

# 4.13

## TRANSPORTATION, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING

### 4.13.1 Introduction

This section describes the existing transportation, circulation, and parking conditions, the applicable regulations, impacts that may result from implementation of the General Plan Update, and mitigation measures that would reduce the significance of these impacts.

A traffic study was completed for the General Plan Update (Iteris 2010) and is presented in Appendix E of this PEIR. The traffic study provided information on existing conditions, methodology, and future operating conditions under various scenarios. Cumulative impacts are discussed near the end of this section.

### 4.13.2 Existing Conditions

The term “Level of Service” (LOS) is used throughout this chapter to describe and evaluate roadway segment performance compared to user expectations. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) definition of LOS is used for this report: the ratio of traffic volume to the built capacity of the roadway segment defined on a scale of A to F. Facilities operating at LOS A are considered to be free-flowing with no restrictions on movement and high speeds. Roadway facilities at LOS F are considered to be congested with many stoppages and slow speeds. As the City does not have a formal policy for acceptable levels of service for its roadways, the County considers LOS D or better as an acceptable condition; therefore, an LOS of E or F is considered to result in an unacceptable level of congestion for purposes of this analysis. Table 4.13-1 defines and describes the LOS criteria for roadway segments.

**Table 4.13-1.** Level of Service Criteria

LOS	Definition	Volume-to-Capacity (V/C) Ratio
A	Free-flow speeds prevail. Vehicles are almost unimpeded in their ability to maneuver within the traffic stream.	0.00–0.60
B	Reasonably free-flow speeds are maintained. The ability to maneuver within traffic is only slightly restricted.	0.61–0.70
C	Flow with speeds at or near free-flow speed of the roadway. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is noticeably restricted, and lane changes require more care and vigilance on the part of the driver.	0.71–0.80
D	Speeds begin to decline slightly with increasing flows. In this range, density begins to increase somewhat more quickly with increasing flow. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is noticeably limited.	0.81–0.90
E	Operation at capacity with no usable gaps in the traffic stream. Any disruption to the traffic stream has little or no room to dissipate.	0.91–1.0
F	Breakdown of the traffic flow with long queues of traffic. Unacceptable conditions.	>1.0

Source: Los Angeles County MTA 2004 Congestion Management Program.

The city is a built-out residential community that is predominantly serviced by local two-lane streets. However, two major freeways, I-210 and SR 2, provide regional access to the city from outside areas. Primary circulation within the city is achieved via Foothill Boulevard.

## Roadway Segments

A total of five roadway classifications are specified in the General Plan Update and are categorized according to the number of vehicle lanes provided. Table 4.13-2 provides an overview of the different roadway classifications, including the typical number of lanes and each roadway's daily capacity. The following is a brief description of the major roadway facilities that serve the city.

- **I-210**, the Foothill Freeway, is a regional east-west limited-access facility between I-5 in Sylmar to the west and Pasadena and San Bernardino County to the east. Within the city, I-210 has four travel lanes in each direction with interchange ramps at the Glendale (SR 2) Freeway, Angeles Crest Highway (SR 2), Gould Avenue (half interchange), Foothill Boulevard (half interchange), and Berkshire Place.

**Table 4.13-2.** La Cañada Flintridge Roadway Characteristics

Roadway Classification	Summary <sup>1</sup>	Typical Number of Lanes	Maximum Daily Capacity
Primary Roadway	A four-lane, divided roadway with a 100-foot ROW and an 80-foot curb-to-curb width.	4	32,900
Major Roadway	A two-lane roadway with an 80-foot ROW width. Street width may vary to accommodate specific transportation needs.	2	15,600
Collector	A two-lane roadway with an 88-foot ROW width and a 68-foot curb-to-curb width.	2	15,600
Residential Collector	A two-lane roadway with a 60-foot ROW dimension and a 40-foot curb-to-curb width.	2	12,600
Local Residential	A two-lane roadway with a 52-foot ROW width; the minimum is shown as 44 feet wide.	2	5,000

<sup>1</sup>Roadways may not be built to their full designation.

- **SR 2**, the Glendale Freeway, is a regional north-south limited-access facility that extends from I-210 in the cities of Glendale and Los Angeles in the south. In the city, SR 2 has four to five travel lanes in each direction with interchange ramps at the I-210, Verdugo Boulevard, and Foothill Boulevard.
- **Foothill Boulevard** is classified as a Primary Roadway and travels in a northwest to southeast direction through the city's commercial thoroughfare, providing access to the city's downtown area. Foothill Boulevard has two lanes in each direction and is generally divided by a raised or painted median. It also has a half-interchange to/from the east with the I-210 near its eastern terminus. East of the I-210 interchange, Foothill is classified a Major Roadway to its terminus at Oak Grove Drive and is divided by double yellow striping.
- **Angeles Crest Highway** provides north-south access to the downtown area at its south end and the Angeles National Forest to its north. The Angeles Crest Highway serves as SR 2 north of the I-210, with two travel lanes in each direction, and is divided by a raised or painted median. Angeles Crest Highway has a full-access interchange with the I-210.
- **Verdugo Boulevard** provides east-west access between the communities of Montrose and La Crescenta to the west and the downtown area to the east. It is a Primary Roadway only west of Descanso Drive. With two travel lanes in each direction, Verdugo Boulevard is divided by a painted median. The arterial has a half-interchange with SR 2 to/from the south.

- **Verdugo Boulevard (east of Alta Canyada Road)** is classified a Major Roadway with one lane in each direction from Alta Canyada to Foothill Boulevard.
- **Alta Canyada Road** travels south of Foothill Boulevard and provides north-south access to the west of the downtown area toward the Descanso Gardens south of Verdugo Boulevard. Alta Canyada Road has one lane in each direction and is divided by double yellow striping.
- **Descanso Drive** provides east-west access southwest of the downtown area to the Descanso Gardens south of Verdugo Boulevard. It has one lane in each direction and is divided by double yellow striping.
- **Gould Avenue** is north of Foothill Boulevard and provides north-south access to the east of the downtown area, with one travel lane in each direction. It has a half-interchange (to/from the west) with the I-210 and is divided by a painted median.
- **Oak Grove Drive** provides north-south access along the far eastern edge of the city. It has two travel lanes in each direction with raised and painted medians. The street primarily provides access to JPL, La Cañada High School, and the Flintridge Riding Club. Only a small portion of Oak Grove Drive is within city limits.
- **Berkshire Place**, between Berkshire Avenue and Oak Grove Drive provides east-west access to the I-210 via a full interchange west of Oak Grove Drive. It has one travel lane in each direction west of the eastbound freeway ramps and two lanes in each direction east of these ramps. Berkshire Place is divided by double yellow striping.

Table 4.13-3 shows the existing roadway segment volumes and LOS for 20 roadways within the city. Table 4.13-4 shows the existing roadway segment volumes and the corresponding LOS for 11 roadways in adjacent jurisdictions, including the cities of Glendale and Pasadena, as well as unincorporated Los Angeles County. These roadways were included because they provide connectivity to the city and are therefore considered in the city's circulation network. As shown on Table 4.13-3, Verdugo Boulevard east of Alta Canyada Road operates at LOS F; the roadway segments in adjacent jurisdictions are shown in Table 4.13-4 to operate at LOS D or better under existing conditions.

**Table 4.13-3.** City of La Cañada Flintridge Existing Roadway Segments

Roadway	Segment	Total Lanes	Capacity	ADT	V/C	LOS
<b>Primary Roadways</b>						
Angeles Crest Highway	North of Foothill Boulevard	4	32,900	16,912	0.51	A
Foothill Boulevard	East of Hillard Avenue	4	32,900	21,254	0.65	B
	East of Verdugo Boulevard	4	32,900	23,524	0.72	C
	East of Gould Avenue	4	32,900	23,188	0.70	C
	East of Ocean View Boulevard	4	32,900	21,344	0.65	B
<b>Major Roadway</b>						
Descanso Drive	West of Chevy Chase Drive	2	15,600	7,106	0.46	A
Gould Avenue	North of I-210 Westbound Ramp	2	15,600	5,998	0.38	A
Oak Grove Drive	South of Foothill Boulevard	4	32,900	11,971	0.38	A
Alta Canyon Rd	North of Foothill Boulevard	2	12,600	2,383	0.19	A
Verdugo Boulevard	East of Alta Canyon Rd	2	15,600	8,300	0.53	A
<b>Residential Collector</b>						
Berkshire Avenue	East of Commonwealth Avenue	2	12,600	2,909	0.23	A
Chevy Chase Drive	South of Berkshire Avenue	2	12,600	4,975	0.39	A
	South of Foothill Boulevard	2	12,600	3,776	0.30	A
Commonwealth Avenue	South of Foothill Boulevard	2	12,600	2,549	0.20	A
Cornishon Avenue	South of Foothill Boulevard	2	12,600	3,771	0.30	A
Crown Avenue	North of Santa Ynez Way	2	12,600	5,550	0.44	A
Highland Drive	East of Chevy Chase Drive	2	12,600	2,524	0.20	A
Hillard Avenue	North of Foothill Boulevard	2	12,600	3,787	0.30	A
La Cañada Boulevard	North of Fairview Drive	2	12,600	3,592	0.29	A
Ocean View Boulevard	North of Foothill Boulevard	2	12,600	7,470	0.59	A
ADT = Average Daily Traffic						

**Table 4.13-4.** Existing Roadway Segments in Adjacent Jurisdictions

Roadway	Segment	Type	Total Lanes	Capacity	ADT	V/C	LOS
<b>City of Glendale</b>							
Chevy Chase Drive	Between Emerald Isle and Sussex	Collector	2	12,600	2,472	0.20	A
Honolulu Avenue	Between Sunset and Wickham	Major Roadway	4	32,900	13,569	0.41	A
Verdugo Boulevard	Between Park Place and Lanterman Lane	Major Roadway	4	32,900	28,585	0.87	D
Verdugo Road	South of La Crescenta Avenue	Major Roadway	6	49,300	20,959	0.43	A
<b>City of Pasadena</b>							
Lida Street	Between Figueroa and Art Center Driveway	Minor Roadway	2	15,600	1,908	0.12	A
Linda Vista Avenue	Between Inverness and I-210	Minor Roadway	2	15,600	3,181	0.20	A
<b>County of Los Angeles</b>							
Angeles Crest Highway	North of Bay Tree Road	Major Highway	2	15,600	4,125	0.26	A
Foothill Boulevard	Between La Crescenta and Rosemont	Major Highway	4	32,900	19,748	0.60	B
Montrose Avenue	Between Mira Vista and Waltonia	Major Roadway	4	32,900	13,209	0.40	A
Oak Grove Drive	Between Verdugo and Windsor Avenue	Secondary Highway	4	32,900	5,076	0.15	A
Ocean View Boulevard	Between Barton and I-210	Secondary Highway	4	32,900	25,295	0.77	C

## Airports

There are two airports in the general area of the city: the Bob Hope and the Whiteman. The Bob Hope Airport is approximately 8 miles to the west and serves the San Fernando Valley area as an alternative to the Los Angeles International (LAX) Airport. Bob Hope Airport covers about 610 acres within the City of Burbank and is owned by the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority. Operations at the airport were reported at 130,849 flights in 2006.<sup>1</sup>

The Whiteman Airport is approximately 12 miles to the west-northwest and serves the San Fernando Valley with about 150,000 flights per year. The airport covers approximately 184 acres in the San Fernando Valley, and is owned by the County of Los Angeles.

### 4.13.3 Regulatory Setting

#### Regional

##### Congestion Management Program

The Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP), last updated in 2004 pursuant to Proposition 111 (1990), requires agencies to consider the relationship between transportation, land use, and air quality when making decisions related to growth. As such, the CMP provides a framework to address local growth on a regional scale in terms of transportation facilities by identifying and monitoring major segments and intersections within the County.

As a part of implementation of the CMP, local agencies are required to identify minimum thresholds in terms of LOS by which to complete traffic assessment reports for discretionary projects.

If a project would result in LOS F on a non-exempt CMP roadway segment or intersection, a deficiency plan would be required to address land use, transportation, and air quality issues related to the project. Mitigation would also need to be identified in the deficiency plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.burbankairport.com/>

## 4.13.4 Impact Analysis

### Methodology

The impact analysis is based on the General Plan Update Traffic Impact Analysis, prepared by Iteris, Inc. dated February 2010. For a detailed methodology, see Appendix E.

### Thresholds of Significance

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines was used to determine that the proposed Project would have a potentially significant effect on traffic, circulation, and parking if it would:

- TR-1:** cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, or the volume to capacity ratio on roads);
- TR-2:** exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways;
- TR-3:** result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks;
- TR-4:** substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment);
- TR-5:** result in inadequate emergency access;
- TR-6:** result in inadequate parking capacity; or
- TR-7:** conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).



## Impacts and Mitigation Measures

*Threshold TR-1: Would the proposed Project cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips or the volume to capacity ratio on roads)?*

Potential significant impacts that may occur as a result of the General Plan Update are determined by comparing baseline traffic conditions<sup>2</sup> to the projected 2030 traffic conditions. Projected 2030 conditions were determined by taking the SCAG projected traffic distribution and adding additional trips to roadways where additional development could be achieved as a result of the proposed Land Use Plan.

Per the CMP, a significant impact occurs when traffic demand on a facility increases by 2% of capacity (change in  $V/C \geq 0.02$ ), causing LOS F ( $V/C > 1.00$ ). If the facility is already at LOS F, a significant impact occurs when traffic demand on the facility increases by 2% of capacity ( $V/C \geq 0.02$ ). The results of the traffic volumes along roadway segments in the projected 2030 condition are shown in Tables 4.13-5 and 4.13-6. As the results show, all monitored roadway segments would meet the CMP thresholds for roadway segments at buildout of the proposed General Plan Update, with the exception of Verdugo Boulevard between Park Place and Lanterman Lane in the city of Glendale.

The increases on these two roadway segments are projected to exceed the City's acceptable levels of service.

### Impact Determination

**Impact TR-1:** At buildout, the proposed Project would contribute traffic to a roadway segment that is operating at, or are projected to operate at, an unacceptable level of service (LOS E or worse): Verdugo Boulevard between Park Place and Lanterman Lane (LOS E).

### Mitigation Measures

Although widening Verdugo Boulevard would improve LOS, an expansion is not considered feasible because of the lack of jurisdiction within the city of Glendale. Thus, no feasible mitigation is available to the lead agency to reduce impacts along Verdugo Boulevard between Park Place and Lanterman Lane.

### Residual Impacts

Impacts related to Threshold TR-1 would remain significant and unmitigable.

---

<sup>2</sup> Baseline traffic conditions were based on two separate 24-hour traffic counts along 31 selected roadway segments. Traffic counts were taken in February 2008 and June 2009.

**Table 4.13-5.** City of La Cañada Flintridge Year 2030 Roadway Segments

Roadway	Segment	Total Lanes	Capacity	ADT	V/C	LOS
<b>Primary Roadways</b>						
Angeles Crest Highway	North of Foothill Boulevard	4	32,900	16,900	0.51	A
	East of Hillard Avenue	4	32,900	24,100	0.73	C
Foothill Boulevard	East of Verdugo Boulevard	4	32,900	29,600	0.90	D
	East of Gould Avenue	4	32,900	28,600	0.87	D
	East of Ocean View Boulevard	4	32,900	25,200	0.77	C
<b>Major Roadway</b>						
Descanso Drive	West of Chevy Chase Drive	2	15,600	9,100	0.58	B
Gould Avenue	North of I-210 Westbound Ramp	2	15,600	7,700	0.49	A
Oak Grove Drive	South of Foothill Boulevard	4	32,900	17,700	0.57	A
Alta Canyada Road	North of Foothill Boulevard	2	12,600	2,900	0.23	A
Verdugo Boulevard	East of Alta Canyada Road	2	15,600	8,300	0.53	A
<b>Residential Collector</b>						
Berkshire Avenue	East of Commonwealth Avenue	2	12,600	3,500	0.28	A
Chevy Chase Drive	South of Berkshire Avenue	2	12,600	5,400	0.43	A
	South of Foothill Boulevard	2	12,600	4,600	0.37	A
Commonwealth Avenue	South of Foothill Boulevard	2	12,600	3,100	0.25	A
Cornishon Avenue	South of Foothill Boulevard	2	12,600	4,600	0.37	A
Crown Avenue	North of Santa Ynez Way	2	12,600	7,200	0.57	A
Highland Drive	East of Chevy Chase Drive	2	12,600	6,700	0.53	A
Hillard Avenue	North of Foothill Boulevard	2	12,600	4,600	0.37	A
La Cañada Boulevard	North of Fairview Drive	2	12,600	4,400	0.35	A
Ocean View Boulevard	North of Foothill Boulevard	2	12,600	8,600	0.68	B

**Table 4.13-6.** Adjacent Jurisdictions Year 2030 Roadway Segments

Roadway	Segment	Type	Total Lanes	Capacity	ADT	V/C	LOS
<b>City of Glendale</b>							
Chevy Chase Drive	Between Emerald Isle and Sussex	Collector	2	12,600	2,600	0.21	A
Honolulu Avenue	Between Sunset and Wickham	Major	4	32,900	13,800	0.42	A
<b>Verdugo Boulevard</b>	<b>Between Park Place and Lanterman Lane</b>	<b>Major</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>32,900</b>	<b>30,400</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>E</b>
Verdugo Road	South of La Crescenta Avenue	Major	6	49,300	24,000	0.49	A
<b>City of Pasadena</b>							
Lida Street	Between Figueroa and Art Center Driveway	Minor	2	15,600	3,800	0.24	A
Linda Vista Avenue	Between Inverness and I-210	Minor	2	15,600	4,000	0.26	A
<b>County of Los Angeles</b>							
Angeles Crest Highway	North of Bay Tree Road	Major Highway	2	15,600	12,900	0.83	D
Foothill Boulevard	Between La Crescenta and Rosemont	Major Highway	4	32,900	24,200	0.74	C
Montrose Avenue	Between Mira Vista and Waltonia	Major	4	32,900	13,500	0.41	A
Oak Grove Drive	West of Windsor	Secondary Highway	4	32,900	10,600	0.32	A
Ocean View Boulevard	Between Barton and I-210	Secondary Highway	4	32,900	27,600	0.84	D

*Threshold TR-2: Would the proposed Project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*

The Los Angeles County CMP requires all monitored roadway segments and intersections to be analyzed using the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) method. Monitored facilities are compared with the projected conditions at Project buildout (2030). The city does not contain any monitored roadway segments; however, the intersection of the Angeles Crest Highway and the I-210 Westbound Ramps is a CMP-monitored intersection located within the city limits.

A level of service standard of E has been established by the CMP for designated roads, highways, and intersections; and a facility that operates at LOS F or worse is considered deficient. Existing volumes and projected volumes in the year 2030 are shown in Table 4.13-7. As the results show, the intersection of the Angeles Crest Highway and the I-210 Westbound Ramps would continue to operate under LOS A conditions in both the existing and 2030 conditions. The LOS would be reduced from LOS A to LOS C in the PM peak hour condition, but that reduction would not result in a significant impact.

**Table 4.13-7.** Congestion Management Plan Analysis

Intersection	Existing		Year 2030		Significant?
	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	
Angeles Crest Highway / I-210 Westbound Ramps (AM Peak)	0.528	A	0.598	A	No
Angeles Crest Highway / I-210 Westbound Ramps (PM Peak)	0.637	B	0.725	C	No

### Impact Determination

The proposed Project would not exceed a level of service standard established by the County CMP for designated roads or highways, and impacts would be less than significant.

### Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

### Residual Impacts

Impacts related to Threshold TR-2 would be less-than-significant.

*Threshold TR-3: Would the proposed Project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?*

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update is not expected to result in a significant increase of people using the airport facilities at Bob Hope or Whiteman Airports. Also, any new development that would occur under the General Plan Update would not interfere with air traffic patterns or operations due to the city’s distance from both airports and topographic features including the Verdugo Mountains, which separate the cities of Burbank and La Cañada Flintridge.

### **Impact Determination**

The proposed Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks, and impacts would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

### **Residual Impacts**

Impacts related to Threshold TR-3 would be less than significant.

### ***Threshold TR-4: Would the proposed Project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?***

The proposed Project is a long-range planning document to guide future development within the city. While the General Plan Update designates land uses on a parcel-by-parcel level, site-specific details are unknown until a development proposal with land use intensity, building area, etc. is submitted to the City for discretionary review. Therefore, specific development proposals in the future should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, and project impacts related to the increase of hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses cannot be fully addressed in this Draft PEIR.

The Circulation Element of the General Plan Update would include new policies related to street safety and compatibility. These policies include enhancing primary roadway corridors and creating safe access and crossing points for pedestrians and bicyclists. Also, roadway improvements discussed in the Circulation Element would not increase hazards due to a design feature or an incompatible use.

### **Impact Determination**

Specific impacts cannot be identified at the programmatic level regarding the increase of hazards due to a design feature or any incompatible uses; therefore, potential significant impacts are considered to be less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

### **Residual Impacts**

Impacts related to Threshold TR-4 would be less than significant.

***Threshold TR-5: Would the proposed Project result in inadequate emergency access?***

The City would continue to implement existing regulations for vehicular access from the City's Municipal Code, and future development proposals would continue to be evaluated for emergency accessibility by the Fire Department. As a result, new or modified roadways would be designed to accommodate adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles.

The City also would continue to coordinate with their Public Safety Commission and the Public Safety Coordinator regarding emergency preparedness plans. The City participates in the California Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) to ensure a coordinated response for extraordinary emergency situations. The General Plan Update also includes goals, objectives, and policies to promote emergency planning and access throughout the city. As such, the proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

**Impact Determination**

The proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access and impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts related to Threshold TR-5 would be less than significant.

***Threshold TR-6: Would the proposed Project result in inadequate parking capacity?***

The General Plan Update does not include specific project plans and would not result in inadequate parking capacity. All new development would be required to comply with Chapter 11.38, *Parking and Vehicle Storage*, and 08.10.020, *Parking Restrictions*, of the City's Municipal Code.

**Impact Determination**

The proposed Project would not result in inadequate parking capacity, and impacts would remain less than significant.

## Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

## Residual Impacts

Impacts related to Threshold TR-6 would be less than significant.

### *Threshold TR-7: Would the proposed Project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*

Many of the proposed goals, objectives, and policies in the General Plan Update address alternative transportation. Because the city is nearly built out, the General Plan Update identifies areas for mixed-use development within urbanized areas. As discussed in Section 4.11, "Population and Housing," it is expected that a majority of residents within the new mixed-use areas would be senior citizens and would therefore create less vehicle trips when compared to other populations (i.e., families). In addition, residents living in a mixed-use environment are located within walking or biking distance to work, shops, and recreation, thereby reducing the demand for automobiles.

The City promotes bicycling and walking throughout the proposed General Plan Update. Class II and III bikeways have been planned for Descanso Drive and Berkshire Avenue, and they are currently in the design phase. Under the General Plan Update, the City would continue to support and fund the free Foothill Boulevard Shuttle and would enhance service as detailed within the Downtown Village Specific Plan. The General Plan Update also would include a Bicycle Transportation Plan that would connect bikeway paths to park and ride facilities.

A number of proposed General Plan Update goals, objectives, and policies would continue to promote alternative transportation. These policies include: CE Policy 1.1.2, coordination of the City's Circulation Plan with local, county, regional and state transportation plans; CE Objective 1.4, supporting transit and non-motorized transportation; CE Policy 2.1.1, requiring new development to promote alternative transportation; and CE Objective 2.2, improving transit service through the facilitation of pedestrian and non-motorized methods of transportation. As such, the proposed General Plan Update would support and would not conflict with adopted plans, policies, or programs supporting alternative methods of transportation.

## Impact Determination

The proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, and impacts would be less than significant.

## Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

## Residual Impacts

Impacts related to Threshold TR-7 would be less than significant.

## Cumulative Impacts

The above analysis is cumulative in nature. The identified impacts include regional traffic and add the Project's contribution to the regional traffic. The analysis determined that Verdugo Boulevard between Park Place and Lanterman Lane would operate at LOS D under existing conditions without the proposed Project. The addition of Project-related traffic would result in a change of LOS D to LOS E; therefore, the Project's contribution, when combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, is considered to contribute to a cumulatively significant impact along this roadway segment.

## Impact Determination

**Impact C-TR-1:** At buildout, the proposed Project would contribute traffic to a roadway segment operating at, or projected to operate at, an unacceptable level of service (LOS E or worse): Verdugo Boulevard between Park Place and Lanterman Lane (LOS E).

## Mitigation Measures

Although widening Verdugo Boulevard would improve LOS, an expansion is not considered feasible because of the lack of jurisdiction within the city of Glendale. Thus, no feasible mitigation is available to the lead agency to reduce impacts along Verdugo Boulevard between Park Place and Lanterman Lane.

## Residual Impacts

Feasible mitigation would not be available to improve the level of service along this roadway, and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.



## Significant and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Adoption and implementation of the General Plan Update would result in the following significant and unavoidable adverse traffic impact:

**Impact TR-1:** At buildout, the proposed Project would contribute traffic to a roadway segment operating at, or projected to operate at, an unacceptable level of service (LOS E or worse): Verdugo Boulevard between Park Place and Lanterman Lane (LOS E). This impact is also considered cumulative and is listed as Impact C-TR-1. No mitigation is feasible because the City does not have jurisdiction in the city of Glendale. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.