

## 3.2 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section summarizes existing and projected traffic conditions in the County's Planning Area. The County's Planning Area consists of unincorporated land outside the City's Planning Area and adopted Sphere of Influence (SOI) but within the One Valley One Vision (OVOV) Planning Area boundaries. The City of Santa Clarita's (City) Planning Area consists of its incorporated boundaries and adopted SOI. Both the County and City Planning Areas comprise the OVOV Planning Area. Information on existing and proposed traffic conditions was provided by a traffic impact analysis prepared by Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. (2010), which is included in **Appendix 3.2**.<sup>1</sup>

Buildout of the County's proposed Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan Update in place of the existing Area Plan would reduce traffic on the County's roadways, including those monitored by the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP), and at principal intersections. However, without implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be potentially significant. Implementation of the proposed Area Plan Update would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses, result in inadequate emergency access, or generate a parking demand that exceeds municipal code-required parking capacity. Furthermore, implementation of the proposed Area Plan would promote policies, plans, and programs supporting alternative transportation, and remove hazards and barriers to pedestrians and bicyclists. Therefore, with the implementation of mitigation measures potential traffic and circulation impacts would be less than significant.

### EXISTING CONDITIONS

#### Vehicle Circulation System

##### *Introduction*

##### **Arterial Roadways**

Traffic can be measured by identifying both the capacity and volume of a roadway. "Capacity" refers to the vehicle carrying ability of a roadway, and "volume" is either a traffic count or a forecast for a future point in time. The ratio of the volume to the capacity provides the volume/capacity (V/C) ratio. Intersection capacity utilization (ICU) is a measure of the V/C ratio for an intersection. Based on the V/C ratio and ICU value, a corresponding level of service (LOS) is defined. The LOS designation of a roadway

---

<sup>1</sup> Austin-Foust Associates, Inc., Technical Report for the Circulation Elements of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan Update (Los Angeles County) and the City of Santa Clarita General Plan Update, (2009).

or intersection indicates whether the capacity is adequate to handle the volume of traffic using the facility. Levels of service provided by street segments and intersections are dependent upon traffic volumes, number of lanes, whether the roadway is divided, the number of access points (driveways and cross streets) along the roadway, and the lane configuration at intersections. The LOS rating may range from A to F, with LOS A representing free flowing traffic conditions and LOS F representing severe traffic congestion, long queues of traffic, and unstable flows. Traffic flow quality for each LOS rating is provided in **Table 3.2-1, Level of Service Criteria – Roadways and Intersections.**

**Table 3.2-1  
Level of Service Criteria – Roadways and Intersections**

<b>Level of Service</b>	<b>Roadway V/C Ratio &amp; Intersection ICU Ranges</b>	<b>Flow Conditions</b>	<b>Percent of free flow speeds (FFS)</b>
A	0.00 – 0.60	LOS "A" describes primarily free-flow operations at average travel speeds, usually about 90 percent of the FFS for the given street class. Vehicles are completely unimpeded in their ability to maneuver within the traffic stream. Control delay at signalized intersections is normal.	90
B	0.61 – 0.70	LOS "B" describes reasonably unimpeded operations at average travel speeds, usually about 70 percent of the FFS for the street class. Vehicles are completely unimpeded in their ability to maneuver with the traffic stream. Control delay at signalized intersections is minimal.	70
C	0.71 – 0.80	LOS "C" describes stable operations; however, ability to maneuver and change lanes in midblock locations may be more restricted than at LOS "B," and longer queues, adverse signal coordination, or both may contribute to lower average travel speeds of about 50 percent of the FFS for the street class.	50
D	0.81 – 0.90	LOS "D" borders on a range in which small increases in flow may cause substantial increases in delay and decreases in travel speed. LOS "D" may be due to adverse signal progression, inappropriate signal timing, high volumes, or a combination of these factors. Average travel speeds are about 40 percent of FFS.	40
E	0.91 – 1.00	LOS "E" is characterized by significant delays and average travel speeds of 33 percent or less of the FFS. Such operations are caused by a combination of adverse progression, high signal density, high volumes, extensive delays at critical intersections, and inappropriate signal timing.	33
F	Above 1.00	LOS "F" is characterized by urban street flow at extremely low speeds, typically one-third to one-fourth of the FFS. Intersection congestion is likely at critical signalized locations, with high delays, high volumes, and extensive queuing.	25

*Source: Austin-Foust Associates, Inc., 2009.*

Average Daily Traffic (ADT) is a measurement of the average number of vehicles that travel a segment of roadway during a 24-hour period. Arterial roadway segments in the OVOV Planning Area are evaluated using a generalized ADT capacity based on their classifications, each of which is identified in **Table 3.2-2, Roadway Classification Capacities**. The actual capacity of a roadway is based upon a number of factors including the relationships between peak hour and daily traffic volumes, roadway design features (access, intersection geometrics, etc.), the volume of traffic crossing the roadway or turning onto or off of the roadway at intersecting roadways, and the actual turn movements at an intersection.

**Table 3.2-2  
Roadway Classification Capacities**

County Area Plan/City General Plan Classification	Number of Lanes	Ultimate Capacity (Level of Service "E") <sup>1</sup>
Major Arterial Highway	8	72,000
	6	54,000
Secondary Arterial Highway	4	36,000
Limited Secondary Arterial Highway	2	18,000
Collector <sup>2</sup>	2	15,000

Source: Austin-Foust Associates, Inc., 2009.

<sup>1</sup> The ultimate capacity value is an estimate of the physical limit of daily traffic flows (level of service "E") based upon typical suburban peak hour characteristics. This value can vary significantly depending upon volume demand characteristics (i.e., volume of off-peak travel and duration of peak periods) as well as roadway design features (access, spacing, intersection geometrics, etc.).

## Freeways

**Table 3.2-3, Level of Service Criteria – Freeway Segments** summarizes the V/C ratio ranges that correspond to LOS A through F for general freeway segments. The V/C ratio ranges listed for freeway segments are based on the V/C and LOS relationships for basic freeway sections with free-flow speeds of 65 miles per hour, and are specified by the County's Congestion Management Program (CMP) for the evaluation of CMP freeway monitoring stations (the CMP is discussed in greater detail later in the section).

## Roadway Network

**Figure 3.2-1, Existing Roadway Network**, identifies the roadways, including freeways and arterial roadways, within the Santa Clarita Valley. The primary regional roadways serving the Santa Clarita Valley are the Interstate-5 (I-5) and State Route-14 (SR-14) freeways, passing through the Santa Clarita

Valley in the north-south direction, and State Route-126 (SR-126) expressway, which connects the Santa Clarita Valley to Ventura County.

**Table 3.2-3**  
**Level of Service Criteria – Freeway Segments**

LOS	Freeway Segment Volume Density Ranges	Freeway Segment V/C Ratio Ranges
A	0.0 – 11.0	0.00 – 0.30
B	11.1 – 18.0	0.31 – 0.50
C	18.1 – 26.0	0.51 – 0.71
D	26.1 – 35.0	0.72 – 0.89
E	35.1 – 45.0	0.90 – 1.00
F	Above 45.0	Above 1.00

Sources: HCM 2000; Congestion Management Program of Los Angeles County

The I-5 freeway serves inter-regional travel in the north-south direction from California's southern border with Mexico to Washington's northern border with Canada. Within the OVOV Planning Area, the I-5 freeway is classified as an urban interstate. The I-5 freeway generally consists of four mix-flow lanes in each direction through the OVOV area. Through the SR-14 interchange area, the I-5 freeway consists of three mix-flow lanes in each direction along with two dedicated truck bypass lanes which are separated from the mainline lanes. A truck weigh station facility operated by the California Highway Patrol is located on the northbound side of the I-5 freeway just south of the SR-126 interchange. High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes are located just south of the Santa Clarita Valley.

The SR-14 freeway, which runs from the I-5 freeway at Newhall Pass to US 395, is one of the four major north-south corridors serving California. This corridor connects the Eastern Sierra and Western Nevada regions to the Southern California region. The SR-14 freeway is designated as a Super Truck Route (STR), and is also part of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA) truck network, which provides freeway access for oversized trucks. Within Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, the SR-14 freeway serves as a major commuter route between Antelope Valley cities such as Palmdale and Lancaster and the Los Angeles area. Within the OVOV area, the SR-14 freeway generally consists of three to six lanes in each direction, including one HOV lane in each direction. From the I-5 freeway to the Newhall Avenue interchange, there are five mix-flow lanes and one HOV lane in each direction; from the Newhall Avenue interchange to the Golden Valley Road interchange, there are three mix-flow lanes and one HOV lane in

each direction; from the Golden Valley Road interchange to the Sierra Highway interchange, there are four mix-flow lanes and one HOV lane in each direction; from the Sierra Highway interchange to the Sand Canyon Road interchange, there are three mix-flow lanes and one HOV lane in each direction; from the Sand Canyon Road interchange to the Soledad Canyon Road interchange, there are two mix-flow lanes and one HOV lane in each direction; and from the Soledad Canyon Road interchange to the Escondido Canyon Road interchange, there are three mix-flow lanes and one HOV lane in each direction.

Secondary regional access to the County's Planning Area is provided to motorists via SR-126, which extends from the City of Ventura east to the I-5 freeway. SR-126 was once designated along portions of Magic Mountain Parkway and San Fernando Road between the I-5 and SR-14 freeways; however, these roadways were turned over to the City in 2002 and no longer serve as a State highway alignment.

In addition to the above roadways, several major north-south arterials run through the County's Planning Area, including the following:

- Newhall Avenue/Railroad Avenue/Bouquet Canyon Road originates at the southern part of the SR-14 freeway, traverses the Santa Clarita Valley, and terminates at Elizabeth Lake Road, just west of Palmdale, and well north of the OVOV boundaries. The roadway varies in width from two to eight lanes.
- Stevenson Ranch Road/McBean Parkway originates at Pico Canyon Road, traverses the City, and terminates at Copper Hill Drive. The roadway varies in width from four to eight lanes.
- The Old Road originates near the SR-14/I-5 interchange and traverses the entire west side of the Santa Clarita Valley, terminating north of Lake Hughes Road. The roadway varies in width from two to six lanes.
- Sierra Highway originates near the SR-14/I-5 interchange, traverses the Santa Clarita Valley on the east side, and terminates at Angeles Forest Highway just north of the Angeles National Forest and well northeast of the OVOV boundaries. Sierra Highway varies between two to six lanes.

Several east-west arterials serve the Santa Clarita Valley and provide access to the I-5 and SR-14 freeways. Many of these arterials are incomplete and provide access to only portions of the Santa Clarita Valley. These roadways include the following:

- SR-126/Newhall Ranch Road varies from four to eight lanes and provides an interchange to the I-5 freeway and terminates at Golden Valley Road.
- Magic Mountain Parkway originates just west of the I-5 freeway and terminates at Railroad Avenue.
- Valencia Boulevard/Soledad Canyon Road is the main east-west arterial; and varies from two to seven lanes. Valencia Boulevard originates just west of the I-5 freeway, and is renamed to Soledad

Canyon Road at the Bouquet Canyon Road intersection. The roadway terminates to the east of the SR-14 freeway near the Acton Canyon area and well east of the OVOV boundaries. This roadway features interchanges with the I-5 freeway as well as the SR-14 freeway.


- Pico Canyon Road/Lyons Avenue varies from two to six lanes. This stretch of roadway is relatively short, starting west of Stevenson Ranch Parkway in the Santa Susana Mountains and terminating at Railroad Avenue. It also provides an interchange with the I-5 freeway.
- The Cross Valley Connector is a primarily east-west roadway formed by the combination of Newhall Ranch Road and Golden Valley Road. As Newhall Ranch Road, the Cross Valley Connector originates at the SR-126/I-5 interchange and continues east to a terminus east of Bouquet Canyon Road near the Santa Clara River. A future extension of Golden Valley Road will cross the Santa Clara River and connect to Newhall Ranch Road, resulting in a continuous roadway between SR-126 and the SR-14 freeway.

Within the Santa Clarita Valley, connectivity of the street network is interrupted by topographic constraints, including rolling terrain, canyons, and the Santa Clara River. In addition, due to the prevalent pattern of cul-de-sac streets with limited connectivity within residential subdivisions, traffic is funneled onto collector and arterial streets. As a result, regional traffic is concentrated onto a limited number of arterial streets.

### *Existing Levels of Service*

#### **Arterial Roadway Segments**

**Figure 3.2-2, Study Area Roadway Segments**, identifies the study arterial roadway segments included in this analysis. Existing ADT volumes on each study segment are illustrated in **Figure 3.2-3, Existing Average Traffic Volumes**. Traffic counts used to determine these ADT volumes were conducted at various times between 2005 and 2008 by the Traffic and Transportation Planning Division of the City of Santa Clarita Department of Public Works, the Traffic and Lighting division of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, and by various development projects within the OVOV Planning Area as part of their entitlement process.



**Legend:**


- xx Existing Number of Lanes
- Blue line City Boundary
- Pink line City SOI
- Thick black line OVOV Boundary


**NOT TO SCALE**

SOURCE: Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. - June 2010

FIGURE 3.2-1


Existing Roadway Network



SOURCE: Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. - June 2010

FIGURE 3.2-2

Study Area Roadway Segments



SOURCE: Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. - June 2010

FIGURE 3.2-3

Existing Average Traffic Volumes

**Table 3.2-4, Existing Level of Service Summary – Arterial Roadways**, lists the existing ADT volume and corresponding V/C ratio and LOS rating of each study segment. The majority of segments operate at LOS A or B. Of the intersections operating at or below LOS C, the following four arterial roadway segments operate at LOS F:

- Bouquet Cyn w/o Haskell (Segment No. 15)
- Lyons Avenue between Orchard Village Road and Newhall Avenue (Segment No.92)
- Newhall Avenue between Lyons Avenue and Main Street (Segment No.131)
- Whites Canyon Road between Soledad Canyon Road and Pleasantdale Street (Segment No.288)

All of the above arterial roadway segments are located within the City’s Planning Area. Therefore, no segments within the County’s Planning Area operate at LOS F.

**Table 3.2-4  
Existing Level of Service Summary – Arterial Roadways**

Map No.	Roadway Segment (Location)	Average Daily Traffic Volume	Year	Number of Lanes	Capacity	V/C Ratio	LOS
1.	Agua Dulce n/o Escondido Canyon (County)	4,000	2006	2	18,000	0.22	A
2.	Agua Dulce n/o Davenport (County)	3,000	2006	2	18,000	0.17	A
4.	Agua Dulce s/o SR-14 (County)	<500	2005	2	18,000	0.00	A
6.	Ave Scott s/o Stanford (City)	14,000	2007	4	36,000	0.39	A
8.	Ave Stanford s/o Vanderbilt (City)	5,000	2007	4	36,000	0.14	A
10.	Ave Stanford s/o Rye Canyon (City)	9,000	2007	4	36,000	0.25	A
11.	Bouquet Canyon n/o Vasquez (County)	4,000	2007	2	18,000	0.22	A
14.	Bouquet Cyn e/o Haskell (City)	25,000	2010	4	36,000	.69	B
15.	Bouquet Cyn w/o Haskell (City)	39,000	2010	4	36,000	1.08	F
16.	Bouquet Canyon e/o Seco (City)	43,000	2006	5	45,000	0.96	E
17.	Bouquet Cyn w/o Seco (City)	48,000	2010	6	54,000	.89	D
18.	Bouquet Cyn s/o Newhall Ranch (City)	50,000	2010	8	72,000	.69	B
20.	Bouquet Cyn n/o Magic Mtn (City)	36,000	2010	4	36,000	1.00	E
25.	Castaic n/o Lake Hughes (County)	11,000	2007	4	36,000	0.31	A
28.	Chiquito Canyon s/o San Martinez Canyon (County)	1,000	2007	2	18,000	0.06	A
31.	Commerce Center s/o Franklin (County)	16,000	2006	6	54,000	0.30	A

### 3.2 Transportation and Circulation

Map No.	Roadway Segment (Location)	Average Daily Traffic Volume	Year	Number of		V/C Ratio	LOS
				Lanes	Capacity		
32.	Commerce Center n/o SR-126 (County)	11,000	2006	6	54,000	0.20	A
35.	Copper Hill n/o Newhall Ranch (City)	35,000	2005	8	72,000	0.49	A
39.	Copper Hill e/o McBean (City)	35,000	2007	4	36,000	0.97	E
43.	Davenport e/o Sierra Hwy (County)	2,000	2005	2	18,000	0.11	A
44.	Davenport w/o Agua Dulce (County)	2,000	2006	2	18,000	0.11	A
46.	Decoro e/o Dickason (City)	20,000	2005	4	36,000	0.56	A
48.	Decoro w/o Hillsborough (City)	16,000	2005	4	36,000	0.44	A
51.	Dickason n/o Newhall Ranch (City)	13,000	2005	4	36,000	0.36	A
54.	Escondido e/o Agua Dulce (County)	3,000	2007	2	18,000	0.17	A
55.	Franklin e/o Wolcott Way (County)	<500	2006	2	15,000	0.00	A
56.	Franklin w/o Commerce Center (County)	6,000	2006	4	36,000	0.17	A
62.	Golden Valley s/o Centre Point (City)	19,000	2007	4	36,000	0.53	A
64.	Golden Valley e/o Sierra Hwy (City)	14,000	2007	6	54,000	0.26	A
68.	Hasley Canyon w/o Del Valle (County)	3,000	2007	2	18,000	0.17	A
69.	Hasley Canyon w/o Commerce Center (County)	7,000	2006	4	36,000	0.19	A
70.	Hasley Canyon w/o The Old Road (County)	17,000	2006	6	54,000	0.31	A
71.	Hasley Canyon w/o I-5 (County)	11,000	2006	4	36,000	0.31	A
74.	Hillcrest w/o The Old Road (County)	9,000	2007	4	36,000	0.25	A
75.	Jakes Way e/o Canyon Park (City/County)	6,000	2005	2	18,000	0.33	A
77.	Lake Hughes e/o Castaic (County)	9,000	2008	4	36,000	0.25	A
78.	Lake Hughes e/o Ridge Route (County)	2,000	2007	2	18,000	0.11	A
86.	Lost Canyon n/o Via Princessa (County/City)	9,000	2008	4	36,000	0.25	A
87.	Lost Canyon s/o Via Princessa (County/City)	2,000	2005	2	18,000	0.11	A
92.	Lyons e/o Orchard Village (City)	47,000	2007	4	36,000	1.31	F
93.	Lyons w/o Main Street (City)	20,000	2007	4	36,000	0.56	A
105.	Magic Mountain e/o Valencia (City)	16,000	2006	4	36,000	0.44	A
109.	McBean s/o Copper Hill (City)	21,000	2010	6	54,000	0.39	A
112.	McBean n/o Newhall Ranch (City)	39,000	2010	6	54,000	.72	C
113.	McBean s/o Newhall Ranch (City)	50,000	2008	8	72,000	0.69	B
114.	McBean s/o Ave Scott (City)	58,000	2010	6	54,000	1.07	F
117.	McBean s/o Valencia (City)	35,000	2005	6	54,000	0.65	B

### 3.2 Transportation and Circulation

Map No.	Roadway Segment (Location)	Average Daily Traffic Volume	Year	Number of Lanes	Capacity	V/C Ratio	LOS
118.	McBean n/o Orchard Village (City)	40,000	2010	6	54,000	0.67	B
119.	McBean e/o Rockwell Canyon (City)	24,000	2005	6	54,000	0.44	A
120.	McBean w/o Rockwell Cyn (City)	32,000	2010	6	54,000	.59	A
124.	Newhall Ranch e/o Rye Canyon (City)	11,000	2005	8	72,000	0.15	A
126.	Newhall Ranch e/o McBean (City)	32,000	2005	8	72,000	0.44	A
127.	Newhall Ranch w/o Bouquet Canyon (City)	37,000	2008	8	72,000	0.51	A
128.	Newhall Ranch e/o Bouquet Cyn (City)	25,000	2010	4	36,000	.69	<b>B</b>
131.	Newhall s/o Lyons (City)	22,000	2007	2	18,000	1.22	<b>F</b>
132.	Newhall n/o Valle Oro (City)	44,000	2010	6	54,000	.81	D
133.	Newhall n/o Sierra Hwy (City)	41,000	2010	6	54,000	.76	C
136.	Orchard Village s/o McBean (City)	30,000	2007	4	36,000	0.83	D
137.	Orchard Village s/o Wiley Canyon (City)	29,000	2007	4	36,000	0.81	D
138.	Orchard Village n/o Lyons (City)	21,000	2007	4	36,000	0.58	A
146.	Placerita Canyon e/o SR-14 (County)	4,000	2007	2	18,000	0.22	A
150.	Poe s/o Mallory (County)	1,000	2007	4	36,000	0.03	A
151.	Poe w/o Stevenson Ranch (County)	8,000	2007	4	36,000	0.22	A
155.	Railroad s/o Oak Ridge (City)	33,000	2010	4	36,000	.92	E
157.	Railroad n/o Lyons (City)	34,000	2010	4	36,000	.94	E
161.	Ridge Route n/o Lake Hughes (County)	5,000	2007	6	54,000	0.09	A
166.	Rockwell Canyon n/o McBean (City)	8,000	2005	4	36,000	0.22	A
168.	Rye Canyon w/o Ave Scott (City)	41,000	2005	6	54,000	0.76	C
169.	Rye Canyon e/o The Old Road (County)	47,000	2007	6	54,000	0.87	D
172.	San Martinez Grande Canyon n/o SR-126 (County)	<500	2005	2	15,000	0.00	A
174.	Sand Canyon n/o Soledad Canyon (City)	7,000	2005	2	18,000	0.39	A
175.	Sand Canyon s/o Soledad Canyon (City)	27,000	2005	4	36,000	0.75	C
192.	Sierra Hwy n/o Vasquez Canyon (County)	11,000	2008	2	18,000	0.61	B
195.	Sierra Hwy n/o Soledad Canyon (City)	23,000	2010	4	36,000	0.64	B
196.	Sierra Hwy s/o Soledad Canyon (City)	36,000	2010	6	54,000	0.67	B
198.	Sierra Hwy s/o Via Princessa (City)	24,000	2010	4	36,000	.67	<b>B</b>
201.	Sierra Hwy n/o Newhall (City)	19,000	2010	4	36,000	.53	<b>A</b>

3.2 Transportation and Circulation

Map No.	Roadway Segment (Location)	Average Daily Traffic Volume	Year	Number of Lanes	Capacity	V/C Ratio	LOS
211.	Soledad Canyon e/o Bouquet Canyon (City)	47,000	2010	6	54,000	.87	D
212.	Soledad Cyn w/o Golden Valley (City)	45,000	2010	6	54,000	.83	D
213.	Soledad Cyn e/o Golden Valley (City)	37,000	2010	6	54,000	.69	B
215.	Soledad Canyon w/o Whites Canyon (City)	44,000	2010	6	54,000	0.81	D
216.	Soledad Cyn e/o Whites Cyn (City)	43,000	2010	6	54,000	.80	C
217.	Soledad Canyon e/o Sierra Hwy (City)	30,000	2010	6	54,000	0.56	A
220.	Soledad Cyn e/o SR-14 (at Sand Cyn) (City)	17,000	2010	4	36,000	.47	A
222.	Soledad Canyon e/o Shadow Pines (City)	5,000	2009	4	36,000	0.22	A
223.	Soledad Canyon e/o SR-14 (County)	2,000	2009	2	18,000	0.33	A
224.	Soledad Canyon w/o Agua Dulce (County)	2,000	2005	2	18,000	0.11	A
225.	Soledad Canyon e/o Agua Dulce (County)	2,000	2006	2	18,000	0.11	A
227.	SR-126 w/o San Martinez Grande Canyon (County)	24,000	2007	4	44,000	0.55	A
228.	SR-126 w/o Chiquito Canyon/Long Canyon (County)	24,000	2007	4	44,000	0.55	A
229.	SR-126 w/o Wolcott (County)	24,000	2007	4	44,000	0.55	A
230.	SR-126 w/o Commerce Center (County)	25,000	2007	4	44,000	0.57	A
231.	SR-126 w/o I-5 (County)	34,000	2007	6	66,000	0.52	A
239.	The Old Road n/o Sedona Way (County)	15,000	2006	2	18,000	0.83	D
242.	The Old Road n/o Biscailuz (County)	10,000	2006	2	18,000	0.56	A
245.	The Old Road s/o Henry Mayo (County)	15,000	2006	4	36,000	0.42	A
247.	The Old Road n/o Magic Mtn (County)	31,000	2006	4	36,000	0.86	D
248.	The Old Road s/o Magic Mtn (County)	15,000	2006	4	36,000	0.42	A
254.	Avenue Tibbitts s/o Newhall Ranch (City)	11,000	2007	6	54,000	0.20	A
262.	Valencia w/o The Old Road (County)	16,000	2006	6	54,000	0.30	A
266.	Valencia w/o McBean (City)	48,000	2010	7	63,000	.76	C
271.	Valencia s/o Cinema (City)	54,000	2010	6	54,000	1.00	E
273.	Valley s/o Lyons (City)	2,000	2007	4	36,000	0.06	A
274.	Vasquez Canyon e/o Bouquet Canyon (County)	7,000	2007	2	18,000	0.39	A

Map No.	Roadway Segment (Location)	Average Daily Traffic Volume	Year	Number of Lanes	Capacity	V/C Ratio	LOS
275.	Vasquez Canyon w/o Sierra Hwy (County)	8,000	2008	2	18,000	0.44	A
288.	Whites Canyon n/o Soledad (City)	39,000	2005	4	36,000	1.08	F
289.	Whites Canyon s/o Soledad (City)	32,000	2005	6	54,000	0.59	A
290.	Wiley Canyon e/o Orchard Village (City)	11,000	2007	4	36,000	0.31	A
294.	Wiley Canyon n/o Calgrove (City)	9,000	2007	2	18,000	0.50	A

Source: Austin-Foust Associates, Inc., 2010.

Note: Only those roadway segments for which ADT volumes are available are shown above.

### Principal Intersections

Key intersections within the OVOV Planning Area accommodate significant volumes of traffic and are critical to vehicle mobility within the Santa Clarita Valley. These intersections are identified in **Figure 3.2-4, Study Area Principal Intersections**. As with the ADT counts, the peak hour counts were collected at various times between 2005 and 2008 and provide a representative sample of existing traffic conditions throughout the Santa Clarita Valley.

**Table 3.2-5, ICU and Level of Service Summary – Principal Intersections (2007–2010)**, lists the existing ICU ratio and LOS rating for each principal intersection during the AM and PM peak hour periods. These periods represent the hours during which the greatest number of vehicle trips on a given roadway are generated. The AM peak period is between 7:00 AM and 9:00 PM, and the PM peak period is between 3:00 PM and 6:00 PM. As shown in the table, all principal intersections operate at LOS D or better except for the Bouquet Canyon Road/Soledad Canyon Road intersection in the City’s Planning Area, which operates at LOS E during the PM peak hour. No principal intersections currently operate at LOS F.

**Table 3.2-5  
ICU and Level of Service Summary – Principal Intersections (2007–2010)**

<b>Intersection (Location)</b>	<b>AM Peak Hour</b>		<b>PM Peak Hour</b>	
	<b>ICU</b>	<b>LOS</b>	<b>ICU</b>	<b>LOS</b>
1. The Old Road & Rye Canyon (County)	.61	B	.66	B
2. The Old Road & Magic Mountain (County)	.28	A	.32	A
3. The Old Road & Valencia (County)	.67	B	.44	A
4. The Old Road & McBean (County)	.58	A	.76	C
5. The Old Road & Pico Canyon (County)	.76	C	.71	C
6. Rye/Copper Hill & Newhall Ranch (City)	.63	B	.70	B
7. McBean & Newhall Ranch (City)	.73	C	.78	C
8. McBean & Magic Mountain (City)	.61	B	.76	C
9. McBean & Valencia (City)	.61	B	.74	C
10. Orchard Village & McBean (City)	.57	A	.68	B
11. Orchard Village & Wiley Canyon (City)	.60	A	.62	B
12. Valencia & Magic Mountain (City)	.58	A	.66	B
13. Bouquet Canyon & Plum Canyon (City)	.68	B	.73	C
14. Bouquet Canyon & Newhall Ranch (City)	.66	B	.82	D
15. Bouquet Canyon & Soledad Canyon (City)	.68	B	.77	C
16. Railroad & Lyons (City)	.57	A	.56	A
17. Sierra Highway & Newhall (City)	.57	A	.64	B
18. Whites Canyon & Soledad Canyon (City)	.80	C	.86	D
19. Sierra Highway & Soledad Canyon (City)	.67	B	.76	C

Source: Source: Austin-Foust Associates, Inc., 2010.

### ***Planned Roadway Improvements***

In order to provide greater connectivity and capacity for east-west traffic across the Santa Clarita Valley, the County and City have worked in partnership to complete the Cross-Valley Connector. When completed, the 8.5-mile system of arterial road, bridges, and intersections will provide a seamless connection between Newhall Ranch Road and Golden Valley Road, and a direct connection between the I-5/SR-126 junction and the SR-14/Golden Valley Road interchange. In addition to serving auto and truck traffic in the Santa Clarita Valley with six to eight travel lanes, the Cross-Valley Connector was designed to include a Class 1 bike path adjacent to the roadway and a landscaped median. Completed in 2010, the Cross-Valley Connector is projected to substantially reduce traffic volumes on Soledad Canyon Road and other major arterials in the City.



## Public Transportation

Public transportation within the County's Planning Area is primarily operated by the City.

### *City of Santa Clarita Transit*

Local and regional bus service is provided by City of Santa Clarita Transit, which operates local routes within the OVOV Planning Area and commuter service into and out of Century City, the Antelope Valley, Van Nuys, and Warner Center. The City completed a Transit Development Plan (TDP) in 1997, which made several recommendations for improvements and modifications. Since 1997 and based on the TDP, total transit system ridership has more than doubled. The City updated the TDP in 2006.

City of Santa Clarita Transit provides connections with services by Metrolink, Antelope Valley Transit Authority, Metro, and other regional transit providers. City of Santa Clarita Transit provides service on nine local fixed routes, nine commuter express routes, four station link routes, and supplemental school day service. Local routes provide service seven days a week while the remaining services operate on weekdays only. Express buses operate to and from the Antelope Valley, downtown Los Angeles, Van Nuys, Westwood/Century City, and Woodland Hills. City of Santa Clarita Transit's regional routes serve several park-and-ride lots located throughout the Santa Clarita Valley, as well as the Santa Clarita and Newhall Metrolink stations. The areas generating the highest transit ridership are Newhall and Canyon Country in the vicinity of the intersection of Soledad Canyon Road and Sierra Highway.

City of Santa Clarita Transit also provides daily Dial-a-Ride (DAR) service within the Santa Clarita Valley to provide service to senior citizens and disabled residents. Much of the DAR services are to the Adult Day Care Center and the Senior Center in Newhall. The updated TDP proposes several operational improvements to improve efficiency of this program.

### *Commuter Express Transit Service*

City of Santa Clarita Transit operates local commuter service into and out of Century City, downtown Los Angeles, the Antelope Valley, and Warner Center. Most of these routes are well used; use is monitored and adjustments are made to times if necessary to accommodate demand. The busiest commuter transit stops serve the Metrolink stations and park-and-ride lots. Commuters have identified the need to increase service to downtown Los Angeles during mid-day hours, and to provide service to the North Hollywood Metrolink Station, which has service to the Orange and Red Lines. City of Santa Clarita Transit will continue to expand service to meet customer needs as funding allows.

### ***Special Transit Services***

In 2006, the City acquired an old-fashioned trolley (Santa Clarita Hometown Trolley) that provides free service to major destination points within the community, including the Town Center, Six Flags Magic Mountain, and the Aquatics Center. Service hours and routes may be expanded in the future. In order to facilitate multi-modal transportation, City of Santa Clarita Transit installed bicycle racks on all buses in July 2006. These racks can accommodate two to three bicycles per bus. Approximately 100 riders per month use the bicycle racks.

### ***Bus Stop Improvement Program***

The Bus Stop Improvement Program identified opportunities to create uniform and aesthetically pleasing bus stop improvements throughout the Santa Clarita Valley. As highly visible features within the streetscape right-of-way, bus shelters and benches provide an opportunity to assist in creating a distinctive identity for the Santa Clarita Valley, as well as promoting a positive environment for transit riders. A goal of the program is to remove shelters that provide advertising and replace them with an architecturally enhanced bus shelter design that meets federal regulations and enhances the Santa Clarita Valley's image.

### ***Park-and-Ride Lots***

Two park-and-ride lots are located in and near the County's Planning Area to encourage the use of public transit for a portion of commuter travel. All park-and-ride lots within the City have transit service except for the lot at Golden Valley Road at SR-14. Several of the park-and-ride lots, including those at the Newhall and Santa Clarita Metrolink stations, are at or exceeding capacity. Additional commuter parking is provided in scattered locations within businesses adjacent to transit routes.

### ***School Bus Transportation***

Each of the elementary school districts provides yellow bus transportation to students. Over the last decade the William S. Hart School District has gradually eliminated school buses to junior high and high schools. City of Santa Clarita Transit provides transit services near the schools, providing an alternative means of transportation for students although not designated as the official school transport provider.

## Rail Service

### *Metrolink Service*

The Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) operates Metrolink, a five-county commuter rail network of over 400 miles. Metrolink serves Union Station in downtown Los Angeles, where connections to other trains operated by Amtrak can be made, or where riders may board buses, vans, or the Metro Red Line subway to central downtown Los Angeles locations. Union Station also provides connections to the Metro Gold Line, a light rail transit line connecting to Pasadena and other San Gabriel Valley destinations, and to Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) via the Metro Purple, Blue and Green light rail lines or the Fly-Away Bus service.

Metrolink provides commuter service between Santa Clarita and downtown Los Angeles, Glendale, Burbank, Sun Valley, Sylmar, San Fernando, and the Antelope Valley. The Antelope Valley line operates on the Union Pacific rail line, which is also used for occasional freight rail service.

Metrolink's Santa Clarita station near Soledad Canyon Road in Saugus, about 2 miles east of Valencia, provides parking for about 500 vehicles, restroom facilities, and a passenger drop-off area. The station also serves as a major transit center for buses. The Via Princessa station, which opened as a temporary facility in 1994, contains 420 parking spaces. The Jan Heidt Newhall station in Newhall contains 250 parking spaces.

As of 2008, 12 commuter trains run daily in each direction on the Antelope Valley line from Monday through Friday, with five trains departing Santa Clarita to Union Station before 8:00 AM. Three of the 12 daily trains in each direction do not extend to the Antelope Valley, and City of Santa Clarita Transit provides connecting express buses for those trips. Reduced weekend service is also available on the Antelope Valley Line, with six trains on Saturday and three trains on Sunday running between Union Station and Lancaster.

### *Amtrak Service*

Amtrak rail service does not operate between Bakersfield and Santa Clarita. However, Amtrak operates an extensive network of daily express buses along the I-5 freeway that connects throughout Southern California, to and from the daily San Joaquin trains that originate at the Bakersfield Amtrak station. Of these connecting Bakersfield buses, a total of 5 daily northbound and 6 daily southbound trips stop in Santa Clarita at the Newhall Metrolink station.

### ***Future Rail Service***

The State of California has been studying the feasibility of a statewide intercity high speed rail network since the early 1990s. Various possible alignments have been reviewed by the California High Speed Rail Authority for the proposed 700-mile route linking the cities of Sacramento, San Francisco, Los Angeles and San Diego. The proposed rail system would use steel wheels on steel rails and be powered by electricity, with top speeds of over 200 miles per hour. One segment of the proposed route would extend from Union Station in Los Angeles to Bakersfield, through the San Fernando Valley, Santa Clarita, the Antelope Valley, and Tehachapi Pass. Under this scenario, the closest station serving Santa Clarita would likely be Sylmar.

In addition to the State's high speed rail project, the Orangeline Development Authority (OLDA) was formed as a joint powers authority to "finance, acquire, design, construct, reconstruct, improve, and operate the facilities and improvements to the Orangeline," a proposed regional magnetic levitation (maglev) rail network throughout Southern California. OLDA includes 14 Orange County and Los Angeles County cities, including the City of Santa Clarita. The Orangeline high-speed maglev is proposed as an elevated transportation system that would provide service between Irvine and Palmdale with stations located at key locations along the 108-mile route, including one in Santa Clarita proposed in the vicinity of the SR-14/Via Princessa interchange. The proposed network would also link Los Angeles International Airport to airports in Ontario and Palmdale as well as extend to Las Vegas. The County and City will work cooperatively with the OLDA on the alignment for the Orangeline rail through the OVOV Planning Area, and identifying the most suitable station site in the Santa Clarita Valley.

### **Bicycle Circulation System**

The Santa Clarita Valley's interconnected network of bikeways provides residents with both recreational opportunities and options for reducing vehicle trips. Bikeways are classified into three categories based on their location and type. A Class I bikeway is an exclusive, two-way path for bicycles that is completely separated from a street or highway. Class II bike lanes are signed and striped one-way lanes on streets or highways, typically at the edge of the pavement. Bike lanes provide a demarcated space for bicyclists within the roadway right-of-way, which is especially important on streets with moderate or higher volumes and speeds. Class III bike routes share the right-of-way with vehicles; they may be signed, but are not exclusively striped for use by cyclists. Although bike routes offer little benefit to cyclists on busy roadways, they can be used to guide cyclists through the street network. On any street carrying over 10,000 vehicles per day at speeds of 30 mph or higher, striped bike lanes are recommended over bike routes. In selecting routes for bikeways that share the right-of-way with vehicles, design criteria include

connectivity, traffic volumes, speeds, curb width, intersection protection, and the number of commercial driveways.

The Metro Board adopted the Metro Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan (Metro Bicycle Plan) in 2006 to promote bicycle use throughout the County. The Metro Bicycle Plan's vision is to make cycling a viable travel choice by promoting links between bicycle facilities and the transit network. The plan identifies four "biketransit" hubs within the Santa Clarita Valley: the Valley's three Metrolink commuter rail stations, and the McBean Transfer Station. Another goal of the Metro Bicycle Plan was to evaluate gaps in the interjurisdictional bikeway network connecting cities and unincorporated areas to destinations and transit stops, and provide strategies for connecting bikeway links. Within the Santa Clarita Valley, four gaps in the interjurisdictional bikeway network were identified by the Metro Bicycle Plan. These gaps are:

- Old Road - Within jurisdiction of the County and is located along Old Road adjacent to I-5 with a connection between Valencia, Santa Clarita and San Fernando Road Metrolink right-of-way bike path in the San Fernando Valley.
- Route 126 – Within jurisdiction of the County and is connected between Santa Clarita and the Ventura County Line (portion of bikeway extends through the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan area).
- Castaic/San Francisquito Creek – Within jurisdiction of the County/City and is connected between Santa Clarita and Castaic Lake along Castaic Creek, San Francisquito Creek, and I-5.
- Sierra Highway – Within jurisdiction of the County/City and is connected between the Old Road and Soledad Canyon Bike Path.

Funds are available from the Bicycle Transportation Account program to help improve bicycle facilities, provided local agencies have adopted Bicycle Transportation Plans. The Master Plan for Trails within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shows a regional trail planned adjacent to the Santa Clara River from the eastern edge of the project to the Ventura County Line. When completed, this trail would fulfill the need for a bikeway connection between the Santa Clarita Valley and Ventura County.

Bicycle lockers are provided at all three Metrolink stations and at City Hall. Several major employers, such as Six Flags Magic Mountain and The Master's College, provide bicycle parking and changing facilities to promote bicycle support for employees.

### **Pedestrian Circulation System**

The Santa Clarita Valley's existing pedestrian network is comprised of sidewalks, paseos, and multi-use trails. Sidewalks are defined as pathways running alongside a parallel roadway. Paseos are paved walking paths that provide pedestrian links outside of the street network. Multi-use trails are unpaved

trails that are suitable for walkers, hikers, equestrians and mountain bikers. Most of the major roadways in the Santa Clarita Valley have sidewalks along portions of their length. Along many arterials, such as Soledad Canyon Road, sidewalks are located adjacent to the curb and are not buffered from vehicle traffic by landscaped parkways, causing an unpleasant walking environment due to traffic noise and fumes. In other areas, such as McBean Parkway, sidewalks are separated from vehicle lanes by landscaped parkways, resulting in a more user-friendly pedestrian experience. The network of sidewalks is discontinuous in many areas; sidewalks are not provided on some residential streets, in some industrial areas, or on designated rural roads. Not all bus stops are served by sidewalks, and in some areas sidewalks are not provided on both sides of a street. Some rural communities in the Santa Clarita Valley, such as Agua Dulce and those with special standards districts such as Placerita Canyon and Sand Canyon, have opted not to have concrete sidewalks and prefer streetscape designs more in keeping with the rural and equestrian character of these neighborhoods.

## **Airports**

Aviation facilities are an integral component of the regional transportation system. The Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) provides commercial air travel to the OVOV Planning Area through its main facilities in Los Angeles (LAX) and the Van Nuys Regional Airport. In addition, the Burbank/Glendale/Pasadena Regional Airport (also called the Bob Hope Airport) serves residents of the OVOV Planning Area.

Santa Clarita Valley residents primarily use the Bob Hope Airport in Burbank for shorter distance flights and LAX for international flights, or for destinations not served by Burbank. In addition to taxi service, shuttles provide trips to local airports, including the Van Nuys Fly-Away Shuttle. Fly-Away service to LAX is also available from Union Station in Los Angeles, which connects with Metrolink service to the Santa Clarita Valley.

The Agua Dulce Airpark is a privately owned airport serving general aviation needs with one runway, aircraft parking, fuel, and basic passenger services. The Airpark averages about 28 operations per week and stores about 35 aircraft. Most of the Airpark's activity involves local operations. The Airpark is located in an unincorporated area of Los Angeles County, and the County has adopted an Airport Land Use Plan to protect the clear zones and ensure land use compatibility with airport operations. In 2006, the County approved continued operation and expansion of Airpark services, including allowing up to 300 airplanes and adding helicopter operations.

### *Future Airport Service*

Planned expansion of passenger air service at the Palmdale Regional Airport is being studied as an alternative to continued expansion of service at LAX. Officials representing the Santa Clarita Valley have indicated support for this plan, which would make air service more accessible to Santa Clarita Valley residents. Due to congestion on the I-5 and I-405 freeways, expanded airport operations in Palmdale would provide a shorter and less congested alternative for air passengers from the Santa Clarita Valley.

## **REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

### **Congestion Management Program**

The CMP was enacted by the California Legislature in 1989 to improve traffic congestion in urban areas. The program became effective with the passage of Proposition 111 in 1990, which also increased the State gas tax. Funds generated by Proposition 111 are available to cities and counties for regional road improvements, provided these agencies are in compliance with CMP requirements. The intent of the legislation was to link transportation, land use, and air quality decisions by addressing the impact of local growth on the regional transportation system. State statute requires that a CMP be developed, adopted, and updated biennially for every county that includes an urbanized area, which shall include every city and county government within that county. Therefore, the County of Los Angeles and the City of Santa Clarita must comply with CMP requirements in developing a circulation plan for the Santa Clarita Valley.

Under this legislation, regional agencies are designated within each county to prepare and administer the CMP for agencies within that county. Each local planning agency included in the CMP has the following responsibilities:

- Assisting in monitoring the roadways designated within the CMP system;
- Adopting and implementing a trip reduction and travel demand ordinance;
- Analyzing the impacts of local land use decisions on the regional transportation system; and
- Preparing annual deficiency plans for portions of the CMP system where level-of-service standards are not maintained.

Metro is the CMP agency for Los Angeles County. Metro has the responsibility to review compliance with the CMP by agencies under its jurisdiction. For any agency out of compliance, after receiving notice and after a correction period, a portion of State gas tax funds may be withheld if compliance is not

achieved. In addition, compliance with the CMP is necessary to preserve eligibility for state and federal funding of transportation projects.

Metro adopted the County's first CMP in 1992, and completed its most recent update in 2004. The statute requires that all State highways and principal arterials be included within the CMP roadway system. Within the Santa Clarita Valley, the following roadways are designated as CMP roadways:

- I-5 Freeway;
- SR-14 Freeway;
- Sierra Highway from Newhall Avenue (formerly San Fernando Road) to SR-14 at Red Rover Mine Road;
- Magic Mountain Parkway from I-5 to Railroad Avenue (formerly San Fernando Road);
- Railroad Avenue/Newhall Avenue (formerly San Fernando Road) from Magic Mountain Parkway to SR-14; and

The 2004 CMP noted that both the I-5 and SR-14 freeways within the OVOV Planning Area demonstrate traditional commute patterns, with congestion flowing into Los Angeles and the San Fernando Valley in the morning and a reverse flow in the afternoon. Various strategies are available to local jurisdictions to mitigate CMP traffic impacts, including constructing new roadway improvements, managing traffic flow through signal improvements and trip reduction measures, and land use strategies such as locating higher density uses in proximity to public transit.

### **Metro Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan**

The Metro Board adopted the Metro Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan in 2006 to promote bicycle use throughout Los Angeles County. The Plan's vision is to make cycling a viable travel choice by promoting links between bicycle facilities and the transit network. The plan identifies four "bike-transit" hubs within the Santa Clarita Valley: the three Metrolink commuter rail stations, and the McBean Transfer Station. The Metro Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan evaluated gaps in the inter-jurisdictional bikeway network connecting cities and unincorporated areas to destinations and transit stops. Within the Santa Clarita Valley, four gaps in the inter-jurisdictional bikeway network were identified with the Old Road, SR-126, Castaic/San Francisquito Creek, and Sierra Highway corridors.

## THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

In order to assist in determining whether a project will have a significant effect on the environment, the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G identify criteria for conditions that may be deemed to constitute a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in physical conditions. Potentially significant impacts on transportation and circulation would occur if the proposed Area Plan would:

- Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections);
- Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways;
- 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;
- Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment);
- Result in inadequate emergency access;
- Generate a parking demand that exceeds municipal code–required parking capacity.
- Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks); and/or
- Cause a hazard or barrier for pedestrians or bicyclists.

According to the County,<sup>2</sup> the project would cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system if the project would:

- Increase the V/C ratio or ICU by at least one percentage point (0.01) at any location where the final V/C ratio or ICU is 0.91 or greater (LOS E or F).
- Increase the V/C ratio or ICU by at least two percentage points (0.02) at any location where the final V/C ratio or ICU is between 0.81 and 0.90 (LOS D).
- Increase the V/C ratio or ICU by at least four percentage points (0.04) at any location where the final V/C ratio or ICU is between 0.71 and 0.80 (LOS C).

---

<sup>2</sup> County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, *County of Los Angeles Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines*, (1997), p. 5 and 6.

These standards would be applied to individual development projects as buildout of the County's Planning Area occurs.

Los Angeles County does not specify an acceptable LOS for the purpose of long-range planning. However, in conformance with the Los Angeles County CMP, the maximum acceptable level of service on arterial roads (i.e., major, secondary, and limited secondary highways) within the OVOV Planning Area is LOS E.

## IMPACT ANALYSIS

**Impact 3.2-1                      Implementation of the proposed Area Plan could result in a potentially significant increase in traffic.**

### Trip Generation

The Santa Clarita Valley Consolidated Traffic Model (SCVCTM) was used to derive traffic forecasts.<sup>3</sup> This traffic model produces peak hour and ADT forecasts for the OVOV area roadway system. Buildout land use data from the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan Land Use Elements was used as the basis for the traffic forecasts.

The number of trips generated by a certain type of land use is estimated by applying a representative trip generation rate to the quantity of land use in the area under consideration. The SCVCTM uses a predefined set of trip generation rates calibrated specifically to local conditions to calculate both peak hour and ADT trips by land use.

**Table 3.2-6, Trip Generation – Existing vs. OVOV Buildout** compares the number of trips generated by existing (2004)<sup>4</sup> land uses to that generated by future (OVOV Buildout) land uses in the Santa Clarita Valley based on six generalized land use categories. As shown in the table, buildout of the OVOV land uses would result in an approximately 121 percent increase in valley-wide trip ends<sup>5</sup> over existing trip ends. However, this comparison does not account for future increases in trip ends that could result from growth under the existing County Area Plan and City General Plan. Therefore, the more appropriate approach involves comparing the number of trips that would be generated under buildout of the current

<sup>3</sup> The SCVCTM, originally developed in 1994, was substantially updated in 2004 with subsequent refinements. See **Appendix 3.2** for a more detailed discussion of the updates to this model and the version used in this traffic analysis.

<sup>4</sup> One Valley One Vision Valley-Wide Traffic Study, Austin-Foust Associates, June 2010, 2-19.

<sup>5</sup> Trip ends are daily trip ends where one trip is equal to two trip ends. One Valley One Vision Valley-Wide Traffic Study, Austin-Foust Associates, June 2010, 2-18.

County Area Plan and City General Plan to the number of trips that would be generated under buildout of the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan. This comparison, which is presented in **Table 3.2-7, Trip Generation – Existing County Area Plan and City General Plan Buildout vs. OVOV Buildout**, forms the basis for the analysis of project impacts in this section. As shown in this table, buildout of the OVOV land uses would result in an approximately 3 percent increase in valley-wide trip ends over those that would be generated under buildout of the current County Area Plan and City General Plan.

**Table 3.2-6  
Trip Generation – Existing vs. OVOV Buildout**

Land Use Category	Units	Existing (2004)		Future (OVOV Buildout)		Increase
		Quantity	Trip Ends	Quantity	Trip Ends	
Single-Family Residential	du	48,251	471,153	81,395	795,563	69%
Multi-Family Residential	du	24,387	191,023	67,679	514,809	170%
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>du</i>	<i>72,638</i>	<i>662,176</i>	<i>149,074</i>	<i>1,310,372</i>	<i>98%</i>
Commercial Retail	tsf	9,157.63	515,716	23,585.06	1,230,042	139%
Commercial Office	tsf	2,072.12	25,996	17,311.53	205,851	692%
Industrial Park	tsf	18,332.42	107,565	40,735.96	240,697	124%
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>tsf</i>	<i>29,562.17</i>	<i>649,277</i>	<i>81,632.55</i>	<i>1,676,590</i>	<i>158%</i>
Other (Schools, etc.)	--	--	176,541	--	301,424	71%
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>1,487,994</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>3,288,386</b>	<b>121%<sup>1</sup></b>

<sup>1</sup> Represents an annual increase of approximately 2.6% (compounded) if buildout is presumed to occur over a 30-year period.

*du* = dwelling units

*tsf* = thousand square feet

*Trip Ends* = Daily trip ends (one trip = 2 trip ends)

**Table 3.2-7**  
**Trip Generation – Existing County Area Plan and City General Plan Buildout vs. OVOV Buildout**

Land Use Category	Units	Existing Plan Buildout		Proposed Plan Buildout		Increase
		Quantity	Trip Ends	Quantity	Trip Ends	
Singe-Family Residential	du	89,373	877,112	81,395	795,563	-9%
Multi-Family Residential	du	62,543	481,988	67,679	514,809	7%
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>du</i>	<i>151,916</i>	<i>1,359,100</i>	<i>149,074</i>	<i>1,310,372</i>	<i>-4%</i>
Commercial Retail	tsf	21,561.65	1,134,793	23,585.06	1,230,042	8%
Commercial Office	tsf	14,746.77	169,850	17,311.53	205,851	21%
Industrial Park	tsf	43,144.21	254,465	40,735.96	240,697	-5%
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>tsf</i>	<i>79,452.63</i>	<i>1,559,108</i>	<i>81,632.55</i>	<i>1,676,590</i>	<i>8%</i>
Other (Schools, etc.)	--	--	288,885	--	301,424	4%
<b>Total:</b>		<b>--</b>	<b>3,207,093</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>3,288,386</b>	<b>3%<sup>1</sup></b>

*du = dwelling units*

*tsf = thousand square feet*

*Trip Ends = Daily trip ends (one trip = 2 trip ends)*

### Roadway Segments

A comparison of traffic forecasts based on the proposed OVOV plan (the proposed land uses along with the proposed highway network) to existing conditions is provided in **Table 3.2-8**. The table presents roadway segment V/C ratios and LOS values for each of the two scenarios. A comparable table for peak hour intersection conditions is provided in **Table 3.2-8**.

**Table 3.2-8** demonstrates that with the proposed Highway Plan in place, each of the four of the five roadway segments that exceed are at LOS F for existing conditions are forecast to operate at LOS E or better with the proposed OVOV plan. The fifth segment that is at LOS F for existing conditions, McBean Parkway south of Avenue Scott, is shown to remain at LOS F with the OVOV plan. However, the V/C ratio at that location does not increase with the OVOV plan.

**Table 3.2-8** (the comparison of existing conditions to OVOV Buildout Conditions) identifies three segments that are forecast to operate at LOS F, **Table 3.2-9** (the comparison of the current City/County plan to OVOV Buildout Conditions) identifies five roadway segments that are forecast to operate at LOS F due to a greater number of locations evaluated in **Table 3.2-9**. The number of locations evaluated in the comparison of existing conditions to OVOV Buildout Conditions is limited to the locations where existing traffic data is available, hence a fewer number of locations are evaluated in **Table 3.2-8**.

**Table 3.2-8**  
**ADT V/C and LOS – Existing Conditions vs OVOV Buildout Conditions**  
**(With Highway Plan Roadways)**

Roadway Segment	Existing Conditions			OVOV General Plan With Highway Plan		
	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
1. Agua Dulce n/o Escondido Cyn	4,000	.22	A	8,000	.22	A
2. Agua Dulce n/o Davenport	3,000	.17	A	13,000	.36	A
4. Agua Dulce s/o SR-14	<500	.00	A	3,000	.08	A
6. Ave Scott s/o Stanford	14,000	.39	A	37,000	.69	B
8. Ave Stanford s/o Vanderbilt	5,000	.14	A	17,000	.47	A
10. Ave Stanford s/o Rye Cyn	9,000	.25	A	16,000	.44	A
11. Bouquet Cyn n/o Vasquez	4,000	.22	A	6,000	.17	A
14. Bouquet Cyn e/o Haskell	25,000	.69	B	32,000	.59	A
15. Bouquet Cyn w/o Haskell	39,000	1.08	F	49,000	.91	E
16. Bouquet Cyn e/o Seco	43,000	.96	E	54,000	1.00	E
17. Bouquet Cyn w/o Seco	48,000	.89	D	53,000	.74	C
18. Bouquet Cyn s/o Newhall Ranch	50,000	.69	B	77,000	1.07	F
20. Bouquet Cyn n/o Magic Mtn	36,000	1.00	E	54,000	1.00	E
25. Castaic n/o Lake Hughes	11,000	.31	A	5,000	.14	A
28. Chiquito Cyn s/o San Martinez Cyn	1,000	.06	A	6,000	.33	A
31. Commerce Center s/o Franklin	16,000	.30	A	39,000	.72	C
32. Commerce Center n/o SR-126	11,000	.20	A	43,000	.80	C
35. Copper Hill n/o Newhall Ranch	35,000	.49	A	54,000	.75	C
39. Copper Hill e/o McBean	35,000	.97	E	41,000	.76	C
43. Davenport e/o Sierra Hwy	2,000	.11	A	6,000	.17	A
44. Davenport w/o Agua Dulce	2,000	.11	A	3,000	.08	A
46. Decoro e/o Dickason	20,000	.56	A	14,000	.39	A
48. Decoro w/o Hillsborough	16,000	.44	A	17,000	.47	A
51. Dickason n/o Newhall Ranch	13,000	.36	A	21,000	.39	A
54. Escondido e/o Agua Dulce	3,000	.17	A	5,000	.14	A
55. Franklin e/o Wolcott Way	<500	.00	A	8,000	.53	A
56. Franklin w/o Commerce Center	6,000	.17	A	11,000	.31	A
62. Golden Valley s/o Centre Point	19,000	.53	A	39,000	.72	C
64. Golden Valley e/o Sierra Hwy	14,000	.26	A	36,000	.67	B
68. Hasley Cyn w/o Del Valle	3,000	.17	A	13,000	.72	C

3.2 Transportation and Circulation

Roadway Segment	Existing Conditions			OVOV General Plan With Highway Plan		
	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
69. Hasley Cyn w/o Commerce Center	7,000	.19	A	14,000	.39	A
70. Hasley Cyn w/o The Old Road	17,000	.31	A	38,000	.70	B
71. Hasley Cyn w/o I-5	11,000	.31	A	34,000	.63	B
74. Hillcrest w/o The Old Road	9,000	.25	A	17,000	.47	A
75. Jakes Way e/o Canyon Park	6,000	.33	A	12,000	.67	B
77. Lake Hughes e/o Castaic	9,000	.25	A	37,000	.69	B
78. Lake Hughes e/o Ridge Route	2,000	.11	A	7,000	.39	A
85. Lost Cyn n/o Canyon Park	6,000	.17	A	16,000	.30	A
86. Lost Cyn n/o Via Princessa	9,000	.25	A	21,000	.39	A
87. Lost Cyn s/o Via Princessa	2,000	.11	A	11,000	.31	A
92. Lyons e/o Orchard Village	47,000	1.31	F	52,000	.96	E
93. Lyons w/o Main Street	20,000	.56	A	24,000	.44	A
105. Magic Mtn e/o Valencia	16,000	.44	A	54,000	1.00	E
109. McBean s/o Copper Hill	21,000	.39	A	27,000	.50	A
112. McBean n/o Newhall Ranch	39,000	.72	C	48,000	.89	D
113. McBean s/o Newhall Ranch	50,000	.69	B	58,000	.81	D
114. McBean s/o Ave Scott	58,000	1.07	F	77,000	1.07	F
117. McBean s/o Valencia	35,000	.65	B	54,000	1.00	E
118. McBean n/o Orchard Village	40,000	.74	CB	43,000	.80	C
119. McBean e/o Rockwell Cyn	24,000	.44	A	44,000	.81	D
120. McBean w/o Rockwell Cyn	32,000	.59	A	53,000	.98	E
124. Newhall Ranch e/o Rye Cyn	11,000	.15	A	49,000	.68	B
126. Newhall Ranch e/o McBean	32,000	.44	A	68,000	.94	E
127. Newhall Ranch w/o Bouquet Cyn	37,000	.51	A	69,000	.96	E
128. Newhall Ranch e/o Bouquet Cyn	25,000	.69	B	46,000	.85	D
131. Newhall s/o Lyons	22,000	1.22	F	27,000	.75	C
132. Newhall n/o Valle Oro	44,000	.81	D	33,000	.61	B
133. Newhall n/o Sierra Hwy	41,000	.76	C	40,000	.74	C
136. Orchard Village s/o McBean	30,000	.83	D	54,000	1.00	E
137. Orchard Village s/o Wiley Cyn	29,000	.81	D	44,000	.81	D
138. Orchard Village n/o Lyons	21,000	.58	A	34,000	.63	B
146. Placerita Cyn e/o SR-14	4,000	.22	A	4,000	.11	A
150. Poe s/o Mallory	1,000	.03	A	3,000	.08	A
151. Poe w/o Stevenson Ranch	8,000	.22	A	14,000	.39	A


Roadway Segment	Existing Conditions			OVOV General Plan With Highway Plan		
	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
155. Railroad s/o Oak Ridge	33,000	.92	E	40,000	.74	C
157. Railroad n/o Lyons	34,000	.94	E	36,000	.67	B
161. Ridge Route n/o Lake Hughes	5,000	.09	A	35,000	.65	B
166. Rockwell Cyn n/o McBean	8,000	.22	A	23,000	.64	B
168. Rye Cyn w/o Ave Scott	41,000	.76	C	48,000	.89	D
169. Rye Cyn e/o The Old Road	47,000	.87	D	58,000	.92	E
172. San Martinez Grande Cyn n/o SR-126	<500	.00	A	5,000	.14	A
174. Sand Cyn n/o Soledad Cyn	7,000	.39	A	14,000	.39	A
175. Sand Cyn s/o Soledad Cyn	27,000	.75	C	25,000	.46	A
176. Sand Cyn s/o SR-14	11,000	.61	B	26,000	.48	A
177. Sand Cyn s/o Lost Cyn	9,000	.50	A	14,000	.78	C
192. Sierra Hwy n/o Vasquez Cyn	11,000	.61	B	16,000	.30	A
195. Sierra Hwy n/o Soledad Cyn	23,000	.64	B	52,000	.96	E
196. Sierra Hwy s/o Soledad Cyn	36,000	.67	B	36,000	.67	B
198. Sierra Hwy s/o Via Princessa	24,000	.67	B	30,000	.56	A
201. Sierra Hwy n/o Newhall	19,000	.53	A	23,000	.43	A
211. Soledad Cyn e/o Bouquet Cyn	47,000	.87	D	45,000	.83	D
212. Soledad Cyn w/o Golden Valley	45,000	.83	D	38,000	.70	B
213. Soledad Cyn e/o Golden Valley	37,000	.69	B	50,000	.93	E
215. Soledad Cyn w/o Whites Cyn	44,000	.81	D	38,000	.70	B
216. Soledad Cyn e/o Whites Cyn	43,000	.80	C	44,000	.81	D
217. Soledad Cyn e/o Sierra Hwy	30,000	.56	A	34,000	.63	B
220. Soledad Cyn e/o SR-14 (at Sand Cyn)	17,000	.47	A	18,000	.33	A
221. Soledad Cyn w/o Shadow Pines	11,000	.31	A	10,000	.19	A
222. Soledad Cyn e/o Shadow Pines	5,000	.14	A	17,000	.31	A
223. Soledad Cyn e/o SR-14	2,000	.11	A	10,000	.28	A
224. Soledad Cyn w/o Agua Dulce	2,000	.11	A	4,000	.11	A
225. Soledad Cyn e/o Agua Dulce	2,000	.11	A	3,000	.08	A
227. SR-126 w/o San Martinez Grande Cyn	24,000	.55	A	33,000	.75	C
228. SR-126 w/o Chiquito Cyn/Long Cyn	24,000	.55	A	38,000	.86	D
229. SR-126 w/o Wolcott	24,000	.55	A	59,000	.89	D
230. SR-126 w/o Commerce Center	25,000	.57	A	66,000	.75	C
231. SR-126 w/o I-5	34,000	.52	A	75,000	.85	D
239. The Old Road n/o Sedona Way	15,000	.83	D	23,000	.64	B

Roadway Segment	Existing Conditions			OVOV General Plan With Highway Plan		
	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
242. The Old Road n/o Biscailuiz	10,000	.56	A	18,000	.33	A
245. The Old Road s/o Henry Mayo	15,000	.42	A	16,000	.30	A
247. The Old Road n/o Magic Mtn	31,000	.86	D	52,000	.96	E
248. The Old Road s/o Magic Mtn	15,000	.42	A	30,000	.56	A
254. Tibbitts s/o Newhall Ranch	11,000	.20	A	34,000	.63	B
262. Valencia w/o The Old Road	16,000	.30	A	61,000	.97	E
266. Valencia w/o McBean	48,000	.76	C	61,000	.85	D
271. Valencia s/o Cinema	54,000	1.00	E	59,000	1.09	<b>F</b>
273. Valley s/o Lyons	2,000	.06	A	11,000	.31	A
274. Vasquez Cyn e/o Bouquet Cyn	7,000	.39	A	6,000	.33	A
275. Vasquez Cyn w/o Sierra Hwy	8,000	.44	A	10,000	.56	A
283. Via Princessa n/o Lost Cyn	13,000	.29	A	24,000	.44	A
288. Whites Cyn n/o Soledad	39,000	1.08	<b>F</b>	42,000	.78	C
289. Whites Cyn s/o Soledad	32,000	.59	A	48,000	.89	D
290. Wiley Cyn e/o Orchard Village	11,000	.31	A	42,000	.78	C
294. Wiley Cyn n/o Calgrove	9,000	.50	A	19,000	.53	A

LOS in **Bold** exceeds performance criteria of LOS E.

Level of service ranges: .00 - .60 A    .61 - .70 B    .71 - .80 C  
.81 - .90 D    .91 - 1.00 E    Above 1.00 F

Future daily traffic volumes on study arterial roadways were estimated for both the current County Area Plan and City General Plan land uses and the proposed OVOV land uses, with incorporation of the proposed Highway Plan, which is illustrated in **Figure 3.2-5, OVOV Highway Plan**. The proposed Highway Plan includes improvements such as roadway designation changes, widenings, and traffic signal modifications, to roadways located throughout the OVOV Planning Area. These improvements are summarized in **Appendix 3.2**. For purposes of this analysis, the buildout year is conservatively assumed to be 2035.



SOURCE: Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. - June 2010

FIGURE 3.2-5

OVOV Highway Plan

### *Plan to Plan Analysis*

Long-range ADT volumes for study arterial roadways under current County Area Plan and City General Plan buildout are shown in **Figure 3.2-6, Average Daily Traffic Volumes – Buildout of County Area Plan and Current City General Plan**. Long-range ADT volumes for study arterial roadways under the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan buildout are shown in **Figure 3.2-7, Average Daily Traffic Volumes – Buildout of County Area Plan and Proposed City General Plan**.

As previously stated, the maximum acceptable LOS on arterial roads within the OVOV Planning Area is LOS E; therefore, a LOS F rating is considered unacceptable. According to **Table 3.2-9, Future Level of Service Summary – Arterial Roadways**, the following 10 roadway segments would operate at LOS F under buildout of the existing County Area Plan and City General Plan:

#### **County**

- County: Valencia Boulevard between Pico Canyon Road and Magic Mountain Parkway (West) (Segment No. 258)

#### **City**


- Bouquet Canyon Road between Newhall Ranch Road and Soledad Canyon Road (Segment No. 18)
- Golden Valley Road between Via Princessa and Sierra Highway (Segment No. 63)
- McBean Parkway between Avenue Scott and Creekside Road (Segment No. 114)
- McBean Parkway between the I-5 freeway and Rockwell Canyon Road (Segment No. 120)
- Newhall Avenue between Sierra Highway and SR-14 freeway (Segment No. 134)
- Valencia Boulevard between Creekside Road and Magic Mountain Parkway (Segment No. 270)
- Valencia Boulevard between Cinema Drive and Creekside Road (Segment No. 271)
- Via Princessa between Santa Clarita Parkway and Golden Valley Road (Segment No. 278)
- Via Princessa between Whites Canyon Road and Sierra Highway (Segment No. 281)

In contrast, five arterial roadway segments, all located within the City, would operate at LOS F under buildout of the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan.

**City**

- Bouquet Canyon Road between Newhall Ranch Road and Soledad Canyon Road (Segment No. 18)
- McBean Parkway between Avenue Scott and Creekside Road (Segment No. 114)
- Valencia Boulevard between Creekside Road and Magic Mountain Parkway (Segment No. 270)
- Valencia Boulevard between Cinema Drive and Creekside Road (Segment No. 271)
- Via Princessa between Santa Clarita Parkway and Golden Valley Road (Segment No. 278)


It should be noted that these same arterial roadway segments would also operate at LOS F under buildout of the existing County Area Plan and City General Plan. Therefore, five fewer roadway segments would operate at LOS F with implementation of the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan. Consequently, roadway operations would incrementally improve with implementation of the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan in place of the existing County Area Plan and City General Plan.



SOURCE: Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. - June 2010

FIGURE 3.2-6

Average Daily Traffic Volumes - Buildout of County Area Plan and Current City General Plan



SOURCE: Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. - June 2010

FIGURE 3.2-7

Average Daily Traffic Volumes - Buildout of County Area Plan and Proposed City General Plan

**Table 3.2-9  
Future Level of Service Summary – Arterial Roadways**

Roadway Segment (Location)	Lanes	Capacity	Existing Area Plan and General Plan			OVOV Area Plan and General Plan		
			Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
1. Agua Dulce n/o Escondido Canyon (County)	4	36,000	8,000	0.22	A	8,000	0.22	A
2. Agua Dulce n/o Davenport (County)	4	36,000	13,000	0.36	A	13,000	0.36	A
3. Agua Dulce n/o SR-14 (County)	4	36,000	14,000	0.39	A	14,000	0.39	A
4. Agua Dulce s/o SR-14 (County)	4	36,000	2,000	0.06	A	3,000	0.08	A
5. Ave Scott s/o Rye Canyon (City)	6	54,000	16,000	0.30	A	18,000	0.33	A
6. Ave Scott s/o Stanford (City)	6	54,000	35,000	0.65	B	37,000	0.69	B
7. Ave Scott n/o McBean (City)	4	36,000	23,000	0.64	B	25,000	0.69	B
8. Ave Stanford s/o Vanderbilt (City)	4	36,000	14,000	0.39	A	17,000	0.47	A
9. Ave Stanford n/o Rye Canyon (City)	4	30,000	7,000	0.23	A	8,000	0.27	A
10. Ave Stanford s/o Rye Canyon (City)	4	36,000	15,000	0.42	A	16,000	0.44	A
11. Bouquet Canyon n/o Vasquez (County)	4	36,000	6,000	0.17	A	6,000	0.17	A
12. Bouquet Canyon n/o Copper Hill (County)	4	36,000	20,000	0.56	A	19,000	0.53	A
13. Bouquet Canyon e/o Plum Canyon (City)	4	36,000	23,000	0.64	B	23,000	0.64	B
14. Bouquet Canyon e/o Haskell (City)	6	54,000	33,000	0.61	B	32,000	0.59	A
15. Bouquet Canyon w/o Haskell (City)	6	54,000	49,000	0.91	E	49,000	0.91	E
16. Bouquet Canyon e/o Seco (City)	6	54,000	53,000	0.98	E	54,000	1.00	E
17. Bouquet Canyon w/o Seco (City)	8	72,000	52,000	0.72	C	53,000	0.74	C
18. Bouquet Canyon s/o Newhall Ranch (City)	8	72,000	75,000	1.04	F	77,000	1.07	F
19. Bouquet Canyon s/o Soledad (City)	6	54,000	46,000	0.85	D	54,000	1.00	E
20. Bouquet Canyon n/o Magic Mtn (City)	6	54,000	48,000	0.89	D	54,000	1.00	E
21. Calgrove e/o The Old Road (County)	4	36,000	30,000	0.83	D	18,000	0.50	A
22. Calgrove w/o Wiley Canyon (City)	4	36,000	19,000	0.53	A	19,000	0.53	A
23. Calgrove e/o Wiley Canyon (City)	4	36,000	3,000	0.08	A	3,000	0.08	A
24. Canyon Park e/o Sierra Hwy (County)	4	36,000	22,000	0.61	B	19,000	0.53	A
25. Castaic n/o Lake Hughes (County)	4	36,000	6,000	0.17	A	5,000	0.14	A
26. Castaic s/o Lake Hughes (County)	6	54,000	25,000	0.46	A	24,000	0.44	A
27. Castaic s/o Ridge Route (County)	2	15,000	5,000	0.33	A	3,000	0.20	A
28. Chiquito Canyon s/o San Martinez Canyon (County)	2	18,000	8,000	0.44	A	6,000	0.33	A
29. Chiquito Canyon (Long Canyon) n/o SR-126 (County)	4	36,000	27,000	0.75	C	25,000	0.69	B

Roadway Segment (Location)	Lanes	Capacity	Existing Area Plan and General Plan			OVOV Area Plan and General Plan		
			Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
30. Commerce Center s/o Industry (County)	6	54,000	24,000	0.44	A	25,000	0.46	A
31. Commerce Center s/o Franklin (County)	6	54,000	39,000	0.72	C	39,000	0.72	C
32. Commerce Center n/o SR-126 (County)	6	54,000	43,000	0.80	C	43,000	0.80	C
33. Commerce Center s/o Henry Mayo (County)	6	54,000	33,000	0.61	B	32,000	0.59	A
34. Commerce Center n/o Magic Mtn (County)	6	54,000	37,000	0.69	B	36,000	0.67	B
35. Copper Hill n/o Newhall Ranch (City)	8	72,000	55,000	0.76	C	54,000	0.75	C
36. Copper Hill s/o Decoro (City)	6	54,000	54,000	1.00	E	52,000	0.96	E
37. Copper Hill n/o Decoro (County)	6	54,000	52,000	0.96	E	50,000	0.93	E
38. Copper Hill w/o McBean (County)	6	54,000	43,000	0.80	C	42,000	0.78	C
39. Copper Hill e/o McBean (City)	6	54,000	40,000	0.74	C	41,000	0.76	C
40. Copper Hill e/o Seco Canyon (City)	4	36,000	29,000	0.81	D	30,000	0.83	D
41. Copper Hill e/o Haskell (County)	4	36,000	18,000	0.50	A	17,000	0.47	A
42. Creekside e/o McBean Pkwy (City)	4	36,000	8,000	0.22	A	7,000	0.19	A
43. Davenport e/o Sierra Hwy (County)	4	36,000	4,000	0.11	A	6,000	0.17	A
44. Davenport w/o Agua Dulce (County)	4	36,000	3,000	0.08	A	3,000	0.08	A
45. Decoro e/o Copper Hill (City)	4	36,000	9,000	0.25	A	8,000	0.22	A
46. Decoro e/o Dickason (City)	4	36,000	14,000	0.39	A	14,000	0.39	A
47. Decoro e/o McBean (City)	4	36,000	19,000	0.53	A	19,000	0.53	A
48. Decoro w/o Hillsborough (City)	4	36,000	17,000	0.47	A	17,000	0.47	A
49. Decoro w/o Seco Canyon (City)	4	36,000	11,000	0.31	A	11,000	0.31	A
50. Del Valle n/o San Martinez (County)	2	18,000	11,000	0.61	B	6,000	0.33	A
51. Dickason n/o Newhall Ranch (City)	6	54,000	21,000	0.39	A	21,000	0.39	A
52. Dockweiler e/o Railroad (City)	4	36,000	22,000	0.61	B	18,000	0.50	A
53. Dockweiler w/o Sierra Hwy (City)	4	36,000	25,000	0.69	B	24,000	0.67	B
54. Escondido e/o Agua Dulce (County)	4	36,000	5,000	0.14	A	5,000	0.14	A
55. Franklin e/o Wolcott Way (County)	2	15,000	8,000	0.53	A	8,000	0.53	A
56. Franklin w/o Commerce Center (County)	4	36,000	11,000	0.31	A	11,000	0.31	A
57. Golden Valley s/o Plum Canyon (City)	4	36,000	12,000	0.33	A	12,000	0.33	A
58. Golden Valley n/o Newhall Ranch (City)	4	36,000	30,000	0.83	D	29,000	0.81	D
59. Golden Valley n/o Soledad (City)	6	54,000	44,000	0.81	D	44,000	0.81	D
60. Golden Valley s/o Soledad (City)	6	54,000	30,000	0.56	A	29,000	0.54	A
61. Golden Valley n/o Centre Point (City)	6	54,000	30,000	0.56	A	32,000	0.59	A
62. Golden Valley s/o Centre Point (City)	6	54,000	43,000	0.80	C	39,000	0.72	C

Roadway Segment (Location)	Lanes	Capacity	Existing Area Plan and General Plan			OVOV Area Plan and General Plan		
			Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
63. Golden Valley s/o Via Princessa (City)	6	54,000	57,000	1.06	F	51,000	0.94	E
64. Golden Valley e/o Sierra Hwy (City)	6	54,000	39,000	0.72	C	36,000	0.67	B
65. Golden Valley e/o SR-14 (City)	4	36,000	18,000	0.50	A	15,000	0.42	A
66. Golden Valley e/o Lost Canyon (City)	4	36,000	5,000	0.14	A	4,000	0.11	A
67. Haskell Canyon n/o Bouquet (City)	4	36,000	12,000	0.33	A	13,000	0.36	A
68. Hasley Canyon w/o Del Valle (County)	2	18,000	11,000	0.61	B	13,000	0.72	C
69. Hasley Canyon w/o Commerce Center (County)	4	36,000	17,000	0.47	A	14,000	0.39	A
70. Hasley Canyon w/o The Old Road (County)	6	54,000	40,000	0.74	C	38,000	0.70	B
71. Hasley Canyon w/o I-5 (County)	6	54,000	35,000	0.65	B	34,000	0.63	B
72. Henry Mayo e/o Commerce Center (County)	4	36,000	17,000	0.47	A	15,000	0.42	A
73. Henry Mayo w/o The Old Road (County)	4	36,000	10,000	0.28	A	9,000	0.25	A
74. Hillcrest w/o The Old Road (County)	4	36,000	18,000	0.50	A	17,000	0.47	A
75. Jakes Way e/o Canyon Park (County)	2	18,000	18,000	1.00	E	12,000	0.67	B
76. Lake Hughes w/o Castaic (County)	6	54,000	43,000	0.80	C	37,000	0.69	B
77. Lake Hughes e/o Castaic (County)	6	54,000	43,000	0.80	C	37,000	0.69	B
78. Lake Hughes e/o Ridge Route (County)	2	18,000	12,000	0.67	B	7,000	0.39	A
79. Long Canyon s/o SR-126 (County)	6	54,000	35,000	0.65	B	32,000	0.59	A
80. Long Canyon s/o River Village (County)	6	54,000	37,000	0.69	B	35,000	0.65	B
81. Long Canyon n/o Potrero Canyon (County)	6	54,000	33,000	0.61	B	31,000	0.57	A
82. Long Canyon s/o Potrero Canyon (County)	6	54,000	35,000	0.65	B	32,000	0.59	A
83. Lost Canyon w/o Sand Canyon (County)	4	36,000	10,000	0.28	A	12,000	0.33	A
84. Lost Canyon n/o Jakes Way (County)	4	36,000	14,000	0.39	A	16,000	0.44	A
85. Lost Canyon n/o Canyon Park (County)	6	54,000	14,000	0.26	A	16,000	0.30	A
86. Lost Canyon n/o Via Princessa (County)	6	54,000	20,000	0.37	A	21,000	0.39	A
87. Lost Canyon s/o Via Princessa (County)	4	36,000	12,000	0.33	A	11,000	0.31	A
88. Lost Canyon n/o Golden Valley (City)	4	36,000	14,000	0.39	A	12,000	0.33	A
89. Lyons e/o I-5 (City)	6	54,000	49,000	0.91	E	53,000	0.98	E
90. Lyons e/o Wiley Canyon (City)	6	54,000	39,000	0.72	C	44,000	0.81	D
91. Lyons w/o Orchard Village (City)	6	54,000	39,000	0.72	C	42,000	0.78	C
92. Lyons e/o Orchard Village (City)	6	54,000	49,000	0.91	E	52,000	0.96	E
93. Lyons w/o Main Street (City)	6	54,000	25,000	0.46	A	24,000	0.44	A
94. Magic Mtn e/o Long Canyon (County)	4	36,000	18,000	0.50	A	18,000	0.50	A
95. Magic Mtn w/o Commerce Center (County)	4	36,000	34,000	0.94	E	34,000	0.94	E

Roadway Segment (Location)	Lanes	Capacity	Existing Area Plan and General Plan			OVOV Area Plan and General Plan		
			Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
96. Magic Mtn e/o Commerce Center (County)	6	54,000	52,000	0.96	E	53,000	0.98	E
97. Magic Mtn e/o Westridge (County)	8	72,000	46,000	0.64	B	47,000	0.65	B
98. Magic Mtn w/o The Old Road (County)	10	90,000	83,000	0.92	E	85,000	0.94	E
99. Magic Mtn e/o The Old Road (County)	10	90,000	80,000	0.89	D	83,000	0.92	E
100. Magic Mtn e/o I-5 (City)	8	72,000	65,000	0.90	D	66,000	0.92	E
101. Magic Mtn e/o Tourney (City)	8	72,000	56,000	0.78	C	57,000	0.79	C
102. Magic Mtn w/o McBean (City)	8	72,000	58,000	0.81	D	59,000	0.82	D
103. Magic Mtn e/o McBean (City)	8	72,000	50,000	0.69	B	54,000	0.75	C
104. Magic Mtn w/o Valencia (City)	8	72,000	48,000	0.67	B	51,000	0.71	C
105. Magic Mtn e/o Valencia (City)	6	54,000	52,000	0.96	E	54,000	1.00	E
106. Magic Mtn e/o Bouquet Canyon (City)	6	54,000	46,000	0.85	D	46,000	0.85	D
107. Magic Mtn n/o Via Princessa (City)	6	54,000	38,000	0.70	B	37,000	0.69	B
108. McBean n/o Copper Hill (City)	2	18,000	9,000	0.50	A	9,000	0.50	A
109. McBean s/o Copper Hill (City)	6	54,000	27,000	0.50	A	27,000	0.50	A
110. McBean n/o Decoro (City)	6	54,000	35,000	0.65	B	35,000	0.65	B
111. McBean s/o Decoro (City)	6	54,000	37,000	0.69	B	38,000	0.70	B
112. McBean n/o Newhall Ranch (City)	6	54,000	47,000	0.87	D	48,000	0.89	D
113. McBean s/o Newhall Ranch (City)	8	72,000	55,000	0.76	C	58,000	0.81	D
114. McBean s/o Ave Scott (City)	8	72,000	73,000	1.01	F	77,000	1.07	F
115. McBean n/o Magic Mtn (City)	8	72,000	67,000	0.93	E	72,000	1.00	E
116. McBean n/o Valencia (City)	8	72,000	59,000	0.82	D	63,000	0.88	D
117. McBean s/o Valencia (City)	6	54,000	50,000	0.93	E	54,000	1.00	E
118. McBean n/o Orchard Village (City)	6	54,000	43,000	0.80	C	43,000	0.80	C
119. McBean e/o Rockwell Canyon (City)	6	54,000	44,000	0.81	D	44,000	0.81	D
120. McBean w/o Rockwell Canyon (City)	6	54,000	55,000	1.02	F	53,000	0.98	E
121. McBean w/o I-5 (County)	6	54,000	43,000	0.80	C	42,000	0.78	C
122. Newhall Ranch e/o I-5 (City)	8	72,000	65,000	0.90	D	66,000	0.92	E
123. Newhall Ranch w/o Rye Canyon (City)	8	72,000	68,000	0.94	E	72,000	1.00	E
124. Newhall Ranch e/o Rye Canyon (City)	8	72,000	48,000	0.67	B	49,000	0.68	B
125. Newhall Ranch w/o McBean (City)	8	72,000	69,000	0.96	E	71,000	0.99	E
126. Newhall Ranch e/o McBean (City)	8	72,000	65,000	0.90	D	68,000	0.94	E
127. Newhall Ranch w/o Bouquet Canyon (City)	8	72,000	67,000	0.93	E	69,000	0.96	E
128. Newhall Ranch e/o Bouquet Canyon (City)	6	54,000	44,000	0.81	D	46,000	0.85	D

Roadway Segment (Location)	Lanes	Capacity	Existing Area Plan and General Plan			OVOV Area Plan and General Plan		
			Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
129. Newhall Ranch e/o Santa Clarita (City)	6	54,000	49,000	0.91	E	49,000	0.91	E
130. Newhall n/o Lyons (City)	4	36,000	2,000	0.06	A	1,000	0.03	A
131. Newhall s/o Lyons (City)	4	36,000	27,000	0.75	C	27,000	0.75	C
132. Newhall n/o Valle Oro (City)	6	54,000	39,000	0.72	C	33,000	0.61	B
133. Newhall n/o Sierra Hwy (City)	6	54,000	47,000	0.87	D	40,000	0.74	C
134. Newhall s/o Sierra Hwy (City)	6	54,000	58,000	1.07	F	50,000	0.93	E
135. Oak Ridge e/o Railroad (City)	4	36,000	20,000	0.56	A	21,000	0.58	A
136. Orchard Village s/o McBean (City)	6	54,000	54,000	1.00	E	54,000	1.00	E
137. Orchard Village s/o Wiley Canyon (City)	6	54,000	43,000	0.80	C	44,000	0.81	D
138. Orchard Village n/o Lyons (City)	6	54,000	32,000	0.59	A	34,000	0.63	B
139. Parker e/o Sloan (County)	2	18,000	1,000	0.06	A	1,000	0.06	A
140. Parker w/o I-5 (County)	6	54,000	11,000	0.20	A	10,000	0.19	A
141. Pico Canyon s/o Valencia (County)	6	54,000	27,000	0.50	A	22,000	0.41	A
142. Pico Canyon w/o Whispering Oaks (County)	6	54,000	27,000	0.50	A	22,000	0.41	A
143. Pico Canyon w/o Stevenson Ranch (County)	6	54,000	29,000	0.54	A	29,000	0.54	A
144. Pico Canyon w/o The Old Road (County)	6	54,000	47,000	0.87	D	41,000	0.76	C
145. Pico Canyon w/o I-5 (County)	6	54,000	45,000	0.83	D	44,000	0.81	D
146. Placerita Canyon e/o SR-14 (County)	4	36,000	8,000	0.22	A	4,000	0.11	A
147. Plum Canyon s/o Bouquet Canyon (County)	6	54,000	22,000	0.41	A	23,000	0.43	A
148. Plum Canyon w/o Golden Valley (City)	6	54,000	13,000	0.24	A	13,000	0.24	A
149. Poe s/o Valencia (County)	4	36,000	5,000	0.14	A	5,000	0.14	A
150. Poe s/o Mallory (County)	4	36,000	3,000	0.08	A	3,000	0.08	A
151. Poe w/o Stevenson Ranch (County)	4	36,000	15,000	0.42	A	14,000	0.39	A
152. Potrero s/o SR-126 (County)	4	36,000	11,000	0.31	A	9,000	0.25	A
153. Potrero w/o Long Canyon (County)	4	36,000	18,000	0.50	A	17,000	0.47	A
154. Railroad s/o Magic Mtn (City)	6	54,000	50,000	0.93	E	54,000	1.00	E
155. Railroad s/o Oak Ridge (City)	6	54,000	41,000	0.76	C	40,000	0.74	C
156. Railroad n/o 13 <sup>th</sup> St. (City)	6	54,000	34,000	0.63	B	34,000	0.63	B
157. Railroad n/o Lyons (City)	6	54,000	39,000	0.72	C	36,000	0.67	B
158. Railroad s/o Lyons (City)	4	36,000	28,000	0.78	C	26,000	0.72	C
159. Rainbow Glen s/o Soledad Canyon (City)	2	15,000	6,000	0.40	A	6,000	0.40	A
160. Rainbow Glen n/o Via Princessa (City)	2	15,000	9,000	0.60	A	11,000	0.73	C
161. Ridge Route n/o Lake Hughes (County)	6	54,000	36,000	0.67	B	35,000	0.65	B

Roadway Segment (Location)	Lanes	Capacity	Existing Area Plan and General Plan			OVOV Area Plan and General Plan		
			Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
162. Ridge Route n/o Castaic (County)	4	36,000	4,000	0.11	A	8,000	0.22	A
163. Ridge Route e/o I-5 (County)	6	54,000	36,000	0.67	B	35,000	0.65	B
164. Ridge Route btwn I-5 Ramps (County)	6	54,000	25,000	0.46	A	25,000	0.46	A
165. Landmark e/o Long Canyon (County)	4	36,000	16,000	0.44	A	16,000	0.44	A
166. Rockwell Canyon n/o McBean (City)	4	36,000	26,000	0.72	C	23,000	0.64	B
167. Rye Canyon e/o Ave Scott (City)	6	54,000	47,000	0.87	D	49,000	0.91	E
168. Rye Canyon w/o Ave Scott (City)	6	54,000	46,000	0.85	D	48,000	0.89	D
169. Rye Canyon e/o The Old Road (City)	7	63,000	57,000	0.90	D	58,000	0.92	E
170. San Martinez w/o Del Valle (County)	2	15,000	9,000	0.60	A	2,000	0.13	A
171. San Martinez Grande Canyon n/o VTTM 60678 (County)	2	15,000	2,000	0.13	A	<500	0.00	A
172. San Martinez Grande Canyon n/o SR-126 (County)	4	36,000	7,000	0.19	A	5,000	0.14	A
173. Sand Canyon s/o Sierra Hwy (County)	4	36,000	8,000	0.22	A	8,000	0.22	A
174. Sand Canyon n/o Soledad Canyon (City)	4	36,000	14,000	0.39	A	14,000	0.39	A
175. Sand Canyon s/o Soledad Canyon (City)	6	54,000	29,000	0.54	A	25,000	0.46	A
176. Sand Canyon s/o SR-14 (City)	6	54,000	36,000	0.67	B	26,000	0.48	A
177. Sand Canyon s/o Lost Canyon (City)	2	18,000	15,000	0.83	D	14,000	0.78	C
178. Santa Clarita s/o Bouquet Canyon (City)	6	54,000	38,000	0.70	B	36,000	0.67	B
179. Santa Clarita s/o Newhall Ranch (City)	6	54,000	33,000	0.61	B	32,000	0.59	A
180. Santa Clarita s/o Soledad (City)	6	54,000	31,000	0.57	A	30,000	0.56	A
181. Santa Clarita s/o Porta Bella (City)	6	54,000	23,000	0.43	A	21,000	0.39	A
182. Santa Clarita n/o Via Princessa (City)	6	54,000	39,000	0.72	C	34,000	0.63	B
183. Santa Clarita s/o Via Princessa (City)	6	54,000	47,000	0.87	D	38,000	0.70	B
184. Santa Clarita w/o Sierra Hwy (City)	6	54,000	48,000	0.89	D	39,000	0.72	C
185. Seco Canyon n/o Copper Hill (City)	2	15,000	10,000	0.67	B	10,000	0.67	B
186. Seco Canyon s/o Copper Hill (City)	4	36,000	19,000	0.53	A	19,000	0.53	A
187. Seco Canyon n/o Bouquet Canyon (City)	4	36,000	33,000	0.92	E	34,000	0.94	E
188. Shadow Pines n/o Soledad Canyon (City)	4	36,000	14,000	0.39	A	12,000	0.33	A
189. Shadow Pines n/o Grandifloras (City)	2	18,000	6,000	0.33	A	5,000	0.28	A
190. Sierra Hwy w/o Agua Dulce (County)	6	54,000	2,000	0.04	A	2,000	0.04	A
191. Sierra Hwy n/o Davenport (County)	6	54,000	2,000	0.04	A	2,000	0.04	A
192. Sierra Hwy n/o Vasquez Canyon (County)	6	54,000	15,000	0.28	A	16,000	0.30	A
193. Sierra Hwy s/o Sand Canyon (County)	6	54,000	19,000	0.35	A	17,000	0.31	A

Roadway Segment (Location)	Lanes	Capacity	Existing Area Plan and General Plan			OVOV Area Plan and General Plan		
			Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
194. Sierra Hwy n/o Skyline Ranch (City)	6	54,000	36,000	0.67	B	38,000	0.70	B
195. Sierra Hwy n/o Soledad Canyon (City)	6	54,000	50,000	0.93	E	52,000	0.96	E
196. Sierra Hwy s/o Soledad Canyon (City)	6	54,000	37,000	0.69	B	36,000	0.67	B
197. Sierra Hwy s/o Canyon Park (City)	6	54,000	36,000	0.67	B	36,000	0.67	B
198. Sierra Hwy s/o Via Princessa (City)	6	54,000	32,000	0.59	A	30,000	0.56	A
199. Sierra Hwy s/o Golden Valley (City)	6	54,000	28,000	0.52	A	25,000	0.46	A
200. Sierra Hwy n/o Dockweiler (City)	6	54,000	43,000	0.80	C	40,000	0.74	C
201. Sierra Hwy n/o Newhall (City)	6	54,000	27,000	0.50	A	23,000	0.43	A
202. Sierra Hwy s/o Newhall (City)	6	54,000	42,000	0.78	C	33,000	0.61	B
203. Sierra Hwy n/o SR-14 (County)	6	54,000	37,000	0.69	B	30,000	0.56	A
204. Skyline Ranch e/o Plum Canyon (City)	4	36,000	15,000	0.42	A	15,000	0.42	A
205. Skyline Ranch w/o Sierra Hwy (City)	4	36,000	19,000	0.53	A	18,000	0.50	A
206. Sloan Canyon e/o The Old Road (County)	6	54,000	26,000	0.48	A	22,000	0.41	A
207. Sloan Canyon e/o Parker (County)	4	36,000	1,000	0.03	A	1,000	0.03	A
208. Sloan Canyon w/o Parker (County)	4	36,000	2,000	0.06	A	2,000	0.06	A
209. Sloan Canyon s/o Hillcrest (County)	2	18,000	4,000	0.22	A	3,000	0.17	A
210. Smyth s/o Copper Hill (City)	4	30,000	8,000	0.27	A	8,000	0.27	A
211. Soledad Canyon e/o Bouquet Canyon (City)	6	54,000	42,000	0.78	C	45,000	0.83	D
212. Soledad Canyon w/o Golden Valley (City)	6	54,000	38,000	0.70	B	38,000	0.70	B
213. Soledad Canyon e/o Golden Valley (City)	6	54,000	48,000	0.89	D	50,000	0.93	E
214. Soledad Canyon e/o Rainbow Glen (City)	6	54,000	43,000	0.80	C	43,000	0.80	C
215. Soledad Canyon w/o Whites Canyon (City)	6	54,000	38,000	0.70	B	38,000	0.70	B
216. Soledad Canyon e/o Whites Canyon (City)	6	54,000	43,000	0.80	C	44,000	0.81	D
217. Soledad Canyon e/o Sierra Hwy (City)	6	54,000	39,000	0.72	C	34,000	0.63	B
218. Soledad Canyon w/o Sand Canyon (City)	6	54,000	24,000	0.44	A	22,000	0.41	A
219. Soledad Canyon e/o Sand Canyon (City)	6	54,000	34,000	0.63	B	31,000	0.57	A
220. Soledad Canyon e/o SR-14 (at Sand Canyon) (City)	6	54,000	21,000	0.39	A	18,000	0.33	A
221. Soledad Canyon w/o Shadow Pines (City)	6	54,000	12,000	0.22	A	10,000	0.19	A
222. Soledad Canyon e/o Shadow Pines (City)	6	54,000	22,000	0.41	A	17,000	0.31	A
223. Soledad Canyon e/o SR-14 (County)	4	36,000	13,000	0.36	A	10,000	0.28	A
224. Soledad Canyon w/o Agua Dulce (County)	4	36,000	4,000	0.11	A	4,000	0.11	A
225. Soledad Canyon e/o Agua Dulce (County)	4	36,000	3,000	0.08	A	3,000	0.08	A
226. SR-126 at County Line (County)	4	44,000	33,000	0.75	C	32,000	0.73	C

Roadway Segment (Location)	Lanes	Capacity	Existing Area Plan and General Plan			OVOV Area Plan and General Plan		
			Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
227. SR-126 w/o San Martinez Grande Canyon (County)	4	44,000	34,000	0.77	C	33,000	0.75	C
228. SR-126 w/o Chiquito Canyon/Long Canyon (County)	4	44,000	39,000	0.89	D	38,000	0.86	D
229. SR-126 w/o Wolcott (County)	6	66,000	58,000	0.88	D	59,000	0.89	D
230. SR-126 w/o Commerce Center (County)	8	88,000	64,000	0.73	C	66,000	0.75	C
231. SR-126 w/o I-5 (County)	8	88,000	73,000	0.83	D	75,000	0.85	D
232. Stevenson Ranch w/o Old Road (County)	6	54,000	30,000	0.56	A	33,000	0.61	B
233. Stevenson Ranch n/o Poe (County)	6	54,000	8,000	0.15	A	11,000	0.20	A
234. Stevenson Ranch n/o Pico Canyon (County)	6	54,000	11,000	0.20	A	13,000	0.24	A
235. The Old Road n/o I-5 (at Lake Hughes) (County)	4	36,000	10,000	0.28	A	11,000	0.31	A
236. The Old Road n/o Sloan Canyon (County)	6	54,000	24,000	0.44	A	20,000	0.37	A
237. The Old Road n/o Parker (County)	4	36,000	4,000	0.11	A	3,000	0.08	A
238. The Old Road n/o Hillcrest (County)	4	36,000	14,000	0.39	A	13,000	0.36	A
239. The Old Road n/o Sedona Way (County)	4	36,000	25,000	0.69	B	23,000	0.64	B
240. The Old Road n/o Hasley Canyon (County)	4	36,000	24,000	0.67	B	23,000	0.64	B
241. The Old Road s/o Hasley Canyon (County)	6	54,000	18,000	0.33	A	16,000	0.30	A
242. The Old Road n/o Biscailuiz (County)	6	54,000	20,000	0.37	A	18,000	0.33	A
243. The Old Road n/o Turnberry (County)	6	54,000	20,000	0.37	A	17,000	0.31	A
244. The Old Road n/o Henry Mayo (County)	6	54,000	23,000	0.43	A	21,000	0.39	A
245. The Old Road s/o Henry Mayo (County)	6	54,000	19,000	0.35	A	16,000	0.30	A
246. The Old Road n/o Rye Canyon (County)	6	54,000	49,000	0.91	E	48,000	0.89	D
247. The Old Road n/o Magic Mtn (County)	6	54,000	54,000	1.00	E	52,000	0.96	E
248. The Old Road s/o Magic Mtn (County)	6	54,000	33,000	0.61	B	30,000	0.56	A
249. The Old Road s/o Valencia (County)	6	54,000	47,000	0.87	D	41,000	0.76	C
250. The Old Road s/o McBean (County)	6	54,000	41,000	0.76	C	35,000	0.65	B
251. The Old Road s/o Pico (County)	4	36,000	20,000	0.56	A	9,000	0.25	A
252. The Old Road n/o Calgrove (County)	4	36,000	24,000	0.67	B	13,000	0.36	A
253. The Old Road s/o Calgrove (County)	6	54,000	24,000	0.44	A	20,000	0.37	A
254. Tibbitts s/o Newhall Ranch (City)	6	54,000	34,000	0.63	B	34,000	0.63	B
255. Tibbitts n/o Magic Mtn (City)	6	54,000	32,000	0.59	A	32,000	0.59	A
256. Tournament s/o McBean (City)	2	15,000	6,000	0.40	A	7,000	0.47	A
257. Tourney n/o Valencia (City)	4	36,000	15,000	0.42	A	14,000	0.39	A

Roadway Segment (Location)	Lanes	Capacity	Existing Area Plan and General Plan			OVOV Area Plan and General Plan		
			Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
258. Valencia e/o Magic Mtn (County)	6	54,000	55,000	1.02	F	51,000	0.94	E
259. Valencia e/o Pico Canyon (County)	6	54,000	31,000	0.57	A	33,000	0.61	B
260. Valencia e/o Poe (County)	6	54,000	29,000	0.54	A	30,000	0.56	A
261. Valencia w/o Westridge (County)	6	54,000	44,000	0.81	D	46,000	0.85	D
262. Valencia w/o The Old Road (County)	7	63,000	60,000	0.95	E	61,000	0.97	E
263. Valencia e/o Old Road (County)	8	72,000	59,000	0.82	D	61,000	0.85	D
264. Valencia e/o I-5 (City)	8	72,000	66,000	0.92	E	68,000	0.94	E
265. Valencia e/o Tourney (City)	8	72,000	57,000	0.79	C	59,000	0.82	D
266. Valencia w/o McBean (City)	8	72,000	60,000	0.83	D	61,000	0.85	D
267. Valencia e/o McBean (City)	6	54,000	47,000	0.87	D	53,000	0.98	E
268. Valencia w/o Citrus (City)	6	54,000	51,000	0.94	E	53,000	0.98	E
269. Valencia s/o Magic Mtn (City)	6	54,000	47,000	0.87	D	48,000	0.89	D
270. Valencia n/o Magic Mtn (City)	6	54,000	61,000	1.13	F	60,000	1.11	F
271. Valencia s/o Cinema (City)	6	54,000	58,000	1.07	F	59,000	1.09	F
272. Valencia w/o Bouquet Canyon (City)	6	54,000	51,000	0.94	E	50,000	0.93	E
273. Valley s/o Lyons (City)	4	36,000	10,000	0.28	A	11,000	0.31	A
274. Vasquez Canyon e/o Bouquet Canyon (County)	2	18,000	6,000	0.33	A	6,000	0.33	A
275. Vasquez Canyon w/o Sierra Hwy (County)	2	18,000	11,000	0.61	B	10,000	0.56	A
276. Via Princessa e/o Oak Ridge (City)	6	54,000	37,000	0.69	B	37,000	0.69	B
277. Via Princessa e/o Magic Mtn (City)	6	54,000	54,000	1.00	E	52,000	0.96	E
278. Via Princessa e/o Santa Clarita (City)	6	54,000	66,000	1.22	F	66,000	1.22	F
279. Via Princessa w/o Rainbow Glen (City)	6	54,000	23,000	0.43	A	27,000	0.50	A
280. Via Princessa e/o Rainbow Glen (City)	6	54,000	26,000	0.48	A	29,000	0.54	A
281. Via Princessa s/o Whites Canyon (City)	6	54,000	55,000	1.02	F	52,000	0.96	E
282. Via Princessa s/o Sierra Hwy (City)	6	54,000	44,000	0.81	D	41,000	0.76	C
283. Via Princessa n/o Lost Canyon (County)	6	54,000	23,000	0.43	A	24,000	0.44	A
284. Via Princessa s/o Lost Canyon (County)	6	54,000	4,000	0.07	A	3,000	0.06	A
285. Westridge s/o Magic Mtn (County)	4	36,000	13,000	0.36	A	12,000	0.33	A
286. Westridge n/o Valencia (County)	4	36,000	11,000	0.31	A	9,000	0.25	A
287. Whites Canyon s/o Skyline Ranch (City)	6	54,000	19,000	0.35	A	19,000	0.35	A
288. Whites Canyon n/o Soledad (City)	6	54,000	43,000	0.80	C	42,000	0.78	C
289. Whites Canyon s/o Soledad (City)	6	54,000	50,000	0.93	E	48,000	0.89	D
290. Wiley Canyon e/o Orchard Village (City)	6	54,000	38,000	0.70	B	42,000	0.78	C


Roadway Segment (Location)	Lanes	Capacity	Existing Area Plan and General Plan			OVOV Area Plan and General Plan		
			Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
291. Wiley Canyon e/o Tournament (City)	6	54,000	29,000	0.54	A	32,000	0.59	A
292. Wiley Canyon n/o Lyons (City)	6	54,000	31,000	0.57	A	34,000	0.63	B
293. Wiley Canyon s/o Lyons (City)	4	36,000	17,000	0.47	A	20,000	0.56	A
294. Wiley Canyon n/o Calgrove (City)	4	36,000	19,000	0.53	A	19,000	0.53	A
295. Wolcott n/o SR-126 (County)	2	15,000	6,000	0.40	A	6,000	0.40	A
296. Wolcott s/o SR-126 (County)	4	36,000	13,000	0.36	A	14,000	0.39	A
297. 13 <sup>th</sup> St. e/o Railroad (City)	2	15,000	14,000	0.93	E	11,000	0.73	C
298. 16 <sup>th</sup> St. e/o Orchard Village (City)	4	36,000	9,000	0.25	A	9,000	0.25	A
Average	n/a	n/a	29,583	0.59	A	29,003	0.57	A

### *Principal Intersections*

**Table 3.2-10, ICU and LOS Summary for Principal Intersections – Existing Conditions vs OVOV Buildout Conditions (With Highway Plan Roadways)**, identifies the LOS ratings at principal intersections in the study area under existing conditions and proposed City General Plan and County Area Highway Plans. Table 3.2-10 shows that with the proposed Highway Plan in place, there are no intersections forecast to exceed LOS E, as is also the case for existing conditions.

### **Plan to Plan Analysis**

**Table 3.2-11, Comparison of Existing General Plan and Area Plan Intersections with OVOV Buildout without Improvements to Roadways**, identifies the LOS ratings at principal intersections in the study area under both the existing and proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan. Additionally, this table identifies LOS ratings at the same principal intersections based on the existing roadway configurations and the modified roadway configurations under the proposed Highway Plan. Peak hour volumes for principal intersections are shown in **Figure 3.2-8, Level of Service Comparison for Principal Intersections**.



SOURCE: Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. - June 2010

FIGURE 3.2-8

Level of Service Comparison for Principal Intersections

As previously stated, an LOS F rating is considered unacceptable. As shown in this table, without implementation of the roadway improvements in the proposed Highway Plan, multiple intersections would operate at LOS F under buildout of either the existing or proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan. Under the current County Area Plan and City General Plan, the following 12 intersections would operate at LOS F during one or both peak hours without incorporation of the roadway improvements:

**Table 3.2-10  
ICU and LOS Summary for Principal Intersections – Existing Conditions vs OVOV Buildout  
Conditions (With Highway Plan Roadways)**

Intersection	Buildout Intersection Lanes							
	Existing Conditions				OVOV GP With Highway Plan			
	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
1. The Old Road & Rye Canyon	.61	B	.66	B	.85	D	.99	E
2. The Old Road & Magic Mountain	.28	A	.32	A	.78	C	.86	D
3. The Old Road & Valencia	.67	B	.44	A	.84	D	.95	E
4. The Old Road & Stevenson Ranch	.58	A	.76	C	.65	B	.90	D
5. The Old Road & Pico Canyon	.76	C	.71	C	.85	D	.97	E
6. Rye/Copper Hill & Newhall Ranch	.63	B	.70	B	.81	D	.89	D
7. McBean & Newhall Ranch	.73	C	.78	C	.83	D	.89	D
8. McBean & Magic Mountain	.61	B	.76	C	.77	C	.95	E
9. McBean & Valencia	.61	B	.74	C	.70	B	.87	D
10. Orchard Village & McBean	.57	A	.68	B	.78	C	.98	E
11. Orchard Village & Wiley Canyon	.60	A	.62	B	.78	C	.98	E
12. Valencia & Magic Mountain	.58	A	.66	B	.82	D	.86	D
13. Bouquet Canyon & Plum Canyon	.68	B	.73	C	.80	C	.77	C
14. Bouquet Canyon & Newhall Ranch	.66	B	.82	D	.86	D	.89	D
15. Bouquet Canyon & Soledad Canyon	.68	B	.77	C	.78	C	.90	D
16. Railroad & Lyons	.57	A	.56	A	.60	A	.83	D
17. Sierra Highway & Newhall	.57	A	.64	B	.86	D	.93	E
18. Whites Canyon & Soledad Canyon	.80	C	.86	D	.80	C	.90	D
19. Sierra Highway & Soledad Canyon	.67	B	.76	C	.86	D	.89	D
20. Commerce Center & Magic Mtn <sup>1</sup>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	.76	C	.77	C
21. Pico Canyon & Valencia Boulevard <sup>1</sup>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	.75	C	.81	D

Intersection	Buildout Intersection Lanes							
	Existing Conditions				OVOV GP With Highway Plan			
	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
22. Magic Mountain & Via Princesa <sup>1</sup>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	.61	B	.81	D
23. Golden Valley & Via Princesa <sup>1</sup>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	.88	D	.76	C

*LOS in **Bold** exceeds performance criteria of LOS E.*

<sup>1</sup> Future Intersection

Level of service ranges:

.00 - .60	A	.61 - .70	B	.71 - .80	C
.81 - .90	D	.91 - 1.00	E	Above 1.00	F

### County

- The Old Road and Rye Canyon (Intersection No. 1)
- The Old Road and Magic Mountain (Intersection No. 2)
- The Old Road and McBean (Intersection No. 4)
- The Old Road and Pico Canyon (Intersection No. 5)

### City

- McBean & Newhall Ranch (Intersection No. 7)
- Orchard Village and McBean (Intersection No. 10)
- Orchard Village and Wiley Canyon (Intersection No. 11)
- Valencia and Magic Mountain (Intersection No. 12)
- Bouquet Canyon and Newhall Ranch (Intersection No. 14)
- Sierra Highway and Newhall (Intersection No. 17)
- Sierra Highway and Soledad Canyon (Intersection No. 19)

Under the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan, all of the above intersections, except Intersection No. 5 (The Old Road and Pico Canyon), would operate at LOS F during one or both peak hours without incorporation of the roadway improvements. Overall, the ICU values at each intersection under either buildout scenario would be comparable.

As shown in **Table 3.2-11**, incorporation of the proposed Highway Plan roadway improvements would reduce the number of intersections operating at LOS F to two intersections (Intersection No. 5, The Old

Road & Pico Canyon, and Intersection No. 17, Sierra Highway & Newhall) under buildout of the existing County Area Plan and City General Plan, and would eliminate LOS F ratings from all intersections under buildout of the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan. An illustration of intersection LOS conditions based on both the proposed OVOV land uses and the existing County Area Plan and City General Plan is provided in **Figure 3.2-8**.

Given the existing LOS ratings identified in **Table 3.2-5**, this analysis indicates that each of the principal intersections, with the exception of Bouquet Canyon Road at Plum Canyon Road, would be significantly impacted as the Santa Clarita Valley builds out under either the existing or the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan. However, no intersection would operate at LOS F under the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan, while two intersections would operate at LOS F under the existing County Area Plan and City General Plan. Therefore, intersection operations would incrementally improve with implementation of the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan in place of the existing County Area Plan and City General Plan.

**Table 3.2-11**  
**Comparison of Existing General Plan and Area Plan Intersections with OVOV Buildout without Improvements to Roadways**

Intersection (Location)	<u>Current Area Plan and General Plan</u>				<u>OVOV Area Plan and General Plan</u>				
	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		
	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	
<b><u>Existing Intersection Configurations</u></b>									
1. The Old Road & Rye Canyon (County)	1.58	F	2.31	F	1.74	F	2.30	F	
2. The Old Road & Magic Mountain (County)	.79	C	1.03	F	.78	C	1.06	F	
3. The Old Road & Valencia (County)	0.85	D	0.95	E	0.84	D	0.95	E	
4. The Old Road & McBean (County)	0.72	C	1.05	F	0.69	B	1.12	F	
5. The Old Road & Pico Canyon (County)	1.05	F	1.08	F	0.93	E	0.99	E	
6. Rye/Copper Hill & Newhall Ranch (City)	0.85	D	0.89	D	0.81	D	0.89	D	
7. McBean & Newhall Ranch (City)	0.80	C	1.15	F	0.83	D	0.93	E	
8. McBean & Magic Mountain (City)	0.87	D	1.21	F	0.97	E	1.24	F	
9. McBean & Valencia (City)	0.70	B	0.89	D	0.71	C	0.94	E	
10. Orchard Village & McBean (City)	0.91	E	1.23	F	0.94	E	1.26	F	
11. Orchard Village & Wiley Canyon (City)	1.00	E	1.42	F	1.04	F	1.42	F	
12. Valencia & Magic Mountain (City)	0.98	E	1.13	F	1.10	F	1.25	F	
13. Bouquet Canyon & Plum Canyon (City)	0.80	C	0.76	C	0.80	C	0.77	C	
14. Bouquet Canyon & Newhall Ranch	0.97	E	1.16	F	1.00	E	1.17	F	

Intersection (Location)	<u>Current Area Plan and General Plan</u>				<u>OVOV Area Plan and General Plan</u>			
	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
(City)								
15. Bouquet Canyon & Soledad Canyon (City)	0.80	C	.99	E	0.78	C	1.00	E
16. Railroad & Lyons (City)	0.71	C	0.94	E	0.60	A	0.83	D
17. Sierra Highway & Newhall (City)	1.31	F	1.29	F	1.14	F	1.23	F
18. Whites Canyon & Soledad Canyon (City)	0.89	D	0.92	E	0.86	D	0.91	E
19. Sierra Highway & Soledad Canyon (City)	0.90	D	1.23	F	0.86	D	1.10	F
20. Commerce Center & Magic Mountain (County)*	0.76	C	0.74	C	0.76	C	0.77	C
21. Pico Canyon & Valencia Boulevard (County) *	0.85	D	0.98	E	0.75	C	0.81	D
22. Magic Mountain & Via Princesa (City) *	0.57	A	0.80	C	0.61	A	0.81	D
23. Golden Valley & Via Princesa (City) *	0.91	E	0.83	D	0.88	D	0.76	C
<b><u>Intersection Configurations Under Proposed Highway Plan</u></b>								
1. The Old Road & Rye Canyon (County)	0.70	B	1.00	E	0.85	D	0.99	E
2. The Old Road & Magic Mountain (County)	0.79	C	0.84	D	0.78	C	0.86	D
3. The Old Road & Valencia (County)	0.85	D	0.92	E	0.84	D	0.95	E
4. The Old Road & McBean (County)	0.68	B	0.95	E	0.65	B	0.90	D
5. The Old Road & Pico Canyon (County)	0.96	E	1.07	F	0.85	D	0.97	E
6. Rye/Copper Hill & Newhall Ranch (City)	0.85	D	0.89	D	0.81	D	0.89	D
7. McBean & Newhall Ranch (City)	0.80	C	0.88	D	0.83	D	0.89	D
8. McBean & Magic Mountain (City)	0.75	C	0.93	E	0.77	C	0.95	E
9. McBean & Valencia (City)	0.66	B	0.85	D	0.70	B	0.87	D
10. Orchard Village & McBean (City)	0.79	C	0.97	E	0.78	C	0.98	E
11. Orchard Village & Wiley Canyon (City)	0.74	C	0.98	E	0.78	C	0.98	E
12. Valencia & Magic Mountain (City)	0.83	D	0.95	E	0.82	D	0.86	D
13. Bouquet Canyon & Plum Canyon (City)	0.80	C	0.76	C	0.80	C	0.77	C
14. Bouquet Canyon & Newhall Ranch (City)	0.84	D	0.87	D	0.86	D	0.89	D
15. Bouquet Canyon & Soledad Canyon (City)	0.80	C	0.90	D	0.78	C	0.90	D
16. Railroad & Lyons (City)	0.71	C	0.94	E	0.60	A	0.83	D
17. Sierra Highway & Newhall (City)	0.99	E	0.99	E	0.86	D	0.93	E

Intersection (Location)	Current Area Plan and General Plan				OVOV Area Plan and General Plan			
	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS
18. Whites Canyon & Soledad Canyon (City)	0.80	C	0.92	E	0.80	C	0.90	D
19. Sierra Highway & Soledad Canyon (City)	0.88	D	0.88	D	0.86	D	0.89	D
20. Commerce Center & Magic Mountain (County) *	0.76	C	0.74	C	0.76	C	0.77	C
21. Pico Canyon & Valencia Boulevard (County) *	0.85	D	0.98	E	0.75	C	0.81	D
22. Magic Mountain & Via Princesa (City) *	0.57	A	0.80	C	0.61	B	0.81	D
23. Golden Valley & Via Princesa (City) *	0.91	E	0.83	D	0.88	D	0.76	C

Source: Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. 2010.

\* Denotes a future intersection.

## Plan to Plan Analysis

### Vehicle Miles Traveled

The traffic forecasting process utilized by the SCVCTM also calculates vehicle miles travelled (VMT) based on the geographical placement of land uses within an area and the number of trips they generate. **Table 3.2-12, Trip Length and VMT Comparison – Existing County Area Plan and City General Plan Buildout vs. OVOV Buildout**, provides a comparison between total ADT, VMT and trip length under buildout of the existing and proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan. The table shows that the total number of vehicle trips under buildout of the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan is approximately 1 percent lower than those under buildout of the existing County Area Plan and City General Plan. The table also shows that total VMT is reduced by approximately 15 percent and the average trip length is reduced by approximately 1.9 miles. The amount of VMT is reduced due to the land use designations between the existing Area Plan and City General Plan and the proposed Area Plan and General Plan. As described in **Section 3.1, Land Use and Planning**, the proposed Area Plan would decrease by 10,224 acres of rural land, increase 9,417 acres of urban residential (includes mixed uses), and would increase by 1,897 acres of commercial and industrial land uses.

**Table 3.2-12**  
**Trip Length and VMT Comparison – Existing County Area Plan and City General Plan Buildout vs. OVOV Buildout**

Scenario	ADT	Total VMT	Average Trip Length (miles)
Existing County Area Plan and City General Plan at Buildout	1,874,000	25,373,000	13.5
Proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan at Buildout	1,860,000	21,532,000	11.6
Difference	-14,000	-3,841,000	-1.9
	-1%	-15%	-14%

Source: Santa Clarita Valley Consolidated Traffic Model (SCVCTM)

ADT = Average Daily Trips

VMT = Vehicle Miles Traveled (daily)

### *Analysis of Proposed Area Plan Policies*

The technical analysis above provides a general overview of long-term impacts to various arterial roadway segments and principal intersections in the OVOV Planning Area. However, impacts on roadway segments and intersections would be assessed on a project by project basis as buildout of the proposed Area Plan occurs; the actual impacts are dependent on the uses proposed by each individual project. In order to ensure that impacts to roadway segments and intersections would be minimized, the proposed Area Plan contains several policies intended to increase mobility, ensure the funding of transportation improvements, and reduce vehicle trips.

The proposed Area Plan would promote transit-oriented development (**Policy C 1.2.1**), mixed-use development (**Policy C 1.2.5**), and walkable and bicycle-friendly communities (**Policies C 1.2.2 and 1.2.12**) that place housing and businesses in close proximity and connect such uses to alternative modes of transportation. Development would be oriented around public transit and pedestrian circulation via flexible roadway design and parking standards (**Policies C 1.2.4 and C 1.2.6**), smaller blocks (**Policy C 1.2.7**), unified neighborhoods (**Policy C 1.2.10**) and the provision of the right-of-way for non-vehicular transportation modes (**Policy C 1.2.9**). Smart growth concepts would be followed to reduce VMT (**Policy C 1.2.11**). Additionally, the location, availability, and accessibility of transit would be considered in the evaluation of new development plans (**Policy C 1.2.12**), and new commercial and industrial development would be required to provide walkway connections to public sidewalks and transit stops, where available (**Policy C 1.2.3**).

Another objective of the proposed Area Plan is to ensure that funding and phasing of new transportation improvements as growth occurs in the County's Planning Area. The County would require that new development would construct or provide its fair share of the cost of transportation improvements, and that required improvements or in-lieu contributions are in place to support the development prior to occupancy (**Policy C 2.6.1**). The County would also consider implementation of a joint City/County transportation management system impact fee to better address traffic impacts that cannot be mitigated (**Policy C 2.6.2**). The County would work with other local, regional, state and federal agencies in identifying funding alternatives for the Santa Clarita Valley's transportation systems (**Policy C 2.6.3**). These policies would help maintain a functional and adequate transportation system throughout the Santa Clarita Valley.

To further reduce VMT, the proposed Area Plan would require trip reduction measures in evaluating new development projects (**Policy C 3.1.1**); promote home-based business and live-work units as a means of reducing home-to-work trips (**Policy C 3.1.2**), promote the use of flexible work schedules (**Policy C 3.1.3**), promote employee incentives to encourage alternative travel modes to work (**Policy C 3.1.4**), promote the use of van pools and car pools (**Policy C 3.1.5**), promote the provision of showers within businesses to encourage bicycling to work (**Policy C 3.1.6**) and encourage special event center operators to advertise and offer discount passes with event tickets and carpooling patrons (**Policies C 3.1.7 and C 3.1.8**). All of these policies represent ways in which the County would promote the use of travel demand strategies to reduce vehicle trips.

### ***Proposed Area Plan Policies***

- Policy C 1.2.1:** Develop coordinated plans for land use, circulation, and transit to promote transit-oriented development that concentrates higher density housing, employment, and commercial areas in proximity to transit corridors.
- Policy C 1.2.2:** Create walkable communities, with paseos and walkways connecting residential neighborhoods to multi-modal transportation services such as bus stops and rail stations.
- Policy C 1.2.3:** Require that new commercial and industrial development provide walkway connections to public sidewalks and transit stops, where available.
- Policy C 1.2.4:** Consider location, availability, and accessibility of transit in evaluating new development plans.

- Policy C 1.2.5:** In mixed use projects, require compact development and a mix of land uses to locate housing, workplaces, and services within walking or bicycling distance of each other.
- Policy C 1.2.6:** Provide flexible standards for parking and roadway design in transit-oriented development areas to promote transit use, where appropriate.
- Policy C 1.2.7:** In pedestrian-oriented areas, provide a highly connected circulation grid with relatively small blocks to encourage walking.
- Policy C 1.2.9:** Emphasize providing right-of-way for non-vehicular transportation modes so that walking and bicycling are the easiest, most convenient modes of transportation available for short trips.
- Policy C 1.2.10:** Protect communities by discouraging the construction of facilities that sever residential neighborhoods.
- Policy C 1.2.11:** Reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) through the use of smart growth concepts.
- Policy C 1.2.12:** Balance the anticipated volume of people and goods movement with the need to maintain a walkable and bicycle friendly environment.
- Policy C 2.6.1:** Require that new development construct or provide its fair share of the cost of transportation improvements, and that required improvements or in-lieu contributions are in place to support the development prior to occupancy.
- Policy C 2.6.2:** Evaluate the feasibility of establishing a joint City/County Intelligent Transportation Management System (ITMS) impact fee for new development that is unable to otherwise mitigate its impacts to the roadway system through implementation of the adopted Highway Plan.
- Policy C 2.6.3:** Support local, regional, state and federal agencies in identifying and implementing funding alternatives for the Valley's transportation systems.
- Policy C 3.1.1:** In evaluating new development projects, require trip reduction measures as feasible to relieve congestion and reduce air pollution from vehicle emissions.

- Policy C 3.1.2:** Promote home-based businesses and live-work units as a means of reducing home-to-work trips.
- Policy C 3.1.3:** Promote the use of flexible work schedules and telecommuting to reduce home to work trips.
- Policy C 3.1.4:** Promote the use of employee incentives to encourage alternative travel modes to work.
- Policy C 3.1.5:** Promote the use of van pools, car pools, and shuttles to encourage trip reduction.
- Policy C 3.1.6:** Promote the provision of showers and lockers within businesses and employment centers, in order to encourage opportunities for employees to bicycle to work.
- Policy C 3.1.7:** Encourage special event center operators to advertise and offer discounted transit passes with event tickets.
- Policy C 3.1.8:** Encourage special event center operators to advertise and offer discount on-site parking incentives to carpooling patrons with four or more persons per vehicle.

### ***Effectiveness of Proposed Area Plan Policies***

The proposed Area Plan would promote denser, transit-oriented development in areas where transit use is already high. Emphasis is also placed on introducing mixed-use development in order to allow residents to reach services in ways that are not exclusively automobile-dependent, such as by walking, biking and transit. Grouping mixed uses together also reduces the need for residents to make multiple vehicle trips to obtain services and reach employment centers, resulting in a net reduction in the number of vehicles on the roadway. The proposed OVOV land uses also represent a reduction in residential dwelling units of approximately 4 percent and an increase in office square footage of approximately 21 percent in comparison to the current County Area Plan and City General Plan. This change results in an improved jobs-to-housing balance for the Santa Clarita Valley, which reduces the need for residents to commute outside of the Valley for employment. For these reasons, trip generation, VMT, and impacts on arterial roadways and intersections would be incrementally reduced with the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan in place of the current County Area Plan and City General Plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**Impact 3.19-2 Implementation of the proposed Area Plan could exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways.**

In conformance with the Los Angeles County CMP, the maximum acceptable level of service on CMP roadways within the OVOV Planning Area is LOS E. As previously stated, the following CMP roadways are located within the OVOV Planning Area:

#### **Freeways**

- I-5 Freeway
- SR-14 Freeway

#### **Arterial Roadway Segments**

- Sierra Highway from Newhall Avenue to the SR-14 freeway at Red Rover Mine Road
- Magic Mountain Parkway from the I-5 freeway to Railroad Avenue
- Railroad Avenue/Newhall Avenue from Magic Mountain Parkway to the SR-14 freeway

As shown in **Tables 3.2-8** and **3.2-9**, each of the three CMP arterial roadway segments would operate at LOS E or better under the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan. Therefore, the following analysis evaluates impacts on the I-5 and SR-14 freeways. Caltrans has identified proposed improvements to the I-5 freeway through the Santa Clarita Valley. Caltrans currently proposes to add additional lanes to the I-5 freeway between the SR-14 interchange and the Parker Road interchange, a distance of approximately 13.6 miles. This includes extending the existing HOV lanes from the SR-14 interchange to just south of the Parker Road interchange, incorporating truck climbing lanes from the SR-14 interchange to the Pico Canyon Road/Lyons Avenue interchange, and constructing and/or extending auxiliary lanes between interchanges at six locations.

The North County Combined Highway Corridors Study, a joint study sponsored in part by Metro, Caltrans, the County of Los Angeles, and the City of Santa Clarita, identified the SR-14 freeway through the OVOV area as needing additional lanes to accommodate existing and anticipated increases in traffic volumes. The study identified a short-range plan to complete the mainline to a minimum of three lanes in each direction, and a long-range plan to complete the mainline to four lanes in each direction between the Newhall Avenue interchange and the Sand Canyon interchange, and to add a dedicated truck lane between the I-5 freeway and the Placerita Canyon Road interchange.

The study also identified a short-range plan to convert the existing HOV lanes to a reversible HOV lane configuration that would provide three HOV lanes in the peak travel direction. However, subsequent planning efforts by Caltrans and Metro have focused on utilizing two conventional (i.e., non-reversible) HOV lanes in each direction in-lieu of reversible HOV lanes. Caltrans is currently constructing HOV lane direct connectors between the existing SR-14 HOV lanes and the existing I-5 HOV lanes. This project is estimated to be completed by 2013.

A summary of ADT volumes, as well as AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes, is provided in **Table 3.2-13, Freeway Segment Level of Service** for six key freeway segments within the OVOV Planning Area. The freeway LOS ratings are presented for both the existing number of lanes and the planned number of lanes described above. As shown in the table, all six freeway segments, except for the I-5 freeway south of the Parker Interchange, would operate at LOS F during both peak hours under buildout of the current or proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan if the additional freeway lanes are not added. However, with incorporation of the additional freeway lanes described above, the number of segments operating at LOS F during both peak hours would be reduced to the following three segments under buildout of the existing County Area Plan and City General Plan:

- SR-14 south of Aqua Dulce Interchange;
- SR-14 south of Sierra Highway Interchange; and
- SR-14 north of I-5 Interchange.

### **Plan to Plan Analysis**

Under buildout of the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan, the number of segments operating at LOS F during both peak hours would be further reduced to the following two segments with incorporation of the additional freeway lanes.

- SR-14 south of Aqua Dulce Interchange; and
- SR-14 south of Sierra Highway Interchange.

Therefore, traffic impacts on each freeway segment would be incrementally lower under the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan than the existing City General Plan and County Area Plan.

**Table 3.2-13  
Freeway Segment Level of Service**

Segment	<u>AM Peak Hour</u>		<u>PM Peak Hour</u>	
	NB	SB	NB	SB
<b><u>Existing Lane Configuration</u></b>				
<b>I-5 south of Parker Interchange</b>				
Existing Conditions	A	A	B	B
Current GP	C	D	F	E
Proposed OVOV GP	C	D	F	E
<b>I-5 south of Valencia Interchange</b>				
Existing Conditions	C	C	D	D
Current GP	F	F	F	F
Proposed OVOV GP	E	F	F	F
<b>I-5 north of SR-14 Interchange</b>				
Existing Conditions	A	F	D	E
Current GP	F	F	F	F
Proposed OVOV GP	E	F	F	F
<b>SR-14 south of Aqua Dulce Interchange</b>				
Existing Conditions	A	C	C	B
Current GP	C	F	F	C
Proposed OVOV GP	B	F	F	B
<b>SR-14 south of Sierra Highway Interchange</b>				
Existing Conditions	A	C	D	B
Current GP	B	F	F	C
Proposed OVOV GP	B	F	F	C
<b>SR-14 north of I-5 Interchange</b>				
Existing Conditions	A	C	C	B
Current GP	C	F	F	C
Proposed OVOV GP	B	F	F	C
<b><u>Planned Freeway Configuration</u></b>				
<b>I-5 south of Parker Interchange</b>				
Current GP	C	C	D	D
Proposed OVOV GP	B	C	D	D
<b>I-5 south of Valencia Interchange</b>				
Current GP	D	E	E	E
Proposed OVOV GP	D	D	E	E

Segment	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	NB	SB	NB	SB
<b>I-5 north of SR-14 Interchange</b>				
Current GP	D	D	E	D
Proposed OVOV GP	C	C	D	D
<b>SR-14 south of Aqua Dulce Interchange</b>				
Current GP	B	F	F	C
Proposed OVOV GP	A	F	F	B
<b>SR-14 south of Sierra Highway Interchange</b>				
Current GP	B	F	F	C
Proposed OVOV GP	B	F	F	B
<b>SR-14 north of I-5 Interchange</b>				
Current GP	B	F	F	C
Proposed OVOV GP	B	E	E	B

### *Analysis of Proposed Area Plan Policies*

The proposed Area Plan contains two policies that specifically address impacts to CMP arterial roadway and freeway segments. The County would continue to coordinate with Metro to implement the CMP for designated roadways (**Policy C 1.3.1**), and continue to coordinate with Caltrans on circulation and land use decisions that could affect I-5 and SR-14 (**Policy C 1.3.4**) to increase capacity and improve operations on these roadways.

### *Proposed Area Plan Policies*

**Policy C 1.3.1:** Continue coordinating with the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA or Metro) to implement the County’s Congestion Management Program (CMP) for designated CMP roadways.

**Policy C 1.3.4:** Continue coordination with Caltrans on circulation and land use decisions that may affect Interstate 5, State Route 14, and State Route 126, and support programs to increase capacity and improve operations on these highways.

### *Effectiveness of Proposed Area Plan Policies*

Adherence to the proposed Area Plan policies would ensure that the planned improvements to the I-5 and SR-14 freeways would be implemented. With these roadway improvements, operating conditions along both freeways would improve. These proposed policies would be supported by the increased

coordination between the County and City regarding land use and transportation improvements, an opportunity provided through the OVOV planning process.

As shown in **Tables 3.2-8 and 3.2-13**, operating conditions along CMP roadways would improve with buildout of the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan in place of the current County Area Plan and City General Plan. However, roadway conditions would only improve with the implementation of roadway improvements. Therefore, impacts would remain potentially significant without mitigation.

**Impact 3.2-3                    Implementation of the proposed Area Plan would not 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.**

The proposed Area Plan would result in a significant impact to air traffic patterns if it would cause an increase in air traffic levels or introduce incompatible land uses. Buildout of the proposed Area Plan would not result in the development of a new airport within the OVOV Planning Area nor would it introduce new land uses that could prevent safety hazards to air traffic. The proposed Area Plan contains a policy to ensure consistency with the County's Airport Land Use Plan as it pertains to the Agua Dulce Airport (**Policy C 1.3.5**).

### ***Proposed Area Plan Policies***

**Policy C 1.3.5:**            Ensure consistency with the County's adopted Airport Land Use Plan as it pertains to the Agua Dulce Airport, in order to mitigate aviation-related hazards and protect airport operations from encroachment by incompatible uses.

### ***Effectiveness of Proposed Area Plan Policies***

The proposed Area Plan policy ensures consistency with the Airport Land Use Plan for the Agua Dulce Airport, the only airport that influences land use within the OVOV Planning Area. Since no other airport land use plans are applicable to development within the OVOV Planning Area, the above policy is considered effective. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Impact 3.2-4                    Implementation of the proposed Area Plan would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).**

The proposed Area Plan promotes changes to the designs of specific roadways that enhance their safety. These include increasing the number of lanes on major highways and other improvements under the

proposed Highway Plan (see **Appendix 3.2** for a detailed description of the Highway Plan). Hazards due to roadway design features would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis as buildout of the proposed Area Plan occurs. However, the proposed Area Plan does contain several policies that would reduce the potential for hazardous design.

The County would periodically monitor levels of service, traffic accident patterns, and physical conditions of the existing street system, and upgrade roadways as needed through the Capital Improvement Program (**Policy C 2.1.5**). Additionally, the County would apply consistent standards throughout the Santa Clarita Valley for street design to promote travel safety. It would accomplish this by designating roadways based on their functional classification (**Policy C 2.2.1**), adopting consistent standard street cross sections (**Policy C 2.2.2**), coordinating circulation plans of new development project with each other (**Policy C 2.2.3**), and adopting common standards for pavement width (**Policy C 2.2.5**). Within residential neighborhoods, “healthy streets” would be promoted through traffic-calming devices, shorter block length, and other considerations (**Policy C 2.2.6**). Where practical, the use of a grid or modified grid street system would be encouraged (**Policy 2.2.7**), and local street patterns would be designed to create logical and understandable travel paths for users and discourage cut-through traffic (**Policy C 2.2.8**). As set forth by **Policy C 2.2.10**, the street system design, including block length, width, horizontal and vertical alignments, curves, and other design characteristics, should function safely and effectively without the subsequent need for excessive traffic control devices to slow or deflect traffic. For intersections of collector or larger streets, four-way intersections would be preferred over offset intersection (**Policy C 2.2.11**), and private streets would typically be constructed to standards for public rights-of-way (**Policy C 2.2.12**).

### **Plan to Plan Analysis**

Both the existing Area Plan and proposed Area Plan contain policies that would encourage safe roadway design and use. Impacts would be similar between both Area Plans.

### ***Proposed Area Plan Policies***

**Policy C 2.1.5:** Periodically monitor levels of service, traffic accident patterns, and physical conditions of the existing street system, and upgrade roadways as needed through the Capital Improvement Program.

**Policy C 2.2.1:** Designate roadways within the planning area based on their functional classification as shown on Exhibit C 2.

- Policy C 2.2.2:** Adopt consistent standard street cross sections for City and County roadways in the planning area, as shown on Exhibit C 3.
- Policy C 2.2.3:** Coordinate circulation plans of new development projects with each other and the surrounding street network, within both City and County areas.
- Policy C 2.2.5:** Adopt common standards for pavement width in consideration of capacity needs to serve projected travel demand, provided that a reduction in pavement width may be allowed in order to reduce traffic speeds, protect resources, enhance pedestrian mobility, or as otherwise deemed appropriate by the reviewing authority.
- Policy C 2.2.6:** Within residential neighborhoods, promote the design of “healthy streets” which may include reduced pavement width, shorter block length, provision of on-street parking, traffic-calming devices, bike routes and pedestrian connectivity, landscaped parkways, and canopy street trees.
- Policy C 2.2.7:** Where practical, encourage the use of grid or modified grid street systems to increase connectivity and walkability; where cul-de-sacs are provided, promote the use of walkways connecting cul-de-sac bulbs to adjacent streets and/or facilities to facilitate pedestrian access; where street connectivity is limited and pedestrian routes are spaced over 500 feet apart, promote the use of intermediate pedestrian connections through or between blocks.
- Policy C 2.2.8:** Local street patterns should be designed to create logical and understandable travel paths for users and to provide access between neighborhoods for local residents while discouraging cut-through traffic; cul-de-sac length should not exceed 600 feet, and “dog-leg” cul-de-sacs with one or more turns between the bulb and the outlet should be avoided where possible.
- Policy C 2.2.10:** The street system design, including block length, width, horizontal and vertical alignments, curves, and other design characteristics, should function safely and effectively without the subsequent need for excessive traffic control devices to slow or deflect traffic.
- Policy C 2.2.11:** For intersections of collector or larger streets, four-way intersections are preferred over offset intersections.

**Policy C 2.2.12:** Private streets, other than driveways and alleyways typically associated with multi-family development, should be constructed to standards for public rights-of-way, except as otherwise approved by the reviewing agency.

### *Effectiveness of Proposed Area Plan Policies*

Implementation of the proposed Area Plan policies would establish several roadway design standards for future development within the County's Planning Area. They would promote standards pertaining to roadway width, block length, street parking, and other features to achieve safe design. Additionally, the County would monitor levels of service, traffic accident patterns, and the physical conditions of the existing street system, and upgrade roadways as needed. Since the proposed Area Plan would provide the framework to avoid roadway hazards, as opposed to increasing their occurrence, impacts would be less than significant.

**Impact 3.2-5 Implementation of the proposed Area Plan would not result in inadequate emergency access.**

Emergency access would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis as buildout of the proposed Area Plan occurs. However, the proposed Area Plan contains several policies intended to ensure that adequate emergency access is maintained throughout the Santa Clarita Valley. In order to promote mobility within the roadway network, the proposed Area Plan seeks to limit excessive cross traffic, access points, and turning movements on arterial highways; and enforce the appropriate spacing of traffic signals (**Policy C 2.1.1**), enhance connectivity of the roadway network through such methods as grade separations and bridges (**Policy C 2.1.2**), enhance the capacity of the roadway system by upgrading intersections when necessary (**Policy C 2.1.3**), ensure that the future dedication and acquisitions of roadways are based on projected demand (**Policy C 2.1.5**), and implement the construction of paved crossover points through medians for emergency vehicles (**Policy C 2.2.9**).

Additionally, the proposed Area Plan would facilitate consideration of the needs for emergency access in transportation planning. The County would maintain a current evacuation plan (**Policy C 2.5.1**), ensure that new development is provided with adequate emergency and/or secondary access, including two points of ingress and egress for most subdivisions (**Policy C 2.5.2**), require visible street name signage (**Policy C 2.5.3**), and provide directional signage to the I-5 and SR-14 freeways at key intersections to assist in emergency evacuation operations (**Policy C 2.5.4**).

***Proposed Area Plan Policies***

- Policy C 2.1.1:** Protect mobility on arterial highways by limiting excessive cross traffic, access points, and turning movements; traffic signals on arterial highways should be spaced at least ½-mile apart, and the minimum allowable separation should be at least ¼-mile.
- Policy C 2.1.2:** Enhance connectivity of the roadway network to the extent feasible given the constraints of topography, existing development patterns, and environmental resources, by constructing grade separations and bridges; connecting discontinuous streets; extending secondary access into areas where needed; prohibiting gates on public streets; and other improvements as deemed appropriate based on traffic analysis.
- Policy C 2.1.3:** Protect and enhance the capacity of the roadway system by upgrading intersections to meet level of service standards, widening and/or restriping for additional lanes, synchronizing traffic signals, and other means as appropriate.
- Policy C 2.1.4:** Ensure that future dedication and acquisition of right-of-way is based on the adopted Circulation Plan, proposed land uses, and projected demand.
- Policy C 2.2.9:** Medians constructed in arterial streets should be provided with paved crossover points for emergency vehicles, where deemed necessary by the Fire Department.
- Policy C 2.5.1:** Maintain a current evacuation plan as part of emergency response planning.
- Policy C 2.5.2:** Ensure that new development is provided with adequate emergency and/or secondary access for purposes of evacuation and emergency response; require two points of ingress and egress for every subdivision or phase thereof, except as otherwise approved for small subdivisions where physical constraints preclude a second access point.
- Policy C 2.5.3:** Require provision of visible street name signs and addresses on all development to aid in emergency response.
- Policy C 2.5.4:** Provide directional signage to Interstate 5 and State Route 14 at key intersections in the Valley, to assist emergency evacuation operations.

### *Effectiveness of Proposed Area Plan Policies*

The proposed Area Plan policies are designed to maintain adequate emergency access throughout the County's Planning Area. They would promote mobility to allow for acceptable response times by emergency vehicles, and ensure emergency access to various types of properties. Additionally, the County would maintain a current evacuation plan. Since the proposed Area Plan would provide the framework to ensure adequate emergency access, impacts would be less than significant.

### **Plan to Plan Analysis**

Both the existing Area Plan and proposed Area Plan contain policies that would provide for safe emergency access. Impacts would be similar between both Area Plans.

**Impact 3.2-6                    Implementation of the proposed Area Plan would not generate a parking demand that exceeds municipal code–required parking capacity.**

Parking demand and capacity would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis as buildout of the proposed Area Plan occurs. However, the proposed Area Plan contains several policies intended to maintain adequate parking supply throughout the Santa Clarita Valley, while allowing flexibility where appropriate. The proposed Area Plan would facilitate the use of various parking management strategies. These include evaluating parking standards and reducing requirements where they exceed demand (**Policy C 3.3.1**), providing common parking facilities in pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use districts (**Policy C 3.3.2**), promoting shared use of parking between businesses (**Policy C 3.3.3**), providing lower parking requirements for transit-oriented development projects (**Policy C 3.3.4**), encouraging short-term parking in high-activity areas and all-day parking at the periphery of those areas (**Policy C 3.3.5**), the creation of parking benefit districts (**Policy C 3.3.7**) and establish performance pricing of street parking (**Policy C 3.3.8**). Additionally, the County would adopt regulations for truck parking on public streets (**Policy C 2.4.4**).

### *Proposed Area Plan Policies*

**Policy C 2.4.4:**            Adopt regulations for truck parking on public streets, to avoid impacts to residential neighborhoods.

**Policy C 3.3.1:**            Evaluate parking standards and reduce requirements where appropriate, based on data showing that requirements are in excess of demand.

- Policy C 3.3.2:** In pedestrian-oriented, high density mixed use districts, provide for common parking facilities to serve the district, where appropriate.
- Policy C 3.3.3:** Promote shared use of parking facilities between businesses with complementary uses and hours, where feasible.
- Policy C 3.3.4:** Within transit-oriented development projects, provide incentives such as higher floor area ratio and/or lower parking requirements for commercial development that provides transit and ride-share programs.
- Policy C 3.3.5:** Encourage convenient short-term parking in high-activity areas, and all day parking at the periphery of the development areas.
- Policy C 3.3.7:** Create parking benefit districts which invest meter revenues in pedestrian infrastructure and other public amenities wherever feasible.
- Policy C 3.3.8:** Establish performance pricing of street parking so that the costs are enough to promote frequent turnover, with a goal to keep 15 percent of spaces empty at all times, whenever feasible.

### ***Effectiveness of Proposed Area Plan Policies***

Implementation of the proposed Area Plan policies would allow adjustments to the parking requirements for individual development projects, where appropriate. For example, to encourage transit-oriented development, the County may consider lowering the parking requirement if such development provides transit and ride-share programs. However, such exceptions to the parking requirements of the Los Angeles County Code would only be granted if those requirements are determined to exceed the project's demand. Otherwise, the code requirements, which would be continuously evaluated and, if necessary, updated, would continue to be enforced. For these reasons, implementation of the proposed Area Plan would not generate a parking demand that exceeds code requirements. Therefore, parking demand impacts would be less than significant.

### **Plan to Plan Analysis**

Both the existing Area Plan and proposed Area Plan contain policies that would require for adequate parking consistent with the County of Los Angeles Municipal Code. Impacts would be similar between both Area Plans.

**Impact 3.2-7 Implementation of the proposed Area Plan would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).**

One of the primary goals of the proposed Area Plan is to promote policies, plans and programs that support alternative transportation to a greater extent than the existing Area Plan. The proposed Area Plan contains numerous policies to expand and improve alternative transportation systems. General policies include promoting expansion of alternative transportation options to all demographic and economic groups (**Policy C 1.1.2**), working with local and regional agencies and employers to promote an integrated, seamless transportation system (**Policy C 1.1.3**), planning for efficient links between circulation systems at bus-rail connections and pedestrian-bus connections (**Policy C 1.1.5**), encouraging multi-modal travel through provision of bus turnouts, bus rapid transit, bikeways, walkways, and linkages to trail systems (**Policy C 1.1.8**), acquiring right-of-way in transportation corridors to accommodate multiple travel modes (**Policy C 1.1.9**), providing for flexibility in the transportation system to accommodate new technologies (**Policy C 1.1.10**), providing adequate way-finding programs directing users to transit stations (**Policy C 1.1.11**), and promoting walking, and bicycling and circulator transit within activity centers (**Policy C 1.1.13**). The proposed Area Plan would coordinate land use and circulation planning to achieve greater accessibility and mobility for users of all travel modes. This includes providing opportunities and infrastructure to support the use of alternative fuel vehicles and travel devices (**Policy C 3.2.3** and **Policy 3.2.4**) and promoting multi-modal travel choices between Palmdale Regional Airport and the Santa Clarita Valley (**Policy C 1.3.6** and **Policy C 1.3.7**).

The proposed Area Plan also promotes rail service to meet regional and inter-regional needs for convenient, cost-effective travel alternatives. To maximize the effectiveness of Metrolink's commuter rail service, the proposed Area Plan includes policies to develop permanent Metrolink facilities with an expanded bus transfer station at the Via Princessa station, or at other locations (**Policy C 4.1.1**), facilitate extension of a passenger rail line from the Santa Clarita Station to Ventura County (**Policy C 4.1.2**), expand commuter services at all Metrolink stations (**Policy C 4.1.3**), preserve abandoned railroad right-of-way for future transportation facilities (**Policy C 4.1.4**), increase rail efficiency and public safety through street and track improvements and grade separations (**Policy C 4.1.5**), promote transit-oriented development near rail stations (**Policy C 4.1.6**), and facilitate coordination of planning for any future high speed regional rail systems (**Policy C 4.1.7**).

The proposed Area Plan promotes a high speed rail system connecting the Santa Clarita Valley with other regions, and other regional rail service connections. Policies including working with the Orange Line Development Authority and other agencies to develop a high speed transportation system (**Policies C**

4.2.1 and Policy C 4.2.2), and promoting the expansion of Amtrak Rail Service to the Santa Clarita Valley (Policy C 4.2.3).

In addition to promoting improved rail service, the proposed Area Plan also promotes improved bus service for the Santa Clarita Valley. The proposed Area Plan seeks to ensure that street patterns and design standards accommodate bus transit needs. The County would require that new subdivisions provide for two means of access into and out of the development, in order to provide for transit access, where feasible (Policy C 5.1.1). For private gated communities, the County would require that the developer accommodate bus access through the entry gate or provide bus waiting facilities at the project entry (Policy C 5.1.2). Bus operations would be considered when determining acceptable street designs (Policy C 5.1.3), and bus stops would be located within 0.25 mile of residential neighborhoods (Policy C 5.1.4). The proposed Area Plan would promote locating and designing bus turnouts such that they would limit traffic obstruction and would provide sufficient merging length for the bus to re-enter the traffic flow (Policy C 5.1.5). The feasibility of giving buses priority at signalized intersections to maintain transit service level standards would be evaluated (Policy 5.1.6). Additional strategies would be considered, including the provision for bicycles on buses, bicycle parking at transit centers, and park-and-ride lots at transit stops (Policy C 5.2.5).

Second, the proposed Area Plan seeks to explore opportunities to improve and expand bus transit service. Supporting policies include providing fixed route service to significant activity areas, and serving low-density and rural areas with dial-a-ride, flexible fixed routes, or other transit services as deemed appropriate (Policy C 5.3.1). The County would promote concentrated development patterns in coordination with transit planning to maximize service efficiency and ridership (Policy C 5.3.2), evaluate the feasibility of providing “fly-away” bus transit service to various airports (Policy C 5.3.3), and evaluate the feasibility of providing bus rapid transit for key transit corridors when light-rail is not feasible (Policy C 5.3.4).

To provide adequate funding for the expansion of transit services, the County would incorporate funding for all modes of transportation in the capital improvement program (Policy C 1.1.9), establish transit impact fee rates that are based on the actual impacts of new development on the transit system (Policy C 5.4.1), evaluate the feasibility of establishing a joint City/County transit impact fee (Policy C 5.4.2), and seek funding for transit system improvement from local, state, and federal programs and grants (Policy C 5.4.3).

***Proposed Area Plan Policies***

- Policy C 1.1.2:** Promote expansion of alternative transportation options to increase accessibility to all demographic and economic groups throughout the community, including mobility-impaired persons, senior citizens, low-income persons, and youth.
- Policy C 1.1.3:** Work with local and regional agencies and employers to promote an integrated, seamless transportation system that meets access needs, including local and regional bus service, dial-a-ride, taxis, rail, van pools, car pools, bus pools, bicycling, walking, and automobiles.
- Policy C 1.1.5:** Plan for efficient links between circulation systems at appropriate locations, including but not limited to bus-rail connections and pedestrian-bus connections.
- Policy C 1.1.6:** Provide adequate facilities, including but not limited to bicycle parking and storage, expansion of park-and-ride lots, and provision of adequate station and transfer facilities in appropriate locations.
- Policy C 1.1.8:** Acquire and/or reserve adequate right-of-way in transportation corridors to accommodate multiple travel modes, including bus turnouts, bus rapid transit (BRT), bikeways, walkways, and linkages to trail systems.
- Policy C 1.1.9:** Incorporate funding for all modes of transportation in the capital improvement program, and seek funding from all available sources for multi-modal system development.
- Policy C 1.1.10:** Provide for flexibility in the transportation system to accommodate new technology as it becomes available, in order to reduce trips by vehicles using fossil fuels where feasible and appropriate.
- Policy C 1.1.11:** Promote use of multi-modal facilities by providing adequate and attractive way-finding programs directing users to transit stations, park-and-ride lots, bicycle storage, and other facilities.
- Policy C 1.1.13:** Design new activity centers and improve existing activity centers to prioritize walking, bicycling and circulator transit for internal circulation of person-travel.

- Policy C 1.3.6:** Support the expansion of Palmdale Regional Airport and the extension of multi-modal travel choices between the airport and the Santa Clarita Valley, in conformance with regional planning efforts.
- Policy C 1.3.7:** Apply for regional, State, and federal grants for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure projects.
- Policy C 3.2.3:** When available and feasible, provide opportunities and infrastructure to support use of alternative fuel vehicles and travel devices.
- Policy C 3.2.4:** The City and County will encourage new commercial and retail developments to provide prioritized parking for electric vehicles and vehicles using alternative fuels.
- Policy C 4.1.1:** Develop permanent Metrolink facilities with an expanded bus transfer station and additional park-and-ride spaces at the Via Princessa station, or other alternative location as deemed appropriate to meet the travel needs of residents on the Valley's east side.
- Policy C 4.1.2:** Coordinate with other agencies to facilitate extension of a passenger rail line from the Santa Clarita Station to Ventura County, which may be used for Metrolink service.
- Policy C 4.1.3:** Continue to expand and improve commuter services, including park-and-ride lots, bicycle parking and storage, and waiting facilities, at all Metrolink stations.
- Policy C 4.1.4:** Encourage the preservation of abandoned railroad right-of-way for future transportation facilities, where appropriate.
- Policy C 4.1.5:** Work with other agencies to increase rail efficiency and public safety through street and track improvements and grade separations, where needs are identified.
- Policy C 4.1.6:** Provide incentives to promote transit-oriented development near rail stations.
- Policy C 4.1.7:** Facilitate coordination of planning for any future high speed regional rail systems in the Valley with Metrolink services.

- Policy C 4.2.1:** Continue to work with the Orange Line Development Authority (OLDA) to plan for development of an environmentally sensitive high speed transportation system with a route through the Santa Clarita Valley, including a regional transit hub with associated infrastructure that would provide connections to the Los Angeles Basin, Palmdale Regional Airport, and other
- Policy C 4.2.2:** Coordinate with other agencies as needed to facilitate planning for other high-speed rail alternatives in the Santa Clarita Valley.
- Policy C 4.2.3:** Promote and encourage the expansion of Amtrak Rail Service to the Santa Clarita Valley.
- Policy C 5.1.1:** Require that new subdivisions provide for two means of access into and out of the development, in order to provide for transit access, where feasible.
- Policy C 5.1.2:** For private gated communities, require the developer to accommodate bus access through the entry gate, or provide bus waiting facilities at the project entry with pedestrian connections to residential streets, where appropriate.
- Policy C 5.1.3:** Consider the operational characteristics of buses when determining acceptable street designs, including grades and turning radii.
- Policy C 5.1.4:** Provide for location of bus stops within ¼-mile of residential neighborhoods, and include paved bus waiting areas in street improvement plans wherever appropriate and feasible.
- Policy C 5.1.5:** Locate and design bus turnouts to limit traffic obstruction and to provide sufficient merging length for the bus to re-enter the traffic flow.
- Policy C 5.1.6:** Evaluate the feasibility of giving buses priority at signalized intersections to maintain transit service level standards, where appropriate.
- Policy C 5.2.5:** Complementary transportation modes should be interconnected at intermodal transit centers, including provisions for bicycles on buses, bicycle parking at transit centers, and park-and-ride at transit stops.
- Policy C 5.3.1:** Continue to provide fixed route service to significant activity areas and neighborhoods with moderate to high density, and serve low-density and rural

areas with dial-a-ride, flexible fixed routes, or other transit services as deemed appropriate.

- Policy C 5.3.2:** Promote concentrated development patterns in coordination with transit planning to maximize service efficiency and ridership.
- Policy C 5.3.3:** Evaluate the feasibility of providing “fly-away” bus transit service to airports located at Burbank, Palmdale, and Los Angeles, and implement this program when warranted by demand.
- Policy C 5.3.4:** Evaluate the feasibility of providing bus rapid transit (BRT) for key transit corridors when light-rail is not feasible or cost effective.
- Policy C 5.4.1:** Establish transit impact fee rates that are based on the actual impacts of new development on the transit system, and regularly monitor and adjust these fees as needed to ensure adequate mitigation.
- Policy C 5.4.2:** Evaluate the feasibility of establishing a joint City/County transit impact fee to equitably distribute the capital costs of transit system expansion to meet the needs of new development in both County and City areas of the Valley.
- Policy C 5.4.3:** Seek funding for transit system expansion and improvement from all available sources, including local, state, and federal programs and grants.

### ***Effectiveness of Proposed Area Plan Policies***

The proposed Area Plan policies address the deficiencies in the existing alternative transportation system, and provide direction for the expansion and improvement of alternative transportation throughout the Santa Clarita Valley. Several policies encourage the provision of infrastructure to accommodate alternative modes of transportation, links between bus, rail and pedestrian hubs, and the support of new transportation technology, among others. Several policies specifically address rail and bus transit service in the Santa Clarita Valley to ensure new facilities can be adequately accommodated. For example, the policies seek to provide bus service to locations that are not presently served due to various barriers, including terrain, infrastructure, street design, and grade separations, and provide for the location of bus stops with 0.25 mile of residential neighborhoods. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Area Plan would encourage and enhance, as opposed to conflict with, plans supporting alternative transportation and impacts would be less than significant.

## Plan to Plan Analysis

Both the existing Area Plan and proposed Area Plan contain policies that promote alternative transportation systems. However the proposed Area Plan promotes alternative modes of transportation more substantively by providing more policies which address the issue. Additionally, the proposed Area Plan proposes more dense land uses on the Valley floor which would use or be located in closer proximity to alternative modes of transportation including but not limited to buses, bikeways, and trains.

**Impact 3.2-8                    Implementation of the proposed Area Plan would not cause a hazard or barrier for pedestrians or bicyclists.**

As discussed above, the proposed Area Plan strongly supports alternative modes of transportation, including walking and bicycling, to reduce total VMT. Additionally, the proposed Area Plan establishes several policies to ensure the safety and mobility of pedestrians and bicyclists. The County would provide safe and convenient access to safe transit, bikeways, and walkways (**Policies C 1.1.1 and C 1.1.4**), consider the safety and convenience of pedestrians and cyclists in the design and development of transportation systems (**Policy C 1.1.7 and C 1.3.7**), provide safe pedestrian connections across barriers such as major traffic corridors, drainage and flood control facilities, and grade separations (**Policy C 1.2.8**), adopt consistent standards for implementation of Americans with Disabilities Act requirements (**Policy C 2.2.15**), and in the development review process prioritize direct pedestrian access between building entrances, sidewalks and transit stops (**Policy C 3.3.6**).

The proposed Area Plan seeks to develop a unified and well-maintained bikeway system by adopting and implementing a coordinated master plan for bikeways for the Santa Clarita Valley. The County would develop Class 1 bike paths linking neighborhoods to open space and activity areas (**Policy C 6.1.1**), provide striped Class 2 bike lanes within the right-of-way for bicycle commuters (**Policy C 6.1.2**), acquire right-of-way needed to complete the bicycle circulation system (**Policy C 6.1.3**), provide signage for Class 3 bike routes or designate alternative routes (**Policy C 6.1.4**), and plan for continuous bikeways to serve major destinations (**Policy C 6.1.5**).

The proposed Area Plan encourages the provision of equipment and facilities to support the use of bicycles as an alternative means of travel. The County would require bicycle parking at commercial sites and multi-family housing complexes (**Policy C 6.2.1**), bicycle racks on transit vehicles (**Policy C 6.2.2**), and services for bicycle commuters, such as showers and changing rooms, as part of the review process for new or substantially altered development (**Policy C 6.2.3**).

The proposed Area seeks to develop walkable communities through an integrated system of pedestrian walkways, paseos and trails. The County would consider pedestrian connections within and between developments in reviewing development proposals (**Policy C 7.1.1**), promote the extension of pedestrian access to connect existing walled subdivisions to transit and services (**Policy C 7.1.2**), consider grade separated facilities to provide pedestrian connections across barriers (**Policy C 7.1.3**), develop an improvement program to connect existing walkways and paseos to transit and services (**Policy C 7.1.4**), provide for pedestrian walkways from transit stops and parking areas to businesses, and avoid placement of uses that would obstruct pedestrian pathways (**Policy C 7.1.5**), encourage sidewalk access to building entrances (**Policy C 7.1.6**), promote use of pedestrian-oriented scale and design features (**Policy C 7.1.7**), upgrade streets that are not pedestrian-friendly (**Policy C 7.1.8**), promote pedestrian-oriented street design through traffic-calming measures (**Policy C 7.1.9**), and improve the Santa Clarita Valley's multi-use trail system (**Policy C 7.1.10**).

### ***Proposed Area Plan Policies***

- Policy C 1.1.1:** Reduce dependence on the automobile, particularly single-occupancy vehicle use, by providing safe and convenient access to transit, bikeways, and walkways.
- Policy C 1.1.4:** Promote public health through provision of safe, pleasant, and accessible walkways, bikeways, and multi-purpose trail systems for residents.
- Policy C 1.1.7:** Consider the safety and convenience of the traveling public, including pedestrians and cyclists, in design and development of all transportation systems.
- Policy C 1.2.8:** Provide safe pedestrian connections across barriers, which may include but are not limited to major traffic corridors, drainage and flood control facilities, utility easements, grade separations, and walls.
- Policy C 2.2.15:** Adopt consistent standards for implementation of Americans with Disabilities Act requirements such as curb ramp design and accessible pedestrian signals.
- Policy C 3.3.6:** In the development review process, prioritize direct pedestrian access between building entrances, sidewalks and transit stops, by placing parking behind buildings where possible, to the sides of buildings when necessary, and always away from street intersections.

- Policy C 6.1.1:** For recreational riders, continue to develop Class 1 bike paths, separated from the right-of-way, linking neighborhoods to open space and activity areas.
- Policy C 6.1.2:** For long-distance riders and those who bicycle to work or services, provide striped Class 2 bike lanes within the right-of-way, with adequate delineation and signage, where feasible and appropriate.
- Policy C 6.1.3:** Continue to acquire or reserve right-of-way and/or easements needed to complete the bicycle circulation system as development occurs.
- Policy C 6.1.4:** Where inadequate right-of-way exists for Class 1 or 2 bikeways, provide signage for Class 3 bike routes or designate alternative routes as appropriate.
- Policy C 6.1.5:** Plan for continuous bikeways to serve major destinations, including but not limited to regional shopping areas, college campuses, public buildings, parks, and employment centers.
- Policy C 6.2.1:** Require bicycle parking, which can include bicycle lockers and sheltered areas, at commercial sites and multi-family housing complexes for use by employees and residents, as well as customers and visitors.
- Policy C 6.2.2:** Provide bicycle racks on transit vehicles to give bike-and-ride commuters the ability to transport their bicycles.
- Policy C 6.2.3:** Promote the inclusion of services for bicycle commuters, such as showers and changing rooms, as part of the review process for new development or substantial alterations of existing commercial or industrial uses, where appropriate.
- Policy C 7.1.1:** In reviewing new development proposals, consider pedestrian connections within and between developments as an integral component of the site design, which may include seating, shading, lighting, directional signage, accessibility, and convenience.
- Policy C 7.1.2:** For existing walled subdivisions, extend pedestrian access to connect these neighborhoods to transit and services through public education and by facilitating retrofitted improvements where feasible.

- Policy C 7.1.3:** Where feasible and practical, consider grade separated facilities to provide pedestrian connections across arterial streets, flood control channels, utility easements, and other barriers.
- Policy C 7.1.4:** Identify and develop an improvement program to connect existing walkways and paseos to transit and services, where needed and appropriate.
- Policy C 7.1.5:** In new commercial development, provide for direct, clearly delineated, and preferably landscaped pedestrian walkways from transit stops and parking areas to building entries, and avoid placement of uses (such as drive-through facilities) in locations that would obstruct pedestrian pathways.
- Policy C 7.1.6:** Encourage placement of building entries in locations accessible to public sidewalks and transit.
- Policy C 7.1.7:** Utilize pedestrian-oriented scale and design features in areas intended for pedestrian use.
- Policy C 7.1.8:** Upgrade streets that are not pedestrian-friendly due to lack of sidewalk connections, safe street crossing points, vehicle sight distance, or other design deficiencies.
- Policy C 7.1.9:** Promote pedestrian-oriented street design through traffic-calming measures where appropriate, which may include but are not limited to bulb-outs or chokers at intersections, raised crosswalks, refuge islands, striping, and landscaping.
- Policy C 7.1.10:** Continue to expand and improve the Valley's multi-use trail system to provide additional routes for pedestrian travel.

### ***Effectiveness of Proposed Area Plan Policies***

The proposed Area Plan policies would encourage the creation of walkable communities and neighborhoods within the Santa Clarita Valley by considering pedestrian access in all phases of development planning, including site design, subdivision design, and public improvement projects. Intersections would be made more pedestrian-friendly through the installation of traffic calming features such as striping, landscaping, and pedestrian islands, or construction of pedestrian bridges. Additionally, the policies seek to create a unified and well-maintained bikeway system, which includes connection of the gaps in the existing system. The proposed Area Plan has been designed to reduce, as opposed to

cause, hazards and barriers to pedestrians and bicyclists, therefore impacts are considered less than significant.

### **Plan to Plan Analysis**

Both the existing Area Plan and proposed Area Plan contain policies that encourage walkable communities. Both the proposed and existing Area Plans have similar policies concerning this issue and potential impacts are similar.

### **MITIGATION FRAMEWORK**

The following mitigation measures shall be implemented for activities that would occur under the proposed plan.

- 3.2.1 Both the County of Los Angeles and the of Santa Clarita shall work with Caltrans as they add additional lanes to the I-5 freeway between the SR-14 interchange and the Parker Road interchange. This improvement includes extending the existing HOV lanes from the SR-14 interchange to just south of the Parker Road interchange, incorporating truck climbing lanes from the Pico Canyon Road/Lyons Avenue interchange to the SR-14 interchange and constructing or extending auxiliary lanes between interchanges at six locations.
- 3.2.2 The County of Los Angeles shall continue to participate in implementing short-term measures of the North County Combined Highway Corridors Study, including adding additional lanes to the SR-14 to create a minimum of three lanes in each direction. Participation for long-term measures includes the completion of SR-14 to four lanes in each direction between the Newhall Avenue interchange and the Sand Canyon Interchange and to add a dedicated truck lane between the I-5 freeway and the Placerita Canyon Road interchange.
- 3.2.3 The County shall continue to monitor potential impacts on roadway segments and intersections on a project-by-project basis as buildout occurs by requiring traffic studies for all projects that could significantly impact traffic and circulation patterns.

### **SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT WITH MITIGATION FRAMEWORK**

No significant and unavoidable impacts would occur.