Appendix A – Environmental Checklist

Environmental Checklist Form

Introduction

This Initial Study has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines as amended to determine if the proposed Bay Theater Restoration Project at 340 Main Street in the City of Seal Beach (City) will have the potential to cause significant effects on the environment. The City of Seal Beach will use the Initial Study in deciding whether to approve the Project and whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), approve a Negative Declaration (ND), or approve a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) with mitigation measures.

Project Background

a) Project Title:

Bay Theater Restoration Project

b) Lead Agency Name and Address:

City of Seal Beach 211 Eighth Street Seal Beach, CA 90740

c) Contact Person and Phone Number:

Steven Fowler, Assistant Planner City of Seal Beach 211 Eighth Street Seal Beach, CA 90740 (562) 431-2527, ext. 1316

d) Project Location:

The Project is located at 340 Main Street in the City of Seal Beach, Orange County, California.

e) Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Paul T. Dunlap Dunlap Property Group 810 E. Chapman Ave, Suite 233 Fullerton, CA 92831

f) General Plan Designation:

Commercial-Service

g) Zoning:

MSSP - Main Street Specific Plan

h) **Description of Project**: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the Project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

The Bay Theater is located at 340 Main Street in the Old Town area of the City of Seal Beach near the intersection with Pacific Coast Highway. The Project involves restoration of the theater into a luxury entertainment venue that will feature art movies and live entertainment designed to be integrated with the surrounding environment of restaurants and boutiques in the Old Town area of the City.

The existing building features slightly more than 7,000 square feet in three stories with the first-floor theater comprising about 5,000 square feet and 475 seats. The concession area in the theater's lobby will feature high-quality pre-packaged snacks, beer, wine and non-alcoholic beverages. Patrons will also have the choice of bringing food into the theater to encourage patronage of surrounding restaurants to create a symbiotic environment in the Old Town area of the community.

The proposed renovation will also restore a combined 2,200 square feet of office and apartment space on the second and third floors of the building. The third-floor apartment will be utilized by the on-site management firm that will run the facility. The theater auditorium will be used for holiday-themed and community event movies as well as art house films and live entertainment. The Bay Theater would be available to host a variety of live entertainment acts predicated on compatibility with the Seal Beach community. Proposed hours of operation will range between 10 a.m. and 12 a.m. dependent upon the event. Numbers of employees and security personnel would also be dependent on the event.

Bay Theater event parking will be provided primarily on an off-site basis at the parking lot of the nearby Chase Bank. The parking will be managed by a professional valet firm. The bank parking lot can provide up to 80 spaces. Other spaces are available within the City's 10th Street Parking Area and throughout Main Street. It is anticipated that many theater patrons will use on-demand shuttles and taxis to reach Bay Theater events. It is also expected that many will walk to the theater from surrounding neighborhoods in the pedestrian-oriented community of Old Town.

i) Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

Surrounding and nearby land uses to the Project site include commercial establishments, restaurants, boutiques and residential areas and streets.

j) Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

Orange County Fire Authority

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this Project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- □ Aesthetics
- □ Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- □ Air Quality
- □ Biological Resources
- □ Cultural Resources
- □ Geology and Soils
- □ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- □ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- □ Hydrology and Water Quality
- □ Land Use and Planning

- □ Mineral Resources
- Noise
- □ Population and Housing
- Public Services
- □ Recreation
- □ Transportation and Circulation
- □ Tribal Cultural Resources
- □ Utilities and Service Systems
- □ Mandatory Findings of Significance

Determination

(To be completed by the Lead Agency) On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	Ø
I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made by or agreed to by the Project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	
I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	
"potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.	
I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed Project, nothing further is required.	

Submitted by: City of Seal Beach

Prepared by: Hodge & Associates

E Hodge William E. Hodge

Hodge & Associates

4-21-17

Date

Appendix A-4

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

- 1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project screening analysis).
- 2. All answers must take account the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less then significant with mitigation, or less then significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence then an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4. "Negative Declaration: Less Then Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less then significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration, Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describes the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). References to a previously prepared or outside documents should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8. This is only a suggested form, and the lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agency should normally address the questions from the checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.
- 10. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to *California Public Resources Code* §21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

City of Seal Beach Environmental Checklist

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. A	ESTHETICS				
Wo	uld the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				\checkmark
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				\square
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				\checkmark
II. A	GRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES				
Wo	uld the project:				
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				V
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				Ø
c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				Ŋ
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				V
e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				V
	AIR QUALITY				
Wo	uld the project:				
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			\checkmark	
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?			Ŋ	
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			R	
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				V
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				V

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
	uld the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				Ø
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impeded the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				V
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				Ø
V. C	ULTURAL RESOURCES				
Wou	uld the project:				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				V
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				Ø
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				V
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				\square
VI. (GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
	Would the project:				
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	 Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. 			R	
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			V	
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			V	
	iv) Landslides?				V
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				V

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				Ø
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18- 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			Ø	
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				
VII.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
Wou	Id the project:				
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			Ø	
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			Ŋ	
VIII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				
Wou	Id the project:				
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				V
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				V
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites which complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			Ø	
e)	For a project within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				Ø
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				V
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				V
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				Ŋ
IX.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
Wou	Id the project:				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				V
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				V
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of a course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site?				V
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				V
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				Ŋ
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				\square
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				A
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			V	
X. L	AND USE AND PLANNING				
Wo	uld the proposal:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?				V
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				Ŋ
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				Ø
XI.	MINERAL RESOURCES				
Wo	uld the project:				
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				\square
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				N
XII.	NOISE				
	uld the project result in:				
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			V	
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				Ø
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			Ø	
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			V	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
XIII.	POPULATION AND HOUSING				
Wou	Id the project:				
a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				Ø
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				V
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				₹ I
XIV.	PUBLIC SERVICES				
a)	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	Fire protection?				\checkmark
	Police protection?				\checkmark
	Schools?				\checkmark
	Parks?				\checkmark
	Other public facilities?				V
XV.	RECREATION				
a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				V
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction of or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				V
	TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC				
	Id the project:				
a)	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				
b)	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			V	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				V
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				V
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?				\checkmark
f)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance of safety of such facilities?				Ŋ
XVII	. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
a)	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
	 Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or 				V
	 A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe 				g
XVII	I. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS				
Wou	Id the project:				
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				\checkmark
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				Ø
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				V
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				V
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				V

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV	III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major period of California history or prehistory?				Ŋ
b)	Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?				Ŋ
c)	Does the project have possible environmental effects which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				Ŋ
d)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				V

XIX. EARLIER ANALYSES

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D).

In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets:

- a) Earlier analyses used. Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
- b) Impacts adequately addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
- c) Mitigation measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

Source List

The following enumerated documents are available at the offices of the City of Seal Beach, Community Development Department, 211 Eighth Street, Seal Beach, California 90740.

- 1. City of Seal Beach General Plan Policies, Adopted 12/03
- 2. California Environmental Quality Act as amended January 1, 2016. §§21000-21178 of the *California Public Resources Code*
- 3. Guidelines for California Environmental Quality Act as amended January 1, 2016 §15000-15387 of the *California Code of Regulations*, Title 14, Chapter 3, State of California
- 4. City of Seal Beach Land Use Element, Adopted 12/03
- 5. City of Seal Beach Open Space/Conservation Element Adopted 12/03
- 6. City of Seal Beach Noise Element, Adopted 12/03
- 7. City of Seal Beach Circulation Element, Adopted 12/03
- 8. Zoning Map, City of Seal Beach
- 9. Air Quality and GHG Impact Analysis, prepared by Giroux & Associates, dated April 11, 2017
- 10. Noise Impact Analysis prepared by Giroux and Associates, dated April 12, 2017
- 11. Federal Flood Insurance Rate Map, Panel No. 06059C-0226J, 2009
- 12. <u>https://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov</u>
- 13. City of Seal Beach Safety Element, Adopted 12/03
- 14. Focus Traffic Analysis, Kunzman Associates, February 15, 2017