April 6, 2017

Mr. Jon Friedman
JEMSTREET PROPERTIES, INC.
1435 Reynolds Court
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

## Subject: Canyon View Estates (TT 52905) Focused Access Traffic Evaluation

Dear Mr. Jon Friedman:
Urban Crossroads, Inc. is pleased to provide the Canyon View Estates (TT 52905) Focused Access Traffic Evaluation. The project site location is shown on Exhibit A. The project is located south of Pico Canyon Road and east of the extension of Stevenson Ranch Parkway. Access to the proposed project will be via an extension of Magnolia Lane. The project consists of 37 detached residential dwelling units. The project site plan is shown on Exhibit B.

The purpose of this work effort is to document existing traffic conditions in the vicinity of the proposed project. The study area is presented on Exhibit C. Traffic operations have been evaluated at the following 3 intersections that will be most affected by project traffic:

- Stevenson Ranch Parkway (NS) at Pico Canyon Road (EW)
- Southern Oaks Drive (NS) at Pico Canyon Road (EW)
- Southern Oaks Drive (NS) at Magnolia Lane (EW)

Analysis has been performed for the following scenarios:

- Existing Conditions
- Existing Plus Project (E+P) Conditions
- Existing Plus Project Plus Cumulative Project ( $\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{P}+\mathrm{C}$ ) Conditions


## TRAFFIC OPERATIONS ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

Traffic operations of roadway facilities are described using the term "Level of Service" (LOS). LOS is a qualitative description of traffic flow based on several factors such as speed, travel time, delay, and freedom to maneuver. Six levels are typically defined ranging from LOS A, representing completely freeflow conditions, to LOS F, representing breakdown in flow resulting in stop-and-go conditions. LOS E represents operations at or near capacity, an unstable level where vehicles are operating with the minimum spacing for maintaining uniform flow.
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Exhibit A: Project Location Map
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Exhibit B: Project Site Plan
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## Exhibit C: Study Area
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Per the Los Angeles County TIA Report Guidelines, study area intersections must be analyzed using the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) technique. To calculate an ICU, the volume of traffic using the intersection is compared with the capacity of the intersection. ICU is usually expressed as a volume to capacity (V/C) ratio. The V/C represents that portion of the hour required to provide sufficient capacity to accommodate all intersection traffic if all approaches operate at capacity.

A maximum saturation flow rate of 1,600 vehicles per hour of green (vphg) per lane was utilized in this study, except for dual left turn lanes, in which case a capacity of 2,880 vehicles per hour has been used as the combined capacity for dual left turn lanes. A 10 percent yellow clearance cycle has also been included. The ICU analysis has been performed using the Traffix software (Version 8.0 R1). The ICU V/C ratio and corresponding Level of Service (LOS) are shown on Table 1.

Table 1: Level Of Service Criteria

| Level of Service | Critical Volume To Capacity Ratio |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $0.00-0.60$ |
| B | $0.61-0.70$ |
| C | $0.71-0.80$ |
| D | $0.81-0.90$ |
| E | $0.91-1.00$ |
| F | $>1.00$ |

## SIGNIFICANT IMPACT THRESHOLD

For intersections, the impact is considered significant if the project related increase in the volume to capacity (V/C) ratio equals or exceeds the thresholds shown on Table 2.

## Table 2:Impact Significance Thresholds

| INTERSECTIONS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Preproject | Project V/C Increase |  |
| LOS |  |  |
| C | 0.71 to 0.80 | 0.04 or more |
| D | 0.81 to 0.90 | 0.02 or more |
| E/F | 0.91 or more | 0.01 or more |

## PROJECT TRAFFIC

Project traffic has been developed based on the estimated trip generation and trip distribution characteristics of the proposed project. Trip generation represents the amount of traffic which is both attracted to and produced by a development. Traffic generation rates for the proposed Project have been derived from the informational document Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation ( ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition, 2012). The proposed project is a single family detached residential development. Table 3 presents the trip rates obtained from the ITE Trip Generation manual and Table 4 presents the resulting trip generation estimates for the proposed project.

Table 3: Project Trip Generation Rates

| Land Use ${ }^{1}$ | Units ${ }^{2}$ | ITE <br> LU <br> Code | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  | Daily |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |  |
| Actual Vehicle Trip Generation Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Family Detached | DU | 210 | 0.19 | 0.56 | 0.75 | 0.63 | 0.37 | 1.00 | 9.52 |

[^0]Table 4: Project Trip Generation Summary

| Land Use | Quantity | Units ${ }^{1}$ | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  | Daily |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |  |
| Single Family Detached | 37. | DU | 7 | 21 | 28 | 23 | 14 | 37 | 352 |

${ }^{1}$ DU = Occupied Dwelling Units
The proposed project is expected to generate 352 vehicle trips on a daily basis, with a total of 28 vehicles per hour (VPH) during the AM peak hour ( 21 outbound vehicles and 7 inbound vehicles) and 37 VPH during the PM peak hour (23 inbound vehicles and 14 outbound vehicles). The Los Angeles County Traffic Study Guidelines state that a traffic study is generally required if a project generates over 500 trips per day. Although a formal traffic study is not required for this project (as it falls below the 500 trips per day threshold), this focused access evaluation has been prepared to confirm that the local roadway system in the immediate vicinity of the project will operate acceptably with the addition of project traffic.

The project trip distribution has been estimated based on the trip distribution for a similar residential project located further west on Pico Canyon Road (Aidlin Hills VTTM 52796 Traffic Impact Analysis, Stantec, November 24, 2014). The project trip distribution is presented on Exhibit D. Project traffic is expected to enter and leave the neighborhood via Southern Oaks Drive and travel to/from the east on Pico Canyon Road. At Stevenson Ranch Parkway, $52 \%$ of the project traffic is projected to travel to/from the north on Stevenson Ranch Parkway, while the remaining $48 \%$ will continue to travel to/from the east on Pico Canyon Road.

The project only traffic volumes are presented on Exhibit E. Project traffic will utilize Magnolia Lane and Southern Oaks Drive to travel to and from Pico Canyon Road to access regional destinations.

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

Exhibit F presents the existing number of through lanes and intersection geometry and traffic control devices. Pico Canyon Road and Stevenson Ranch Parkway are four lane divided roadways. Southern Oaks Drive and Magnolia Lane are two lane undivided roadways. The intersection of Stevenson Ranch Parkway at Pico Canyon Road is controlled by a traffic signal. The other two intersections (Southern Oaks Drive at Pico Canyon Road and Southern Oaks Drive at Magnolia Lane) are cross street STOP controlled intersections.

Existing traffic volume data was collected in January, 2017. AM and PM peak period turning movement counts were conducted at each of the study area intersections. A 24 hour directional traffic volume machine count was also conducted on Magnolia Lane east of Southern Oaks Drive The traffic count data worksheets are included in Attachment A. The existing hour traffic volumes are summarized on Exhibit G.
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## Exhibit D: Project Trip Distribution
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## Exhibit E: Project Only Traffic Volumes
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Exhibit F: Existing Number of Through Lanes and Intersection Control Devices
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Exhibit G: Existing Traffic Volumes
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The Existing conditions roadway geometry and traffic volumes have been used to evaluate the Existing conditions intersection operations at each of the study area intersections. The results of the analysis are summarized on Table 5. The Existing conditions operations analysis worksheets are contained in Attachment B.

## Table 5: Existing Conditions Operations Analysis Summary



1 When a right turn is designated, the lane can either be striped or unstriped. To function as a right turn lane there must be sufficient width for right turning vehicles to travel outside the through lanes. $\mathrm{L}=$ Left; $\mathrm{T}=$ Through; $\mathrm{R}=$ Right
$1!=$ Where turns occur and only a through lane is provided, the turning vehicles use the through lane
${ }^{2}$ Per the Los Angeles County Traffic Study Guidelines, the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) planning method has been use to determine the level of service for intersections.
${ }^{3}$ CSS $=$ Cross Street Stop, TS $=$ Traffic Signal
As shown on Table 5, all of the study area intersections operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS) traffic operations under Existing conditions.

## EXISTING PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS

The project only volumes have been combined with the Existing traffic volumes to develop Existing Plus Project conditions traffic volumes. The Existing Plus Project volumes are presented on Exhibit H. These volumes have been used to evaluate Existing Plus Project ( $\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{P}$ ) peak hour intersection operations.

The results of the analysis are summarized on Table 6. The E+P conditions operations analysis worksheets are contained in Attachment C. The E+P conditions intersection operations analysis results indicate that all of the study area intersections operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS) traffic operations under $\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{P}$ conditions.
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Exhibit H: Existing Plus Project Traffic Volumes


Table 6: Existing Plus Project Conditions Operations Analysis Summary

| \# | Intersection | Traffic Control | Intersection Approach Lanes ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | $\mathrm{ICU}^{2}$ |  | Level of Service |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | NB | SB | EB | WB |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | L T R | L T R | L T R | L T R | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| 1 | Southern Oaks Dr. / Pico Canyon Rd. | CSS | 0 1! 0 | 000 | 110 | 011 | 0.440 | 0.284 | A | A |
| 2 | Southern Oaks Dr. / Magnolia Ln. | CSS | 0 1! 0 | 0110 | 0 1! 0 | 000 | 0.206 | 0.223 | A | A |
| 3 | Stevenson Ranch Pkwy. / Pico Canyon Rd. | TS | 000 | 201 | 011 | 110 | 0.535 | 0.455 | A | A |

1 When a right turn is designated, the lane can either be striped or unstriped. To function as a right turn lane there must be sufficient width for right turning vehicles to travel outside the through lanes. L = Left; $\mathrm{T}=$ Through; $\mathrm{R}=$ Right
$1!$ = Where turns occur and only a through lane is provided, the turning vehicles use the through lane
${ }^{2}$ Per the Los Angeles County Traffic Study Guidelines, the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) planning method has been use to determine the level of service for intersections.
${ }^{3}$ CSS $=$ Cross Street Stop, TS $=$ Traffic Signal

## EXISTING PLUS PROJECT PLUS CUMULATIVE PROJECT CONDITIONS

The final scenario evaluated in this report is Existing Plus Project Plus Cumulative Projects ( $\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{P}+\mathrm{C}$ ) conditions. Potential cumulative projects were identified through a review of the Los Angeles County geographic information system (GIS) database. Three pending projects were identified that could potentially contribute additional traffic to the study area at the time of full project occupancy, which is expected in 2020. The three pending projects are TR 061911, TR 061996, and VTTM 52796.

The Los Angeles Country website includes an area ("Case \& Hearing Information") that provides data regarding the project description and project status. Data for each of the three pending projects was reviewed (and is included in Attachment D of this report), yielding the following information:

- TR 061911 - This project, also referred to as Portrero Village, is an approximately 2,500 acre project. The proposed land uses include 4, 385 dwelling units, 245,000 square feet of commercial development, and various other supporting uses. The last activity on this project occurred in 2015, and the status of the project per the County database is "pending/holds not cleared". Therefore, no development is anticipated by 2020 for this project.
- TR 061996 - This project, also referred to as Legacy Village, is an approximately 1,760 acre project. The proposed land uses include 3,457 dwelling units, 839,000 square feet of commercial development, and various other supporting uses. The last activity on this project also occurred in 2015, and the status of the project per the County database is "pending/holds not cleared". Therefore, no development is anticipated by 2020 for this project.
- VTTN 52796 - This project, also known as Aidlin Hills, consists of 102 single family residential units on approximately 230 acres. The project is located south of Pico Canyon Road and east of Southern Oaks Drive. Access to the project is via Pico Canyon Road. This project was recently approved and has therefore been included as a cumulative project in this analysis.

The project trip generation, trip distribution, and project only traffic volumes for the Aidlin Hills project were obtained directly from the traffic study report that was prepared for this project. This information is also included in Attachment D.

The resulting cumulative project only traffic volumes are presented on Exhibit I. The cumulative project only volumes were combined with the previously presented Existing Plus Project volumes, resulting in traffic volumes representing Existing Plus Project Plus Cumulative Project ( $\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{P}+\mathrm{C}$ ) conditions. The $\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{P}+\mathrm{C}$ conditions traffic volumes are presented on Exhibit J.

The $\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{P}+\mathrm{C}$ volumes were then used to evaluate $\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{P}+\mathrm{C}$ peak hour intersection operations. The results of the analysis are summarized on Table 7. The E+P conditions operations analysis worksheets are contained in Attachment E . The $\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{P}+\mathrm{C}$ conditions intersection operations analysis results indicate that all of the study area intersections operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS) traffic operations under $\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{P}+\mathrm{C}$ conditions.

Table 7: Existing Plus Project Plus Cumulative Project Conditions Operations Analysis Summary


1 When a right turn is designated, the lane can either be striped or unstriped. To function as a right turn lane there must be sufficient width for right turning vehicles to travel outside the through lanes.
$\mathrm{L}=$ Left; $\mathrm{T}=$ Through; $\mathrm{R}=$ Right
$1!=$ Where turns occur and only a through lane is provided, the turning vehicles use the through lane
${ }^{2}$ Per the Los Angeles County Traffic Study Guidelines, the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) planning method has been use to determine the level of service for intersections.
${ }^{3}$ CSS $=$ Cross Street Stop, TS = Traffic Signal

Mr. Jon Friedman
JEMSTREET PROPERTIES, INC.
April 6, 2017
Page 16 of 18
Exhibit I: Cumulative Project Only Traffic Volumes


10743 - vols.dwg
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## Exhibit J: Existing Plus Project Plus Cumulative Project Traffic Volumes




10743 - vols.diwg

## SUMMARY \& CONCLUSIONS

The focused access evaluation presented in this report considers Existing conditions, project traffic and cumulative development anticipated to occur by the time of full occupancy of the proposed project in 2020. Scenarios evaluated include Existing Conditions, Existing Plus Project Conditions, and Existing Plus Project Plus Cumulative Project Conditions.

The proposed project is expected to generate 352 vehicle trips on a daily basis, with a total of 28 vehicles per hour (VPH) during the AM peak hour ( 21 outbound vehicles and 7 inbound vehicles) and 37 VPH during the PM peak hour (23 inbound vehicles and 14 outbound vehicles). The Los Angeles County Traffic Study Guidelines state that a traffic study is generally required if a project generates over 500 trips per day. Although a formal traffic study is not required for this project (as it falls below the 500 trips per day threshold), this focused access evaluation has been prepared to confirm that the local roadway system in the immediate vicinity of the project will operate acceptably with the addition of project traffic.

The project trip distribution has been estimated based on the trip distribution for a similar residential project located further west on Pico Canyon Road (Aidlin Hills VTTM 52796 Traffic Impact Analysis, Stantec, November 24, 2014). The project trip distribution is presented on Exhibit D. Project traffic is expected to enter and leave the neighborhood via Southern Oaks Drive and travel to/from the east on Pico Canyon Road. At Stevenson Ranch Parkway, $52 \%$ of the project traffic is projected to travel to/from the north on Stevenson Ranch Parkway, while the remaining $48 \%$ will continue to travel to/from the east on Pico Canyon Road.

Based in the results of the peak hour intersection operations analysis, all of the study area intersections are anticipated to experience acceptable (LOS A) operating conditions during the AM and PM peak hours for each of the scenarios evaluated. The project will have no negative impact at any of the intersections evaluated.

Urban Crossroads, Inc. is pleased to provide this focused access evaluation for your use. If you have any questions, please contact me directly at (949) 336-5981.

Respectfully submitted,
URBAN CROSSROADS, INC.

## Cenctitn hor

Carleton Waters, P.E.<br>Senior Transportation Engineer

## Attachment A:

## Existing Conditions Traffic Count Worksheets
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PO Box 1178
Corona, CA 92878
Phone: 951-268-6268
CLAMAESO
email: counts@countsunlimited.com

| Start | 1/18/2017 | Eastbound |  | Hour Totals |  | Westbound |  | Hour Totals |  | Combined Totals |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Wed | Morning | Afternoon | Morning | Afternoon | Morning | Afternoon | Morning | Afternoon | Morning | Afternoon |
| 12:00 |  | 1 | 6 |  |  | 0 | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 12:15 |  | 1 | 6 |  |  | 0 | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 12:30 |  | 0 | 7 |  |  | 0 | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 12:45 |  | 0 | 9 | 2 | 28 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 22 | 2 | 50 |
| 01:00 |  | 1 | 6 |  |  | 0 | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| 01:15 |  | 0 | 7 |  |  | 0 | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 01:30 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  | 0 | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 01:45 |  | 0 | 5 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 31 | 1 | 51 |
| 02:00 |  | 0 | 4 |  |  | 0 | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| 02:15 |  | 0 | 7 |  |  | 0 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 02:30 |  | 1 | 5 |  |  | 0 | 13 |  |  |  |  |
| 02:45 |  | 0 | 7 | 1 | 23 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 35 | 1 | 58 |
| 03:00 |  | 0 | 13 |  |  | 0 | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 03:15 |  | 0 | 9 |  |  | 0 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 03:30 |  | 1 | 14 |  |  | 0 | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 03:45 |  | 0 | 10 | 1 | 46 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 1 | 65 |
| 04:00 |  | 0 | 8 |  |  | 0 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 04:15 |  | 0 | 7 |  |  | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30 |  | 1 | 5 |  |  | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 04:45 |  | 0 | 11 | 1 | 31 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 18 | 5 | 49 |
| 05:00 |  | 0 | 11 |  |  | 0 | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 05:15 |  | 1 | 12 |  |  | 2 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| 05:30 |  | 1 | 8 |  |  | 5 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 05:45 |  | 1 | 5 | 3 | 36 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 25 | 11 | 61 |
| 06:00 |  | 2 | 9 |  |  | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 06:15 |  | 1 | 5 |  |  | 2 | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 06:30 |  | 2 | 8 |  |  | 3 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 06:45 |  | 2 | 8 | 7 | 30 | 11 | 5 | 17 | 21 | 24 | 51 |
| 07:00 |  | 4 | 6 |  |  | 8 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 07:15 |  | 3 | 6 |  |  | 7 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 07:30 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 20 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 07:45 |  | 4 | 7 | 14 | 27 | 13 | 2 | 48 | 12 | 62 | 39 |
| 08:00 |  | 7 | 6 |  |  | 12 | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 08:15 |  | 2 | 5 |  |  | 15 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 08:30 |  | 5 | 9 |  |  | 8 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 08:45 |  | 6 | 7 | 20 | 27 | 13 | 2 | 48 | 15 | 68 | 42 |
| 09:00 |  | 3 | 3 |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 09:15 |  | 4 | 3 |  |  | 5 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 09:30 |  | 2 | 4 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 09:45 |  | 6 | 7 | 15 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 17 | 6 | 32 | 23 |
| 10:00 |  | 2 | 2 |  |  | 6 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 10:15 |  | 4 | 3 |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 10:30 |  | 3 | 1 |  |  | 5 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 10:45 |  | 3 | 2 | 12 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 21 | 3 | 33 | 11 |
| 11:00 |  | 4 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 11:15 |  | 3 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 11:30 |  | 2 | 0 |  |  | 6 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 11:45 |  | 9 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 33 | 2 |
| Total |  | 95 | 294 | 95 | 294 | 178 | 208 | 178 | 208 | 273 | 502 |
| Combined Total |  |  |  |  | 9 |  | 6 |  | 6 |  |  |
| AM Peak | - | 08:00 | - | - | - | 07:30 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Vol. | - | 20 | - | - | - | 60 | - | - | - | - | - |
| P.H.F. |  | 0.714 |  |  |  | 0.750 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PM Peak | - | - | 03:00 | - | - | - | 01:45 | - | - | - | - |
| Vol. | - | - | 46 | - | - | - | 35 | - | - | - | - |
| P.H.F. |  |  | 0.821 |  |  |  | 0.673 |  |  |  |  |
| Percentag <br> e |  | 24.4\% | 75.6\% |  |  | 46.1\% | 53.9\% |  |  |  |  |
| ADT/AADT |  | ADT 775 |  | AADT 775 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

County of Los Angeles
File Name : CLASOPIAM
N/S: Southern Oaks Drive
Site Code : 05117027
E/W: Pico Canyon Road
Start Date : 1/18/2017
Weather: Clear
Groups Printed- Total Volume

|  | Pico Canyon Road Westbound |  |  |  | Southern Oaks Drive Northbound |  |  |  | Pico Canyon Road Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | U-Turns | App. Total | Left | Right | U-Turns | App. Total | Thru | Right | U-Turns | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 11 | 9 | 2 | 22 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 19 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 49 |
| 07:15 AM | 10 | 7 | 5 | 22 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 51 |
| 07:30 AM | 11 | 12 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |
| 07:45 AM | 25 | 22 | 6 | 53 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 42 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 148 |
| Total | 57 | 50 | 13 | 120 | 0 | 132 | 0 | 132 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 322 |
| 08:00 AM | 20 | 17 | 19 | 56 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 43 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 114 |
| 08:15 AM | 14 | 10 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 31 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 70 |
| 08:30 AM | 13 | 12 | 7 | 32 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 26 | 27 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 86 |
| 08:45 AM | 10 | 12 | 4 | 26 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 31 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 78 |
| Total | 57 | 51 | 31 | 139 | 0 | 131 | 0 | 131 | 77 | 1 | 0 | 78 | 348 |
| Grand Total | 114 | 101 | 44 | 259 | 0 | 263 | 0 | 263 | 147 | 1 | 0 | 148 | 670 |
| Apprch \% | 44 | 39 | 17 |  | 0 | 100 | 0 |  | 99.3 | 0.7 | 0 |  |  |
| Total \% | 17 | 15.1 | 6.6 | 38.7 | 0 | 39.3 | 0 | 39.3 | 21.9 | 0.1 | 0 | 22.1 |  |


|  | Pico Canyon Road <br> Westbound |  |  | Southern Oaks Drive <br> Northbound |  |  |  | Pico Canyon Road <br> Eastbound |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | U-Turns | App. Total | Left | Right | U-Turns | App. Total | Thru | Right |

Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:45 AM

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $07: 45$ AM | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | 6 | 53 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 42 | $\mathbf{5 3}$ | 0 | 0 | 53 | $\mathbf{1 4 8}$ |
| $08: 00$ AM | 20 | 17 | $\mathbf{1 9}$ | 56 | 0 | $\mathbf{4 3}$ | 0 | $\mathbf{4 3}$ | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 114 |
| $08: 15$ AM | 14 | 10 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 31 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 70 |
| $08: 30$ AM | 13 | 12 | 7 | 32 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 26 | 27 | $\mathbf{1}$ | 0 | 28 | 86 |
| Total Volume | 72 | 61 | 33 | 166 | 0 | 142 | 0 | 142 | 109 | 1 | 0 | 110 | 418 |
| \% App. Total | 43.4 | 36.7 | 19.9 |  | 0 | 100 | 0 |  | 99.1 | 0.9 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | .720 | .693 | .434 | .741 | .000 | .826 | .000 | .826 | .514 | .250 | .000 | .519 | .706 |

County of Los Angeles
N/S: Southern Oaks Drive
E/W: Pico Canyon Road
Weather: Clear

File Name : CLASOPIAM
Site Code : 05117027
Start Date: 1/18/2017
Page No : 2


Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Each Approach Begins at:

|  | 07:45 AM |  |  |  | 07:30 AM |  |  |  | 07:45 AM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +0 mins. | 25 | 22 | 6 | 53 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 51 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| +15 mins. | 20 | 17 | 19 | 56 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 42 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| +30 mins. | 14 | 10 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 43 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| +45 mins. | 13 | 12 | 7 | 32 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 31 | 27 | 1 | 0 | 28 |
| Total Volume | 72 | 61 | 33 | 166 | 0 | 167 | 0 | 167 | 109 | 1 | 0 | 110 |
| \% App. Total | 43.4 | 36.7 | 19.9 |  | 0 | 100 | 0 |  | 99.1 | 0.9 | 0 |  |
| PHF | . 720 | . 693 | . 434 | . 741 | . 000 | . 819 | . 000 | . 819 | . 514 | . 250 | . 000 | . 519 |

County of Los Angeles
File Name : CLASOPIPM
N/S: Southern Oaks Drive
Site Code : 05117027
E/W: Pico Canyon Road
Start Date : 1/18/2017
Weather: Clear

|  | Pico Canyon Road Westbound |  |  |  | Southern Oaks Drive Northbound |  |  |  | Pico Canyon Road Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | U-Turns | App. Total | Left | Right | U-Turns | App. Total | Thru | Right | U-Turns | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 04:00 PM | 22 | 15 | 7 | 44 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 15 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 72 |
| 04:15 PM | 22 | 14 | 1 | 37 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 63 |
| 04:30 PM | 23 | 14 | 4 | 41 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 70 |
| 04:45 PM | 26 | 16 | 5 | 47 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 73 |
| Total | 93 | 59 | 17 | 169 | 1 | 55 | 0 | 56 | 51 | 2 | 0 | 53 | 278 |
| 05:00 PM | 28 | 15 | 5 | 48 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 72 |
| 05:15 PM | 21 | 20 | 2 | 43 | 1 | 19 | 0 | 20 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 70 |
| 05:30 PM | 22 | 22 | 1 | 45 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 68 |
| 05:45 PM | 27 | 16 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 27 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 84 |
| Total | 98 | 73 | 8 | 179 | 1 | 74 | 0 | 75 | 39 | 1 | 0 | 40 | 294 |
| Grand Total | 191 | 132 | 25 | 348 | 2 | 129 | 0 | 131 | 90 | 3 | 0 | 93 | 572 |
| Apprch \% | 54.9 | 37.9 | 7.2 |  | 1.5 | 98.5 | 0 |  | 96.8 | 3.2 | 0 |  |  |
| Total \% | 33.4 | 23.1 | 4.4 | 60.8 | 0.3 | 22.6 | 0 | 22.9 | 15.7 | 0.5 | 0 | 16.3 |  |


|  | Pico Canyon Road <br> Westbound |  |  | Southern Oaks Drive <br> Northbound |  |  |  | Pico Canyon Road <br> Eastbound |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | U-Turns | App. Total | Left | Right | U-Turns | App. Total | Thru | Right | U-Turns | App. Total | Int. Total |
| :--- | :--- |

Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 05:00 PM

| 05:00 PM | 28 | 15 | 5 | 48 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 72 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 05:15 PM | 21 | 20 | 2 | 43 | 1 | 19 | 0 | 20 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 70 |
| 05:30 PM | 22 | 22 | 1 | 45 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 68 |
| 05:45 PM | 27 | 16 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 27 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 84 |
| Total Volume | 98 | 73 | 8 | 179 | 1 | 74 | 0 | 75 | 39 | 1 | 0 | 40 | 294 |
| \% App. Total | 54.7 | 40.8 | 4.5 |  | 1.3 | 98.7 | 0 |  | 97.5 | 2.5 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 875 | . 830 | . 400 | . 932 | . 250 | . 685 | . 000 | . 694 | . 750 | . 250 | . 000 | . 714 | . 875 |

County of Los Angeles
File Name : CLASOPIPM
N/S: Southern Oaks Drive Site Code : 05117027
E/W: Pico Canyon Road Start Date : 1/18/2017
Weather: Clear


Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Each Approach Begins at:

|  | 04:45 PM |  |  |  | 05:00 PM |  |  |  | 04:00 PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +0 mins. | 26 | 16 | 5 | 47 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 13 |
| +15 mins. | 28 | 15 | 5 | 48 | 1 | 19 | 0 | 20 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| +30 mins. | 21 | 20 | 2 | 43 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| +45 mins. | 22 | 22 | 1 | 45 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 27 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 11 |
| Total Volume | 97 | 73 | 13 | 183 | 1 | 74 | 0 | 75 | 51 | 2 | 0 | 53 |
| \% App. Total | 53 | 39.9 | 7.1 |  | 1.3 | 98.7 | 0 |  | 96.2 | 3.8 | 0 |  |
| PHF | . 866 | . 830 | . 650 | . 953 | . 250 | . 685 | . 000 | . 694 | . 797 | . 500 | . 000 | . 828 |

County of Los Angeles
N/S: Southern Oaks Drive
E/W: Magnolia Lane
Weather: Clear

File Name : CLASOMAAM
Site Code : 05117027
Start Date: 1/18/2017
Page No : 1


|  | Southern Oaks Drive Southbound |  |  | Magnolia Lane Westbound |  |  | Southern Oaks Drive Northbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | App. Total | Left | Right | App. Total | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:30 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:30 AM | 3 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 28 | 0 | 28 | 58 |
| 07:45 AM | 4 | 12 | 16 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 29 | 0 | 29 | 58 |
| 08:00 AM | 7 | 8 | 15 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 22 | 0 | 22 | 49 |
| 08:15 AM | 2 | 14 | 16 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 46 |
| Total Volume | 16 | 41 | 57 | 0 | 60 | 60 | 94 | 0 | 94 | 211 |
| \% App. Total | 28.1 | 71.9 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 100 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 571 | . 732 | . 891 | . 000 | . 750 | . 750 | . 810 | . 000 | . 810 | . 909 |

County of Los Angeles
N/S: Southern Oaks Drive
E/W: Magnolia Lane
Weather: Clear

File Name : CLASOMAAM
Site Code : 05117027
Start Date: 1/18/2017
Page No : 2


Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Each Approach Begins at:

|  | 07:45 AM |  |  | 07:30 AM |  |  | 07:30 AM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +0 mins. | 4 | 12 | 16 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 28 | 0 | 28 |
| +15 mins. | 7 | 8 | 15 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 29 | 0 | 29 |
| +30 mins. | 2 | 14 | 16 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 22 | 0 | 22 |
| +45 mins. | 5 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 15 |
| Total Volume | 18 | 41 | 59 | 0 | 60 | 60 | 94 | 0 | 94 |
| \% App. Total | 30.5 | 69.5 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 100 | 0 |  |
| PHF | . 643 | . 732 | . 922 | . 000 | . 750 | . 750 | . 810 | . 000 | . 810 |

County of Los Angeles
N/S: Southern Oaks Drive
E/W: Magnolia Lane
Weather: Clear

File Name : CLASOMAPM
Site Code : 05117027
Start Date: 1/18/2017
Page No : 1

|  | Southern Oaks Drive Southbound |  |  | Magnolia Lane Westbound |  |  | Southern Oaks Drive Northbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | App. Total | Left | Right | App. Total | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 04:00 PM | 8 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 30 |
| 04:15 PM | 6 | 11 | 17 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 12 | 32 |
| 04:30 PM | 5 | 13 | 18 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 32 |
| 04:45 PM | 10 | 14 | 24 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 9 | 41 |
| Total | 29 | 46 | 75 | 0 | 18 | 18 | 40 | 2 | 42 | 135 |
| 05:00 PM | 11 | 13 | 24 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 37 |
| 05:15 PM | 12 | 13 | 25 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 46 |
| 05:30 PM | 8 | 14 | 22 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 36 |
| 05:45 PM | 5 | 22 | 27 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 19 | 0 | 19 | 53 |
| Total | 36 | 62 | 98 | 1 | 24 | 25 | 49 | 0 | 49 | 172 |
| Grand Total | 65 | 108 | 173 | 1 | 42 | 43 | 89 | 2 | 91 | 307 |
| Apprch \% | 37.6 | 62.4 |  | 2.3 | 97.7 |  | 97.8 | 2.2 |  |  |
| Total \% | 21.2 | 35.2 | 56.4 | 0.3 | 13.7 | 14 | 29 | 0.7 | 29.6 |  |


|  | Southern Oaks Drive Southbound |  |  | Magnolia Lane Westbound |  |  | Southern Oaks Drive Northbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | App. Total | Left | Right | App. Total | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 05:00 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00 PM | 11 | 13 | 24 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 37 |
| 05:15 PM | 12 | 13 | 25 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 46 |
| 05:30 PM | 8 | 14 | 22 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 36 |
| 05:45 PM | 5 | 22 | 27 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 19 | 0 | 19 | 53 |
| Total Volume | 36 | 62 | 98 | 1 | 24 | 25 | 49 | 0 | 49 | 172 |
| \% App. Total | 36.7 | 63.3 |  | 4 | 96 |  | 100 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 750 | . 705 | . 907 | . 250 | . 750 | . 781 | . 645 | . 000 | . 645 | . 811 |

County of Los Angeles
N/S: Southern Oaks Drive
E/W: Magnolia Lane
Weather: Clear

File Name : CLASOMAPM
Site Code : 05117027
Start Date: 1/18/2017
Page No : 2


Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Each Approach Begins at:

|  | 05:00 PM |  |  | 04:30 PM |  |  | 05:00 PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +0 mins. | 11 | 13 | 24 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| +15 mins. | 12 | 13 | 25 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 13 |
| +30 mins. | 8 | 14 | 22 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| +45 mins. | 5 | 22 | 27 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 19 | 0 | 19 |
| Total Volume | 36 | 62 | 98 | 1 | 25 | 26 | 49 | 0 | 49 |
| \% App. Total | 36.7 | 63.3 |  | 3.8 | 96.2 |  | 100 | 0 |  |
| PHF | . 750 | . 705 | . 907 | . 250 | . 781 | . 813 | . 645 | . 000 | . 645 |

County of Los Angeles
File Name : CLASTPIAM
Site Code : 05117027
Start Date: 1/18/2017
Page No : 1
N/S: Stevenson Ranch Parkway
E/W: Pico Canyon Road
Weather: Clear
Groups Printed- Total Volume

|  | Stevenson Ranch Parkway Southbound |  |  | Pico Canyon Road Westbound |  |  | Pico Canyon Road Eastbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Right | App. Total | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 100 | 1 | 101 | 14 | 15 | 29 | 7 | 21 | 28 | 158 |
| 07:15 AM | 89 | 4 | 93 | 12 | 20 | 32 | 7 | 23 | 30 | 155 |
| 07:30 AM | 133 | 1 | 134 | 20 | 36 | 56 | 19 | 34 | 53 | 243 |
| 07:45 AM | 165 | 1 | 166 | 38 | 39 | 77 | 27 | 62 | 89 | 332 |
| Total | 487 | 7 | 494 | 84 | 110 | 194 | 60 | 140 | 200 | 888 |
| 08:00 AM | 154 | 6 | 160 | 36 | 59 | 95 | 20 | 39 | 59 | 314 |
| 08:15 AM | 113 | 5 | 118 | 11 | 23 | 34 | 19 | 21 | 40 | 192 |
| 08:30 AM | 92 | 9 | 101 | 15 | 20 | 35 | 29 | 20 | 49 | 185 |
| 08:45 AM | 101 | 8 | 109 | 13 | 22 | 35 | 37 | 24 | 61 | 205 |
| Total | 460 | 28 | 488 | 75 | 124 | 199 | 105 | 104 | 209 | 896 |
| Grand Total | 947 | 35 | 982 | 159 | 234 | 393 | 165 | 244 | 409 | 1784 |
| Apprch \% | 96.4 | 3.6 |  | 40.5 | 59.5 |  | 40.3 | 59.7 |  |  |
| Total \% | 53.1 | 2 | 55 | 8.9 | 13.1 | 22 | 9.2 | 13.7 | 22.9 |  |


|  | Stevenson Ranch Parkway Southbound |  |  | Pico Canyon Road Westbound |  |  | Pico Canyon Road Eastbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Right | App. Total | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:30 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:30 AM | 133 | 1 | 134 | 20 | 36 | 56 | 19 | 34 | 53 | 243 |
| 07:45 AM | 165 | 1 | 166 | 38 | 39 | 77 | 27 | 62 | 89 | 332 |
| 08:00 AM | 154 | 6 | 160 | 36 | 59 | 95 | 20 | 39 | 59 | 314 |
| 08:15 AM | 113 | 5 | 118 | 11 | 23 | 34 | 19 | 21 | 40 | 192 |
| Total Volume | 565 | 13 | 578 | 105 | 157 | 262 | 85 | 156 | 241 | 1081 |
| \% App. Total | 97.8 | 2.2 |  | 40.1 | 59.9 |  | 35.3 | 64.7 |  |  |
| PHF | . 856 | . 542 | . 870 | . 691 | . 665 | . 689 | . 787 | . 629 | . 677 | . 814 |

County of Los Angeles
N/S: Stevenson Ranch Parkway E/W: Pico Canyon Road
Weather: Clear

File Name : CLASTPIAM
Site Code : 05117027
Start Date: 1/18/2017
Page No : 2


Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Each Approach Begins at:

|  | 07:30 AM |  |  | 07:30 AM |  |  | 07:30 AM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +0 mins. | 133 | 1 | 134 | 20 | 36 | 56 | 19 | 34 | 53 |
| +15 mins. | 165 | 1 | 166 | 38 | 39 | 77 | 27 | 62 | 89 |
| +30 mins. | 154 | 6 | 160 | 36 | 59 | 95 | 20 | 39 | 59 |
| +45 mins. | 113 | 5 | 118 | 11 | 23 | 34 | 19 | 21 | 40 |
| Total Volume | 565 | 13 | 578 | 105 | 157 | 262 | 85 | 156 | 241 |
| \% App. Total | 97.8 | 2.2 |  | 40.1 | 59.9 |  | 35.3 | 64.7 |  |
| PHF | . 856 | . 542 | . 870 | . 691 | . 665 | . 689 | 787 | . 629 | . 677 |

County of Los Angeles
File Name : CLASTPIPM
Site Code : 05117027
Start Date: 1/18/2017
Page No : 1
N/S: Stevenson Ranch Parkway
E/W: Pico Canyon Road
Weather: Clear

|  | Stevenson Ranch Parkway Southbound |  |  | Pico Canyon Road Westbound |  |  | Pico Canyon Road Eastbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Right | App. Total | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 04:00 PM | 68 | 9 | 77 | 27 | 80 | 107 | 12 | 13 | 25 | 209 |
| 04:15 PM | 54 | 9 | 63 | 28 | 73 | 101 | 14 | 15 | 29 | 193 |
| 04:30 PM | 78 | 6 | 84 | 30 | 63 | 93 | 13 | 19 | 32 | 209 |
| 04:45 PM | 71 | 6 | 77 | 36 | 75 | 111 | 14 | 20 | 34 | 222 |
| Total | 271 | 30 | 301 | 121 | 291 | 412 | 53 | 67 | 120 | 833 |
| 05:00 PM | 73 | 8 | 81 | 32 | 84 | 116 | 9 | 23 | 32 | 229 |
| 05:15 PM | 60 | 11 | 71 | 28 | 99 | 127 | 11 | 13 | 24 | 222 |
| 05:30 PM | 74 | 4 | 78 | 32 | 88 | 120 | 16 | 12 | 28 | 226 |
| 05:45 PM | 67 | 5 | 72 | 34 | 77 | 111 | 20 | 17 | 37 | 220 |
| Total | 274 | 28 | 302 | 126 | 348 | 474 | 56 | 65 | 121 | 897 |
| Grand Total | 545 | 58 | 603 | 247 | 639 | 886 | 109 | 132 | 241 | 1730 |
| Apprch \% | 90.4 | 9.6 |  | 27.9 | 72.1 |  | 45.2 | 54.8 |  |  |
| Total \% | 31.5 | 3.4 | 34.9 | 14.3 | 36.9 | 51.2 | 6.3 | 7.6 | 13.9 |  |


|  | Stevenson Ranch Parkway Southbound |  |  | Pico Canyon Road Westbound |  |  | Pico Canyon Road Eastbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Right | App. Total | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:45 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:45 PM | 71 | 6 | 77 | 36 | 75 | 111 | 14 | 20 | 34 | 222 |
| 05:00 PM | 73 | 8 | 81 | 32 | 84 | 116 | 9 | 23 | 32 | 229 |
| 05:15 PM | 60 | 11 | 71 | 28 | 99 | 127 | 11 | 13 | 24 | 222 |
| 05:30 PM | 74 | 4 | 78 | 32 | 88 | 120 | 16 | 12 | 28 | 226 |
| Total Volume | 278 | 29 | 307 | 128 | 346 | 474 | 50 | 68 | 118 | 899 |
| \% App. Total | 90.6 | 9.4 |  | 27 | 73 |  | 42.4 | 57.6 |  |  |
| PHF | . 939 | . 659 | . 948 | . 889 | . 874 | . 933 | . 781 | . 739 | 868 | 981 |

County of Los Angeles
N/S: Stevenson Ranch Parkway E/W: Pico Canyon Road
Weather: Clear

File Name : CLASTPIPM
Site Code : 05117027
Start Date: 1/18/2017
Page No : 2


Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Each Approach Begins at:

|  | 04:30 PM |  |  | 04:45 PM |  |  | 04:15 PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +0 mins. | 78 | 6 | 84 | 36 | 75 | 111 | 14 | 15 | 29 |
| +15 mins. | 71 | 6 | 77 | 32 | 84 | 116 | 13 | 19 | 32 |
| +30 mins. | 73 | 8 | 81 | 28 | 99 | 127 | 14 | 20 | 34 |
| +45 mins. | 60 | 11 | 71 | 32 | 88 | 120 | 9 | 23 | 32 |
| Total Volume | 282 | 31 | 313 | 128 | 346 | 474 | 50 | 77 | 127 |
| \% App. Total | 90.1 | 9.9 |  | 27 | 73 |  | 39.4 | 60.6 |  |
| PHF | . 904 | . 705 | . 932 | . 889 | . 874 | . 933 | . 893 | . 837 | . 934 |

This page intentionally left blank

## Attachment B:

## Existing Conditions Intersection Operations Analysis Worksheets

## THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## JN:10734 Canyon Hills Estates <br> Existing Conditions <br> AM PEAK HOUR

Level Of Service Computation Report
ICU 1(Loss as Cycle Length \%) Method (Base Volume Alternative)


| Approach: | North Bound |  |  | South Bound |  |  |  | East Bound |  |  | West Bound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement: | L - | T | R | L | T | - | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Control: | Permitted |  |  | Permitted |  |  |  | Permitted |  |  | Protected |  |  |
| Rights: | Include |  |  | Include |  |  |  | Include |  |  | Include |  |  |
| Min. Green: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{R}$ : | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lanes: | 0 | 0 | 01 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 10 | 1 |  |


| Volume Module: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Vol: | 0 | 0 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 | 1 | 105 | 61 | 0 |
| Growth Adj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Initial Bse: | 0 | 0 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 | 1 | 105 | 61 | 0 |
| User Adj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| PHF Adj: | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 |
| PHF Volume: | 0 | 0 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 1 | 149 | 86 | 0 |
| Reduct Vol: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |
| Reduced Vol: | 0 | 0 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 1 | 149 | 86 | 0 |
| PCE Adj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| MLF Adj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| FinalVolume: | 0 | 0 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 1 | 149 | 86 | 0 |
| Saturation Flow Module: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sat/Lane: | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 |
| Adjustment: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lanes: | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Fi | 0 | 0 | 1600 |  |  |  |  |  | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 |  |

 Capacity Analysis Module:
Vol/Sat: $\quad 0.000 .00 \quad 0.13 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.10 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.09 \quad 0.05 \quad 0.00$ Crit Moves: **** **** ****
$\qquad$

Traffix 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to URBAN CROSSROADS, IRVINE

## JN:10734 Canyon Hills Estates <br> Existing Conditions <br> AM PEAK HOUR

Level Of Service Computation Report
ICU 1(Loss as Cycle Length \%) Method (Base Volume Alternative)
Intersection \#3 Southern Oaks Dr (NS) at Magnolia Ln (EW)
$* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ~$

| Approach: | North Bound |  |  | South Bound |  |  | East Bound |  |  | West Bound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement: | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Control: | Protected |  |  | Permitted |  |  | Permitted |  |  | Permitted |  |  |
| Rights: | Include |  |  | Include |  |  | Include |  |  | Include |  |  |
| Min. Green: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{R}$ : | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lanes: |  | 1 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| ume Module: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Vol: | 0 | 94 | 0 | 16 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| Growth Adj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Initial Bse: | 0 | 94 | 0 | 16 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| User Adj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| PHF Adj: | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| PHF Volume: | 0 | 103 | 0 | 18 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |
| Reduct Vol: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced Vol: | 0 | 103 | 0 | 18 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |
| PCE Adj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| MLF Adj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| FinalVolume: | 0 | 103 | 0 | 18 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |
| Saturation Flow Module: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sat/Lane: | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 |
| Adjustment: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lanes: | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.72 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Final Sat.: | 0 | 1600 | 0 | 449 | 1151 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1600 |


Capacity Analysis Module:
Vol/Sat: $\quad 0.000 .06 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.010 .04 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.04$ Crit Moves


Traffix 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to URBAN CROSSROADS, IRVINE

## JN:10734 Canyon Hills Estates <br> Existing Conditions <br> AM PEAK HOUR

Level Of Service Computation Report
ICU 1(Loss as Cycle Length \%) Method (Base Volume Alternative)

| Intersection \#7 Stevenson Ranch Pkwy (NS) at Pico Canyon Rd (EW) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ~$ |  |


| Approach: | North Bound |  |  |  | South Bound |  |  |  | East Bound |  |  |  | West Bound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement: | L - | T | - | R | L | T | - | R | L | T | - | R | L | T | R |
| Control: | Permitted |  |  |  | Permitted |  |  |  | Protected |  |  |  | Permitted |  |  |
| Rights: | Include |  |  |  | Include |  |  |  | Include |  |  |  | Include |  |  |
| Min. Green: | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{R}$ : | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lanes: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 |




Capacity Analysis Module:
Vol/Sat: $\quad 0.000 .00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.240 .00 \quad 0.01 \quad 0.070 .12 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.08 \quad 0.12$ Crit Moves: $\qquad$

Traffix 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to URBAN CROSSROADS, IRVINE

## JN:10734 Canyon Hills Estates <br> Existing Conditions <br> PM PEAK HOUR

Level Of Service Computation Report
ICU 1(Loss as Cycle Length \%) Method (Base Volume Alternative)
Intersection \#6 Southern Oaks (NS) at Pico Cyn (EW)
$* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ~$

| Approach: | North Bound |  |  | South Bound |  |  |  | East Bound |  |  |  | West Bound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement: | L - | T | - R | L | T | - | R | L | T | - | R | L | T | R |
| Control: | Permitted |  |  | Permitted |  |  |  | Permitted |  |  |  | Protected |  |  |
| Rights: | Include |  |  | Include |  |  |  | Include |  |  |  | Include |  |  |
| Min. Green: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{R}$ : | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lanes: | 0 | $1!$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 0 |


| Volume Modul |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Vol: | 1 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 1 | 106 | 73 | 0 |
| Growth Adj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Initial Bse: | 1 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 1 | 106 | 73 | 0 |
| User Adj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| PHF Adj: | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 |
| PHF Volume: | 1 | 0 | 85 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 45 | 1 | 121 | 83 | $\bigcirc$ |
| Reduct Vol: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced Vol: | 1 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 1 | 121 | 83 | 0 |
| PCE Adj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| MLF Adj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| FinalVolume: | 1 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 1 | 121 | 83 | 0 |
| Saturation Flow Module: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sat/Lane: | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 |
| Adjustment: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lanes: | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Final Sat.: | 21 | 0 | 1579 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 0 |


|  |
| :---: |

Capacity Analysis Module:
Vol/Sat: $\quad 0.000 .00 \quad 0.05 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.03 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.08 \quad 0.05 \quad 0.00$ Crit Moves: **** **** ****
$\qquad$

Traffix 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to URBAN CROSSROADS, IRVINE

## JN:10734 Canyon Hills Estates <br> Existing Conditions <br> PM PEAK HOUR

Level Of Service Computation Report
ICU 1(Loss as Cycle Length \%) Method (Base Volume Alternative)

| Intersection \#3 Southern Oaks Dr (NS) at Magnolia Ln (EW) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cycle (sec): 100 | Critical Vol./Cap. (X): | 0.195 |
| Loss Time (sec): | 10 | Average Delay (sec/veh): |
| Optimal Cycle: | 60 | Level Of Service: |


| Approach: | North Bound |  |  | South Bound |  |  | East Bound |  |  | West Bound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement: | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Control: | Protected |  |  | Permitted |  |  | Permitted |  |  | Permitted |  |  |
| Rights: | Include |  |  | Include |  |  | Include |  |  | Include |  |  |
| Min. Green: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Y+R: | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lanes: | 0 | 1 | 0 | 01 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $1!$ | 0 |


| ume Module: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Vol: | 0 | 49 | 0 | 36 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 24 |
| Growth Adj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Initial Bse: | 0 | 49 | 0 | 36 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 24 |
| User Adj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| PHF Adj: | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| PHF Volume: | 0 | 60 | 0 | 44 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 30 |
| Reduct Vol: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced Vol: | 0 | 60 | 0 | 44 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 30 |
| PCE Adj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| MLF Adj: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| FinalVolume: | 0 | 60 | 0 | 44 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 30 |
| Saturation Flow Module: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sat/Lane: | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 |
| Adjustment: | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lanes: | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.37 | 0.63 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.96 |
| Final Sat.: | 0 | 1600 | 0 | 588 | 1012 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 1536 |



Capacity Analysis Module:
Vol/Sat: $\quad 0.00$ 0.04 $0.00 \quad 0.030 .08 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.02$ Crit Moves: **** **** ****
$\qquad$

Traffix 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to URBAN CROSSROADS, IRVINE

## JN:10734 Canyon Hills Estates <br> Existing Conditions <br> PM PEAK HOUR

Level Of Service Computation Report
ICU 1(Loss as Cycle Length \%) Method (Base Volume Alternative)

| Intersection \#7 |  | at Pico Canyon Rd (EW) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cycle (sec): | 100 | Critical Vol./Cap.(X): | 0.451 |
| Loss Time (sec) : | 10 | Average Delay (sec/veh): | xxxxxx |
| Optimal Cycle: | 60 | Level Of Service: | A |


| Approach: | North Bound |  |  |  | South Bound |  |  |  | East Bound |  |  |  | West Bound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement: | L - | T | - | R | L | T | - | R | L | T | - | R | L | T | R |
| Control: | Permitted |  |  |  | Permitted |  |  |  | Protected |  |  |  | Permitted |  |  |
| Rights: | Include |  |  |  | Include |  |  |  | Include |  |  |  | Include |  |  |
| Min. Green: | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{R}$ : | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lanes: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 |



Capacity Analysis Module:
Vol/Sat: $\quad 0.000 .00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.100 .00 \quad 0.02 \quad 0.030 .04 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.00 \quad 0.08 \quad 0.22$ Crit Moves: $\qquad$

Traffix 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to URBAN CROSSROADS, IRVINE

## Attachment C:

## Existing Plus Project Conditions Intersection Operations Analysis Worksheets
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Traffix 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to URBAN CROSSROADS, IRVINE


Traffix 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to URBAN CROSSROADS, IRVINE


Traffix 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to URBAN CROSSROADS, IRVINE


Traffix 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to URBAN CROSSROADS, IRVINE


Traffix 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to URBAN CROSSROADS, IRVINE


Traffix 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to URBAN CROSSROADS, IRVINE

## Attachment D:

## Cumulative Project Information

This page intentionally left blank

## REQUESTED ENTITLEMENTS

Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. TR061911
Conditional Use Permit No. 201300091

## SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE REPORT

Oak Tree Permit No. 201300024
Environmental Assessment No. 201300154

## MAP/EXHIBIT DATE:

April 15, 2015

SCM REPORT DATE:
May 21, 2015

SCM DATE:

May 28, 2015

## PROJECT OVERVIEW

The proposed project, "Potrero Village," consists of a mixed use development with 4,385 dwelling units (1,614 SFR units and $3,221 \mathrm{MF} /$ Condo units), three (3) parks totaling 190 acres, five (5) recreation centers, an elementary school, a fire station, a visitor center, a 14.8 acre spineflower reserve, 1,463 acres of open space, and 245,000 square feet of commercial development on a 26.9 -acre site (gross).

Subdivision: To create 1,198 residential lots ( 1,164 single-family lots and 36 multi-family/condominium lots), 3 commercial lots ( $245,000 \mathrm{sf}$ ), 1 school lot ( 11.5 ac ), 1 fire station lot ( 1.5 ac ), 5 recreation center lots ( 8.9 ac ), 1 visitor center lot ( 36.6 ac), 1 spineflower preserve lot ( 14.8 ac ), 7 park lots (191 ac), ( 329 open space lots ( $1,463 \mathrm{ac}$ ), and 29 public facility lots (including a fire station, debris basins, water quality basins, and an SCE Substation), 40 private drive lots (1,616 total lots).

The project will require other infrastructure improvements such as debris basins, electrical transfer station, water quality basins and an internal circulation system consisting of trails, driveways, streets and highways. The property is located within the boundary of the adopted Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and the irregular-shaped property consists of slopping topography, with flat agricultural lands along the Santa Clara River to the south with step and rolling hills to the north. Portion of the property is located within a designated floodplain, SEA 20 is within the southerly portion of the project site and off-site improvements may be located within SEA 23. The development of the project requires approximately 35 million cubic yards of grading (cut and fill) to be balanced on-site and the encroachment and removal of yet to be determined number of oak trees.

CUP: For development within an SEA and onsite grading in excess of 100,000 cubic yards.
To authorize the development of second units on single-family lots located within the Estate (E) and Low Residential (L) land use designations pursuant to Section 3.9 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

Oak Tree Permit: For the removal of __ oak trees and encroachment into the protected zone of __ oak trees. There are heritage-status oak trees onsite and $\qquad$ are proposed to be encroached upon/removed.

## MAP STAGE

Tentative: $\boxtimes$
Revised:
Amendment: $\square$
Amended: $\square$
Modification to :


Other: $\square$

## MAP STATUS

Initial: $\square \quad 1^{\text {st }}$ Revision: $\square \quad 2^{\text {nd }}$ Revision: $\square \quad$ Additional Revisions (requires a fee): $\boxtimes$

## LOCATION

South of Route 126, approx. one mile west of I-5, east of Barranca Drive and west of the terminus of Magic Mountain Parkway.

## ACCESS

Future extension of Magic Mountain Parkway (TR061105 \& TR060678) and Long Canyon Road (TR53108 \& TR060678). Both are mapped secondary highways.

## ASSESSORS PARCEL NUMBER(S)

APNs. 2826-123-003, 2826-001-034 2826-123-001; and 2826-122-001, 002, 005, 006, 007 and 008

| Newhall Ranch Specific Plan | Newhall | $5^{\text {th }}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LAND USE DESIGNATION | ZONE | CSD |
| Specific Plan (Newhall Ranch SP) | Specific Plan | N/A (adjacent to Castaic |
|  |  |  |
| PROPOSED UNITS | MAX DENSITY/UNITS | GRADING, CUBIC YARDS |
| (DU) | (DU) | (CUT/FILL, IMPORT/EXPORT, ONSITE/OFFSITE) |
| 1.75 du/ac or | TBD by SP consistency | Cut: 35,200,000 cyds |
| 4,385 du/2,500 ac | analysis (pending) | Fill: 35,200,000 cyds |
|  |  | Grading to be balanced on-site. |

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION (CEQA)
EIR is required.

| SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE DEPARTMENT CLEARANCE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Department | Status | Contact |
| Regional Planning | Hold | Diane Aranda (213) 974-1522 daranda@planning.lacounty.gov |
| Public Works | Hold | Henry Wong (626) 458-4961 hwong@dpw.lacounty.gov |
| Fire | Hold | Juan Padilla (323) 890-4243 jpadilla@fire.lacounty.gov |
| Parks \& Recreation | Hold | Clement Lau (213) 351-5120 clau@parks.lacounty.gov |
| Public Health | Hold | Thao Komura (626) 430-5581 tkomura@ph.lacounty.gov |

## SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE STATUS

Tentative Map Revision Required: $\boxtimes$
Exhibit Map/Exhibit ÊËRevision Required: $\boxtimes$
Revised Application Required: $\boxtimes$

Reschedule for Subdivision Committee Meeting: $\boxtimes$ Reschedule for Subdivision Committee Reports Only: $\square$ Other Holds (see below): $\boxtimes$

## REGIONAL PLANNING ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND HOLDS

Case Status/Recommendation: At this time, Regional Planning does not recommend approval of the tentative map.
Please read below for further details.

Land Use Policy:
Clear $\square$ Hold $\boxtimes$

1. Under Review

## Tentative Map:

Clear $\square$ Hold $\boxtimes$
(Sheet 1)

1. Include a description for the Substantial Conformance Review request
2. Revise General Note no. 5 to state, ÊPermission is requested to file "Large Lot" Tract Maps of 20 Acres or More (Without Improvements) as specified in the County Subdivision Code."
3. Revise no. 6, 7 and 8 to add $\hat{\text { Êo the satisfaction of DRP and DPW as depictedË }}$
(Sheet 2)
4. All street sections must comply with the Healthy Design Ordinance (see HDO code summary and guidelines). (Sheet 3)
5. Lots $22,25,23,24,40,41$ and 44 are $<40$ li. Are some of these lots proposed to be flag lots?
6. Lot 65 is missing. Not clear on where it is located.
7. The table lists that Lot 84 is within Area A7 although the lot is located adjacent to A2, A3 and A4. Organize/label lots to be located within the correct area.
8. Unclear if area adjacent to lot 167 is part of lot 167 or is it a lot without a designated number.
(Sheet 4)
9. Add pedestrian connection between 218/219 (comment from previous report)
10. Lots 242 and 243 (open space) are within the A 8 area on the map but are listed in the table as being in Area 9. Revise table and map to be consistent
11. Label for lot 65 is cluttered/unclear.
12. Insert pedestrian connection between lots 99 and 100.
13. Lot 136 lot frontage < 40 í
14. Area between lot 139 and 138 does not have a designated lot number.
15. Lot 89 and 147 (open space) is missing
16. Insert pedestrian access from condos to adjacent recreation center
(Sheet 5)
17. Lot 435 is missing
18. Lot 455 should be in Area B10 instead of B3.
(Sheet 6)
19. Lots 294, 295, 296, and 297 have lot frontage <40í as required in Title 21.
20. Lot 466 (park) is located within the Area B6 on the map although it is listed in the table as being in Area B11. Revise table/map to be consistent.
21. Lots 725 and 726 have lot frontage < 40 Í as required by Title 21.
22. Lot 667 (park) is listed in the table as being in Area C3 although the map shows that itls in the C5 area. Revise map/table to be consistent.
23. Lots 668 and 669 are missing (Sheet 7)
24. Lot 881 (park) is located in Area D8 although the table says that it is in the D3 area. The table does not have an Area D8.
25. Provide a pedestrian access from condo lot 880 to the adjacent park lot 881. (Sheet 10)
26. Lots 532, 548, and 549 have lot frontage <40l as required in Title 21.
(Sheet 11)
27. Lot 932 has lot frontage <401́ as required in Title 21.
28. Condo lot 1539 is landlocked; provide access to ROW.
(Sheet 12)
29. A condition shall limit residential development to 300 dwelling units where there is only a single means of access, until a second means of access is provided through future development.
(Global Comments)
30. Eliminate/redesign irregular and curvilinear lot lines where appropriate.
31. Provide typical access width for flag lots or identify the width of each flag lot strip (15í, 20 Í and 241 for single, dual and greater than three, respectively). Not clear on which lots are flag.
32. Provide separate oak tree exhibit.
33. Private drives shall be designed per the Westside Communities Private Drive and Traffic Calming Design Guidelines as consistent with Healthy Design Ordinance (see previously provided HDO summary and scaled cross section sample). Include scaled cross-section typicals in planning handbook.
34. Only ÊtandardËroad cross sections shall be used, per HDO, no ÊlternateËsections.
35. All common pedestrian walkways (such as for cul-de-sac thru-connections) should either be located on separate common private lots, or, have easements (HDO requirement).
36. Provide a statistical Substantial Conformance summary table illustrating how the proposed project is in substantial conformance with the Specific Plan.
37. Provide a substantial conformance analysis illustrating how the proposed areas overlay on the existing specific plan land use designations.

## Exhibit Map/Exhibit ÊAË

Clear $\square$ Hold $\boxtimes$

## (Sheet 1)

38. Add Êo the satisfaction of DRP and DPW as depictedËto General Notes nos. 6, 7 and 8.
39. Please provide the Êtreet Tree NoteËto illustrate compliance with the Healthy Design Ordinance. (Section 21.32 .160 (street) and 21.32.195 (onsite) (total linear frontage / $25=$ total trees required). Pursuant to section 2.32.160 street trees are required; 21.32.195 onsite trees are required with 25 -foot spacing and required street trees may be utilized as part of count.
(Sheet 2)
40. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
41. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of 12 du/ac or more.
42. Main condo unit (pedestrian) entrances are to take access from a landscaped common area (i.e. courtyard or paseo). Main pedestrian access is prohibited from a fire lane shared by garages (secondary access allowed)
(Sheet 3)
43. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
44. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of 12 du/ac or more.
45. Main condo unit (pedestrian) entrances are to take access from a landscaped common area (i.e. courtyard or paseo). Main pedestrian access is prohibited from a fire lane shared by garages (secondary access allowed) (Sheet 4)
46. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
47. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of 12 du/ac or more.
48. Main condo unit (pedestrian) entrances are to take access from a landscaped common area (i.e. courtyard or paseo). Main pedestrian access is prohibited from a fire lane shared by garages (secondary access allowed)
49. Illustrate pedestrian pathway from condo lot 68 to open space lot 84 .
(Sheet 5)
50. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
51. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of 12 du/ac or more.
(Sheet 6)
52. Revise guest/street parking to be located outside of the fire lane.
53. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
54. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of $12 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ or more.
(Sheet 7)
55. Illustrate pedestrian pathway to ÊShared recreation centerË
56. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
57. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of $12 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ or more. (Sheet 8)
58. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
59. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of 12 du/ac or more.
(Sheet 9)
60. Illustrate pedestrian access connection from lot 465 to lot 466.
61. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
62. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of 12 du/ac or more.
(Sheet 10)
63. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
64. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of 12 du/ac or more.
(Sheet 11)
65. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
(Sheet 12)
66. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
67. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of 12 du/ac or more.
(Sheet 13)
68. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
69. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of 12 du/ac or more. (Sheet 14)
70. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
71. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of 12 du/ac or more.
72. Provide a pedestrian connection from condo lot to park.
(Sheet 15)
73. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
74. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of 12 du/ac or more. (Sheet 16)
75. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
76. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of 12 du/ac or more.
77. Condo lot 899 does not illustrate guest parking. Revise to show required guest parking. (Sheet 17)
78. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
79. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of 12 du/ac or more. (Sheet 18)
80. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
81. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of 12 du/ac or more. (Sheet 19)
82. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
83. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot
width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of 12 du/ac or more.
(Sheet 20)
84. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
85. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of 12 du/ac or more. (Sheet 21)
86. Condo lot 1565 does not illustrate the required handicap guest parking spaces. Revise to show the required handicap parking spaces.
87. Include bicycle parking note to comply with bicycle parking requirement. Long term bicycle parking shall be provided per LA County Code requirements (Section 22.52.1225.4.(b)). The required space shall be provided within an enclosed garage or other appropriate location(s) to the satisfaction of DRP.
88. Add internal pedestrian walkway standards for residential and commercial condo projects, minimum five-foot width and with a four-foot wide planting strip for residential projects with a density of 12 du/ac or more.

## (Global Comments)

89. Provide typical garage layout for double and tandem option.
90. Clarify unit identification for each MF lots.
91. Indicate MF lots with townhouse, detached and attached options.

## Plan Amendment:

(N/A)

## Zone Change:

(N/A)
Variance
(N/A)
Conditional Use Permit:
Clear $\square$ Hold $\boxtimes$
92. SEATAC review required.
93. Provide burden of proof for SEA CUP.
94. Provide general slope density analysis and grading exhibit for SP as discussed.

## Housing Permit:

(N/A)
Parking Permit:
(N/A)

## Oak Tree Permit:

Clear $\square$ Hold $\boxtimes$
95. Additional information required. Provide full scale oak tree exhibit and two copies of revised Oak Tree Report.
96. Revised OTP burden of proof to include information for number of impacted trees.

## Environmental Determination:

Clear $\square$ Hold $\boxtimes$
97. EIR Required. Prepare an Initial Study and Notice of Preparation.

## Community Standards District:

(N/A)

## Healthy Design Ordinance (ÊTDOË:

ClearHold $\boxtimes$
98. Provide a table listing HDO project features such as: cul-de-sac pedestrian connections; use of the standard road cross section (not the ÊalternateËcross section); scaled road cross sections; bicycle parking; and parking lot walkways and landscaping.
99. Final Map Condition: The onsite tree planting requirement will be one tree per each 25 feet of existing and proposed street frontage located within the subject property. Based on the project total of $\qquad$ linear feet of street frontage, a total of __ tree plantings shall be required for the project and indicated on a tree planting plan to be approved by Regional Planning prior to final map recordation.

## Administrative/Other:

Clear $\square$ Hold $\boxtimes$
100. Burdens of Proof: Under review.
101. Specific Plan consistency: Under review.
102. Provide updated Planning Notebook depicting typical units.
103. Provide notarized ownership and consent affidavit for land division, OTP and CUP applications.
104. One copy of 1000 -foot radius land use map.
105. Parking permit is needed for share and reciprocal parking.
106. IEC approval for elimination of Potrero Valley Road.
107. Pending DEIR preparation and completion.
108. Provide internal circulation exhibit that include vehicular (public and private streets, internal driveways) and pedestrian access (include existing and proposed trail system).
109. Provide open space exhibit (can be combine with other pertinent exhibits).
110. Demonstrate compliance with SP Affordable Housing Program.
111. Provide updated land use statistical table along with Planning Notebook for Phase IV.
112. Pending WSA and litigation for Phases I \& II.
113. Status of construction of Newhall Ranch WRP (possible condition similar to Phases I \& II).
114. Clarification on status of permits needed for off-site improvements.
115. See attached report for holds from DPR (park improvement \& design), FD (planning, access \& circulation), and DPW (hydrology, soil, geo tech, grading, road, sewer, water supply \& traffic).
116. Check SP (Ch 5.2) for consistency with note 1.
117. Need building permit history for existing building to remain.
118. Provide a statistical Substantial Conformance summary table illustrating how the proposed project is in substantial conformance with the Specific Plan.
119. Provide a substantial conformance analysis illustrating how the proposed areas overlay on the existing specific plan land use designations.
120. Provide Planning Notebook-

- Land Use Statistical Comparison and Substantial Conformance Summary
- Annotated Land Use Plan Statistical table
- Landscape plan
- Circulation Plan
- Annotated Trails and Infrastructure table
- List off-site improvements


## RESUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

If a map revision is required, please submit the following items:

- A completed and signed Land Division application
- A signed and dated cover letter describing all changes made to the map
- Six (6) folded and collated copies of Tract/Parcel Map and Exhibit Map/Exhibit "A"
- A digital (CD or Flash drive) copy of the map/exhibit in PDF format
- Revision fee payment (for the $3^{\text {rd }}$ revision and thereafter)
- Any other additional materials requested by the case planner

NOTE: An appointment is required for resubmittal. You must call Land Divisions Section at 213-974-6433 to schedule the appointment. Prior to scheduling, you are strongly encouraged to contact the case planner and discuss the map revision and other materials.

# SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE REPORT 

PROJECT NUMBER
TR061996 (Legacy Village)

## REQUESTED ENTITLEMENTS

Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 061996
Zone Change No. 200500012
Plan Amendment No. 200500008 Pending
Conditional Use Permit No. 200500122
Oak Tree Permit No. 200600072
Parking Permit No. Pending
Housing Permit No. 200600002
Highway Realignment No. 200500001
Environmental Assessment No. 200500137
EIR SCH No.: Pending

OWNER / APPLICANT
Newhall Land and Farming (Miles Helfrich)
Additional Contacts: Hunsaker \& Associates (Jeannine Giem); Psomas (Ellen Fiztgerald)

MAP/EXHIBIT DATE:
11/19/14

SCM REPORT
DATE:
12/16/14

## SCM DATE:

1/08/15

## PROJECT OVERVIEW

The proposed project, "Legacy Village" (1,758.6-acre site (gross)), consists of a mixed use development with 3,457 dwelling units ( 1,011 SFR units and 2,446 MF/Condo units, a senior assisted living facility ( 342 beds)), 30.2 acres of public and private recreation areas, a 3.0 -acre fire station, and 839,000 square feet of commercial development (including 337,000 square feet for a senior assisted living facility).

Subdivision: To create 1,472 lots including 1,032 residential lots ( 1,011 single-family lots ( 180.6 acres) and 21 multifamily/condominium lots ( 152.3 acres)); 7 commercial lots ( 6 retail commercial ( 30.2 acres) 502,000 sf and 1 senior assisted living facility ( 12.0 acres) $337,000 \mathrm{sf}$ ); 311 open space lots ( $1,104.6$ acres); 1 public park lot ( 20.9 acres); 3 private recreation lots ( 9.3 acres); 52 public facility lots ( 125.4 acres including a fire station, sewer lift station, electrical substation, drainage, water quality, debris basins, and water tanks), and 66 private drive lots (123.3 acres).

Primary access to the site will require the extensions of Valencia Boulevard (on-site) and Magic Mountain Parkway (external map improvement); both are mapped as highways. The existing portion of Poe Parkway located within VTTM 061996 will require upgrading to Secondary Highway to match the existing roadway which is already constructed to secondary highway standards, and the proposed northerly extension of Poe Parkway would be constructed as a collector street and private drive. The project will require infrastructure improvements such as electrical, sewer, water, water quality basins, and an internal circulation system consisting of trails, driveways, streets and connections to highways. The property is located within the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan, 2012 planning area (and not located within the boundary of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan area). The irregularly-shaped property consists of hilly and sloping topography. The development of the project requires approximately 25.9 million cubic yards of grading ( 25.9 million cubic yards of cut and 25.9 million cubic yards of fill) to be balanced on-site with minor boundary contour grading linkages with adjacent properties owned by the applicant.

General Plan Amendment: [Pending Plan of Highways determination]
Highway Realignment: To realign Valencia Boulevard from the easterly boundary of VTTM 061996 to the westerly boundary of VTTM 061996 (on-site) and to realign Magic Mountain Parkway located north of the north boundary of VTTM 061996 at adjacent VTTM 061105 to the northeast and VTTM 060678 to the northwest (external map improvement).

Zone Change: To change R-1 zoning within the H 2 land use classification area to RPD-5000-2.4U for the residential areas proposed and to $\mathrm{C}-2$ for the commercial areas proposed; to change $\mathrm{R}-1$ zoning within the $\mathrm{H}-5$ land use classification area to RPD-5000-4.8U for the residential areas proposed and OS for the undisturbed open space areas proposed; and to change A-2-2 zoning within the RL5 land use classification area to OS.

CUP: To authorize development within an SEA; development within a hillside management area; residential development within a residential planned development (RPD) zone; senior housing density bonus (20\%) and discretionary housing permit; onsite grading in excess of 100,000 cubic yard; and construction of water tanks.

Housing Permit: To authorize a discretionary housing permit for a maximum density bonus of 20 percent ( 354 dwelling units allowed; 349 units proposed) with a developer set-aside of 1,455 units for senior housing and 342 beds for senior assisted living, and modification of front yard setbacks from 20 feet to 10 feet and rear yard setbacks from 15 feet to 10 feet, and modification of lot area from 5,000 minimum square feet to 4,875 minimum square feet on the lesser of 100 total single-family residence lots or 10 percent of total single-family residence lots in Planning Areas A and C inclusive of lots with reduced frontage,

Oak Tree Permit: To authorize removal of 60 on-site oak trees ( 4 heritage) and 38 off-site oak trees ( 3 heritage) and encroachment into the protected zone of 1 on-site oak tree (not heritage) and 34 off-site oak trees (4 heritage). (Pending revised Oak Tree Report)

Parking Permit: To authorize shared and reciprocal parking across commercial office and retail lots and shared and reciprocal parking across multi-family residential lots. (Pending application)

| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { MAP STAGE } \\ \text { Tentative: } \boxtimes & \text { Revised: } \square\end{array}$ | Amended : $\square$ Modification to : $: \square$ <br> Exhibit "A" <br> Recorded Map |
| :---: | :---: |
| MAP STATUS Initial: $\square$ | $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ Revision: $\boxtimes$ |
| LOCATION <br> West of the terminus of Valencia Blvd., north of the terminus of Pico Canyon Rd., east of Newhall Ranch SP area, west of Westridge / Stevenson Ranch communities | ACCESS <br> Magic Mountain Parkway on the north, northeast, and northwest; Valencia Blvd. on the east and west, Poe Parkway on the southeast |
| ASSESSORS PARCEL NUMBER(S) $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2826-009-050, 052, 053, 086, 104, } 105 \\ & 2826-116-023,025 \\ & 2826-070-019 \end{aligned}$ | SITE AREA <br> Gross: 1,758.6 acres Net: 1,692.5 acres |
| GENERAL PLAN / LOCAL PLAN <br> Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan: One Valley One Vision 2012 | ZONED DISTRICT SUP DISTRICT <br> Newhall 5 th |
| LAND USE DESIGNATION <br> Existing (existing to remain): <br> H2 (Residential 2), H5 (Residential 5), RL5 (Rural Land 5) | zONE CSD <br> Existing: R-1, A-2-2 None <br> Proposed: RPD 5000-2.4U, RPD 5000-  <br> 4.8U, C-2, OS  |
| PROPOSED UNITS MAX DENSITY/UNITS <br> (DU) (DU) <br> 3,457 du H2: 2 DU/AC <br> (plus 342 beds senior H5: $5 \mathrm{DU} / \mathrm{AC}$ <br> assisted living) RL5: 1 DU/5AC | GRADING, CUBIC YARDS <br> (CUT/FILL, IMPORT/EXPORT, ONSITE/OFFSITE) <br> Cut: 25,900,000 cyds <br> Fill: 25,900,000 cyds <br> Grading to be balanced on-site |

## ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION (CEQA)

EIR

## SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE DEPARTMENT CLEARANCE

| Department | Status | Contact |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Regional Planning | Cleared/Hold | Kim Szalay (213) 974-4876 kszalay@planning.lacounty.gov |
| Public Works | Cleared/Hold | Henry Wong (626) 458-4961 hwong@dpw.lacounty.gov <br> John Chin (626) 458-4921 ichin@dpw.lacounty.gov |


| Fire | Cleared/Hold | Juan Padilla (323) 890-4243 ipadilla@fire.lacounty.gov |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Parks \& Recreation | Cleared/Hold | Clement Lau (213) 351-5120 clau@parks.lacounty.gov <br> Sheela Mathai (213) 351-5121 <br> maths@parks.lacounty.gov |
| Public Health | Cleared/Hold | Michelle Tsiebos (626) 430-5382 mtsiebos@ph.lacounty.gov |

## SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE STATUS

Tentative Map Revision Required: $\boxtimes$
Exhibit Map/Exhibit "A" Revision Required: $\boxtimes$
Revised Application Required: $\boxtimes$

Reschedule for Subdivision Committee Meeting: $\boxtimes$ Reschedule for Subdivision Committee Reports Only: $\square$ Other Holds (see below): $\boxtimes$

## REGIONAL PLANNING ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND HOLDS

Case Status/Recommendation: At this time, Regional Planning does not recommend approval of the tentative map. EIR preparation, revised Tentative and Exhibit/Exhibit "A" Maps, Zone Change, pending Plan Amendment determination, CUP, Parking Permit, Oak Tree Permit and County Forester clearance, Housing Permit, SEATAC. Please read below for further details.

## Land Use Policy:

Clear $\square$ Hold $\boxtimes$

1. Under Review.

Tentative Map:
Clear $\square$ Hold $\boxtimes$

## (Sheet 1)

2. General Notes (by Note No.):

- 17. Add Parking Permit and Highway Re-alignment entitlement requests
- 18. Verify Oak tree removal/encroachment numbers - updated report required to support the numbers.
- 21. Read, "Valencia Blvd. (on-site) and Magic Mountain Parkway (external map improvements) require I.E.C. approval."
- 23. Identify designated areas for flexibility requested and revise note to read, "Within designated areas $\qquad$ ,
$\qquad$ , and $\qquad$ flexibility in future design is permitted..... changes are depicted on a Revised Exhibit Map to the satisfaction of Regional Planning and Public Works ,or, if required a Revised or Amended VTTM according to required procedures pursuant to the Zoning and Subdivision Codes ."
- 25. Indicates structures to be removed must have development standard compliance - revise to correct this. It is presumed that only structures that are to remain must have standards compliance, not those removed.
- 26. Read: Summary of Highway re-alignments:
- Valencia Boulevard and Magic Mountain Parkway I.E.C. alignment approval required
- 28. Pending Highway Plan determination: If amendment required add note, "Summary of Highway Plan Amendments:
- Pico Canyon Road removed from Highway Plan
- Poe Parkway existing portion upgraded to Secondary Highway"
- Add Note 29: request for reduced street frontage from 50 feet to not less than 45 feet on non-cul-de-sac SFR lots and from 40 feet to not less than 30 feet on cul-de-sac SFR lots not to exceed 100 total SFR lots in Areas A and C or 10 percent of SFR lots in Areas A and C, whichever is less inclusive of lots with reduced lot area (21.24.040).
- Add Note 30: request for a modification of minimum required lot area from 5,000 square feet to a minimum of 4,875 square feet on 100 SFR lots total in Areas A and C or 10 percent of SFR lots total in Areas A and C, whichever is less, inclusive of lots with reduced lot frontage, pursuant to a discretionary housing permit (22.52.1860 \& 22.52.1870).
- Add Note 31: request for modification of front yard setbacks from 20 feet to 10 feet and rear yard setbacks from 15 feet to 10 feet on the lesser of 100 total SFR lots or 10 percent of total SFR lots in Planning Areas A and C pursuant to a discretionary housing permit ( 22.52 .1860 \& 22.52.1870).

3. Special Notes: add No. 4. Density transfer explanation note including how it applies to current proposal.

## SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE REPORT <br> TR061996, 1/08/14

4. Add a table showing density transfer areas in relationship to where transfer is from and to.
5. Project Summary: Revise the list of requested entitlements as follows:

- Add Project No. TR061996 to top of list
- No dashes in case nos.
- Add: Submit application for Parking Permit with LDCC
- Add: Plan Amendment (on file) pending highway plan determination

6. Project Table:

- Area A "Type" column identifies the Private Drives as "Street (Private and Future)". Correct label.


## (Sheet 2)

7. Section "Private Drive" "A", "C" Drive (North of Gate) - show gate on associated sheet.
8. Section "Modified Residential Collector (94' R/W) - label North \& West over left R/W and South \& East over right R/W.
9. Section Modified Residential Collector (64' R/W) "A" Street - from Lot 1365 to VTTM 060678 - Sheet 7 shows this section as 16 ' on the northerly and westerly ROW and 8 ' on south and easterly - correct section to match.
10. Section Residential Local ( 60 ' R/W) (Private Drives) - " $K$ " drive label referenced is missing on Sheet 4 - and there are two "L" Drives on Sheet 4. Correct labels on Sheet 4.

## (Sheet 3)

11. Delineate and label trails including cul-de-sac connections where applicable and include in legend.
12. Lot 613 is labeled in legend as drainage access road - is this intended to be a trail with Lot 614 connection?
13. Label location of gates as applicable.
14. Correct "FF" and "GG" Drives labels/pointers.
15. Complete Lot 704 drainage access road depiction.

## (Sheet 4)

16. Depict driveway access point for Lot 584.
17. "T" Drive: is this Lot 776 ? No Lot No. is depicted.
18. Is Lot 793 " $K$ " Drive? Correct from duplicate "L" Drive if so.
19. Correct undersized lot area (less than 5,000 sf) on SFR lots $361,329,334$, and 335 or make specific request for number/percent of undersized lots.
20. Correct frontage below 40 ' for Lot 493 or include in request for reduced frontage.
21. Call out frontage dimensions for Lots 510 and 511.
22. Depict and label trail and end of cul-de-sac trail connections where applicable.

## (Sheet 7)

23. Correct undersized lot area (less than 5,000 sf) on SFR lots 1210, 1211, 1177, 1178, and 1179, or make request for number cap/percent of undersized lots.
24. Correct or make a request for number cap/percent of undersized lot frontages (less than 50 ft . and less than 40 ft . cul-de-sacs) for Lots 1173-1174, 1177-1179, 1189-1194,1199-1211, 1214-1215, 1235, 1249-1251, 1255-1259, 1262-1264.
25. Call out $2^{\text {nd }}$ access on " $A$ " Street.

## (Sheet 8)

26. Depict and label trail and end of cul-de-sac trail connections where applicable (eg. along "A" Street?).
27. Depict $\mathrm{G} / 2$ Section for trail shown on this sheet.
28. Correct acreage label for Lot 1410 Private Park.

## (Sheet 9)

29. Clarify two trail connections along the southwesterly boundary in relationship to trails at Potrero project boundary with Legacy.
30. Pending Highway Plan determination - correct changes to Pico Canyon Road planned ROW.

## (Sheet 10)

31. Label proposed Magic Mountain Parkway.

## (Sheet 11)

32. Delete "Lot No. __" in parentheses under each major Phase heading on both Large Lot Parcel Map and Unit Phasing Map. Current headings confuse the nomenclature.

## (Othe VTTM Re ements)

33. Identify any lots intended to have easements granted to a conservation entity or entities.
34. Provide conceptual landscaping plan for common areas, commercial 10 percent, and rights of way.
35. For all Sheets with trails, include trails in legend.

## Exhibit Map/Exhibit "A":

Clear $\square$ Hold $\boxtimes$

## (Sheet 1)

36. Entitlements Requested: Revise the list of requested entitlements as follows:

- Add Project No. TR0619996 to top of list
- No dashes in case nos.
- Add: Submit application for Parking Permit with LDCC
- Pending highway plan determination, add: Plan Amendment (highway plan is on file)

37. Single-Family Lots Table:

- Limit request for SFR lots with between 4,875 and 5,000 sf of area to to maximum of 100 lots or $10 \%$ of total SFR lots in Areas A and C inclusive of lots with reduced lot frontage.
- Limit SFR lots with between 50 and 45 feet standard frontage or between 40 and 30 feet cul-de-sac to maximum of 100 SFR lots or $10 \%$ of total SFR lots in Areas A and C inclusive of lots with reduced lot area.

38. Label A, B, and C Drives, X Street, Poe Parkway, and Valencia Blvd.
39. Parking Table: Correct parking table for assisted living site, required and provided (see Section 22.52.1120) consistent with table on Sheet 7. Add PA-6 parking required and provided (Sheet 4 incorrectly labeled it PA-7).

## (Sheet 2)

40. General Notes: Correct Notes 17, 18, 21, 23, 25, and 26 to revised language same as VTTM.
41. General Notes: Add Note 29 same as VTTM additional Note 28.
42. Add additional request notes 30, 31, 32 same as VTTM additional Notes 29, 30, 31
43. Depict trails sections within Exhibit Map:

- Show cross-section for trail on PA-5 Sheet 3.
- Take off Sections H and G if those trails are not intended to be depicted on Exhibit Map.


## (Sheet 3)

44. Show trail on legend on this Sheet 3 and trail section on Sheet 2.

## (Sheet 4)

45. Label the Recreation/Open Space on the map to be consistent with how they were labeled on the VTTM: "PA-6" and Lot 588 (incorrectly labeled PA-7 and Lot 583).

## (Sheet 9)

46. Provide perimeter park trail shared with SD access and additional connection if feasible. [ltem for discussion.]

## (Sheet 11)

47. Show breakdown for covered and uncovered parking provided for PB-7. Current allocation shows potentially inadequate covered parking per code (Code: 1.5 covered and . 5 uncovered for 2BR, 1.5 covered 1 BR, and 1 covered Bachelor)

## (Sheet 12)

48. Show walkway connection from Poe Parkway to westerly entrance to private drive for PB-9.

## (Sheet 15)

49. Provide trail section and legend for trail above PC-6.
50. Correct title name to Project Summary for PC-6.
51. Correct title name to Project Summary from incorrect PA-7 (Lot 583) to PC-7 (Lot 1409).
52. Show breakdown for covered and uncovered parking provided for PC-5 Project Summary. Current allocation shows potentially inadequate covered parking per code (Code: 1.5 covered and .5 uncovered for 2BR, 1.5 covered $1 B R$, and 1 covered Bachelor).

## (Global Comments)

53. All applicable sheets: Provide note to provide bicycle parking areas per Code; read, "Bicycle Parking to be provided pursuant to Section 22.52 .1225 " and call out shower facilities location for commercial buildings $75,000 \mathrm{sf}$ and greater.
54. Provide trail legend for sheets with trails.
55. Provide retaining wall sections for walls proposed in excess of 6 feet in ht. if any.
56. Site potential Farmer's Market and/or Community Garden locations.
57. No potential living suites are proposed. Clarify it none intended or if pending pursuant to living suites ordinance.

## Plan Amendment:

ClearHold $\boxtimes$
58. Pending Highway Plan determination.

## Zone Change:

## Clear $\square$ Hold $\boxtimes$

59. Additional information required. Provide existing and proposed zoning exhibit(s).

## Conditional Use Permit:

ClearHold $\boxtimes$
60. SEATAC review required.

## Housing Permit:

Clear $\square$ Hold $\boxtimes$
61. Additional information required regarding modification requests in map notes.

## Parking Permit

Clear $\square$ Hold $\boxtimes$
62. Submit application for reciprocal and shared parking commercial and multi-family where applicable.

## Oak Tree Permit:

Clear $\square$ Hold $\boxtimes$
63. Additional information required. Provide full scale oak tree exhibit and two copies of revised Oak Tree Report.

## Environmental Determination:

Clear $\square$ Hold $\boxtimes$
64. Revised Initial Study and Notice of Preparation required.

## Community Standards District

( $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ )

## Healthy Design Ordinance ("HDO"):

Clear

## Hold $\boxtimes$

65. Final Map Condition: The onsite tree planting requirement will be one tree per each 25 feet of existing and proposed street frontage located within the subject property. Based on the project total of 81,931 linear feet of street frontage, a total of 3,277 tree plantings shall be required for the project subject to modification by Regional Planning, and indicated on a tree planting plan to be approved by Regional Planning prior to final map recordation.

## Administrative/Other:

Clear $\square$ Hold $\boxtimes$
66. Provide updated Planning Notebook depicting typical units, elevations, and other design features.
67. Provide updated Slope Density map with existing SCVAP 2012 land use overlay and density transfer areas.
68. Tree Planting Ordinance pending Board of Supervisors action.

## RESUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

If a map revision is required, please submit the following items:

- A completed and signed Land Division application
- A signed and dated cover letter describing all changes made to the map
- Six (6) folded and collated copies of Tract/Parcel Map and Exhibit Map/Exhibit "A"
- A digital (CD or Flash drive) copy of the map/exhibit in PDF format
- Revision fee payment (for the $3^{\text {rd }}$ revision and thereafter)
- Any other additional materials requested by the case planner

NOTE: An appointment is required for resubmittal. You must call Land Divisions Section at 213-974-6433 to schedule the appointment. Prior to scheduling, you are strongly encouraged to contact the case planner and discuss the map revision and other materials.
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### 1.0 INIRODUCTION

Aidlin Hills VTTM 52796 is a proposed residential community within unincorporated Los Angeles County in the westernmost portion of the Santa Clarita Valley. More specifically, VTTM 52796 is located south of Pico Canyon Road and west of existing/builtout VTTM 43896 in Stevenson Ranch.

### 1.1 PROPOSED PROJ ECT

Figure 1-1 illustrates the location of the project site. The proposed project consists of 102 single family dwelling units on approximately 230 acres. The proposed site plan is provided in Figure 1-2.

Access to the project will be provided by a single entry from Pico Canyon Road. Secondary emergency vehicle access will be provided by a connection to Whispering Oaks Road or Southern Oaks Drive via Tulip Grove Road and Verandah Court to the east.

The site is currently undeveloped, but at buildout the development will result in approximately 970 daily trip ends. Detailed trip generation and trip distribution data is provided in Chapter 3.0, Project Description.

### 1.2 STUDY AREA

Based in part upon consultation with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (DPW), the study area includes the roadways and intersections within the project site as well as locations off-site where project-generated traffic could potentially cause a significant impact. The study area is presented in Figure 1-3.

### 1.3 MEIHODOLOGY

The Los Angeles County DPW has established guidelines for the analysis of traffic impacts based on project opening year and cumulative conditions. These guidelines specify that project impacts are to be evaluated based on opening year traffic conditions, and cumulative impacts are evaluated based on opening year with related (i.e., cumulative) projects to determine the project's fair share of future improvements.

The area to the northwest of the project site is largely undeveloped; however, there are no related projects in the vicinity that will be constructed by the project's build out date of 2017. Therefore, the DPW has specified that the project impacts are to be identified based on an existing plus project analysis. This methodology is also consistent with a ground to plan analysis in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).



Figure 1-2
Project Site Plan
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### 3.0 PROJ ECTDESCRIPIION

This section describes the project site in terms of its transportation characteristics. Trip generation is summarized and the distribution of project trips on the adjoining roadway network is presented.

### 3.1 PROJ ECTOVERVIEW

The proposed project consists of 102 single family dwelling units. Site access will be provided by a single entry from Pico Canyon Road.

### 3.2 PROJ ECTTRIP G ENERATION

Trip generation rates for the proposed residential project were obtained from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, $9^{\text {th }}$ Edition (see Reference 1 in Section 1.5). The trip rates used for this analysis and the resulting trip generation estimates are listed in Table $3-1$. As shown, the project would generate approximately 971 average daily tripends, with approximately 76 tripends during the AM peak hour and 102 tripends during the PM peak hour.

Table 3-1 Land Use and Tip Generation Summary

| Category | Amount | Units | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  | Average Daily Tipends |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |  |
| Tip Generation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Family Detached | 102 | DU | 19 | 57 | 76 | 64 | 38 | 102 | 971 |
| Tip Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Family Detached |  | DU | . 19 | . 56 | 75 | . 63 | . 37 | 1.00 | 9.52 |

Source: "Trip Generation Manual, $9^{\text {th }}$ Edition", Institute of Transportation Engineers
DU = Dwelling unit

### 3.3 PROJ ECTTRIP DISIRIBUIION

The geographic distribution of project-generated trips was derived by the SCVCTM. The SCVCTM is a computerized travel demand model that utilizes a sophisticated trip distribution function to derive the distribution of vehicle trips, and which has previously been calibrated to the existing conditions of the Santa Clarita Valley. The SCVCTM is jointly maintained by City of Santa Clarita and County of Los Angeles staff, and is utilized for all major transportation planning efforts within the Santa Clarita Valley. Production and attraction trip data is generated by the model based on five separate trip purposes, and trip distribution patterns are then derived by the model. As a final step, the model assigns these trips to the roadway network based on the derived distribution patterns.
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Illustrations of the project's trip distribution patterns are provided in Figure 3-1 based on the SCVCTM select zone run. Approximately 52 percent of the project's traffic is distributed to Stevenson Ranch Road northeast of the project site, and approximately 48 percent is distributed to Pico Canyon Road east of the project site. Approximately 34 percent of the project's traffic is distributed to l-5 Freeway ( 18 percent to the north and 16 percent to the south).

### 3.4 PROJ ECTTRAFIC FORECASTS

Project generated ADT volumes are provided in Figure 3-2, and the corresponding project generated peak hour turning movement volumes are provided in Figure 3-3 for the AM peak hour and in Figure 3-4 for the PM peak hour.

The project is forecast to add less than 200 ADT and less than 12 peak hour trips (by direction) to the l-5 freeway.


Figure 3-1
Project Trip Distribution

(1) Stantec

Figure 3-2
ADT Volumes - Project Only


Figure 3-3


Figure 3 -4

## AtTACHMENT E:

## Existing Plus Project Plus Cumulative Project Conditions Intersection Operations Analysis Worksheets
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| JN:10734 Canyon Hills Estates <br> Existing + Project + Cumulative Projects Conditions <br> AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level Of Service Computation Report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection \#6 Southern Oaks (NS) at Pico Cyn (EW) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle (sec): <br> Loss Time (sec): |  | 100 | Critical Vol./Cap.(X): |  |  |  |  |  | 0.490 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Average Delay (sec/veh) |  |  |  |  |  | xxxxxx |  |  |  |
| Optimal Cycle: |  |  | Level Of Service: |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Approach: | North Bound |  | South Bound |  |  | East Bound |  |  | West Bound |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement: | L - T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T |  | R |
| Control: |  |  | Permitted Include |  |  | Permitted |  |  | Protecte |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Includ |  |  | Includ |  |  |
| Min. Green: | 00 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Y+R: | 4.04 .0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |
| Lanes: | 000 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 01 | 0 | 10 | 01 |  |  |
| Volume Modul |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Vol: | 00 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 | 1 | 112 | 80 |  | 0 |
| Growth Adj: | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Initial Bse: | 0 0 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 | 1 | 112 | 80 |  | 0 |
| User Adj: | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| PHF Adj: | 0.710 .71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 |  | 0.71 |
| PHF Volume: | 0 | 231 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 235 | 1 | 159 | 113 |  | 0 |
| Reduct Vol: | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Reduced Vol: | 0 | 231 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 235 | 1 | 159 | 113 |  | 0 |
| PCE Adj: | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| MLF Adj: | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| FinalVolume: | 0 | 231 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 235 | 1 | 159 | 113 |  | 0 |
| Saturation Flow Module: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sat/Lane: | 16001600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 |  | 1600 |
| Adjustment: | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lanes: | 0.000 .00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.00 |
| Final Sat.: | 0 | 1600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 |  | 0 |
| Capacity Analysis Module: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vol/Sat: Crit Moves: | 0.00 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.000 .00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.00 | ${ }_{* * * *}^{0.10} 0.07$ |  | 0.00 |  |
|  |  | **** |  |  |  |  | **** |  |  |  |  |  |
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Trip Generation Source: Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), Trip Generation Manual, Ninth Edition (2012).
    ${ }^{2}$ DU $=$ Occupied Dwelling Units

