveda Boulevard. The busway has two 13-foot lanes flanked on both sides by 10-foot sidewalks. The south sidewalk has an 8-foot wide planter while the north walkway includes a 14-foot bike lane. Next to the north pedestrian walkway is the entry lane for the bus station which has two 11-foot lanes and an 8-foot planter.

The last streetscape we analyzed was the local residential road. In this case we looked at Erwin Street to the north of the site. The street includes two 10-foot travel lanes and two 8-foot parking lanes. On the residential side there is no sidewalk. On the south side there is a 7-foot sidewalk and a 7-foot planter.



INFRASTRUCTURE

We identified one sewer main on the northwest corner of the project site and five storms drains located throughout project site. This means our development should be able to hookup to the sewer line without major disruption to street traffic due to construction.

There is electrical onsite as the station is lit and has lighting in the parking lot. More importantly we did not find any major electrical, water, or gas lines running through our site. This will give us greater flexibility in our designs.

SECTION III. COMMUNITY FEATURES

In this section we identify major community features like restaurants, markets, schools, medical facilities, and financial institutions. Knowing what the existing community has helps us determine what our project should look like from a zoning perspective as well as what kind of commercial programming might be in demand for this community.

MARKETS AND EATING ESTABLISHMENTS

Within our project area there are a number of markets and eating establishments of varying quality. There are at least seven fast food establishments on in the project area. There are about seven restaurants in the project area.

In terms of grocery markets there are three large establishments which include the Target and Costco centers. There are about five convenience stores but they spread throughout the project area.

In terms of programming there might be unmet demand for alternative markets like Trader Joe's or Fresh and Easy as well as restaurant alternatives to fast food. Another potential programming option is to add a convenience store like Famima!

CIVIC USES AND ACTIVITIES

Unlike with the markets and eating establishments, there is very little within the pedestrian shed. There is only a bank, school, and the Delano Recreation Center. If we broaden our scope to include the project area we pickup more civic uses and activities. There are three medical clinics and three more schools. Additionally there is the Van Nuys Youth Center.

As with the markets and eating establishments, this perhaps another void a project at the Sepulveda station might address. Locating a bank for example would help bring more banking choices to the neighborhood. There might also be a need for a variety of medical offices in the area.

SECTION IV. TRANSIT SERVICES FRAMEWORK

In this section we present the different bus lines that serve not just the site but also the project area. We found a low level of transit integration with the built environment. As a result the transit network lacks easy connectivity that makes activities like transfers or tripchaining on public transit less likely. A goal of our project will be to better integrate the built environment with the available transit.

MASS TRANSIT ROUTES AND SCHEDULES

From the regional perspective the project area has a fair level of transit service. To the northeast is the Nan Nuvs Amtrak/Metrolink station which connects commuters with Downtown Los Angeles, Glendale, and Burbank. Metro's Orange Line has three stops within our project area at Nan Nuys, Sepulveda, and Woodley. The next highest level of service is the LA Department of Transportation Commuter Bus Line C549 with service to Pasadena. There are also Metro Rapid Bus lines on Van Nuys Boulevard (Line 761) and on Sepulveda Boulevard (Line 734). Santa Clarita also operates commuter busses on the I-405 but none of the busses stop in our project area.

Looking at the project site, the Sepulveda Orange Line Station is served but Metro Rapid Line 734, Metro Local 234, and the Orange Line. On Victory Boulevard are Metro Local Lines 164 and 237. Burbank Boulevard to the South has Metro Local 154.

One of the challenges presented at the site is the level of service by each bus lines. With the exception of the Orange Line which operates frequently seven days a week, many of the bus lines do not have weekend service. Additionally, nighttime service is infrequent in the area which is largely due to the low



density and lack of nighttime activity centers. Working with Metro to increase service to the Sepulveda Station will be important to creating a viable project.

VISUAL OBSERVATION OF TRANSIT USE

While conducting our survey of the site we looked at where transit riders were going once they exited the bus and where they were coming from to get to the station. We found that most riders exit the Orange Line and walk to Sepulveda Boulevard to connect with the bus lines there. One of the challenges we observed we people attempting to make this connection being delayed by the long walk between the Orange Line Station and the Rapid and Local bus stops on Sepulveda. Since station relocation seems out of the question, we suggest working with Metro to better coordinate schedules at this station so riders to not miss connections.

In terms of commuter we observed low levels of use of the parking lot. This likely has to do with few workers commuting to downtown or using the Orange Line to get to other employment centers in the San Fernando Valley. We suspect that many of the Orange Line riders were already bus riders but switched to this line because it is much faster. The underutilization of the parking lot raises some questions about Metro's desire to replace all the parking spaces in any future development.

In terms of people coming to the bus station the vast majority are riders transferring from one of the bus lines on Sepulveda Boulevard. The same problem noted above about the difficulty of transferring holds true in this case as well. We observed several people missing an Orange Line bus because of the walk from Sepulveda to the Orange Line Station. This will be a very important challenge to address going forward.

Also it is important to note the businesses around the site and in particular the big box stores like Costco. Stores like these while a boon to consumers offer very little in the way of attracting pedestrians. Not in the least because the goods one usually buys are too big to carry onto a bus. Therefore we concluded that Costco likely generates few mass transit trips except perhaps by workers.

RIDERSHIP STATISTICS

The Metro Orange Line is one of the major success stories for Metro. Projected to have a daily average of 22,000 riders, it quickly surpasses that project and in 2007 had approximately 23,000 weekday average boardings and hit a new ridership high in 2009 at more than 24,000 average weekday boardings. The continued growth in ridership on the Orange Line will offer an excellent opportunity for development of the Sepulveda Station parking lot.

At the Sepulveda Station itself ridership is dominated by the Orange Line. This is to be expected as it has the highest frequency of service and connects several destinations in the San Fernando Valley and beyond. The southbound bus service tended to have more riders than the northbound service which suggests heavy transferring in the morning and more dispersed commuters heading home in the evening. That being said the northbound Line 234 had the second highest boardings after the Orange Line.

SECTION V. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

In this section we present the zoning regulations for the site and the surrounding project area. The goal of this section is to help understand the regulatory limits on allowable development and how this will shape our project. The project area is within the Nan Nuys/North Sherman Oaks Community Plan and is in Council District 6 which is currently held by Tony Cardenas.

Existing Zoning

The Sepulveda Station previously was a drive in theater dating back to the 1950's. Currently the site is designated as "Public Facilities" which means it any development must conform to the most restrictive zoning designation in the area. For our site this is R-1 which means a maximum building height of 33 feet and an FAR or 3:1.

The surrounding zones range from a mixture of R-1, R-2, and commercial/industrial zoning classifications. When looking the zoning map the site is largely surrounded by the CM designation which has a low FAR at 1.5:1. The flexible nature of this zoning classification means various businesses and land uses are next to each other with little unifying design standards.

In March 19, 2009 the City enacted an "ordinance that establishes the Los Angeles River Improvement Overlay (LA-RIO), which will implement the first River Improvement Overlay District (RIO). The LA-RIO consists of a required point system for new projects near the Los Angeles River that foster improved private property and public right of way development with regard to watershed, urban design, and mobility. In addition, the LARIO includes green

street standards and guidelines for public and private streets to increase pedestrian and bicycle safety and accessibility, native habitat areas, and opportunities to treat and infiltrate stormwater."



CONCLUSION

The Sepulveda Station offers an excellent opportunity for transit-oriented development that will boost ridership, give commuters more options, bring investment to the community, and improve the quality of life for Van Nuys residents. More over fully utilizing the potential of this site will give Metro an additional funding stream and better manage its real estate portfolio.

At the same time this is not a carte blanche for building the tallest apartment building allowable. This project must be sensitive to the needs of the community. To conclude we present our key findings and recommendations.

From our research here are our key findings:

- The surrounding neighborhood as average to high density for the San Fernando Valley
- Current zoning regulations allow for low to medium density development of the parking lot
- Surrounding land uses have made Sepulveda Boulevard unattractive from an aesthetic standpoint
- The site currently lacks adequate access to Sepulveda Boulevard
- The Orange Line will continue to see increasing ridership

To create the best project for both Metro and the community we recommend the following:

- Development of the site must be in scale with the existing built environment
- Access to Sepulveda Boulevard should be a high priority for any development proposal
- Programming should serve the existing communities needs
- Traffic on Erwin Street should be minimized to the furthest extent possible
- Project should be profitable for Metro and add ridership to the Orange Line

Section I: Executive Summary

This market analysis will focus on real estate trends, demographics, major employers, deficiencies and new construction for the area surrounding the MTA Orange Line – Sepulveda Station Park and Ride. Some of the key points of this analysis include:

- 5,100 total residents live in the immediate vicinity of the station; 40% of the population is between the ages of 30 and 49, 32% of residents have a college degree, the median income is \$47,000
- Low apartment vacancy rate, rents are comparable to the rest of Los Angeles County, approximately half of the residents of the area rent and approximately half of the housing units in the area are multi-family units
- Industrial warehouse activity dominates the area and commands higher rents than in similar areas in other parts of Los Angeles County suggesting more of this type of land use could be supported
- Rents for manufacturing uses were lower than those in similar areas of Los Angeles County suggesting more manufacturing is not needed
- There are several healthcare facilities but few medical office facilities either existing or available suggesting that this could be a viable type of development in the area
- Office rents were lower and vacancies were higher than in the rest of Los Angeles County suggesting that office development is not viable in the current economic environment
- Retail in the area consists of mostly professional type services with relatively few shopping centers
- There has been little new development in the San Fernando Valley over the last few years. Some notable development has occurred in the North Hollywood area and this has acted as a catalyst for job creation in that area

Based on our market analysis, we believe the following recommendations can be made for the Sepulveda TOD site. Because of current rents, vacancy rates and deficiencies in the area, the market is not currently strong enough to support commercial office, general retail and industrial manufacturing uses. Based on these same indicators, we believe that there is a demand for medical office space, industrial warehousing, rental housing, especially senior housing and certain retail if correctly programmed to fit the area. Similar transit oriented development in other parts of the San Fernando Valley has proved successful in recent years and has spurred job growth even in an unstable market.

The following group members contributed to the market analysis report: Jeremy Cogan – employment data and residential comparables, Lauren Finkel – demographics of the proposed project area, Scott John – executive summary and deficiencies, and Steven Mateer – commercial comparables and new developments.

Study Area

Generally the data presented in this analysis refers to either census tracts block groups, the 91411 ZIP code, Van Nuys as a whole, or the San Fernando Valley region, depending on the type of information

being analyzed. Real estate data (from private-sector data sets) and employment data (from the United States Economic Census) covering the vicinity of the Sepulveda station is readily available by ZIP code. The Sepulveda Orange Line station lies within the 91411 ZIP code, which surrounds the station with a radius of between one half-mile to one mile to the north, east and south. The station is adjacent to the western boundary of the ZIP code, which follows the 405 Freeway. Analysis of the 91441 ZIP is supplemented by more detailed demographic scrutiny of four US Census Tract Block Groups: Tract 177710, Block Group 3, Tract 128302, Block Group 1, and Tract 128400, Block Groups 3 and 4. The area defined by these block groups is roughly bounded by Victory Boulevard to the north, Kester Avenue to the east, Burbank Boulevard to the south and the I-405 Freeway to the west. While ZIP boundaries provide a larger study area than the Block Groups, and thus are not directly comparable in population numbers, they are also advantageous for capturing the market as measured by real estate professionals.



Figures 1 & 2: Map of the 91411 ZIP¹ and of four Census Tract Block Groups

Section I: Demographics²

The following demographics apply only to the four aforementioned census tract block groups.

Population Characteristics

Age: Almost 40% of the population is between 30 and 49 years of age (almost 2,000 people). This is a larger percentage of the total population than all other adult age groups combined (1,873 people or 36%). Children under 18 represent about a quarter of the population.

Racial Background: About half of the study area residents are white, 32% are some other race alone, and the remaining 18% are Black or African American, American Indian and Native Alaskan, Asian, Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, or two or more races.

¹ Zip Code Boundary Map. Web. 05 Mar. 2010. < http://www.zipmaps.net/>.

² American Factfinder

Language: The largest proportion of the population (about 47% or 2,216 people over the age of 5) speak Spanish. The next largest proportion (about 45% or 2,115 people) only speak English. The remaining eight percent speak another language.

Place of Birth: Sixty-two percent of the study population was born in the US, 41% of whom were born in California and 21% were born in another state. Thirty-eight percent were born outside of the country 74% of whom are not citizens.

Disability Status: About a quarter of the population lives with a disability.

Marital Status: The population is generally evenly divided into four categories with regard to marital status. Twenty-eight percent, 21%, 25% and 26% of the population over 15 years of age are not married, married, widowed, or divorced respectively.

Employment: Fifty-nine percent of the population is employed while only 3% is unemployed. Thirtyeight percent are not in the labor force.

Education: The largest proportion of the population (827 people or roughly 25%) have an educational attainment of some college with no degree. Thirty-two percent of the population have degrees ranging from Associate to Doctorate. Seven-hundred and twenty-one people (or 21%) have a high school degree, 16% have between a 9th and 12th grade education and another 16% have less than a 9th grade education.

Income

Income: One-hundred and nineteen (7%) households in the study area make less then \$10,000 a year. As each income bracket increases, the number of households in each bracket increases and then peaks with 379 (21%) households having an income between \$20,000 to \$29,999. The number of households within each income bracket then generally decreases, but has a slight peak where 226 (13%) households have an income of \$75,000 to \$99,999. The median income is \$46,938. Of the 1,173 families in the study area, 11% or 131 live below the poverty level.



Language: The largest proportion of the population (about 47% or 2,216 people over the age of 5) speak Spanish. The next largest proportion (about 45% or 2,115 people) only speak English. The remaining eight percent speak another language.

Place of Birth: Sixty-two percent of the study population was born in the US, 41% of whom were born in California and 21% were born in another state. Thirty-eight percent were born outside of the country 74% of whom are not citizens.

Disability Status: About a quarter of the population lives with a disability.

Marital Status: The population is generally evenly divided into four categories with regard to marital status. Twenty-eight percent, 21%, 25% and 26% of the population over 15 years of age are not married, married, widowed, or divorced respectively.

Employment: Fifty-nine percent of the population is employed while only 3% is unemployed. Thirtyeight percent are not in the labor force.

Education: The largest proportion of the population (827 people or roughly 25%) have an educational attainment of some college with no degree. Thirty-two percent of the population have degrees ranging from Associate to Doctorate. Seven-hundred and twenty-one people (or 21%) have a high school degree, 16% have between a 9th and 12th grade education and another 16% have less than a 9th grade education.

Income

Income: One-hundred and nineteen (7%) households in the study area make less then \$10,000 a year. As each income bracket increases, the number of households in each bracket increases and then peaks with 379 (21%) households having an income between \$20,000 to \$29,999. The number of households within each income bracket then generally decreases, but has a slight peak where 226 (13%) households have an income of \$75,000 to \$99,999. The median income is \$46,938. Of the 1,173 families in the study area, 11% or 131 live below the poverty level.



Housing

Vacancy: Only 15 housing units in the study area are vacant. Of the 1,823 total housing units, there was a fairly even distribution of owner occupied and renter occupied units (46% and 54% respectively).

Household Size: Fifty percent of all households have one or two persons therein, where about a quarter have three or four persons and another quarter have five or more.

Bedrooms per Unit: About half of the units within the study area have roughly equal amounts of one, two, and three bedrooms, while the other half have 4 or more.

Occupants per Room: Almost 75% of all units have less than one occupant per room, while about 13% have between 1 and 2 occupants, and 14% have more than 2 occupants.

Housing Units per Structure: Almost half of all housing units are single family detached, while approximately a sixth have 10 to 19 units, another sixth have one to nine units, and the last sixth have 20 or more units.

Housing Units by Year Built: The largest proportion of housing units in the area (about 30% or 540 units) were built between 1950 and 1959 and about equal amounts (22% or 400 units each) were built between 1940 and 1949 and 1960 and 1969.

Area Rent: Seventy-three percent of residents pay between \$400 and \$799 for rent.

Housing Value: Almost 80% of the owner occupied housing in the study area is valued between \$150,000 and \$299,999. Nineteen percent of the housing is valued below \$150,000 and 1% is valued above \$300,000. The median home value is \$188,375.

Transportation

Vehicle Availability: Eighty percent of all residents in the study area have either one or two vehicles at their disposal, while 12% have 3 or more vehicles available, and eight percent have no vehicle available.

Means of Transportation to Work: Eighty-four percent of workers over the age of 16 use a car, truck, or van to get to work (1,906 people). Only seven percent of all workers use public transportation (159 people) and nine percent bicycle, walk, use some other form of transportation, or work from home (201 people).

Commute Time: About half of workers spend less than 30 minutes commuting to work (including those who work from home), a quarter spends between 30 and 44 minutes commuting to work and about a quarter spends more than 45 minutes commuting.

Section III: Employment Information

US Census³ data as of 2007 indicate that the area generates an annual payroll total of \$416,383,000.

³ "Censtats Database." CenStats Databases. Web. 05 Mar. 2010. < http://censtats.census.gov/cbpnaic/cbpnaic.shtml>.

With 10,711 employees in the ZIP, this amounts to average per-worker wages of about \$38,000 generated by local businesses. These employees work in an estimated 821 establishments (places of business activity as reported to the Census and Bureau of Labor Statistics).

From the center point of the 91411 ZIP, there are 1340 businesses serving a population of 23,641 within a 1 mile radius, 13,508 businesses serving a population of 229,956 within a 3 mile radius, and 29,982 businesses serving 668,871 people within a 5 mile radius.⁴

The top sectors by number of establishments are explained below:

- The largest number of establishments (121) are those in the "Professional, Scientific, and Technical services" category, and include those working in law offices, engineering firms, design services, computer programming, marketing, consulting, and veterinary services. For example, there are 36 law offices, generally employing between 1-19 staff members.
- The second largest employment sector is "Retail Trade," with 102 establishments covering a variety of typical retail categories. Roughly 70% of these establishments employ less than 10 employees. Yet there are two retail establishments employing between 100-249 workers, in the "warehouse clubs & supercenters" category (Costco) and the "discount department stores" category (Target).
- Construction represents the third largest sector, with 78 establishments. Construction companies most frequently are those concentrated in the residential remodeling business, plumbing and HVAC business, and flooring installation business.
- Health care has the 4th largest number of establishments, but includes some of the largest establishments by number of employees, with one home health care service and two nursing care facilities employing between 100-249 workers.
- The next largest employment sectors occur in various services, such as auto maintenance, religious organizations, landscaping, temp agencies, janitorial services, laundry services, private security, and pest control.

Data originating from tax filings or federal disclosures can also provide useful information about the business environment:

- As of 2007, the adjusted gross income for the area based on 10,077 tax returns filed was \$44,957. This ranked in the 58th percentile compared to national averages, and this ranking has on average remained consistent since 2000.⁵
- There are 51 non-profit organizations registered within the area⁶, the largest of which is a location of the Contract Services Administration Trust Fund, an organization that provides for

⁴ "ZIP Codes in a Radius Lookup." Melissa Data | Data Quality Tools | Mailing Software | Consumer, Residential Lists | NCOA. Web. 06 Mar. 2010.

">https://www.melissadata.com/lookups/zipradius.asp?zipcode=91411&radius=1&submit=Standard>

⁵ "Income Tax Statistics Lookup." Melissa Data | Data Quality Tools | Mailing Software | Consumer, Residential Lists | NCOA. Web. 06 Mar. 2010. ">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit1=Submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit1=Submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit1=Submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit1=Submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit1=Submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit1=Submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit1=Submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit1=Submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit1=Submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit=Submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip=91411&submit>">http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/TaxZip.asp?Zip</asp?

⁶ "Nonprofit Organization Lookup." Melissa Data | Data Quality Tools | Mailing Software | Consumer, Residential Lists | NCOA. Web. 05 Mar. 2010. <a href="http://www.melissadata.com/lookups/np.asp?zip=91411&submit1=Submit

the collective bargaining needs of theatrical, motion picture, and television employees. Other large non-profits exceeding \$1,000,000 in assets are the Greenberg Foundation, Foundation for Excellence in Education, Sikand Foundation, and Children of the Night.

Four companies in the area have achieved federal contract revenue greater than \$100,000.⁷ These include Jenness-Woodkuts Co., Inc. (6025 N. Sepulveda Blvd) with \$2,162,035 in 30 contracts from 1999 to 2005, Nonlinear Ion Dynamics, Llc (14738 Oxnard St) with \$1,794,251 in 3 contracts from 2002 to 2005, JWK Machinery Sales Company (6025 Sepulveda Blvd) with \$569,359 in 39 contracts from 2003 to 2006, and Electro Rent Corporation (6060 Sepulveda Blvd) with \$460,567 in 28 contracts from 2001 to 2006.

A 2008 ranking of the largest local publicly traded companies by the San Fernando Valley Business Journal⁸ included one company less than a quarter-mile from the Sepulveda Station, The Electro Rent Corp. This company, which engages in the rental, leasing, and sale of electronic equipment, had a market capitalization of 340.9 million with revenues of 131.4 million in 2008, and employs 317 staff.

The largest publicly traded companies with offices in the Van Nuys community also include Superior Industries with 5300 employees (manufacturing of aluminum wheels), Cherokee Inc. with 20 employees (markets and licenses brand names for apparel), Trio-Tech International with 960 employees (provides third-party semiconductor testing), and HemaCare Corp with 204 employees (collection, processing, and distribution of blood products). The largest privately held companies in the Van Nuys area include Valley Presbyterian Hospital with 1,100 employees and Micro Solutions Enterprises with 400 employees.

Large public sector employers include the Valley Municipal Building and the Van Nuys Courthouse.

Section IV: Deficiencies

The neighborhood around the MTA Orange Line – Sepulveda Station Park and Ride is deficient in several types of real estate, land uses and civic services. Most notably, the area immediately around the project site lacks medical office space, high density residential and senior housing, anchored shopping centers, as well as public schools. Data on the area immediately surrounding the Sepulveda TOD project site was collected mostly through visual observation from driving through the surrounding area. Data on the 91411 zip code as well as for the greater San Fernando Valley and Los Angeles County was collected from a variety of sources and is presented in the following section.

The Van Nuys and Sherman Oaks neighborhoods of the City of Los Angeles face a lack of public schools as there is only one elementary, middle and high school in an area where a quarter of the population is

⁷ "91411 Zip Code (California) Profile." Stats about All US Cities. Web. 06 Mar. 2010. http://www.city-data.com/zips/91411.html.

⁸ "Largest Public Companies: Ranked by Market Capitalization. | North America United States from AllBusiness.com." Business Resources, Advice and Forms for Large and Small Businesses. Web. 06 Mar. 2010.

<http://www.allbusiness.com/electronics/computer-electronics-manufacturing/11747246-1.html>.

under the age of 18.⁹ This problem is unlikely to be alleviated with the current budget crisis that the City of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles Unified School District is facing.

Since the economic recession began in 2008, the San Fernando Valley has had the highest office vacancy rates in Los Angeles County. The Valley currently has an 18% vacancy rate for commercial office space compared 16% for the county as a whole as of the fourth quarter of 2009.¹⁰ The Valley's industrial vacancy rate is at 3.5%, which is only slightly higher than the county's at 3.3%. This 3.5% industrial vacancy rate is the highest that the San Fernando Valley has faced in five years, but still well below other industrial vacancy rates around the county.¹¹



A search of the 91411 ZIP code showed over 25 industrial properties were for lease. Similar searches for retail and office space also came up with at least 25 properties for lease in each category.¹² It is clear from our research that this area of the San Fernando Valley has an ample supply of industrial property but still manages to draw above average rents compared to the rest of Los Angeles County. The vacancy rates for industrial properties also happens to be lower than in other parts of the county suggesting that there might be a deficiency in this land use as the demand here is higher as demonstrated though the above average rents. Conversely, there is a glut of office space in the 91411 ZIP code and because this land use is currently overbuilt, the area would most likely not support new growth in this sector.

A search for senior housing properties for sale returned zero results, as did a search for medical office space.¹³ The area is most likely deficient in these two uses as we were not able to locate any for sale in the course of our research. This might suggest that the existing senior housing is either completely rented out or that none exists in the project area. Relatively few homes were sold and few vacancies reported in either owner occupied or renter occupied units suggesting that the area could support more housing units, both single family and multi-family.

⁹ "Los Angeles Unified School District." Web. 11 Mar. 2010.

<http://notebook.lausd.net/portal/page?_pageid=33,47493&_dad=ptl&_schema=PTL_EP>.

¹⁰ 2010 - 2011 Economic Forecast and Industry Outlook. Los Angeles: LAEDC, 2010. Print.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² LoopNet - #1 in Commercial Real Estate Online. Web. 11 Mar. 2010. <http://www.loopnet.com/>.

¹³ Ibid.

Section V: Comparables

Industrial Comparables

Van Nuys has long been a home to industrial activity in the San Fernando Valley. Our site currently abuts an industrial land use on the south of the property. There are also several industrial employment centers near the project site.

TABLE I				
Rent/Month Square Footage Cost/Square Foot/Month				
\$8,670	10,000	\$0.85		
\$1,960-2,574	1,980 - 2,600	\$0.99		
\$2,615	2,615	\$1.00		
\$16,559	6,249	\$2.65		

Source: Loopnet.com

Table I shows comparable rents for warehousing near the site. The ascending order reflects proximity to the site. Rents close to the site are much more than at sites further away. The most expensive site at \$2.65 per square foot is within a half mile of the site.

TABLE II			
MANUF	ACTURING AND R&D RENTS, SQ	UARE FOOTAGE, AND COST PE	r Square Foot
Туре	Rent/Month	Square Footage	Cost/Square Foot/Month
Manufacturing	\$15,505	34,456	\$0.45
Manufacturing	\$1968	2,400	\$0.82
R&D	\$3487-3694	4,650 - 4,926	\$0.75
R&D	\$4,000-18,198	5,000 - 22,748	\$0.80

Source: Loopnet.com

Table II shows comparables for manufacturing and research and development space. Rents were generally lower for manufacturing spaces with some exceptions. Most of the listings for R&D space suggest it would be ideal for film production and other entertainment uses. Yet rents for manufacturing and R&D space are generally lower than warehousing space.

From our market research industrial uses certainly would be viable from rent standpoint. Many of the spaces we observed are over \$0.75 per square feet per month. According to Cushman Wakefield's "Marketbeat: Greater Los Angeles Industrial Market Report," average industrial rent in Los Angeles was below \$0.50 per square foot per month in the fourth quarter of 2009. As an area with above average industrial rents, this perhaps may be a viable use for the site given the weak housing and office market.

Commercial Comparables

The area surrounding the site is largely retail with a few buildings devoted to office space. In this section we present the cost per square foot of commercial property in the Van Nuys/Sherman Oaks neighborhood. This section breaks down commercial uses to office and retail.

Office Comparables

TABLE III COMMAEDICIAL CLASS & OFFICE PENTS, SOURCE FOOTAGE, AND COST DED SOURCE FOOT			
Rent/Month Square Footage Cost/Square Foot/Month			
\$4,676	3,741	\$1.25	
\$7,800	4,000	\$1.95	
\$84,221	34,376	\$2.45	
\$91,466-93,332	37,333	\$2.45 - \$2.50	

Source: Loopnet.com

Table III shows comparable for commercial Class A office space near the site. Prices range from \$1.25 per square foot to \$2.50 per square foot. Other classes of office space ranged in price from \$1.25 per square foot on the high-end and \$0.75 on the low-end.

We were also unable to find any medical office space located within the project site's zip code of 91411. This perhaps represents an untapped demand for medical space or that the current supply is fully used and new medical office space would be financially viable.

TABLE IV Other Commercial Office Rents, Square Footage, and Cost per Square Foot			
Type Rent/Month Square Footage Cost/Square Foot/N			
Office R&D	\$6,000	4,000	\$1.50
Office R&D*	\$33,713-73,043	17,289 - 37,458	\$1.95
Creative/Loft	\$4,360	3,488	\$1.25
Creative/Loft	\$3,724-12,250	2,128 - 7,000	\$1.75

Source: Loopnet.com

*Note: This is a Class A office

Cushman Wakefield's "Marketbeat: Greater Los Angeles Industrial Market Report" found that average rents in Los Angeles County were just below \$2.50 per square foot for commercial office space. In comparing the rents near the site, they are in some cases far below the County average. Until the economy recovers commercial office will be a less viable use for the site.

TABLE V			
RETAIL RENTS, SQUARE FOOTAGE, AND COST PER SQUARE FOOT			
Туре	Rent/Month	Square Footage	Cost/Square Foot/Month
Auto Retail	\$10,668	8,890	\$1.20
Street Retail	\$2,964	1,560	\$1.90
Anchor Retail	\$4,275	2,250	\$1.90
Retail	\$1,789	852	\$2.10

Retail Comparables

Source: Loopnet.com

As we all know the retail market remains weakened given low consumer confidence and high unemployment. Cushman Wakefield reports that "unlike the past, landlords are now more focused on the long-term viability of tenants and their credit rather than leasing to whoever will pay the most rent." If retail is a desirable programming for this site, we should pursue tenants with proven track records and a stable market positions.

Table V shows rental rates for various types of retail near the site. Most of the rent is fairly close together in terms of cost per square foot except auto-oriented retail. The highest price observed was \$2.10 per square foot for retail space. Given the weakness in the office market retail may be more financially viable provided the programming fits the neighborhood and includes tenants that show signs of sustained growth.

Residential Comparables:

Multi-Fam on Market

TABLE VI SINGLE FAMILY HOME AND CONDOMINIUM SALES DATA			
Type Avg Selling or List Price Square Footage Cost/Square I			
Recently Sold	\$410,000	1424	\$288
SFH on Market	\$500,000	1559	\$321
Condo on Market	\$265,000	1021	\$260

The following table provides residential comparables for properties within the 91411 ZIP code:

Sale of Single Family Homes and Condominiums: There have been 41 residential properties sold within a half-mile radius of the Sepulveda Station since January 2009.¹⁴ The average selling price and square footage of these homes were \$410,000 and 1424 square feet, respectively, or \$288 per square foot. On average, these homes were 39 years old.

3524

\$226

Current real estate listings are posted to the MLS, or Multiple Listing Service, and this data is made publicly searchable from a variety of online sources. MLS data for the 25 single-family homes on the

\$795,000

¹⁴ "Home Values for Recent Homes for Sale." Check Home Sale Prices - Find Your Home Value - Get House Values Online -Search Real Estate Listings | Domania. Web. 05 Mar. 2010.

<http://www.domania.com/Resources/RecentSales/default.aspx>.

market in the 91411 ZIP show an average list price and square footage of nearly \$500,000 and 1559 square feet, respectively, or \$321 per square foot. On average, these homes currently on the market are 61 years old. Additionally, the 13 condominiums or townhomes on the market show an average list price and square footage of \$265,000 and 1021 square feet, respectively, or \$260 per square foot. Finally, there are currently 9 multiple family buildings on the market, listed at an average of \$226 per square foot.¹⁵

The chart below shows home sales data for the past 9 years in the 91411 ZIP, along with the number of sales by month. Both figures have declined in recent years, with the average purchase price currently a bit below \$400,000, and sales per month ranging from 1-5.



Figure 2: Average Purchase Price and # of Sales¹⁶

Rental of Homes and Apartments: Unlike commercial rentals or home sales, residential rental rates cannot be reliably tracked by any single authoritative source. Instead, the following data points provide indications of rental pricing in the 91411 ZIP or Van Nuys as a whole:

- 250 renters have submitted reports on 125 apartments throughout Van Nuys reflecting an average 2009 monthly studio rent of \$977, 1-bedroom rent of \$1067, and average 2-bedroom of \$1432.¹⁷
- A twelve-month history of 36 apartment rental listings in the 91411 ZIP revealed an average 1bedroom rental of \$1035, 2-bedroom of \$1375, and 3-bedroom of \$2756.¹⁸

 ¹⁵ Find All the Homes for Sale & Experienced Real Estate Agents | Redfin. Web. 06 Mar. 2010. <http://www.redfin.com/>.
 ¹⁶ Chart by Jeremy Cogan. Data source: "Search New Homeowner Mailing List." *Melissa Data | Data Quality Tools | Mailing Software | Consumer, Residential Lists | NCOA*. Web. 06 Mar. 2010.

<a>http://www.melissadata.com/lists/ezlists/ezHomeowners.aspx?zip=91411>.

¹⁷ "Van Nuys Apartments Pricing and Van Nuys CA Apartment Reviews." *Apartment Ratings :: The Leading Source of Apartment Reviews by Renters for Renters.* Web. 11 Mar. 2010. http://www.apartmentratings.com/rate/CA-Van-Nuys-Pricing.html.

¹⁸ "Rental Rates, Prices, Stats, Statistics for Apartments in Van Nuys, CA." Web. 11 Mar. 2010. < http://rentbits.com/>

- A survey of 24 Craiglist.com postings from March 3-10 revealed an average studio rent of \$816, 1-bedroom of \$1031, 2-bedroom of \$1424, and 3-bedroom of \$1680.
- Observations of six current Rent.com listings show an average of \$850 per month for 582 square feet, or \$1.46 per square foot each month.



Other Residential Findings: As of the 2000 Census, 73.9% of residents in all of Van Nuys were renters, while 26.1% were homeowners.¹⁹ This differs significantly from the demographics immediately surrounding our site, where an aforementioned 56% were renters, and suggests that an individual seeking to rent a unit will have a harder time doing so near this site than elsewhere in Van Nuys.

Section VI: New Real Estate Developments

There has been little new real estate or employment activity near the site. However across the San Fernando Valley there were a few notable new developments that have added jobs. First The Westfield Group recently expanded the Topanga Mall in 2007. The expansion added 100 new stores as well as a Target. It is worth noting that the mall is adjacent to the Orange Line.

The other major real estate project is the North Hollywood Arts District centered on the Metro Red and Orange Line terminus. As part of the CRA/LA East Valley Region, North Hollywood has seen significant investment featuring new office towers and mid to high-rise residential units. The future success of North Hollywood could be a long-term source of jobs for the San Fernando Valley.

NBC/Universal Studios also has a planned expansion and redevelopment of its property in Universal City. NBC/Universal estimates the project will add approximately 12,000 permanent jobs and 31,000 construction jobs. Despite these promising numbers, NBC/Universal is facing stiff community opposition to the project. Major hurdles include approval of the EIR and financing.

¹⁹ "Van Nuys Profile - Mapping L.A. - Los Angeles Times." Databases, Lists, Maps, Rankings - Data Desk - Los Angeles Times. Web. 06 Mar. 2010. http://projects.latimes.com/mapping-la/neighborhoods/neighborhood/van-nuys/.



A Lively Orange Line Neighborhood Concept



Jeremy Cogan Dante Doberneck Lauren Finkel Scott John Andrew Lee Raul Lugo Steven Mateer

This presentation culminates nearly six months of research, observation, planning, and modeling by seven graduate candidates for the Master of Arts degree from the UCLA Department of Urban Planning. The following will present a series of concepts and proposals for Transit Oriented Development at Metro's Orange Line: Sepulveda Station.

The concepts discussed in this document/presentation will begin with an overview of the vision that our team was guided by in creating the Sepulveda Village proposal. This will then be followed with a discussion of the types of building form we envision along with how the project will contribute to LEED neighborhood standards. Two proposals are included for review and consideration: one constrained to the requirements of METRO's RFP, and another that provides an alternative based on the team's preferred urban development strategies. Finally, we conclude with examples and technical details that summarize how to make this the best possible place to live, work, and travel along the 14 mile orange Line corridor.

Our research and design team was informed by nearly six months knowledge of acquisition, starting with an overview of the Metro Request for Proposals document. Extensive onthe-ground observations lead to the production of an Existing



Conditions Analysis. Further fiscal and economic sector studies helped produce an extensive TOD Market Analysis.

It was important to guide our research and proposal with an overriding principle and mission. Over time, that mission became development of the a neighborhood that helps local residents and distant commuters take advantage of the strategic opportunities available at the Sepulveda station site without impacting the neighborhood's local



 How can Sepulveda Village help Van Nuys residents and commuters take advantage of the Orange Line's strategic regional opportunities, yet preserve a local neighborhood *identity and charm*?







identity and charm. Our work to answer this question became known by the name for our concept, Sepulveda Village, yet it was of continued importance to define why Sepulveda Village would provide an added value to this site.

Our first response to planning Sepulveda Village was to consider why it would improve the local lifestyle. From our earliest design efforts through our final massing models, we aimed for a project that would make it easier to walk, bike, and take transit while interfacing with the existing

WHY - LIFESTYLE

- Project makes it easier to walk, bike, and take transit
- Designed within an existing neighborhood context
- Market exists for college students, professionals, and families





Midtown Commons, Austin , TX

neighborhood. Our key solution to this challenge was creating a north-south pedestrian only axis on each of our proposals. These promenades allow for transit station visibility, desirable retail frontage, neighborhood connectivity, public space, and emergency vehicle access. More prominently, the promenades become a focal point of Sepulveda Village that anchors the site in a pedestrian context, thereby impacting every other stage of our design and financial planning process.

It was also important that Sepulveda Village address the recreation and bicycle commuting potential of the Sepulveda site. The station is situated nearly half way along a 14 mile bicycle path. Such a length makes the path one of the longest bikeways along a former rail right of way in the nation, and provides prime opportunities to

WHY - RECREATION

- World-class bikeway provides access to the SFV.
- Adjacent to Sepulveda Basin and Lake Balboa.
- Midpoint of the Orange Line and 14 mile bikeway.
 - Perfect rest location.



navigating the San Fernando Valley along an East-West axis via a car alternative. Further, adjacency to the Sepulveda Basin and Lake Balboa recreation areas – less than 5 minutes away by bicycle path – make the site an important stopping place for trips to and from these public resources. Ultimately, Sepulveda Village seeks to serve the cycling community by contributing key spaces toward locker facilities, bicycle storage, and bicycle sales and repair shops.

Finally, Sepulveda Village can be a positive contributor to local economic and community development goals. The pedestrian orientation of the site serves not only to encourage walkability between the new commercial uses, but also compliments existing commercial properties by inviting walkers to utilize many nearby local businesses and services. Such connectivity between

WHY- ECONOMIC & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

- Both proposals reorient the site around the pedestrian
- Establishes station as an activity center to encourage linking walking, biking, and use of the Orange Line to work, shopping, and home.
- Adds long-term value and improves the quality of life for Van Nuys residents.







the site and nearby land uses establishes Supulveda Village as an activity center that can link mobility uses with new residential and commercial employment opportunities. Ultimately the new residents and commercial users will benefit from working in tandem with existing residents and businesses for the continued maintenance and improvement of the community. Such combined efforts can improve the long-term quality of life for Van Nuys residents.

In our development proposal for Sepulveda Village, we used a formapproach based to describe potential building types, sizes, frontages, and other design guidelines to help shape our vision for the site. We believe that this form-based approach should ensure a pedestrianoriented environment and give greater flexibility to the overall design of the site.

Form-based Approach



Our form-based approach looks to create a density gradient where as one moves south through the project, the density increases. The density gradient moves from the Neighborhood Residential (NR) zone to the Transit Village (TV) zone. The increasing density respects the single-family neighborhood of Victory Park to the north while creating a vibrant and active transit-oriented development around the Orange Line Sepulveda Station.

Commercial

Intent and Purpose

The Commercial Zone applies to areas immediately adjacent to the transit station and for the buildings lining Sepulveda Boulevard. This zone is meant to encourage mixed-used transit and community serving retail and office space. The Commercial Zone is meant to either be a standalone typology or part of the Transit



Commercial

- Stores and offices.
- Located adjacent to transit stop.
- Pedestrian-oriented public realm.
- Shared parking for businesses.
- Limited to mostly 1st and some 2nd story spaces



[1] Concept of commercial space near BRT Station

Village (TV) described below. In either case, the Commercial Zone should serve to draw people into the site either from Sepulveda Boulevard, the Orange Line Station or from the surrounding neighborhoods.

Physical Character

The physical environment is one of ground floor commercial with no setbacks from the transit station plaza or sidewalk along Sepulveda Boulevard. The intent of this zone is to create a comfortable pedestrian feel. Buildings are mixed-use and limited to one or two stories.

Streetscape/Public Realm

Streetscapes are oriented around the pedestrian and should have an urban feel. Sidewalks should be at least 10 feet. Landscaping should focus on creating a pleasant pedestrian experience with individual or groupings of plants and trees. Taller trees should be used to create a canopy effect to provide shade. Ideally landscaping should be native or drought tolerant.

Parking

Parking is provided through shared parking spaces in the parking structures or by on-street parking spaces managed by meters. Surface parking is also allowed but it should be placed behind the

commercial buildings to as to preserve the pedestrian environment. Stores should still front the street and not the surface lot.

Our programming recommendations come from our in-depth market analysis of Van Nuys. Programming for the commercial zone should focus on serving commuters as well as residents. The programming should fit the market of the neighborhood which is largely middle income.

(C)	Commercial	PROGRAMMING CONCEPTS
RFP Constraine	d	Preferred
 Bike Store 8 Dry Cleanin Cellular Pho Stores Café Deli Small Resta Convenience Bank 	& Repair g one/Electronics urants e Stores	 Programming from RFP Constrained, plus Small to Medium Retail Clothing Medium Size Electronics Store Small Format Market Specialty Restaurants Medical Space

Parking

Intent and Purpose The Parking Zone will help this site achieve the minimum parking requirements and Metro replacement parking requirement while preserving the pedestrian feel of the development. This zone is intended to make potential parking structures fit into a more urban environment.



Physical Character

Any parking structure in this site must have a retail, gallery or live-work liner on the first floor. There will be no setbacks from the paseo or the sidewalks for the retail/live-work frontage of the parking structure. Only along alleys or access roads will exposed first-floor parking be allowed.

The parking structures are to be no taller than 45 feet. This will prevent the structure from becoming the dominant architectural feature of Sepulveda Village while allowing for the required parking.

Streetscape/Public Realm

Streetscapes are oriented around the pedestrian and should have an urban feel. Sidewalks should be at least 10 feet.

Landscaping should focus on creating a pleasant pedestrian experience with individual or groupings of plants and trees. Taller trees should be used to create a canopy effect to provide shade. Ideally landscaping should be native or drought tolerant.

Parking

Parking will either be in a raised or subterranean parking structure. The structures should be available to residents, merchants, transit riders, and shoppers. Parking should not be free and should use dynamic pricing to better manage automobile travel to the site.

Neighborhood Residential

Intent and Purpose The Neighborhood Residential (NR) is meant to be the "front door" of Sepulveda Village for the Victory Park neighborhood. The purpose of this zone is to mimic the density of the single-family homes to the north of the site so as to not overwhelm the street or the existing community. This

(NR)

NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTIAL

Neighborhood Residential

- Single-family to duplex style
- homes.
- On-site parking.
- Fronted with stoops, porches, or front yards.
- Mirrors existing residential on the north side of Erwin Street.
- Maximum height: 20 feet



[3] Concept of neighborhood residential fronting Erwin

zone will contain small setbacks, low density housing, with on-site parking in the front or rear.

Physical Character

This residential zone should mirror the existing single-family neighborhood to the north. Homes should range from single-family style units to small duplexes. This site will be fronted will yards, stoops, and porches. Buildings in this zone will be no taller than 20 feet. The setback is 10 feet from the sidewalk.

Streetscape/Public Realm

The street will have a more suburban feel as it is flanked by single-family or duplex style homes. The sidewalks will be 5 feet wide with a 5 foot parkway. Landscaping should focus on creating a pleasant pedestrian experience with individual or groupings of plants and trees. Taller trees should be used to create a canopy effect to provide shade. Ideally landscaping should be native or drought tolerant.

Parking

Parking for the Neighborhood Residential will be on-site with garages facing an alley or facing Erwin Street. The parking garage should not be the main architectural feature of the units. As shown in Picture 3, the garage should be to the side or placed behind the units fronting an alley.
Neighborhood Village

Intent and Purpose

The Neighborhood Village (NV) represents the next zone in Sepulveda Village. This zone is meant to feature slightly more residential units than the Neighborhood Residential zone. The NV zone contains duplexes, apartments, and guadplexes.

Neighborhood Character

The Neighborhood Village features courtyard apartments, bungalow courts, and quadplexes. The



Neighborhood Courtyard

- Courtyard, bungalow court, guadplex.
- Forecourt, stoop, terrace, porch.
- Maximum height: 30 feet
- Subterranean parking.



nts beihind neight

frontage of the buildings in this zone will have forecourts, stoops, terraces, or porches. Buildings will be no taller than 30 feet. Each building will have a setback of no more than 10 feet.

Streetscape/Public Realm

Total street width is not to exceed 28 feet. The sidewalks must be at least 5 feet.

Landscaping should focus on creating a pleasant pedestrian experience with individual or groupings of plants and trees. Taller trees should be used to create a canopy effect to provide shade. Ideally landscaping should be native or drought tolerant.

Parking

Parking will be located in a subterranean garage.

Neighborhood Commons

Intent and Purpose

The Neighborhood Commons (NC) bring a more urban feel to Sepulveda Village. This zone is meant to feature more residential units than the previous two zones. The NC zone contains larger apartments and quadplexes.

Neighborhood Character

Neighborhood The Commons features courtyard apartments. (NC)

NEIGHBORHOOD COMMONS

- Neighborhood Village Courtyard, bungalow court,
 - quadplex.
 - Forecourt, stoop, terrace, porch.
 - Maximum height: 45 feet
 - Subterranean parking.



[5] Concept of apartments along paseo

bungalow courts, and quadplexes. The frontage of the buildings in this zone will have forecourts, stoops, terraces, or porches. Buildings will be no taller than 45 feet. Each building will have a setback of no more than 10 feet.

Streetscape/Public Realm

Total street width is not to exceed 36 feet. The sidewalks must be at least 9 feet.

Landscaping should focus on creating a pleasant pedestrian experience with individual or groupings of plants and trees. Taller trees should be used to create a canopy effect to provide shade. Ideally landscaping should be native or drought tolerant.

Parking

Parking will be located in a subterranean garage.

Transit Village

Intent and Purpose

The Transit Village (TV) represents the most urban zone in Sepulveda Village. This zone is meant to feature more residential units than the previous zones as well as a mixed-use component. The TC zone contains larger apartments and quadplexes as well as retail and office space.

(TV)

TRANSIT VILLAGE

- o Transit Village
 - Mixed-use, lined block, courtvard.
 - Stoop, storefront, gallery,
 - forecourt.
 - Adjacent to transit station.
 - Maximum height: 60 feet



[6] Concept of mixed-us

Neighborhood Character

The Transit Village features mixed-use

apartment buildings as well as larger courtyard apartments. The frontage of the buildings in this zone will have stoops, storefronts, galleries. And forecourts. These building must be adjacent to the transit station.

Buildings will be no taller than 60 feet. There is no setback for these buildings.

Streetscape/Public Realm

Total street width is not to exceed 36 feet. The sidewalks must be at least 9 feet.

Landscaping should focus on creating a pleasant pedestrian experience with individual or groupings of plants and trees. Taller trees should be used to create a canopy effect to provide shade. Ideally landscaping should be native or drought tolerant.

Parking

Parking will be located in a subterranean garage.

Los Angeles' Green Building Ordinance 179.820 specifies that new developments with 50,000 gross square feet or more or 50 or more dwelling units are required to be Leadership in Energy Efficient Design (LEED) Certified. The Sepulveda Village will exceed these minimum thresholds and will thus be subject to the requirements of the Green Building Ordinance.





Neighborhood Development certification. The LEED for Neighborhood Development Rating System certifies "exemplary development projects that perform well in terms of smart growth, urbanism, and green building...This rating system is designed primarily for the planning and development of new green neighborhoods, whether infill sites or new developments proximate to diverse uses or adjacent to connected and previously developed land. Many infill projects or projects near transit will be in urban areas, which helps direct growth into places with existing infrastructure and amenities."

The Project is in an ideal location to receive a LEED certification as it is sited on a previously developed parcel of land in a densely populated area with superior connectivity along the Orange Line. Additionally, in the preferred design scheme, the site will have limited parking on site. Reduced parking counts will help decrease automobile dependence and usage and thus increase transit ridsership. The compact parking structures will also aid in decreasing the urban heat island effect. Additionally, preferred parking will be offered for alternative fueled vehicles, carpool vehicles, and ridesharing vehicles (Zip Car and/or Flex Car). This will encourage decreased automobile usage and increase transit ridership and consequently will conserve energy.

The landscaping of the project site will also incorporate the use of drought-tolerant native species that will decrease water use on site.

Additionally, the Development will provide a recycling service and utilize a "digester" on site. The digester functions by taking organic waste and feeding it to bacteria. The bacteria turns the waste into methane and carbon dioxide wherein the methane • Reduced Auto Dependence: Transit is used as fuel for an internal combustion engine that provides electricity for the site.

LEED CERTIFICATION Notable Credits

- Location & Linkage: Locate the project on an infill site that is also previously developed site.
- Served Location
- There are 5 different Metro routes that service our site within a ½ mile radius.
- Transit Facilities: Proximate bus stops will be improved with a shelter, bench, illumination, kiosks, bulletin boards, signs to provide transit information to the public.



By locating the project within an existing community and within a developed public transit system, the project will help reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT). To reduce the incidence of obesity, heart disease, and hypertension by encouraging daily physical activity associated with walking and bicvcling.

Sepulveda Village will satisfy the credit requirements by locating the project



- on a site served by existing water and wastewater infrastructure
- on an infill site
- in a transit served location
- There are 5 different Metro routes that service our site within a ½ mile radius.

LEED CERTIFICATION

• 234, 734, 164, 234, Orange Line

The project site is located along the 14-mile Metro Orange Line bicycle path. The smart location of the project along this path will help "promote bicycling and transportation efficiency, including reduced vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and help support public health by encouraging utilitarian and recreational physical activity". Additionally the development of bicycle storage and accommodating design will further facilitate the ease of bicycle use.

Sepulveda Village will also incorporate Transportation Demand Management techniques into the development in order to "reduce energy consumption, pollution from motor vehicles, and adverse public health effects by encouraging multimodal travel. These goals will be achieved by:

•Implementing a TDM Program that reduces weekday peak-period motor vehicle trips by at least 20% compared with a baseline case, and fund the program for a minimum of three years following build-out of the project.

•Providing transit passes valid for at least one year, subsidized to be half of regular price or cheaper, to each occupant locating within the project during the first three years of project occupancy (or longer).

•Providing year-round, developer-sponsored private transit service (with vans, shuttles, buses) from at least one central point in the project to other major transit facilities, and/or other destinations such as a retail or employment centers

•Providing transit stop shelters and bicycle racks. The shelters will be covered, have seating, and illumination. Bicycle racks will have a two-point support system for locking the frame and wheels and will be securely affixed to the ground or a building.

•Offering a vehicle-sharing program

Additionally, Sepulveda Village will incorporate design elements to create walkable streets to "promote transportation efficiency, including reduced vehicle miles traveled (VMT), promote walking by providing safe, appealing, and comfortable street environments that support public health by reducing pedestrian injuries and encouraging daily physical activity."



This rendering shows existing conditions at the site, primarily consisting of the public storage facility on the west side, Victory Park neighborhood to the north, Wendy's and former warehouses to the east, and a Chevron fueling facility to the south.



The street layout preserves the existing access via driveway to Sepulveda Boulevard and Haskell Avenue to Victory Boulevard. We add access into the site from Erwin Street via alleyways, on the west and east site boundaries, and two north-south residential streets. Our plan adds sidewalks and parkway space to Erwin Street, as a way to reengage the existing neighborhood and integrate it with the low-density units proposed for the south side of Erwin Street (north site boundary). The plan includes a pedestrian paseo that bisects the site and provides direct access to the BRT station. We preserve the existing bikeway running parallel to the BRT line.

PROPOSAL 1: RFP CONSTRAINED



This picture is the south-west perspective looking from Erwin Street into the site. The model shows a similar transition from low- to middle-density, with conceptual street-fronting building types and ten-foot setbacks.

PROPOSAL 1: RFP CONSTRAINED



This picture is the perspective looking south-east from Erwin Street. The building models show the transition from lowdensity single/duplex units with tree-line frontage into higher density condo and apartment buildings.

PROPOSAL 1: RFP CONSTRAINED



This picture is the south-west perspective looking from the far east border of the constrained site. The building model shows our concept for wrapping the parking garage with residential units.

PROPOSAL 1: RFP CONSTRAINED

This rendering of the RFP proposal shows the basic massing scheme as a birdseye view looking south. Land use intensity ramps up from singlestory along Erwin Street and increases in both height and bulk as the TOD extends southward towards the existing BRT station. Kev elements include retaining the northprevailing



Q

south street axes, interruption of the sight lines from the Victory Park streets, and generous allotment of green space along the northern periphery, in accord with the large turf lawns of the adjacent residences.

This rendering below right is of the baseline TOD shows the physical linkages between the existing BRT station and the major north-south axis of Sepulveda Village (red arrow). The Metro-mandated

replacement parking is contained in a wrapped parking garage just north of the station. Rather than a single blocky mass, the wrapped structure step-backs has and breezeways to lessen the presence of its large volume. At the southern edge of the lot, near the BRT station is a small public space to promote a more welcoming environment to



the rather staid bus shelter. Nearby convienence oriented retail with outdoor seating also serves to promote an activated pedestrian oriented space near the station. The overall effect is to add positive experience potentials (people watching, safety through passive observation, etc.) to a modest sized public venue.

This is an eye-level render ofthe massing model, from the point-af-view of a passenger waiting for a westbound bus. The view corridor through the principle north-south axis is quite clear, with a sense of visual connection of the shelters to the TOD.

The nearby buildings are close, but not looming over the station, providing an appropriate amount of space for traffic, and shielding the more



northerly buildings from vehicle noise. The nearby green spaces and public realms remain close enough for a quick stroll should a transit rider seek out a quick purchase from the nearby convenience stores or opportunity wait for the bus on the grassy pocket park.

A Late-morning view from eye-level, looking south towards the existing BRT station. This view emphasizes massing model of the main north-south axial street, showing the deep setbacks, step-backs, and visual continuity of the BRT from deep within Sepulveda Village. This is the sort of experiential view that a resident of Sepulveda Village could be expected to see on their daily walk to the station during the workday rush hour.



Rather than face a long queue of cars heading across the city, the resident here has a pleasant and short pedestrian oriented stroll directly to the bus station.

SITE SECTION FACING EAST



Facing east we again see the spectrum of building heights from our neighborhood residential on the north side to the transit village zone on the southern side. Building shapes and heights are articulated with a variety of shapes and inconsistent rooflines, providing for a feeling of variety in the streetscape and giving pedestrians the feeling that they not surrounded by massive, impermeable blocks of housing and commercial space.



SITE SECTION FACING NORTH

When facing north, looking towards Erwin Street, we can see our replacement parking structure lined with transit village residential and commercial uses. Building heights are adjusted as necessary to protect sight lines from becoming overly occupied with structures. Residents from Victory park looking down a street into the site will ultimately see only those building heights that have been reduced, while pedestrians walking through the site will see a variety of heights.

PROPOSAL 2: PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE



This illustration again shows existing conditions at the site, primarily consisting of the public storage facility on the west side, Victory Park neighborhood to the north, Wendy's and former warehouses to the east, and a Chevron fueling facility to the south.



The street layout provides direct site access to Sepulveda Boulevard via a new central east-west road. We preserve the existing access via Haskell Avenue to Victory Boulevard. The plan removes the existing access road that runs parallel with the BRT line, and we move the BRT station to the site's southeast corner. The relocated BRT station provides better connectivity to the conventional bus service and creates as a "transfer hub."

PROPOSAL 2: PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE



This picture is the perspective looking south from Erwin Street into the site. The model shows a similar transition from low- to middle-density, with conceptual street-fronting building types and setbacks.



This picture is the south-west perspective looking from Sepulveda Boulevard. The building models show how the plan might integrate ground-floor commercial uses with above-ground office and residential uses. The buildings removed from Sepulveda include middle-density residential uses and lined parking garages.

This rendering of the preferred alternative TOD proposal shows the basic massing scheme from a birdseve view looking south. Again, land use intensity ramps single-story up from along Erwin Street and increases in both height and bulk as the TOD extends southward towards the existing BRT station. The addition of the former Wickes Furniture sites permits new commercial development opportunities along Sepulveda Blvd. The massing and arrangement of these new



commercial buildings are necessarily more monolithic than the highly articulated residential section, yet still share a scale and arrangement relationship with the core residence of Sepulveda Village. Key elements include relocating the BRT station to the south-east corner of the site, retaining the prevailing north-south street axes, interruption of the sight lines from the Victory Park streets, and generous allotment of green space along the northern periphery, in accord with the large turf lawns of the adjacent residences. A major east-west street axis (across from the Costco principal entry) is designed to alleviate the lure of traffic along Erwin Street.

This rendering of the preferred alternative TOD shows the physical linkages between the relocated BRT station and existing transit stops along Sepulveda Blvd. (red arrow). Direct sight-lines between stations permit transit riders to quickly assess the need for haste, or, leisure in making their way to the next bus line. The Metromandated replacement parking has been reduced 50%, and is now contained in parking structures west of the transit station. This small displacement means an



increased amount of foot traffic from the park-n-ride location to the BRT station passing by the convenience oriented retail. This pedestrian circulation coincides with the pocket park just north of the BRT station. Designed to allow cafes and restaurants to spill out onto patios and green space, this corner becomes a hub of leisurely activities and comings-and-goings, both of which make for a highly activated public realm. Additionally, the relocated BRT station has an increased amount of sheltered green space, and increased physical separation from the emergency-access street between the station and the corner pocket park. The result emphasizes the primacy of the pedestrian and enhances the experience of waiting for the bus.

SITE SECTION FACING EAST



Facing east we again see the spectrum of building heights from our neighborhood residential on the north side to the transit village zone on the southern side. Building shapes and heights are articulated with a variety of shapes and inconsistent rooflines, providing for a feeling of variety in the streetscape and giving pedestrians the feeling that they not surrounded by massive, impermeable blocks of housing and commercial space. The large commercial massing along the southern edge match the prevailing scale of larger businesses along Sepulveda Blvd.



SITE SECTION FACING NORTH

When facing north, looking towards Erwin Street, we can see our replacement parking structure lined with transit village residential and commercial uses. As in the RFP, building heights are adjusted as necessary to protect sight lines from becoming overly occupied with structures. Residents from Victory Park looking down a street into the site will ultimately see only those building heights that have been reduced, while pedestrians walking through the site will see a variety of heights.

ERWIN STREET - ROADWAY CONCEPT 1



This roadway concept for Erwin Street shows our plan for adding sidewalks and parkway space to the existing street. Creating a somewhat symmetrical roadway helps integrate the new development into the existing neighborhood and provides a gentle transition into the remainder of Sepulveda Village.

ERWIN STREET - ROADWAY CONCEPT 2



This roadway concept moves the parkways proposed in Concept 1 into a ten-foot center media. This concept continues to integrate the existing neighborhood with Sepulveda Village, but provides a visual separation and traffic calming effect.



This concept for a project internal road includes on-street parking for one side of the street. This plan emphasizes pedestrians by providing nine-foot sidewalks. Ideally we would use this roadway concept for higher-density areas in the plan, where most residents would use underground parking garages and above-ground parking structures. The on-street parking pricing scheme would emphasize rapid turnover, such as pick-up drop off and quick retail trips.



This concept for a project internal road includes on-street parking for both sides of the street. Ideally we would use this roadway concept for lower-density plan areas, like the residential streets abutting Erwin Street.

TYPICAL ALLEY / REAR GARAGE ACCESS



This project concept shows the alleys proposed for the project's west and east boundaries. The alleys would provide supplemental traffic circulation and the twenty-foot width is adequate for emergency vehicle access.

The overall return is approximately half a percent higher for the preferred alternative. Parking reductions were used for the preferred and the alternative MTA replacement parking was unbundled from the individual land uses. The acquisition cost of the additional land for the preferred alternative was also separated from individual land uses. Both projects sought an overall density of 60 units per acre.

PRO-FORMA COMPARISON

RFP	Preferred Alternative
 12.5 acre site \$88.5M total project cost 1565 total parking spots 4.4% overall return on cost 	 18.5 acre site \$141.2M total project cost 1075 total parking spots 5.1% overall return on cost

*Overall density of 60 units/acre used for both schemes

The preferred alternative creates approximately 100 more residential units and 100,000 more square feet of commercial space than the RFP response. 15% of all of the parking spaces is surface parking. Some of the smaller scale residential units are self-parked and their spots are not accounted for in this total.



There are many types of nontraditional funding sources including grants and other subsidies available for TOD development. Metro is well aware of many of these sources and should utilize them in order to reduce the cost of the development and improve the return on investment.

FUNDING SOURCES

- Metro Annual Call For Projects
- SCAG Compass Blueprint
- New Market Tax Credits
- FTA Grants
- TIGER Discretionary Grants
- Facilities District



Traditional parking ratios were used for the RFP response and a 1:1 parking ratio was used on the residential portion of the preferred alternative and a one space per 1,000 square feet ratio was used on the commercial portion. This dramatically reduced the amount of parking spots onsite. All parking is subterranean except for the MTA replacement parking which is an above ground structure.

PARKING COMPARISON (NEW USES)



REPLACEMENT PARKING

	RFP	Preferred Alternative
Spots Replaced	1200	600

While both projects have the potential to increase transit the preferred boardings. alternative can have a far greater impact because of its increased size and number of residential units, as well as the increase in commercial space. Because of this increase, the ability to attract higher quality tenants and rents exists with the alternative, while the amount of commercial space in the RFP response is too small to create a vibrant

CASE FOR PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

	RFP	Alternative
 Potential to dramatically increase transit ridership 	?	•
 Create a commercial hub based around residential 	*	*
 Improve inter-modal transit connections 	*	*
 Assessed value of land will increase as TOD matures 	*	*

commercial hub. By moving the transit station to the corner of Sepulveda Boulevard, it becomes more visible to the public, more accessible to riders using other types of transit and has the ability to become a multi-modal station. Finally, by redeveloping this land from its current use, the assessed value on the land will increase which will benefit Metro and also will increase the return on the investment.

The preferred alternative has the potential to have a much greater impact on the community and create more long term value by redeveloping the land along Sepulveda Boulevard and bringing in more investment. As this development matures, it also has the ability to bring in higher rents and increase the return on investment. The current parking constraints in the RFP make it difficult to

CONCLUSIONS

- The Preferred Alternative adds greater long-term community value
- 2. Metro should apply for federal, state, and local funding in partnership with the developer
- 3. RFP Parking requirements strain the financial and design goals of the project





create a true transit oriented development with good urban design characteristics and place financial strains on the feasibility of the development as well.



Team 2 comprised of Kevin Finkel, Haila Adamo, Eric Douglas, Ruby Horta, Kevin Kahn, and Jacqueline Torres would like to present their vision for the future development of the Orange Line BRT Sepulveda Station Park and Ride.



Comprehensive Planning Project

Sepulveda Station Site Context

Haila Adamo, Eric Douglas, Kevin Finkel, Ruby Horta, Kevin Kahn, Jackie Torres

As you are all familiar, this is the Sepulveda Station Park and Ride. We would like to point out the uses which surround the project site and helped inform our project design. To the north, we'd like to point out the Victory Park neighborhood, a single-family residential enclave that we know to be politically vocal, especially with regard to any future development of the project site. To the east, the project site is bound by a Wendy's fast food restaurant and a former Wicke's Furniture retail store. To the south, the project site is bound by the Orange Line Bus Way and adjacent bike route, the Sepulveda Station, and a Chevron Distribution facility. To the west, the project site is bound by a public storage facility and Interstate 405.

Throughout this process, we balanced three sometimes conflicting influences: the principles of good TOD planning, such as the 4 D's of density, diversity, design, and destination; the realities of the current housing/retail, and general development market; and the wants/needs and demands of the existing Victory Park and greater Van Nuys communities. As all dedicated planners must do, we had to understand each of these influences to create a TOD site that blends in with the existing community while also maximizing the public's infrastructure. An inspiration for our thinking was the Mission Meridian station in South Pasadena, an example of a TOD site that seamlessly blends in with the existing community, while also producing higher density mixed-use development. With these ideas and visions in mind, we present to you today two proposals, one responding to the RFP's requirements, and another unconstrained proposal that we feel best maximizes the potential of the Sepulveda Station site.

inspiration from such notable TODs as Mission Meridian along the Gold Line while also engaging the surrounding uses, we have developed three strategic zones. The first is what we envision as a Neighborhood strategy. Within this area we envision the creation of a low and medium density residential neighborhood that is intended to be a

In this slide, we present to you our strategy for future development. Taking into account our



logical extension of the Victory Park neighborhood onto on our site. To its south, we envision a transit village strategy. Within this area we envision the creation of higher density urban transit village type locale that is intended to provide the type and volume of activity that is appropriate in proximity to a transit stop. To its south, we envision a transit station strategy. Within this area, we envision the development of commercial uses and open spaces in proximity to the transit station to support the level of activity associated with a transit stop.

We would also like to point out our proposed street grid. One such road would be created on a northsouth axis and would be aligned with Langdon Avenue to the north. The other road would be created on an east-west axis and would be aligned with the existing signalized intersection at Sepulveda Boulevard that provides access to the nearby Costco. We maintain the existing ingress and egress locations so as to prevent an increase in traffic volumes along Erwin Street, which we understand is a singularly important concern of the Victory Park neighborhood residents

Based upon these strategies, we present to you an illustrative site plan detailing our vision for site buildout. Note the low to medium density residential structures to the north, higher density residential structures to its south and a new transit plaza and pocket park adjacent to the bus station. Our vision would also incorporate a pedestrian paseo along the north-south axis as a



means of providing connectivity with the Victory Park neighborhood to the north.



We have color coded the illustrative site plan to provide clarity and identify the specific uses we propose to include. Beginning at the northern end of the project site, we line the Erwin Street frontage with townhomes built as duplexes to mirror the look, scale, and feel of the single-family homes in the Victory Park neighborhood. To the south of the townhomes, we step up the density slightly and propose numerous courtyard multi-family residential structures. Our market study indicated that as the population of this area within the valley continues to age, there would be an increase in demand for senior housing. Thus, several of the courtyard structures have been dedicated for senior housing. To the south of the courtyard structures, there is a proposed parking structure, which we also propose to line with live-work units to screen the parking structure from view and activate the adjacent roadways. Finally, as we have stated that we would like to make the area around the transit station the focal point of activity, we have proposed a new transit plaza and pocket park. The plaza is proposed to be lined with commercial/retail and community center uses as well as a bike station











	Total		
Multifamily Units	420		Total
Multifamily Development	359,432 sq. ft.	Contingency	20%
	(Gross sq. ft.) 305,517 sq. ft. (Net Rentable)	Vacancy Rate	7% (Multifamily Development)
Retail/Commercial Development Parking (1882)	40,415 sq. ft. 1200 (Metro)		7% (Retail/Commercial Development)
	630 (Multifamily)	Project Cost	\$108,927,071 (Multifamily)
	/9 (Retail)		\$22,959,844 (Retail/Commercial)
			\$162,345,915 (Total)
		NOI	\$4,422,145 (Multifamily)
			\$1,370,905 (Retail/Commercial)
			\$5,793,051 (Total)
		Return on Cost	4.1% (Multifamily)
			6.0% (Retail/Commercial)
			3.6% (Total)
			3.6% (Total)

In the RFP response and working with 12.5 acres our project aimed for 420 units of multifamily housing that encompasses approximately 9.4 acres. Also within the 12.5 acres our project site will include just slightly less than one acre for retail. In responding to the RFP request, we maintained 1200 parking spaces for Metro and included 630 and 79 parking spaces for multifamily and retail respectively. In our housing estimate we assumed 1.5 spaces per unit. For retail, we slightly modified municipal code requirements. We gave a lower estimation on parking considering that our project site is a TOD and should encourage the use of transit and provide disincentives for car usage. In addition to the logistics of adhering to the RFP request, we considered current market trends and set a contingency rate of 20 percent and a vacancy rate of seven percent for both multifamily and retail development. As a result and considering the specifics and costs of development, total project cost (housing and retail) totaled \$162,345,915 with a total return on cost of 3.6 percent

Preferred Alternative Responsive & Design



Given the conditions surrounding the project site, we telt that both the project and the Orange Line would be better served by proposing a development not constrained to the requirements of the RFP. Thus, we would like to present to you our Preferred Alternative vision for development of the Sepulveda Station Park and Ride.

Similar to the RFP response vision, we present to you our strategy for future development. Again taking into account our inspiration from Mission Meridian and engaging the surrounding uses, we have developed four strategic zones. Three of the four zones will be familiar to you from our RFP response project; however, with our preferred alternative we propose purchasing the parcels along Sepulveda Boulevard currently occupied by the Wendy's fast food restaurant and the former Wicke's Furniture retail store. This fourth strategic zone we envision with a Sepulveda Corridor strategy. Within this area we envision the creation of a high density urban mixed-use environment appropriate for its frontage along Sepulveda Boulevard. Unlike the RFP response project, however, we envision relocating the transit station to the northwest corner of the intersection of Sepulveda Boulevard and the Orange Line Bus Way. The reason for this relocation is that we feel we could provide improved linkages between the Orange Line and the other bus lines operating along Sepulveda Boulevard by decreasing the distance between stops. Unlike the RFP response project where the density steps up as you move from north to south, we see with this strategy an increase in density and activity as you move from northwest to southeast across the project site.

We would also like to point out our proposed street grid. One such road would be created on a north-south axis and would be aligned with Langdon Avenue to the north. The other road would be created on an east-west axis and would be aligned with the existing signalized intersection at Sepulveda Boulevard that provides access to the nearby Costco. There would be three ingress and egress points: the two existing locations plus a third new and larger access point along Sepulveda Boulevard. The idea, like the RFP response would be to minimize traffic along Erwin Street while attempting to focus access from the proposed Sepulveda Boulevard ingress/egress.

Based upon these strategies, we present to you an illustrative site plan detailing our vision for preferred site buildout. Note the low to medium density residential structures to the north, higher density residential and mixed-use structures to its south and east, and a new transit plaza adjacent to the relocated bus station. This vision would also incorporate a pedestrian paseo along the



north-south axis as a means of providing connectivity with the Victory Park neighborhood to the north.

As with the RFP response project, we have color coded the illustrative site plan to provide clarity and identify the specific uses we propose to include. Beginning at the northern end of the project site, we line the Erwin Street frontage with townhomes built as duplexes to mirror the look, scale, and feel of the single-family homes in the Victory Park neighborhood. To the south of the townhomes, we again step up the density slightly and propose numerous courtyard multi-family residential structures. Again using the results of our market study, we found that there would be an increase in demand for senior housing. Thus, several of the courtyard structures have been dedicated for senior housing. To the south and east of the courtyard housing structures, there is a proposed parking structure, which we also propose to line with live work units to screen the parking structure from view and activate the adjacent roadways. To the east of the parking structure and located along Sepulveda Boulevard, we propose the development of several mixed-use buildings incorporating ground floor retail with residential

units above. Finally, as we still want to make the area around the transit station the focal point of activity, proposed we have to relocate the transit station closer to the intersection of the Sepulveda Boulevard and the Orange Line Bus Way and propose to provide an adjacent transit plaza. The plaza is proposed to be lined with a mixedcommercial/retail, use community center, and bike station structure.







Sepulveda Corridor 2	Zone			
	Total		Total	
Multifamily Units	601	Contingangy	1 otal	
Multifamily Development	528,694 sq. ft. (Gross sq. ft.)	Vacancy Rate	7% (Multifamily	
	449,390 sq. ft. (Net Rentable)		7% (Retail/Commercial	
Retail/Commercial Development	118.473 sq. ft.		Development)	
Parking (1604)	400 (Metro)	Project Cost	\$145,257,431	
Tarking (1004)	902 (Multifamily)	-	(Multifamily)	
	302 (Retail)		\$31,855,723	
	502 (retury		(Retail/Commercial)	
		101	\$187,572,154 (Total)	
		NOI	50,080,409 (Multitamily)	
			\$1,502,799	
			(Retail/Commercial)	
		Batum on Cost	56,045,208 (Total)	
		Return on Cost	4.0% (Multianity)	
			(Retail/Commercial)	
			4 3% (Total)	
		L	1.579 (1.5ml)	
CAN Other Resemp Comprehensive Planning Project Final All 2017 Inplants Isaber 100	ancial Feasibility and Specs	Preferred Respons	50 Halla Adams, Eric Douglas, Kevin Fink Ruby Horta, Kevin Kahn, Jackie Torres	

In addition to the 12.5 acres in the RFP response, we had an additional six with the preferred alternative. An additional six acres allowed us to increase multifamily development to approximately 12 acres and retail development to nearly three acres. With these increases we were able to increase dwelling units to 601. In this preferred response, we felt it necessary to drastically reduce parking. Recognizing that the current 1200 parking spaces are rarely used (by one-third), we decided to reduce Metro parking to 400 spaces. We left 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit, which accounted for 902 spaces. Also, an increase of retail space increased the allotted parking spaces of retail to 302 spaces. Like with the RFP response, we used a contingency rate of 20 percent and seven percent vacancy for both multifamily and retail development. Considering project specifics, cost and modifications, total project costs resulted in \$200,599,867. However, regardless of the increase in project costs we also saw an increase in the total return on cost from 3.6 percent to 4.0 percent in this preferred alternative response.

Design Details

This image in the upper right shows the existing conditions (width of rightof-way, length of sidewalk, etc) of the major streets that border the Sepulveda Station site. Sepulveda Boulevard is the main north-south thoroughfare that abuts the east side of the site. It is currently a seven lane street at about 80 feet in width. Its sidewalks are very narrow at only 5 feet in width. On the



west side of the Sepulveda the existing Wickes furniture store provides a blank wall that provides no visual interest to pedestrians. The width of Sepulveda is particularly troublesome for the Sepulveda Station because, from our existing conditions report and studies, we've found it to be a major transfer station for passengers getting off the Orange Line and on to the many Metro lines that traverse Sepulveda Boulevard, including the Rapid Line 734. As transportation research has demonstrated, people particularly despise transferring and waiting for transit. Thus, strategies we can employ to make the transfer easier will help make Metro riders journey easier.

This image at right provides some examples of possible strategies Metro can employ to ease transferring and access to/from the Sepulveda Station TOD. The two precedent photos on the left show examples of how to make pedestrian crossing demarcations more visually obvious to drivers, enabling them to slow down. The top left is an example of "zebra striping", essentially painting



the crossing a different color to provide an obvious signal to drivers to reduce speed because a high-volume pedestrian area is approaching. The bottom left shows how blinking lights can also be employed to alert drivers. Perhaps a little more contentious are the examples shown on the right: road diets that physically shrink the distance required to cross the street. There are two main types of road diets that can be employed: pedestrian bulbouts, as shown in the before-and-after photos of Santa Monica Boulevard in West Hollywood, in which sidewalks are extended out into the street; or refuge medians, in which a median is placed to ensure that pedestrians have a safe resting point if they cannot make it all the way across the street. The latter example is particularly helpful for seniors, who number rather high in the Van Nuys community.

In order to create a definitive and distinctive sense of place, and to ensure that our TOD becomes a "destination" for transit riders and residents alike, we envision a vibrant, active, and open public plaza/transit station. In our Preferred Response, we propose physically moving the bus station from the middle of the site to the corner at Sepulveda Boulevard. This will help with visibility of the transit station from the main arterial



and will also reduce the distance transit patrons would have to walk to transfer to other bus lines. The precedent photos show some examples of other transit stations that we feel possess good "senseof-place" qualities, such as the Fruitvale Transit Village in Oakland, with its water fountains and palm trees, and the famous tubular stations at Curitiba, Brazil's famous BRT system. We also hope to promote non-automobile transportation options by accommodating a Bikestation as a retail tenant. Bikestations provide secure bicycle storage facilities, with some also including repair stations and changing rooms/showers. Bikestation currently is not in the City of Los Angeles, but the Sepulveda Station may be a great place to enter the LA market due to the proximity of the Orange Line Bike Path.

Our principles of good urban design have to also continue into the design of parking structures. In both our site plans we include structured parking. Thus, it is imperative that the parking structures do not become a blight on the TOD site, both for simple aesthetic reasons, but also for psychological reasons. We do not want the most visible element of our TOD site to be a parking structure. That sends the completely wrong message about our transit-oriented development. As such, we propose either

making the parking structure an architectural work of art in its own right, such as picture in the top right of a structure in Miami, or have it blend in seamlessly with the existing community as in Colorado, middle. What we do not want is the photo at the bottom left: a big, behemoth building with long, blank walls that create pedestrian dead zones at street level. Also, we do not want residential units to face into an open garage of visible parked cars.



Throughout the entire process of developina ideas for our site plans, we were very cognizant of the existing residents' concerns in the Victory Park community. We very much strive to create a façade along Erwin Street that blends in with the current homes there. As such, we California-style propose bungalows similar to the precedent photos of the



Mission-Meridian Station TOD in South Pasadena. We propose maintaining the 30' wide street with one land in each direction so as to not encourage additional automobile trips and maintain a quiet residential character. The sidewalks should be at least 6' wide with attractive, pedestrian-scaled lighting.

In the Preferred Scenario, we acquire the existing Wickes site with a determined goal to activate Sepulveda Boulevard. As stated earlier, this main arterial is lined with a blank wall and a very narrow sidewalk, essentially creating a dead pedestrian experience. To improve pedestrian access to and from our station, we envision lining Sepulveda with mixed-use housing and retail with at least an 8' sidewalk. In this wide sidewalk we want to encourage outdoor seating, such as in San Francisco's Pavement to Parks Program (bottom right), and also attractive greenery, as seen in Chicago's beautiful downtown planters. Additionally, we hope to transform Sepulveda into a "green street" by planting native, drought-tolerant plants and permeable surfaces to allow for groundwater recharge. The top left photo

is of Santa Monica's Bicknell Avenue, which is part of that city's green streets program. Underneath each of the sidewalk planters are filters that clean stormwater before it goes into the sewer system. Thus, we envision a walkable, pedestrianoriented, and ecologically sustainable Sepulveda Boulevard. If we can attain this vision on Sepulveda, there is no street in the United States that cannot also meet these goals.



Funding

FEDERAL:

Transportation Enhancement Program Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grants Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program TIGER Program Grants (Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery) Housing Tax Credits

CALIFORNIA:

Prop 1A Funds Transportation Development Act Article 3 Funds Bicycle Transportation Account Safe Routes to School Prop 1C: Transit-Oriented Development Housing Program (TOD) Affordable Housing Innovation Fund (AHIF) Housing Related Parks Program

Golden State Acquisition Funds

REGIONAL:

AB 2766 Clean Air Funds SCAG Compass Blueprint Grants Genesis LA Real Estate Funds I and II managed by Shamrock



Appendix A- Financial Proforma

Team 1 Pro Forma

MASTER PLAN - RFP

Existing Parcels		SF	Acres
MTA Property		542,322	12.5
Total Site Area		542,322	12.5
MTA Replacement Parking			
Metro Parking	1,200	stalls	\$18,000,000
Parking Type:	Structured		
Cost per space (structured)			\$15,000.00
Metro Ingress/Egress			\$459,000
Total			\$18,459,000
Total Parking Stalls Required:			1,565
Land Allocation		SF	Acres
Commerical		47,000	1.1
Residential		177,750	4.1
Public Realm & RoW		222,297	5.1
Metro Parking Structure		39,375	0.9
Metro Ingress/Egress		45,900	1.1
Metro Station		10,000	0.2
Total		542,322	12.5
Total Project Cost:			\$88,492,085
Total Return on Cost:			4.4%

Team 1 Pro Forma

COMMERCIAL - RFP

roiect Size & Scale Prevailing Wage					
Entitled FAR			0.3	Prevailing Wage? (Y/N)	Y
Land SE			47.000	Sitework Markun	10%
Land Acres			1.08		20%
In-Line NSF			36.000		
Anchor			0		
Total GRA			36.000		
Parking Spaces per 1,000 sf			2.0		
Total Parking Spaces			72		
Surface Parking		15%	11		
Underground Parking		85%	61		
Dreiset Budget	Base Cest	Actual Cost		Tetal	DNC
	base Cost		nor land of	iotai col	co oo
Acquisition Price	¢10	\$ 0.00	per failu si		\$0.00
Sitowork	\$10 \$10	\$11.00	per existing gsi	ېن 50 517 000	\$0.00 \$17.26
Now Potail Hard Cost	\$10 \$05	\$11.00	per fallu si	\$317,000	\$14.30
Surface Parking Hard Cost	\$95	\$114.00	per gai	\$4,104,000	\$114.00 \$0.09
Linderground Parking Hard Cost	\$25,000	\$300.00	per space	\$3,240	\$0.09 \$71.40
Retail Tic	\$35,000	\$42,000	per space	\$2,370,400	\$71.40
Hard Cost Contingency		\$33.00 10%	of hard costs	\$1,200,000	\$33.00
Soft Cost		20%	of hard costs	\$1,860,021	\$23.43
Suit Cost		10%	of subtotal	\$1,000,021	\$31.07
Total Project Cost		10/0		\$12,276,137	\$341.00
				φ τ ε <i>ι</i> ε <i>ι</i> σ,-τ.	
Pro Forma				Total	PNSF
Gross Potential Revenue					
In-Line		\$2.10	per nsf/month	\$907,200	\$25.20
Anchor		\$1.90	per nsf/month	\$0	\$22.80
Total Gross Potential Revenue				\$907,200	\$25.20
Other Income		0%	of gpr	\$0	\$0.00
Expense Recoveries				\$315,515	\$8.76
Vacancy		7%	of gross rev	(\$149,094)	(\$4.14)
Scheduled Gross Income				\$1,073,621	\$29.82
Reimbursable Expenses					
Property Tax		1.18%	of land & dev costs	(\$131,131)	(\$3.64)
Insurance		\$1.75	per gsf	(\$63,000)	(\$1.75)
G&A		10%	of reumbursables	(\$28,683)	(\$0.80)
CAM - Parking		\$250.00	per stall	(\$2,700)	(\$0.08)
CAM Repairs & Maintenance		\$2.50	per gsf	(\$90,000)	(\$2.50)
Total Reimbursables				(\$315,515)	(\$8.76)
Non-Reimbursable Expenses	r	201	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(622.200)	(60.00)
Management Fee		3%	of sgi	(\$32,209)	(\$0.89)
Structural Reserves		\$0.20	per gst	(\$7,200)	(\$0.20)
Other		\$0.10	per gst	(\$3,600)	(\$0.10)
Total Non-Reimbursable Expenses				(\$43,009)	(\$1.19)
Total Operating Expenses				(\$358 523)	(\$9.96)
				(\$556,525)	(\$5.50)
Net Operating Income				\$715,097	\$19.86
Return on Cost					ς οο/

Appendix A- Financial Proforma

Team 1 Pro Forma

RESIDENTIAL - RFP

Project Size & Scale					Prevailing Wage	
Units Per Acre			60.0		Prevailing Wage? (Y/N)	Y
Land SF			177.750		Sitework Markup	10%
Land Acres			4.08		Contingency	20%
Number of Units			244			
Average Unit Size			845			
Gross SF			242.565			
Net Rentable SF			206,180			
Building Efficiency			85%			
Existing GSF			0			
Parking Spaces Per Unit			1.2			
Total Parking Spaces			293			
Underground		85%	249			
Surface		15%	44			
Project Budget	Base Cost	Actual Cost	-	Total	PNSF	Per Unit
Acquisition Price		\$0.00	per land sf	\$0	\$0.00	\$0
Demolition	\$10	\$11.00	per bldg. demo. sf	\$0	\$0.00	\$0
Sitework	\$10	\$11.00	per land sf	\$1,955,250	\$11.00	\$8,013
Residential Core & Shell	\$95	\$114.00	per gsf	\$27,652,376	\$134.12	\$113,329
Surface Parking Hard Cost	\$250	\$300.00	per space	\$13,176	\$0.06	\$54
Underground Parking Hard Cost	\$35,000	\$42,000	per space	\$10,452,960	\$50.70	\$42,840
Hard Cost Contingency		10%	of hard costs	\$4,007,376	\$19.44	\$16,424
Soft Cost		20%	of hard costs	\$8,425,178	\$40.86	\$34,529
Financing Cost		10%	of subtotal	\$5,250,632	\$25.47	\$21,518.98
Total Project Cost				\$57,756,948	\$281.65	\$236,709
Pro Forma				Total	PNSF	Per Unit
Annual Gross Potential Revenue		\$2.00	per nsf/month	\$4,948,320	\$24.00	\$20,280
Other Income		2.5%	of gpr	\$123,708	\$0.60	\$507
Vacancy		7%	of gross rev	(\$355,042)	(\$2.00)	(\$1,455)
Scheduled Gross Income				\$4,716,986	\$22.60	\$19,332
Expenses						
Property Tax		1.18%	of land & dev costs	(\$616,949)	(\$2.99)	(\$2,528)
Insurance		\$0.75	per gsf	(\$181,924)	(\$0.88)	(\$746)
General & Administrative		\$350.00	per unit	(\$85,400)	(\$0.41)	(\$350)
CAM-Parking		\$400.00	per stall	(\$117,120)	(\$0.57)	(\$480)
CAM-Repairs & Maintenance		\$1.25	per gsf	(\$303,206)	(\$1.47)	(\$1,243)
Management Fee		3%	of sgi	(\$141,510)	(\$0.69)	(\$580)
Structural Reserves		\$0.25	per gsf	(\$51,545)	(\$0.25)	(\$211)
Other		\$0.00	per gsf	\$0	\$0.00	\$0
Total Operating Expenses				(\$1,497,653)	(\$7.26)	(\$6,138)
Not Operating Income				62 240 222	64E C4	642 404
iver operating income				əs,219,333	\$15.61	\$13,194
Return on Cost						5.6%
						5.570
Team 1 Pro Forma

MASTER PLAN - PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Existing Parcels		SF	Acres
Sepulveda Blvd. Property		0.	, lei es
Wickes/Warehouse		200,812	4.6
Wendy's Parcel		13.591	0.3
Wendy's Parking Lot		48,783	1.1
Sepulveda-Subtotal		263,186	6.0
MTA Property		542,322	12.5
Total Site Area		805,508	18.5
MTA Replacement Parking			
Metro Parking	600	stalls	\$9,000,000
Parking Type:	Structured		
Cost per space:			\$15,000.00
Metro Ingress/Egress			\$459,000
Total			\$9,459,000
Total Parking Stalls Required			1,075
Land Acquistion Cost			
Cost per sq/ft			\$45
Sepulveda Blvd. Property - sq/ft			263,186
Total			\$11,843,370
Land Allocation		SF	Acres
Commercial		182,100	4.2
Residential		246,150	5.7
Public Realm & Right-of-Way		281,983	6.5
Metro Parking Structure		39,375	0.9
Metro Ingress/Egress		45,900	1.1
Metro Station		10,000	0.2
Total		805,508	18.5
Total Project Cost:			\$141,292,412
Total Return on Cost:			5.1%

Appendix A- Financial Proforma

Team 1 Pro Forma

COMMERCIAL - PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Project Size & Scale				Prevailing Wage	
Entitled FAR			0.3	Prevailing Wage? (Y/N)	Ŷ
Land SF			182.100	Sitework Markup	10%
Land Acres			4.18	Contingency	20%
			-		
In-Line NSF			109.000		
Anchor			27.000		
Total GBA			136.000		
			,		
Parking Spaces per 1.000 sf			1.0		
Total Parking Spaces	1		136		
Surface Parking		15%	20		
Underground Parking		85%	116		
Project Budget	Base Cost	Actual Cost		Total	PNSF
Demolition	\$10	\$11.00	Wickes site demo	\$1,447,523	\$10.64
Sitework	\$10	\$11.00	per land sf	\$2,003,100	\$14.73
New Retail Hard Cost	\$95	\$114.00	per gsf	\$15,504,000	\$114.00
Surface Parking Hard Cost	\$250	\$300.00	per space	\$6,120	\$0.05
Underground Parking Hard Cost	\$35,000	\$42,000	per space	\$4,855,200	\$35.70
Retail TIs		\$35.00	per nsf	\$4,760,000	\$35.00
Hard Cost Contingency		10%	of hard costs	\$2,857,594	\$21.01
Soft Cost		20%	of hard costs	\$6,286,707	\$46.23
Financing Cost		10%	of subtotal	\$3,772,024	\$27.74
Total Project Cost	-	-		\$41,492,269	\$305.09
Pro Forma	-			Total	PNSF
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue				Total	PNSF
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line		\$2.10	per nsf/month	Total \$2,746,800	PNSF \$25.20
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor		\$2.10 \$1.90	per nsf/month per nsf/month	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue		\$2.10 \$1.90	per nsf/month per nsf/month	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$24.72
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income		\$2.10 \$1.90 0%	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$24.72 \$0.00
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries		\$2.10 \$1.90 	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$24.72 \$0.00 \$8.30
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries Vacancy		\$2.10 \$1.90 0% 7%	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr of gross rev	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944 \$(\$549,762)	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$24.72 \$0.00 \$8.30 (\$4.04)
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries Vacancy Scheduled Gross Income		\$2.10 \$1.90 0% 7%	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr of gross rev	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944 (\$549,762) \$3,941,582	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$24.72 \$0.00 \$8.30 (\$4.04) \$28.98
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries Vacancy Scheduled Gross Income		\$2.10 \$1.90 0% 7%	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr of gross rev	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944 (\$549,762) \$3,941,582	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$24.72 \$0.00 \$8.30 (\$4.04) \$28.98
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries Vacancy Scheduled Gross Income Reimbursable Expenses		\$2.10 \$1.90 0% 7%	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr of gross rev	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944 (\$549,762) \$3,941,582	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$24.72 \$0.00 \$8.30 (\$4.04) \$28.98
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries Vacancy Scheduled Gross Income Reimbursable Expenses Property Tax		\$2.10 \$1.90 0% 7%	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr of gross rev of land & dev costs	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944 (\$549,762) \$3,941,582 (\$443,213)	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$24.72 \$0.00 \$8.30 (\$4.04) \$28.98 (\$3.26) (\$3.26)
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries Vacancy Scheduled Gross Income Reimbursable Expenses Property Tax Insurance		\$2.10 \$1.90 0% 7% 1.18% \$1.75	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr of gross rev of land & dev costs per gsf	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944 (\$549,762) \$3,941,582 (\$443,213) (\$238,000) (\$238,000)	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$24.72 \$0.00 \$8.30 (\$4.04) \$28.98 (\$3.26) (\$1.75)
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries Vacancy Scheduled Gross Income Reimbursable Expenses Property Tax Insurance G&A Other Dedite		\$2.10 \$1.90 0% 7% 1.18% \$1.75 10%	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr of gross rev of gross rev of land & dev costs per gsf of reumbursables	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944 (\$549,762) \$3,941,582 (\$443,213) (\$238,000) (\$102,631)	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$24.72 \$0.00 \$8.30 (\$4.04) \$28.98 (\$3.26) (\$1.75) (\$0.75)
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries Vacancy Scheduled Gross Income Reimbursable Expenses Property Tax Insurance G&A CAM - Parking		\$2.10 \$1.90 0% 7% 1.18% \$1.75 10% \$250.00	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr of gross rev of land & dev costs per gsf of reumbursables per st	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944 (\$549,762) \$3,941,582 (\$443,213) (\$238,000) (\$102,631) (\$2,100)	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$24.72 \$0.00 \$8.30 (\$4.04) \$28.98 (\$3.26) (\$1.75) (\$0.75) (\$0.04)
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries Vacancy Scheduled Gross Income Reimbursable Expenses Property Tax Insurance G&A CAM - Parking CAM Repairs & Maintenance		\$2.10 \$1.90 0% 7% 1.18% \$1.75 10% \$250.00 \$2.50	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr of gross rev of land & dev costs per gsf of reumbursables per stall per gsf	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944 (\$549,762) \$3,941,582 (\$443,213) (\$238,000) (\$102,631) (\$5,100) (\$340,000)	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$24.72 \$0.00 \$8.30 (\$4.04) \$28.98 (\$3.26) (\$1.75) (\$0.75) (\$0.75) (\$0.04) (\$2.50)
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries Vacancy Scheduled Gross Income Reimbursable Expenses Property Tax Insurance G&A CAM - Parking CAM Repairs & Maintenance Total Reimbursables		\$2.10 \$1.90 0% 7% 1.18% \$1.75 10% \$250.00 \$2.50	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr of gross rev of land & dev costs per gsf of reumbursables per stall per gsf	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944 (\$549,762) \$3,941,582 (\$443,213) (\$238,000) (\$102,631) (\$102,631) (\$5,100) (\$340,000) (\$1,128,944)	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$24.72 \$0.00 \$8.30 (\$4.04) \$28.98 (\$3.26) (\$1.75) (\$0.75) (\$0.75) (\$0.04) (\$2.50) (\$8.30)
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries Vacancy Scheduled Gross Income Reimbursable Expenses Property Tax Insurance G&A CAM - Parking CAM Repairs & Maintenance Total Reimbursables Non-Reimbursable Expenses		\$2.10 \$1.90 0% 7% 1.18% \$1.75 10% \$250.00 \$2.50	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr of gross rev of land & dev costs per gsf of reumbursables per stall per gsf	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944 (\$549,762) \$3,941,582 (\$443,213) (\$238,000) (\$102,631) (\$102,631) (\$340,000) (\$340,000)	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$224.72 \$0.00 \$8.30 (\$4.04) \$28.98 (\$4.04) \$28.98 (\$3.26) (\$1.75) (\$0.75) (\$0.75) (\$0.04) (\$2.50) (\$8.30)
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries Vacancy Scheduled Gross Income Reimbursable Expenses Property Tax Insurance G&A CAM - Parking CAM Repairs & Maintenance Total Reimbursables Non-Reimbursable Expenses Management Ece		\$2.10 \$1.90 0% 7% 1.18% \$1.75 10% \$250.00 \$2.50	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr of gross rev of land & dev costs per gsf of reumbursables per stall per gsf	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944 (\$549,762) \$3,941,582 (\$443,213) (\$238,000) (\$102,631) (\$5,100) (\$340,000) (\$1,128,944)	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$22.80 \$22.72 \$0.00 \$8.30 (\$4.04) \$28.98 (\$4.04) \$28.98 (\$3.26) (\$1.75) (\$0.75) (\$0.75) (\$0.04) (\$2.50) (\$8.30)
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries Vacancy Scheduled Gross Income Reimbursable Expenses Property Tax Insurance G&A CAM - Parking CAM Repairs & Maintenance Total Reimbursable Expenses Non-Reimbursable Expenses Management Fee Structural Reserves		\$2.10 \$1.90 0% 7% 1.18% \$1.75 10% \$250.00 \$2.50 3% \$0.20	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr of gross rev of land & dev costs per gsf of reumbursables per stall per gsf of sgi per gsf	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944 (\$549,762) \$3,941,582 (\$443,213) (\$238,000) (\$102,631) (\$102,631) (\$5,100) (\$340,000) (\$118,247) (\$27,200)	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$22.80 \$22.72 \$0.00 \$8.30 (\$4.04) \$28.98 (\$4.04) (\$5.26) (\$5.75) (\$0.04) (\$8.30) (\$8.30) (\$8.30)
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries Vacancy Scheduled Gross Income Reimbursable Expenses Property Tax Insurance G&A CAM - Parking CAM Repairs & Maintenance Total Reimbursable Expenses Non-Reimbursable Expenses Management Fee Structural Reserves Other		\$2.10 \$1.90 0% 7% 1.18% \$1.75 10% \$250.00 \$250.00 \$2.50 3% \$0.20 \$0.10	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr of gross rev of land & dev costs per gsf of reumbursables per stall per gsf of sgi per gsf per gsf	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944 (\$549,762) \$3,941,582 (\$443,213) (\$238,000) (\$102,631) (\$102,631) (\$5,100) (\$340,000) (\$118,247) (\$27,200) (\$13,600)	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$22.80 \$24.72 \$0.00 \$8.30 (\$4.04) \$28.98 (\$4.04) (\$4.04) \$28.98 (\$4.04) (\$5.250) (\$8.30) (\$8.30) (\$0.75) (\$0.75) (\$0.75) (\$0.75) (\$0.87) (\$0.20) (\$0.20) (\$0.10)
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries Vacancy Scheduled Gross Income Reimbursable Expenses Property Tax Insurance G&A CAM - Parking CAM Repairs & Maintenance Total Reimbursable Expenses Management Fee Structural Reserves Other Total Non-Reimbursable Expenses		\$2.10 \$1.90 0% 7% 1.18% \$1.75 10% \$250.00 \$2.50 3% \$0.20 \$0.10	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr of gross rev of land & dev costs per gsf of reumbursables per stall per gsf of sgi per gsf per gsf	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944 (\$549,762) \$3,941,582 (\$443,213) (\$238,000) (\$102,631) (\$102,631) (\$12,631) (\$13,000) (\$118,247) (\$27,200) (\$13,600) (\$13,600)	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$22.80 \$24.72 \$0.00 \$8.30 (\$4.04) \$28.98 (\$4.04) (\$5.250) (\$5.250) (\$5.20) (\$0.20) (\$0.10) (\$0.10)
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries Vacancy Scheduled Gross Income Reimbursable Expenses Property Tax Insurance G&A CAM Parking CAM Repairs & Maintenance Total Reimbursable Expenses Management Fee Structural Reserves Other Total Non-Reimbursable Expenses		\$2.10 \$1.90 0% 7% 1.18% \$1.75 10% \$250.00 \$2.50 3% \$0.20 \$0.10	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr of gross rev of land & dev costs per gsf of reumbursables per stall per gsf of sgi per gsf per gsf	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944 (\$549,762) \$3,941,582 (\$443,213) (\$238,000) (\$102,631) (\$102,631) (\$102,631) (\$102,631) (\$128,944) (\$13,000) (\$118,247) (\$27,200) (\$13,600) (\$159,047)	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$22.80 \$24.72 \$0.00 \$8.30 (\$4.04) \$28.98 (\$4.04) (\$5.250) (\$0.04) (\$5.250) (\$0.87) (\$0.20) (\$0.10) (\$0.10) (\$0.117)
Pro Forma Gross Potential Revenue In-Line Anchor Total Gross Potential Revenue Other Income Expense Recoveries Vacancy Scheduled Gross Income Reimbursable Expenses Property Tax Insurance G&A CAM Repairs & Maintenance Total Reimbursable Expenses Management Fee Structural Reserves Other Total Non-Reimbursable Expenses		\$2.10 \$1.90 0% 7% 1.18% \$1.75 10% \$250.00 \$2.50 3% \$0.20 \$0.10	per nsf/month per nsf/month of gpr of gross rev of land & dev costs per gsf of reumbursables per stall per gsf of sgi per gsf per gsf	Total \$2,746,800 \$615,600 \$3,362,400 \$0 \$1,128,944 (\$549,762) \$3,941,582 (\$443,213) (\$238,000) (\$102,631) (\$128,5100) (\$128,5100) (\$118,247) (\$118,247) (\$27,200) (\$13,600) (\$13,600) (\$159,047)	PNSF \$25.20 \$22.80 \$22.80 \$22.72 \$0.00 \$8.30 (\$4.04) \$28.98 (\$4.04) (\$5.26) (\$0.75) (\$0.04) (\$2.50) (\$0.87) (\$0.20) (\$0.10) (\$0.10) (\$0.117) (\$0.417) (\$0.417) (\$0.20) (\$0.10)

Team 1 Pro Forma

RESIDENTIAL - PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Project Size & Scale					Prevailing Wage	
Units Per Acre		,	60.0	1 '	Prevailing Wage? (Y/N)	Y
Land SF	1 1	i i	246,150	1 '	Sitework Markup	10%
Land Acres		1	5.65	1 '	Contingency	20%
	أسمعها			1	· · · ·	
Number of Units			339	1		
Average Unit Size		1	845	1		
Gross SF		1	337,006	1		
Net Rentable SF		l I	286,455	1		
Building Efficiency		l I	85%	1		
Existing GSF		l I	0	1		
Parking Spaces Per Unit		1	1.0	1		
Total Parking Spaces	•		339	1		
Underground		85%	288	1		
Surface		15%	51	1		
Project Budget	Base Cost	Actual Cost		Total	PNSF	Per Unit
Demolition	\$10	\$11.00	Wickes site demo	\$1,447,523	\$0.00	\$4,270
Sitework	\$10	\$11.00	per land sf	\$2,707,650	\$11.00	\$7,987
Residential Core & Shell	\$95	\$114.00	per gsf	\$38,418,671	\$134.12	\$113,329
Surface Parking Hard Cost	\$250	\$300.00	per space	\$15,255	\$0.05	\$45
Underground Parking Hard Cost	\$35,000	\$42,000	per space	\$12,102,300	\$42.25	\$35,700
Hard Cost Contingency		10%	of hard costs	\$5,469,140	\$19.09	\$16,133
Soft Cost	1 1	20%	of hard costs	\$11,201,073	\$39.10	\$33,042
Financing Cost	1 1	10%	of subtotal	\$7,136,161	\$24.91	\$21,050.62
Total Project Cost				\$78,497,773	\$270.53	\$231,557
Pro Forma				Total	PNSF	Per Unit
Annual Gross Potential Revenue		\$2.00	per nsf/month	\$6,874,920	\$24.00	\$20,280
Other Income	1 1	2.5%	of gpr	\$171,873	\$0.60	\$507
Vacancy		7%	of gross rev	(\$493,276)	(\$2.00)	(\$1,455)
Scheduled Gross Income				\$6,553,517	\$22.60	\$19,332
Expenses						
Property Tax		1.18%	of land & dev costs	(\$838,499)	(\$2.93)	(\$2,473)
Insurance		\$0.75	per gsf	(\$252,754)	(\$0.88)	(\$746)
General & Administrative		\$350.00	per unit	(\$118,650)	(\$0.41)	(\$350)
CAM-Parking		\$400.00	per stall	(\$135,600)	(\$0.47)	(\$400)
CAM-Repairs & Maintenance		\$1.25	per gsf	(\$421,257)	(\$1.47)	(\$1,243)
Management Fee		3%	of sgi	(\$196,606)	(\$0.69)	(\$580)
Structural Reserves		\$0.25	per gsf	(\$71,614)	(\$0.25)	(\$211)
Other		\$0.00	per gsf	\$0	\$0.00	\$0
Total Operating Expenses				(\$2,034,980)	(\$7.10)	(\$6,003)
Net Operating Income				\$4,518,538	\$15.77	\$13,329
Return on Cost						5.8%

Appendix A- Financial Proforma

Team 2 Pro Forma- RFP Design Response

MASTER PLAN

Existing Parcels		
	SF	Acres
Sepulveda Blvd. Property		
Wicke's/Warehouse	200,812	4.6
Wendy's Parcel	13,591	0.3
Wendy's Parking Lot	48,783	1.1
Sepulveda-Subtotal	263,186	6.0
MTA Property	542,322	12.5
Total Site Area	805,508	18.5
Land Allocation		
	SF	Acres
Retail	118,473	2.7
Single-Family	-	-
Multifamily	528,694	12.1
Parking Structure	102,452	2.4
Metro Ingress/Egress	45,900	1.1

Public Infrastructure Costs

Metro Parking	400	stalls	\$10,000,000
Parking Type:	Structured		
	(Structured/Su	irface)	
Metro Ingress/Egress			\$459,000
Total			\$10,459,000

Land Value

Total

Metro Station

	Total	\$/SF	\$/Ac.
Retail	\$11,843,370	\$99.97	\$4,354,555
Single Family	\$0	\$0.00	\$0
Multifamily	<u>\$0</u>	\$0.00	\$0
Total Commercial RLV	\$11,843,370	\$14.70	\$640,454
Less: Public Infrastructure Costs	(\$10,459,000)		
Adjusted Residual Land Value	\$1,384,370		

10,000

805,519

0.2

18.5

Annual Ground Lease Payment

Discount Rate	8.00%	
Annual Payment	110,804	
Multifamily Project Cost		\$145,257,437
Retail Project Cost		\$44,883,430
Total Project Cost		\$200,599,867
Multifamily NOI		\$6,680,409
Retial NOI		\$1,347,813
Total Project Return on Cost		4.0%

Appendix A- Financial Proforma

Team 2 Pro Forma- Preferred Design Response

MASTER PLAN

Existing Parcels			
		SF	Acres
Sepulveda Blvd. Property			
Wicke's/Warehouse		-	-
Wendy's Parcel		-	-
Wendy's Parking Lot		<u> </u>	-
Sepulveda-Subtotal		-	-
MTA Property	_	542,322	12.5
Total Site Area		542,322	12.5
Land Allocation			
		SF	Acres
Retail		40,415	0.9
Single-Family		-	-
Multifamily		407,511	9.4
Parking Structure		38,496	0.9
Metro Ingress/Egress		45,900	1.1
Metro Station		10,000	0.2
Total		542,322	12.5
Land Value			
	Total	<u>\$/SF</u>	<u>\$/Ac.</u>
Retail	\$0	\$0.00	\$0
Single Family	\$0	\$0.00	\$0
Multifamily	<u>\$0</u>	\$0.00	\$0
Total Commercial RLV	\$0	\$0.00	\$0
Less: Public Infrastructure Costs	(\$30,459,000)		
Adjusted Residual Land Value	(\$30,459,000)		
Annual Ground Lease Payment			
Discount Rate	8.00%		
Annual Payment	(2,437,917)		
Multifamily Project Cost			\$108,927,071
Retail Proect Cost			\$22,959,844
Total Project Cost			\$162,345,915
Multifamily NOI			\$4,422,145
Retail NOI			\$1,370,905
Total Project Return on Cost			3.6%
iotari rojett neturn on cost			3.078

Public Infrastructure Costs

1,200	stalls	\$30,000,000
Structured		
(Structured/Su	irface)	
		\$459,000
		\$30,459,000
	1,200 Structured (Structured/Su	1,200 stalls Structured (Structured/Surface)

HAILA ADAMO

444 1/2 n orange grove ave, los angeles, ca 90036 cell: 619-933-1444 email: hadamo@ucla.edu

EDUCATION	
University of California, Los Angeles Master of Architecture (MArch I) and Master of Arts in Urban Planning Urban Planning Departmental Fellowship Recipient Leon Hoffman Fellowship Recipient, 2007 and 2008 Studio project seleted for Currents Winter 2008 Exhibition Studio project seleted for Currents Winter 2009 Exhibition Studio project selected for Best of Currents 2009 Exhibition Studio project selected for Currents Fall 2009 Exhibition	2006-2010
University of California, Berkeley Bachelor of Arts in Urban Studies in the College of Environmental Design Dean's Honors List	2001-2005
WORK EXPERIENCE	
Undergraduate Studio TA Instructor, UCLA Taught studio with two other instructors. Guided eight students in design of a single-family residence, focusing on development of design parti, model, and drawings.	Fall 2009
Architectural Intern, Behnisch Architects Part of schematic design team for UC Berkeley dorm project and design of Santa Monica City parking structure. General duties included building sketch models and digital models, rendering, and creating drawings and diagrams for presentations.	Summer 2009
Architectural Intern, Touraine Richmond Architects Worked with firm on two design competitions, built sketch models, worked with consultant to prepare RFQ. General duties included building sketch models and digital models, rendering, and aiding in creation of architectural drawings.	2008
Teaching Assistant, UCLA Digital Seminar Taught students to create digital models and extract drawings using Rhinoceros 4.0 in intensive 3 week program.	Summer 2008
Architectural Intern, Hirsuta Worked in a team led by Jason Payne to fabricate a museum quality model.	Summer 2008
Teaching Assistant, UCLA Jump-Start Summer Program Worked with students and instructors in introductory design course.	Summer 2008
Graduate Student Researcher, UCLA Urban Planning Department & Uncommon LA Aided in research and coordination of program for cultural tourism project designed to revitalize ethnic enclaves in LA by promoting tourism and investment in local businesses.	Summer 2007
Intern, Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles (CRA/LA) Organized research and collected GIS-mapping data for city's Industrial Land Use Project, worked with team of interns to develop a general plan for agency's Sustainable Development Policy, worked on downtown greening projects.	Winter 2007
Design-Build Manager, Design Innovation Technologies, Inc Managed contractor program for landscape design company. Proposed and imple- mented improvements to business model and worked with contractors and clients to move designs to build phase.	2006
SOFTWARE and FABRICATION TOOLS	
Drafting: AutoCAD 2008 Parametrics: Grasshopper Digital Modeling: Rhino 4.0, Google Sketchup Rendering: Vray, Maxwell, Photoshop Graphics: Adobe Creative Suite general shop tools	nd

JEREMY DAVID COGAN

11811 Venice Boulevard #206, Los Angeles, CA 90066 phone: 909.210.2771 email: jeremycogan@gmail.com

PLANNING & POLICY EXPERIENCE

Graduate Student Researcher - UCLA Department of Urban Planning: Los Angeles, CA Aug 09 - Present

Conduct data collection, analysis and research on issues relating to elections and transportation funding. Also review and critique academic articles prior to publication in trade journals.

Transportation Planning Intern - City of Santa Monica: Santa Monica, CA

- Achieved \$900,000 in local transportation funding after drafting successful state grant applications for the Safe Routes to Schools program. Received the highest score out of over 80 applicant cities on the materials prepared during this internship. Grant money will provide funding for infrastructure improvements that encourage student walking and cycling to and from their place of learning.
- Succeeded in obtaining national recognition for Santa Monica through the "Bicycle Friendly Community" program of the League of American Bicyclists. Required careful navigation of a rigorous application process through which Santa Monica became one of only 108 cities (out of 274 applicants) to be awarded Bronze or higher designation.
- Organized a widely-attended community design charrette regarding traffic and pedestrian improvements along the busy Lincoln Avenue corridor

Press Secretary & Sr. Legislative Assistant

٠

U.S. Rep. Grace F. Napolitano (CA-38), Washington, DC

- Oversaw messaging of congressional office on broad range of legislative and political issues
- Drafted press releases, statements, media responses, questions and answers, and fact sheets
- Proactively responded to national, local, and Spanish-language media inquiries, pitched stories to TV, radio and print outlets, drafted op-eds, and produced electronic and direct-mail newsletters
- Implemented long-range communications strategy, cultivated strong relationships with Capitol Hill and media colleagues, and developed internal and external Internet operation
- Primary policy advisor on health, mental health, veterans affairs, urban development, and housing
 - Directed initiatives of the Congressional Mental Health Caucus as lead staff member, becoming well versed on a variety of health issues among students, veterans, and seniors, particularly in minority communities.
 - Compiled needs of families, civic leaders, and interests groups into resolution commemorating mental health care and comprehensive legislation authorizing \$200 million in K-12 mental health grants
 - Drafted and amended bill language, worked with House and Senate staff, to ensure successful House introduction of H.R. 3430, the Mental Health in Schools Act of 2007, cosponsored by over 60 members of Congress and endorsed by over national mental health groups and education coalitions.
 - Organized national summit panel on mental health for the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute
- Managed high volume of constituent communications, providing constituent referrals to government agencies, legislative resources, and public services
- Political experience included fieldwork for 2006 Mid-term Congressional election (Indiana's 9th District, Bloomington).
 - Joined the Monroe County Democratic Party's campaign team as part of a victorious, top-tier, DCCC-backed race
 - Participated in precinct walks, voter file processing, community leader training, and college student outreach
 - Recruited over 300 election day volunteer staff; managed data and scheduling of community volunteer efforts
- Began as legislative staff in June '05; promoted to Press Secretary May '06; promoted to Sr. Legislative Asst May '07

Legal & Technical Assistant - Naumann & Levine LLP, San Diego, CA

- Assisted partners & associates on trial preparation for homeowner construction defect litigation
 - Managed document discovery process, client deposition coordination, supervision of homeowner site inspection process, data and archival research, and response to court, client, or opposition correspondence

INTERNATIONAL WORK EXPERIENCE

International Affiliate – China Academy of Urban Planning & Design: Beijing, China Jun 09 – Aug 09 Researched U.N. Habitat Award recipient cities, produced a report on the measurement of "livable" cities

- internationally, and delivered a keynote presentation on the deemphasizing of central urban highways in modern cities.
- Traveled to remote regions with Chinese urban planners to conduct a needs assessment for future development

Volunteer – ECELA Latin Immersion Group: Lima, Peru & Fox Language Academy: Sucre, Bolivia Nov 07 - May 08

Completed intensive Spanish language programs, with outstanding academic performance, while volunteering instruction in English and developing and distributing new instructional materials for low-income students

Jun 05 - Oct 07

Jun 2004 - May 2005

Jan 09 – Jun 09

JEREMY DAVID COGAN

11811 Venice Boulevard #206, Los Angeles, CA 90066 phone: 909.210.2771 email: jeremycogan@gmail.com

EDUCATION

UCLA School of Public Affairs, University of California, Los Angeles:

Candidate for Master of Arts in Urban Planning, expected June 2010 Concentration in Regional & International Development

University of California, San Diego:

Bachelor of Arts in Urban Studies & Planning (GPA: 3.6) + Bachelor of Arts in Political Science (GPA: 3.5) Provost's Honors List: Fall '03, Winter '04, Fall '04

Recipient of Dean's Leadership Award for Outstanding Contributions to the UCSD Student Community

- College Democrats of UCSD President & Chairman
- Associated Students, UCSD – Commissioner of Enterprise Operations, Sophomore & Senior Senator
- Academic Planning Council, UC Board of Regents CA Statewide Undergraduate Representative •
- UCSD Student Foundation Trustee of the Board
- Muir College Residential Life - Resident Advisor

The Library of Congress:

Congressional Research Service: Completion of the Advanced Legislative Process Institute

PUBLICATIONS

- o On-the-record commentary published in The New York Times, The Los Angeles Daily News, The San Gabriel Valley Tribune, and The Hill. Over 80 articles published in the UC San Diego Guardian featuring student leadership roles.
- "Housing Defect Litigation: Institutionalizing Informal Rules of Engagement," University of California, San Diego, Department of Urban Studies and Planning, 2005
- "A Case Study of Mission Valley: The Effects of Mixed Use and Transit Oriented Developments from 1970-2000," 0 University of California, San Diego, Department of Urban Studies and Planning, 2003

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

- 2008 National Convention Delegate, California Democratic Party Delegation, Denver, Colorado
- Chairman, ASUCLA Communications Board, publishers of the UCLA DailyBruin
- Vice President, UCLA Social Sciences Council

UNIQUE SKILLS

- Language: Advanced Spanish speaking, writing, and reading ability. Exposure to very basic Chinese. Technology: Highly productive use of MS Office suite (Word, Excel, Outlook, PowerPoint, Access), Windows
- XP/Vista/7/Server and MacOS X (iLife + iWork suites). Computer repair, upgrade, and maintenance experience. Design: Adobe Creative Suite 4 (Photoshop, Dreamweaver, Illustrator, Flash), Autodesk AutoCAD 2008, Google SketchUp, ESRI ArcGIS 9.3

REFERENCES

- Daniel Chao, Chief of Staff: Representative Grace F. Napolitano, United States House of Representatives, Washington, DC phone: (202) 225-5256 email: Daniel.Chao@mail.house.gov
- Corinne Hart, Executive Assistant to the Executive Director: United Nations Foundation, Washington, DC phone: (714) 404-6335 email: hart.corinne@gmail.com
- Jeremy Paul Gallagher, Supply Chain Consultant: Fortna, Inc. Ontario, CA phone: (858) 243-4959 email: jeremypaulgallagher@gmail.com

Sep 2008 - Present

Sep 2001 – June 2005

Dec 2005

N.D. DOBERNECK

	(607) 339-8322	doberneck@yahoo.com	
Education			
UCLA	M.Arch/M.A. – Architecture + Urban Plannin Dual-degree program in Architecture and U Focus on urban design and land developmen	ng Los Angeles, CA rban Planning. nt.	present
Cornell Univ.	B.S Urban and Regional Studies Emphasis on planning theory and macroeco	Ithaca, NY nomic analysis.	2005
Experience			
China Academy of • Summer intern • Wrote a land-u • Created land-u • Presented lectur • Researched glo	Urban Planning & Design - Intern n for top-level urban planning and design institutes recommendation report for YanJiao new tow use and urban design diagrams and graphics fo ures on American systems of land-use and zoni obal trends on megapolitan regional growth pa	Beijing, China a quasi-governmental agen wn – a greenfield development or YanJiao new town. ang to Chinese planning profese tterns.	2009 ncy. for 500,000 people. sionals.
UCLA, Dept. of Un • Teaching Assis • Instructed stud	ban Planning –Teaching Assistant stant for graduate-level law class (Prof. Cecelia dents on means and methods of legal research,	Los Angeles, CA Estolano) focusing on land-use emphasizing publicly available	2007, 2009 e and urban planning. e sources.
Green Info Netwo • Worked on ex • Generated me	rk - Intern pansive GIS project to update the "Southern Ca tadata and GIS layer editing to match with L.A	Culver City, CA Ilifornia Open Space Database" . County parcel boundaries.	7/06 – 10/06 at the parcel level.
Los Angeles Unifie • Worked direct • Evaluated ven • Incorporated ven	ed School District - Intern ly for OAR during reprogramming and redesig dors for qualifications and gathered bid estima various contractual design requirements to mee	Los Angeles, CA gn of traditional school into a le ites. et change order specifications.	11/05 – 3/06 earning academy.
North Brooklyn D Participated ir Worked for co Identified add Created biling Participated ir	evelopment Corporation a the Cornell Urban Scholars Program. mmunity non-profit serving the predominately itional funding sources for both program speci- ual marketing brochure and assisted in the age a community seminars regarding rezoning, incl	Greenpoint, Brooklyn, N 7 Polish neighborhood of Greer fic and general operations grar ncy's Strategic Plan overhaul. usionary zoning, and local emj	NYC 5/03 – 8/03 npoint. nts. ployment retention.
Computer Skills			
statistics: GIS: office: CAD: graphic:	SPSS 13.0 ArcMap GIS 9.1 Microsoft Pro/XP/Vista Word / Excel / Power Autodesk AutoCad 2008, Form-Z 4.0, Rhino Adobe CS3 Photoshop / Illustrator / InDesig	rPoint ceros 4.0 n	

	(607) 339-8322	loberneck@yahoo.com		
Coursework				
urban planning:	Urban Law, Urban Design, Planning Theory, Planning History, History of American Cities,			
	Devolution & Privatization, Industrial Restruct	uring, Participatory Planning V	Vorkshops,	
	Community Outreach & Education, Community	y Design Charette, GIS		
architecture:	Architectural History, Architectural Theory, Ges	stalt Imagery, Drafting, Site Pla	nning, Freehand	
	Sketching and Illustration, Design Fundamenta	ls, Design Studio, Landscape S	tudio, Structures,	
	Transit Oriented Design Studio, Steel House St	udio, Architectural Programmi	ng	
mathematics:	Introductory Statistics, Quantitative Analysis, N	Jewtonian Physics, Transportat	tion Engineering	
ecology:	Urban Ecology, Green/LEED Design & Building	s, Environmental Biology, Org	anic Chemistry	
finance:	Microeconomics, Regional Economies, Applied	Microeconomics of Urban Plar	ning	
business:	Real Estate Investment & Development, Afford	able Housing Development, Ne	egotiations	
law:	Land Use Law			
Competition				
• ULI	Gerald Hines Student Urban Design Competition	on Los Angeles, CA	2006, 2007, 2009	
• Prop X	"Inventing the Next L.A." (UCLA's CityLab)	Los Angeles, CA	2006	

N.D. DOBERNECK

Eric Douglas

249 S. Doheny Dr. apt C Beverly Hills, CA 90211

ACCREDITATION:

310-858-8482

eric@ericscottdouglas.com www.ericscottdouglas.com

- Licensed Architect (California and New York)
- Licensed Contractor (California C-6)
- Credentialed Teacher (California)
- LEED Accredited Professional

EXPERIENCE:

Owner of Douglas Fine Cabinetry in Beverly Hills, CA during 2008-2010

- Designed, fabricated, and installed residential kitchens and commercial showrooms
- Taught woodworking classes at Beverly Hills High School and Beverly Hills Adult School

Project Architect at Van Tillburg Architects in Santa Monica, CA during 2007-2008

 Produced Design Development drawings (DD) and Construction Documents (CD) for single-residentoccupancy and multi-family construction, including 1 million SF mixed-use, urban infill, Transit-Oriented-Development complex in Hollywood, CA.

Project Architect at Terjesen Associates, Architects in New York, NY during 2005-2007

- Produced DD and CD for 110,000 S.F. mixed-use residential/medical/retail facility.
- Produced DD and CD for 144-unit senior housing project.
- Produced Schematic Design drawings for hospital renovation.
- Presented designs to clients.
- Coordinated engineering drawings.
- Managed 1-4 drafters.

Drafter at CMA Design Studio in New York, NY during 2004-2005

- Surveyed and produced as-built drawings for historic preservation projects and residential renovation/addition projects.
- Produced construction drawings for aircraft hangar/office space project.
- · Produced schematic design presentations for several office and residential projects.
- Coordinated and produced construction drawings and computer renderings for commercial and residential projects.

Production Manager at Adonis Kitchen Designers in Queens, NY during 2003-2004

- Designed kitchens and interiors for residential and retail projects.
- Produced shop drawings, cost estimates, and contracts.
- Oversaw all phases of cabinet design, fabrication, and installation.

Drafter at various architectural firms in the San Francisco Bay Area, CA during 1999-2003

- Produced construction drawings and models for healthcare, educational, industrial, and residential projects.
- Performed forensic investigations of existing structures and construction administration for new projects.

AFFILIATIONS United States Green Building Council . American Institute of Architects Urban Land Institute • EDUCATION: University of California at Los Angeles Master of Architecture/Master of Arts in Urban Planning expected in 2010 • Leaders in Sustainability Certificate expected in 2010 University of California at Berkeley Bachelor of Arts, Architecture in 1999 • CAPABILITIES: AutoCAD, Revit, MAX/VIZ, Maya, Rhino, ArcGIS, Photoshop, Illustrator, Word, Excel • Excellent organizational ability and attention to detail •

- Excellent written, oral, and graphic communication skills
- Excellent in teamwork and leadership roles

LAUREN FINKEL

7801 Denrock Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90045 Lauren.m.finkel@gmail.com (310) 261-3923

EDUCATION

University of California at Los Angeles

Master of Arts – Urban Planning (Current Student) Transportation Policy and Planning Concentration

University of California at Los Angeles

Bachelor of Arts – Geography / Environmental Studies Minor – Urban and Regional Studies Minor – Public Policy Magna Cum Laude GPA – 3.84 Dean's Honor List – Spring Quarter 2006, Fall Quarter 2006, Winter Quarter 2007 Geography Scholarship from UCLA Friends of Geography (FoG) – Recipient

Santa Monica College

Completed Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) GPA – 3.6 Dean's Honor List – Fall Semester 2003, Spring Semester 2005

Santa Monica College Sustainable Works Program - Spring 2005

Nine week voluntary educational program designed for interested students to learn methods of sustainable living and resource conservation

06/06-Present

Ballona Wetlands community service

EXPERIENCE

Assistant project Manager for Craig Lawson & Co., LLC, Land Use Consultants

- Prepare applications for land use entitlements
- Conduct land use and zoning research
- Prepare application exhibits
- Prepare exhibits for public hearings
- Coordinate client meetings with public officials

TECHNICAL SKILLS

٠

Microsoft Office Geographic Information Systems AutoCad

ADDITIONAL EXPERIENCE

Corporate Receptionist for Security Industry Specialists	10/05-09/06
Corporate Receptionist for Stonebridge Holdings and Affiliated Firms	07/04-10/05

KEVIN FINKEL

7801 Denrock Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90045 kevin.a.finkel@gmail.com (310) 350-1307

EDUCATION

Master of Arts, Urban Planning University of California at Los Angeles Expected Graduation Date: June 2010

Bachelor of Arts, International Studies: Emphasis in Economics and Anthropology University of California at San Diego December 2005

RELEVANT WORK EXPERIENCE

Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles, Planning Intern

Projects include:

- Proposition 84 grant eligibility
- Council District 9 Corridors South of the Santa Monica Freeway Redevelopment
 Plan Amendment
- Slauson Wall Park project Initial Study
- Inventory of Restaurants and Schools in South Los Angeles
- General Field Work

Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, Assistant Environmental Planner

Responsibilities

- Write Initial Studies, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, and Environmental Impact Reports
- Conduct field work including land use surveys, site photography, and ambient noise level monitoring
- Produce and distribute project documents and conduct public notification
- Correspondence with public agencies regarding projects

Projects include:

- Tierra Luna (Environmental Impact Report)
- Temple Israel of Hollywood (Environmental Impact Report)
- Plan Amendment/Valley Plaza, and Laurel Plaza Development (Environmental Impact Report)
- The Weatherly Project (Environmental Impact Report)
- Seaglass Townhomes (Environmental Impact Report)
- Providence Holycross Medical Center (Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration)
- Jefferson at Hollywood Residential/Retail Project (Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration)
 - 959 Seward Street Project (Environmental Impact Report)
 - 30th Street West and Avenue K Projects (Environmental Impact Report)

Environmental Legislation Intern, Washington, D.C. Office of United States Senator Dianne Feinstein 9/05-12/05

Legislative Duties

- Research for proposed or future environmental legislation
- Write memos to the Senator and my legislative counsel to apprise them of the status of and my recommendation regarding legislation
- Collect co-sponsors for legislation
- Circulate "Dear Colleague" letters asking for support on legislation or resolutions

8/06-5/09

9/09-Present

Projects include:

- Research to support National Park Service Bill affecting the San Francisco Maritime National Historic Park and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area
- Initial research to determine course of action regarding the possible designation of Walters Camp (in California along the Colorado River) as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern
- Research to support a Senate resolution commemorating the National Audubon Society's Centennial

Administrative Duties

- Give tours of the U.S. Capitol Building to California Constituents
- Process document requests and event invitations

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

American Planning Association

9/08-Present

Ruby Horta

M.A Urban Planning Candidate 2010

Contact

Cell Phone : 209-631-9550 E-mail : rubyhorta@gmail.com

Address

12225 Pacific Ave. Apt #6, Los Angeles, CA 90066

Profile

ObjectiveI am seeking a position as an Associate Planner.**Availability**From June 2010.

Course Work			
Geographic Information Systems	Sectoral Analysis	Business Management	Water Resources
Macroeconomic Theory	Statistical Analysis (Data Desk)	Political & Economic Development	Geographic Economy
Development and Growth Economic Theory	Economic Development & Cultural Change	Portuguese	Public Finance

Education

Eddoddoff		
	2008 to 2010	Masters in Urban Planning University of California, Los Angeles.
	2004 to 2008	Bachelor in International Development and Spanish University of California, Los Angeles.

Work Experience

Caldwell Flores and Winters, Inc. Full-time		
Project Manager	June 2010 – Present	
✓ Finance and plan schools and community colleges.		
✓ Assist with survey design to evaluate community's priorities		
Community Career Development, Inc., Los Angeles, CA	Internship	
Researcher	January to August, 2009	
 ✓ Assisted with the development of a Logistics and Goods Movement Training program 		
\checkmark Began the research to develop a "Green Jobs" training program		
Atwater Elementary School District, Atwater, CA Part-time job		
Substitute Teacher/CELDT Tester July to September 2008		
✓ Performed duties as a teacher for grade levels K-8		
✓ Trained new substitutes to conduct CELDT testing		
\checkmark Translated school paperwork and flyers for teachers and parents		
Skills		
✓ PC, and Macintosh and software		
 Windows 98, ME, 2000, XP, 2003, MAC OS X Panther 		

- ✓ Adobe Photoshop 6
- ✓ GIS

Languages

Spanish (native)

English (fluent)

Portuguese (basic)

Scott John

826 2nd Street #205 | Santa Monica, CA 90403 | scottmjohn@gmail.com | 310.570.5308

Summary My planning and project management experience has helped me to become an adept problem solver who can easily communicate with coworkers, contractors and the public alike. This experience has shown that I have the ability to stay organized and perform under pressure and short timeframes.

Experience U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Los Angeles, CA Project Manager

- Currently managing two American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (stimulus) projects totaling \$10.5 million which requires extensive reporting to executive management and meeting aggressive project schedule and funding milestones
- Successfully managed and executed over \$4.5M in maintenance dredging and construction contracts in 2008-2009 at federal navigation projects in commercial and recreational harbors in Southern California
- Met tight project schedules in order to execute a maintenance dredging project ahead of an environmental window thereby saving the government money by avoiding contractor standby costs

URS Corporation New Orleans, LA & Gaithersburg, MD Urban Planner & Emergency Preparedness Planner

1/06 - 9/06

9/06 - Present

- Met stringent deadlines while writing the 2006 State of Louisiana Hurricane Evacuation Plan for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
- Worked closely with the FEMA Gulf Coast Recovery Office during the 2006 hurricane season to coordinate and ensure the readiness of evacuation transportation, emergency shelters and medical evacuation in the state of Louisiana
- Provided technical assistance to the Louisiana Recovery Authority in the value assessment and plan production process, working primarily on the \$17M Canal Street Redevelopment Strategy
- Organized and hosted the Louisiana Speaks Planning Day for Orleans Parish
- Worked with the New Orleans Downtown Development District to create and implement the Façade Improvement Grant Program and the Louisiana Building Rehabilitation Subcode

City of Seattle Department of Planning & Development Seattle, WA 2/05 – 5/05 Urban Design Intern

- Independently researched, designed and created an informational notebook on the Northgate Urban Center Revitalization Project which was used as a reference tool for city departments and the general public
- Part of a team that organized and ran the Northgate Urban Center Revitalization Project Technical Design Charrette

Well developed written and interpersonal communication skills that are put to use on a daily basis in

Education	University of California, Los Angeles M.A. Urban Planning
	The University of Arizona
	B.S. Regional Development
Affiliations	LEED – Green Associate
& Training	UCLA - Leaders in Sustainability Graduate Certificate
-	U.S. Army Leadership Development Course – February, 2007
	FEMA Emergency Management Institute – Professional Development Series – June, 2006
Skills	Proficient with Microsoft Office, Adobe Illustrator, Photoshop & InDesign; familiar with ArcGIS, AutoCAD

dealing with coworkers, contractors and the public through my job as a project manager

KEVIN LOUIS BARSAMIAN KAHN

974 S. Gramercy Place #202, Los Angeles, CA 90019 Phone: (415) 246-4395 Email: <u>kkahn1@ucla.edu</u>

Education:

University of California, Los Angeles

- September, 2008-June, 2010
- Masters of Arts in Urban Planning,
 - Emphasis in Transportation and Land Use Planning
- Institute of Transportation Studies Fellowship Recipient
- Comprehensive Project: *Transit-Oriented Development at the LAMTA Orange Line Sepulveda Station*

University of California at Berkeley

- Bachelors of Arts with High Honors: May, 2008
- Major: Geography (Physical), Minor: City and Regional Planning
- Senior Honors Thesis: Current and Future Urbanization and the Need for Cumulative Impacts Analysis in the California Delta
- Cumulative GPA: 3.85
- Phi Beta Kappa Inductee 2008

Work Experience:

United States Environmental Protection Agency

- April, 2009-Present (Full time summer and part time during school year)
- Paid Intern in Air Division, Air Planning Office, working with regional air quality agencies and metropolitan planning organizations on Regional Transportation Plans, Transportation Improvement Programs, and projects to ensure air quality conformity with State Implementation Plans

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

- May, 2008-September, 2008
- Paid Intern in Water Resources Planning division, working on water recycling projects within San Francisco

United States Environmental Protection Agency

- May, 2007-August, 2007
- Paid Intern in Water Division, Wetlands Regulatory Office issuing Clean Water Act §404 fill/discharge water permits, determining Federal jurisdiction, and reviewing impact assessments

United States Environmental Protection Agency

- May, 2006-August, 2006
- Paid Intern in Water Division, Enforcement & Compliance Office, ensuring compliance with Clean Water Act water quality standards

UC Berkeley Center of Environmental Design Research

- January, 2007-May, 2008
- Paid campus research assisting Professor Matt Kondolf on the National River Restoration Science Synthesis research project documenting the effectiveness of restorations on 40 creeks in Northern California
- Approximate hours/week: 10

Awards, Honors, and Extracurricular Activities

University of California Institute of Transportation Studies Fellowship

• Graduate fellowship recipient

UC Berkeley Geography Department Oberlander Award Winner

• Outstanding Physical Geography Graduate, Class of 2008

David A. Rose Scholarship in Physical Geography

- Outstanding senior physical geographer at UC Berkeley
- Received: November, 2007

Golden Key International Honour Society Scholar

- Top 15% of class at Berkeley
- Received: October, 2005 (Sophomore honor recipient winner) & February, 2007 (Full membership)

California Alumni Association Leadership Award Scholarship

- Outstanding scholar and leader on Berkeley campus
- Received: October, 2006 & October, 2007

Federal Managers' Association Scholarship

- Honorable mention, with monetary award
- Received: September, 2007

United States Environmental Protection Agency "On-the-Spot" Award

- Recognition for outstanding work
- Received: August, 2006

University of California Marching Band

- August, 2004-May, 2008
- Played trombone and marched a new pregame and halftime show for every home football game, basketball game, selected roadtrips, and various campus/community events
- Approximate hours/week: 25 (volunteer)

Personal Info

Andrew K. Lee 2125 S. Beverly Glen Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90025

Ph. 916-606-6196 Email. anklee80@gmail.com

Resume

Objective

Seeking a mid-level urban/transportation planning or spatial analyst position that will develop my traffic modeling, statistical analysis, design, and public presentation skills in a progressive, sustainable-practice oriented organization.

Work History

COMMUNITIES FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, HUNTINGTON PARK CA Consultant Dec. 2009 – Mar. 2010

Researched environmentally preferable alternatives to the I-710 freeway widening in Los Angeles. Project focused on the effects on low-income and minority residents living along the freeway, which serves heavy freight from the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.
 Summarized engineering, finance, environmental justice, public health, and economic studies for community planners / activists as a report and presentation.

UCLA DEPARTMENT OF URBAN PLANNING Graduate Student Researcher Oct. 2008 – Dec. 2009

- Analyzed immigrant travel behavior using statistical software (STATA) and GIS. Data sources included Census data, microdata (PUMS, CTPP, and LEHD), and SCAG travel demand model output.

OMNI-MEANS, LTD., ROSEVILLE (SACRAMENTO) CA Transportation Engineer / Planner April 2004 – August 2008

Created travel demand models using CUBE and TransCAD software
 Processed land use and socioeconomic data using ArcMap
 Prepared the Circulation Element for General Plans under consultation with city, county, and state agency staff.

- Calculated Traffic Impact Fees working collaboratively with county staff and developers.

Created traffic impact studies for Environmental Impact Reports.
Presented technical results before city councils and planning commissions, and answered questions posed by the general public.
Prepared project scopes of work, budgets, and schedules; managed projects and up to two team members under the supervision of a senior project manager.

Education

University of California, Los Angeles Master of Art in Urban Planning (2010)

Calif. Poly. State Univ., San Luis Obispo Bachelor of Science, Civil Engineering (2002)

Software Knowledge

ArcMap GeoDA Adobe Illustrator CS4 STATA / SPSS AutoCAD SketchUp CUBE / TP+Viper / TransCAD HCS, Synchro, Traffix

Licenses and Publications California Traffic Engineer (TR2455)

Blumenberg, Evelyn, Michael Smart, and Andrew Lee (2010) Commute Distance and Ethnic Neighborhoods. <u>Transportation Research Board 89th</u> <u>Annual Meeting, 2010</u> (10-3814).

OBJECTIVE To succeed.

EDUCATION

UCLA

- B.A. Sociology/Anthropology
- M.A. Urban Planning 2010
- Masters of Business Administration: In progress, to be completed 2011.

EXPERIENCE

Business Analyst• Rehab Green – March 2009-October 2009

- Assist in the conception, formalization, and registration of the business.
- Identify foreclosed properties, and select investment options.
- Provide documentation necessary to close escrow and Real Estate transaction.
- Coordinate rehabilitation activities for properties to be rehabbed.
- Prepare and maintain cost itemization for each property.
- Serve as liason between existing tenants (often Spanish speaking), and firm.
- Create partnerships with local agencies supportive of restoring old housing stock.
- Create advertising and marketing materials, as well as designed a promotional campaign.
- Design new organizational systems to improve efficiency in the organization.

Graduate Research Associate® Chicano Studies Research Ctr. – November 2008-October 2009

- Collect media clips and transcripts for extensive qualitative analysis.
- Design instruments for qualitative research analysis.
- Create partnerships with agencies interested in the center's research.
- · Collect and analyze data, and prepare reports for publication.
- Research new technologies regarding sequencing, creation, and analysis of audio and video.

Administrative Assistant. County of Santa Barbara Department of Public Healt 2007

- Greet the public, customers, and other County employees in person or over the phone, and obtain or give information; explain policies and procedures to inform customers of correct processes; transfer calls and take messages; assist customers in completing forms and documents; schedule customers for appointments dispense and receive documents such as applications, time sheets, and invoices, and verifies them to ensure accuracy and completeness.
- Design or modify filing systems to improve efficiency and effectiveness; file information alphabetically, numerically, and chronologically according to off ce procedure to maintain organized and accurate filing systems; locate and retrieve files from manual or computerized systems to provide requested information; create new files and purges old files; update and correct file information to maintain accurate files; merge and assemble files to maintain records; deliver and pick up files to provide requested information.

- Following specified formats, type a variety of documents including memos, letters, reports,
- Minutes, labels, and correspondence for review by the chief officers.
- Collect and analyze data, and prepare reports for publication.
- Research new technologies regarding sequencing, creation, and analysis of audio and video.
- Complete various forms to process requests or claims, and create analysis documents Such as charts, forms, and logs to meet department needs.

SKILLS

- Bilingual (fluent in Spanish)
- Graphic Design.
- Knowledge of Real Estate laws and principles.
- Business plan development, business analyst
- Land Development Analysis.
- Audio engineering, recording, music production.
- Management training.

REFERENCES FURNISHED UPON REQUEST.

Have a positive day.

Steven Mateer 5361 Russell Avenue #301, Los Angeles, CA, 90027 Tel: 909-967-852 Email: stevenmateer@gmail.com

OBJECTIVE: Assistant Planner

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles

Real Estate and Economic Development Intern

August 2009- Present

- Conduct industry sector studies for 7 CRA regions highlighting top employers, number of companies, and growth industries. Data used for development of sector-specific economic development strategies and meet CRA/LA Strategic Goal for Business Outreach.
- Perform real estate analysis with an emphasis on comparables and site selection.
- Assist with the development of an agencywide Industrial Incentive Program through research, interviews, and report writing.
- Develop a report on fashion industry councils that compares best practices from similar industry groups and recommends strategies for Los Angeles.
- Assisted with data analysis and marketing materials for the Food Retailers Incentive Program.
 - Maintain database of over 250 business assistance providers in Southern California.

Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation Economic and Policy Research Intern August 2008- August 2009

June 2007 to June 2008

- Manage the development of the Consensus Strategic Plan for Economic Development in Los Angeles
 County.
- · Assist with economic impact analysis for various projects and companies.
- Draft policy briefs on AB 32, smart growth, and SB 375.

San Diego Unified Port District

Environmental Services Intern

- Marina and other facility inspections for water discharge compliance.
- Research on green buildings for the proposed green port program and writing of Board Memos
 regarding sustainability issues such as recycling programs, greenhouse gases, and alternative modes
 of commuting.
- Clean Air Program: research on cold-ironing, assist with Carl Moyer Funding Application for coldironing infrastructure.
- Xeriscape Study included field photography, writing a native landscape RFP.
- Water quality and turbidity sampling.
- Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan: Assisted staffs with writing sections, permit enforcement, writing of Notice of Violation letters.

Centre City Development Corporation

March 2006 to January 2007

Planning Intern

- AutoCAD and GIS mapping for the Centre City Advisory Committee, Little Italy parking study, C Street Master plan, and social service locations in downtown San Diego.
- C Street Master Plan for CCDC. Filing, public outreach, assisting with meetings, site analysis with AutoCAD, and research.
- Little Italy Land Use Study involving resident and owner interviews and density analysis.
- East Village and Marina District Parking Study included surveys, field photography, and GIS mapping.
- Lead on the Workforce Housing Reward Program application process for CCDC.

UCSD Physical Planning

March 2005 to March 2006

STEVEN MATEER Page 2

Planning Intern

- LEED transportation modeling for UCSD, which included identifying all transit stops within a half-mile radius from new and proposed buildings on campus.
- Bio-resources tracking for UCSD. Data input on environmental impacts and mitigation measures for new development on the UCSD campus and development of AutoCAD visual layout.
- Density study for UCSD East Campus.
- UCSD Park Survey using AutoCAD and field surveys.

EDUCATION:

University of California, Los Angeles Master of Arts in Urban Planning

Specialization in Transportation Policy and Planning

University of California, San Diego Bachelor of Arts in Urban Studies and Planning; Minor Environmental Studies Specialization in Urban and Regional Planning Los Angeles, CA September 2008 to June 2010

La Jolla, CA September 2004 to June 2008

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENTS:

- UCLA Institute of Transportation Studies Fellowship Spring 2010- TA position
- 2008-2009 San Diego Port with No Borders Scholarship Recipient
- UCSD Department of Urban Studies and Planning Honors with Distinction
- Cum Laude graduate from UCSD

SKILLS:

- · Proficient with MS Office programs, especially MS Word, Excel, and PowerPoint
- Excellent research and analytic skills
- 10 years of public speaking experience
- Eagle Scout
- Prior experience with AutoCAD and GIS
- Ability to learn new programs/methods quickly

Jacqueline A. Torres

Address: 3127 Bagley Ave #105 Los Angeles, CA 90034 Tel: (408) 772-6134 Email: jatorres03@gmail.com

EDUCATION

M.A. Urban Planning, Transportation Concentration

University of California at Los Angeles, School of Public Affairs Degree Completed: 06/2010

B.S. Political Science (Double Major Spanish Studies)

Minor – International Relations Santa Clara University (Santa Clara, Ca) Degree Completed: 06/2003

WORK EXPERIENCE

Internship - Institute of Transportation and Development Policy (ITDP) Rio de Janeiro, Brazil - 06/09-09/09

- Responsible for coordinating with government officials and city representatives for Car Free Day in Rio de Janeiro, September 22, 2009 Responsible for translating organizational documents (English/Spanish/Portuguese) Assisted in establishing ITDP office in Rio de Janeiro Assisted on city and state Bus Rapid Transit projects Assisted in the organization and execution of Non-Motorized and Bus Rapid Transit events in Rio de Janeiro •

Program Assistant, Environment Program - The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Menlo Park, CA - 02/05-08/08

- Responsible for support of two program officers in Menlo Park and staff in Mexico City
- Responsible for coordinating and organizing high-level seminars and technical meetings (often off-site or international), research projects and translation of documents as needed
- Responsible for managing grants in Latin America and California, including reviewing grant proposals, budget, drafting summaries, and
- Responsible for maintaining open communications with grantees throughout Latin America and California
- Responsible for training and assisting in hiring new program staff

Receptionist/Legal Secretary Trainee Littler Mendelson, P.C. New York, NY - 06/04-11/04

- Responsible for translating documents (English/Spanish) throughout nationwide offices.
- Responsible for all incoming invoices from various venders and managing respective invoice transmittals for both the New York and Newark Offices. Manage monthly booking of all attorney and staff in house appointments
- Responsible for entering billable/non-billable time for a given attorney. Responsible for directing all incoming calls and faxes.

- Assist Regional Marketing Manager on various projects including breakfast briefings and nationwide/regional marketing information. Assist secretarial staff with overflow work such as proofing/editing litigation documents.

- Assist in attorney recruiting.

Receptionist/Legal Secretary Trainee Littler Mendelson, P.C. San Jose, CA - 10/03-06/04

- Responsible for directing all incoming calls. Assisted secretarial staff with attorney inner office reservations and appointments.
- Managed monthly invoices for all lunch orders and parking validations. Ran by-weekly reports of various vender invoices and attorney expense • reports.

SPECIALIZED/ADDITIONAL SKILLS

- Proficient on Mac and PC computers
- Software Programs: ArcGIS, MS Office (Access, Excel, PowerPoint, Word) MacPac, iManage, InterAction, LawCruit, Hot Docs, Worldox, GIFTS
- Trained in public speaking, leadership and management techniques and . training.
- Trained as peer crisis counselor ٠
- Frequent volunteer for numerous charities and non-profits.

LANGUAGES

(Native in English & Spanish) Reading Writing Speaking Spanish Excellent Excellent Excellent Portuguese Excellent Excellent Excellent

