

Table 4.9-6 Interior and Exterior Noise Standards

<i>Land Use Categories</i>		<i>CNEL</i>	
<i>Categories</i>	<i>Uses</i>	<i>Interior^a</i>	<i>Exterior^b</i>
Residential	Single Family, Duplex, Multiple Family	45 ^c	55
	Mobile Home	45	55
Commercial	Hotel, Motel, Transient Lodging	45	—
	Commercial Retail, Bank, Restaurant	55	—
	Office Building, Research and Development, Professional Offices, City Office Building	50	—
	Amphitheater, Concert Hall, Auditorium, Meeting Hall	45	—
	Movie Theatres	45	—
	Gymnasium (Multipurpose)	50	—
Industrial	Sports Club	55	—
	Manufacturing, Warehousing, Wholesale, Utilities	65	—
Institutional	Hospital, Schools' classroom	45	55
	Church, Library	45	55
Open Space	Parks	—	65

a. Includes bathrooms, toilets, closets, corridors

b. Limited to the following:

- Private yard of single family
- Multi-family private patio or balcony which is served by a means of exit from inside the dwelling
- Balconies 6 feet deep or less are exempt
- Mobile home park
- Park's picnic area
- School's playground

c. Noise level requirement with closed windows. Mechanical ventilating system or other means of natural ventilation shall be provided as of Chapter 12, Section 1205 of UBC.

The ordinance also stipulates, with respect to exterior noise levels, in Section 9656.2 of the City Municipal Code that:

It shall be unlawful for any person at any location within the city to create any noise, or to allow the creation of any noise on property owned, leased, occupied, or otherwise controlled by such person, when the foregoing causes the noise level, when measured by any other residential property either incorporated or unincorporated, to exceed:

1. The noise standard for a cumulative period of more than fifteen (15) minutes in any hour; or
2. The noise standard plus five (5) db(A) for a cumulative period of more than ten (10) minutes in any hour; or
3. The noise standard plus ten (10) db(A) for a cumulative period of more than five (5) minutes in any hour; or
4. The noise standard plus fifteen (15) db(A) for a cumulative period of more than one (1) minute of any hour; or
5. The noise standard plus twenty (20) db(A) for any period of time.

With regard to restrictions on construction activity, Section 9656.4 of the City Municipal Code states that construction noise is exempted from the noise restrictions listed above, provided that:

Noise ... associated with construction, repair, remodeling, or grading of any real property, provided said activities do not take place between the hours of 8:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. on weekdays, including Saturday, or at any time on Sunday or a legal holiday

4.9.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

■ Analytic Method

Implementation of the General Plan Update could result in elevated noise levels that may exceed permitted City noise levels. The primary sources of noise associated with the proposed project would be construction activities within the City and project-related traffic volumes associated with operation of those projects. Secondary sources of noise would include new stationary sources (such as heating, ventilation, and air conditioning units) and increased human activity throughout the City. The net increase in noise levels generated by these activities and other sources have been quantitatively estimated and compared to the applicable noise standards and thresholds of significance.

Aside from noise levels, groundborne vibration would also be generated during the construction phase of future projects within the City by various types of construction equipment. Thus, the groundborne vibration levels generated by construction equipment have also been quantitatively estimated and compared to applicable thresholds of significance.

Construction Noise Levels

Construction noise levels were estimated by data published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Potential noise levels are identified for on- and off-site locations that are sensitive to noise, including residences and schools.

The EPA has compiled data regarding the noise-generating characteristics of typical construction activities. These noise levels would diminish rapidly with distance from the construction site, at a rate of approximately 6 dBA per doubling of distance as equipment is generally stationary or confined to specific areas during construction. For example, a noise level of 86 dBA measured at 50 feet from the noise source to the receptor would reduce to 80 dBA at 100 feet from the source to the receptor, and reduce by another 6 dBA to 74 dBA at 200 feet from the source to the receptor. The noise levels from construction at the off-site sensitive uses can be determined with the following equation from the HMMH *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report*: $L_{eq} = L_{eq} \text{ at } 50 \text{ ft.} - 20 \text{ Log}(D/50)$, where L_{eq} = noise level of noise source, D = distance from the noise source to the receiver, L_{eq} at 50 ft. = noise level of source at 50 feet.

Roadway Noise Levels

Roadway noise levels have been calculated for various locations within the City of Agoura Hills. The noise levels were calculated using the FHWA-RD-77-108 model and traffic volumes from the project traffic study. The average vehicle noise rates (energy rates) utilized in the FHWA Model reflects vehicle noise rates identified for California by Caltrans. Traffic volumes used in the FHWA model are derived

from the project traffic study, which is provided in its entirety Appendix B and summarized in Section 4.13 (Transportation/Traffic) of this document.

Vibration Levels Associated with Construction Equipment

Groundborne vibration levels resulting from construction activities occurring within the City were estimated using data published by Harris Miller Miller & Hanson Inc. (HMMH 2006) for the Federal Transit Administration. Potential vibration levels are identified for on- and off-site locations that are sensitive to vibration, including residences and schools. The vibration levels at the off-site sensitive uses can be determined with the following equation from the HMMH *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report*: $L_v(D) = L_v(25 \text{ ft}) - 20\log(D/25)$, where L_v = vibration level of equipment, D = distance from the equipment to the receiver, $L_v(25 \text{ feet})$ = vibration level of equipment at 25 feet.

■ Thresholds of Significance

For the purposes of this EIR, implementation of the General Plan Update would have significant impact if it would do any of the following:

- Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies
- Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels
- A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project
- A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project
- For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels
- For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels

The CEQA Guidelines do not define the levels at which temporary and permanent increases in ambient noise are considered “substantial.” As discussed previously in this section, a noise level increase of 3 dBA is barely perceptible to most people, a 5 dBA increase is readily noticeable, and a difference of 10 dBA would be perceived as a doubling of loudness. However, as the existing level of ambient noise increases, the allowable level of project generated noise increases, but the total amount that community noise exposure is allowed to increase is reduced. This accounts for the unexpected result that a project noise exposure which is less than the existing noise exposure can still cause impact. As a result, the following thresholds shown in Table 4.9-7 (Noise Thresholds) are used with respect to assessing operational roadway noise.

Table 4.9-7 Noise Thresholds	
Ambient Noise Levels Without Project (Ldn or CNEL)	Threshold (Ldn or CNEL)
< 60 dB	+ 5.0 dB or more
60-65 dB	+ 3.0 dB or more
> 65 dB	+1.5 dB or more

The justification for the above thresholds are that people already exposed to high noise levels would notice and be annoyed by a small increase in the amount of noise in their community. In contrast, if the existing noise levels are already low, a greater change in community noise would be required for the equivalent level of annoyance (HMMH 2006).

The CEQA Guidelines also do not define the levels at which groundborne vibration or groundborne noise is considered “excessive.” For the purpose of this analysis, groundborne vibration impacts associated with human annoyance would be significant if the vibration or associated groundborne noise exceeds 85 VdB, which is the vibration level that is considered by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to be acceptable only if there are an infrequent number of events per day (as described in Table 4.9-2 (Human Response to Different Levels of Groundborne Vibration)). In terms of groundborne vibration impacts on structures, this analysis would use the Federal Transit Administration’s vibration damage threshold of approximately 100 VdB for fragile buildings and approximately 95 VdB for extremely fragile historic buildings (HMMH 2006).

■ Effects Not Found to Be Significant

Threshold	Would the project expose people residing or working in the City to excessive noise levels for a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport?
-----------	---

The City of Agoura Hills is not located within an airport land use plan. Therefore, the General Plan Update would result in *no impact* (Class III).

The City is not in the vicinity of any commercial airport nor does any area of the City fall within an airport land use plan. As such, implementation of the General Plan Update would not expose people residing or working within the City to excessive noise levels and would thus have *no impact* (Class III). No further discussion of this effect is required, and no mitigation measures are required.

Threshold	Would the project expose people residing or working in the City to excessive noise levels for a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
-----------	--

The City of Agoura Hills is not located within the vicinity of a private air strip. Therefore, the General Plan Update would result in *no impact* (Class III).

There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the City. As such, implementation of the General Plan Update would not expose people residing or working within the City to excessive noise levels and would

thus have *no impact* (Class III). No further discussion of this effect is required, and no mitigation measures are required.

■ Less-Than-Significant Impacts

Threshold	Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
-----------	--

Impact 4.9-1 **Construction activities associated with the General Plan Update would generate noise levels that exceed the noise standards established by the City of Agoura Hills Noise Standards. However, this impact would be temporary and subject to the requirements of the City Municipal Code. This is a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact.**

Implementation of the General Plan Update would potentially increase the level of development within the City and during implementation could result in additional construction activities and traffic volumes that may exceed permitted noise levels. In addition, with increased development, there would also be a potential secondary increase in noise levels associated with increased human activity throughout the City.

Development of projects under the General Plan Update would require the use of heavy equipment for demolition, site excavation, installation of utilities, site grading, paving, and building fabrication. Construction activities would also involve the use of smaller power tools, generators, and other sources of noise. During each stage of construction there would be a different mix of equipment operating, and noise levels would vary based on the amount of equipment in operation and the location of the activity.

The EPA has compiled data regarding the noise generating characteristics of specific types of construction equipment and typical construction activities. These data are presented in Table 4.9-8 (Noise Ranges of Typical Construction Equipment) and Table 4.9-9 (Typical Outdoor Construction Noise Levels). These noise levels would diminish rapidly with distance from the construction site at a rate of approximately 6 dBA per doubling of distance for construction equipment, as identified by the EPA.⁵ For example, a noise level of 86 dBA measured at 50 feet from the noise source to the receptor would reduce to 80 dBA at 100 feet from the source to the receptor, and reduce by another 6 dBA to 74 dBA at 200 feet from the source to the receptor.

Noise that would be experienced by sensitive uses due to development associated with implementation of the General Plan Update is determined at the property lines. Specific development plans have not yet been determined at individual sites; however, there is the potential that future construction activities could be as close as 50 feet from sensitive receptors (single- and multi-family residential, and educational uses). Sensitive receptors within the vicinity of individual development projects could experience noise levels up to 98 dBA L_{eq} as a result of routine construction activities, and up to 107 dBA L_{eq} if pile-driving activities were required.

⁵ United States Environmental Protection Agency. 1971. Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment and Home Appliances.

Table 4.9-8 Noise Ranges of Typical Construction Equipment

<i>Equipment</i>	<i>Noise Levels in dBA L_{eq} at 50 Feet^a</i>
Front Loader	73 to 86
Trucks	82 to 95
Cranes (moveable)	75 to 88
Cranes (derrick)	86 to 89
Vibrator	68 to 82
Saws	72 to 82
Pneumatic Impact Equipment	83 to 88
Jackhammers	81 to 98
Pumps	68 to 72
Generators	71 to 83
Compressors	75 to 87
Concrete Mixers	75 to 88
Concrete Pumps	81 to 85
Back Hoe	73 to 95
Pile Driving (peaks)	95 to 107
Tractor	77 to 98
Scraper/Grader	80 to 93
Paver	85 to 88

SOURCE: United States Environmental Protection Agency, 1971, *Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment and Home Appliances*.

a. Machinery equipped with noise control devices or other noise-reducing design features does not generate the same level of noise emissions as that shown in this table.

Table 4.9-9 Typical Outdoor Construction Noise Levels

<i>Construction Phase</i>	<i>Noise Levels at 50 Feet (dBA L_{eq})</i>	<i>Noise Levels at 50 Feet with Mufflers (dBA L_{eq})</i>
Ground Clearing	84	82
Excavation, Grading	89	86
Foundations	78	77
Structural	85	83
Finishing	89	86

SOURCE: United States Environmental Protection Agency, *Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment and Home Appliances*, 1971

In addition, the *City of Agoura Hills Municipal Code* (Article IX, Part 2, Division 6, Section 9666.4) allows for noise resulting from construction activities to be exempt from noise limits established in the Code. In accordance with the Noise Ordinance, construction activities would also be limited to the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 8:00 P.M. on Monday through Saturday and prohibited on Sundays and federal holidays. As construction would not occur except during times permitted in the City Municipal Code, and as the

Municipal Code allows construction noise in excess of standards to occur between these hours, established standards would not be violated. In the event that construction may take place during times other than those stipulated in the Noise Ordinance, project applicant(s) would be required to obtain a variance from the City in accordance with Section 9656.9 of the Municipal Code. Because the Noise Ordinance exempts construction noise from the City's noise standards with adherence to construction period requirements and any construction carried out within the City would be performed in accordance with the City Municipal Code, this impact would be considered *less than significant* (Class II). No mitigation measures are required.

Threshold	Would the project result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
-----------	--

Impact 4.9-2 **Operation of the General Plan Update would generate and expose sensitive receptors on- or off-site to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. This is a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact.**

During future “operation” of the General Plan Update, background operational vibration levels would be expected to average approximately 50 VdB, as discussed previously in this section. This is substantially less than the aforementioned 85 VdB threshold. Groundborne vibration resulting from operational activities would be largely generated by trucks making periodic deliveries within the City. However, these types of deliveries would be consistent with deliveries that are currently made along existing roadways to commercial uses in the City and would not increase groundborne vibration above existing levels. Because no substantial sources of groundborne vibration are anticipated under the General Plan Update, no vibration impacts would occur during operation of the General Plan Update. Therefore, the General Plan Update would not expose sensitive receptors on- or off-site to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during operation of the uses permitted under the General Plan Update, and this impact would be *less than significant* (Class II). No mitigation measures are required.

Threshold	Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
-----------	---

Impact 4.9-3 **Operation of the proposed project would generate increased local traffic volumes that would cause a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. However, the proposed project will result in a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact.**

Future noise levels within the City would continue to be dominated by vehicular traffic on the adjacent roadways. Other sources of noise would include new stationary sources (such as rooftop heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment) and increased human activity throughout the City. Locations in the vicinity of future individual projects within the City could experience slight changes in noise levels as a result of an increase in population and intensification of uses and the resulting increase in motor vehicle trips. Existing traffic noise levels are identified in Table 4.9-4 (Existing Roadway Noise Levels). Noise levels associated with traffic generated from existing conditions are calculated at the selected locations along the study-area roadway segments within the City using traffic data from the traffic study (included in Appendix B). As stated in the Thresholds of Significance, where ambient noise levels are less

than 60 dB CNEL or less, a 5.0 dB CNEL increase would be considered a substantial increase; where ambient noise levels are between 60 dB and 65 dB CNEL, an increase of 3 dBA would be considered a substantial increase; and if ambient noise levels are greater than 65 dB CNEL, an increase of 1.5 dB or greater would be considered a substantial increase. Table 4.9-10 (Future [2035] Roadway Noise Levels Compared to Ambient Future Noise Levels) presents the average daily noise levels associated with these roadways under the General Plan Update and compares them to existing conditions. Figure 4.9-3 (Noise Contours—Future) depicts the future noise levels in the year 2035, which includes both vehicle growth within the City of Agoura Hills under the General Plan Update as well as cumulative regional vehicle growth (refer to Section 4.12 [Recreation] of this DEIR).

As shown in Table 4.9-10 (Future [2035] Roadway Noise Levels Compared to Ambient Future Noise Levels), no roadway segments are expected to experience a significant increase in ambient noise levels over existing conditions with the addition of future traffic volumes. The roadway segment of Chesebro Road, south of Driver Avenue/Palo Comado Canyon Road, would experience the highest increase in noise levels as a result of implementation of the General Plan Update at 3.1 dB CNEL. As no roadway segment would experience a substantial increase in noise over existing conditions with implementation of the General Plan Update, this impact is considered *less than significant* (Class II), and no mitigation measures are required.

Table 4.9-10 Future (2035) Roadway Noise Levels Compared to Ambient Future Noise Levels

Roadway Segment	Future Noise Levels without Development of the Proposed GP in dBA CNEL at 100 feet	Future Noise Levels with Development of the Proposed GP in dBA CNEL at 100 feet	Increase over future no-project noise levels at 100 feet	Threshold (dBA)	Exceeds Significance Threshold?
Lake Lindero Road, north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard	55.0	55.0	0.0	5	No
Thousand Oaks Boulevard, west of Lindero Road	63.9	64.2	0.3	3	No
Lake Lindero Road, south of Thousand Oaks Boulevard	54.3	54.5	0.2	5	No
Reyes Adobe Road, north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard	58.9	59.0	0.1	5	No
Thousand Oaks Boulevard, west of Reyes Adobe Road	62.9	63.4	0.5	3	No
Thousand Oaks Boulevard, east of Reyes Adobe Road	63.7	63.9	0.2	3	No
Reyes Adobe Road, south of Thousand Oaks Boulevard	60.8	61.4	0.6	3	No
Kanan Road, south of Fountainwood Avenue	63.3	63.7	0.4	3	No
Kanan Road, north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard	64.5	64.9	0.4	3	No
Thousand Oaks Boulevard, west of Kanan Road	63.2	63.5	0.3	3	No
Thousand Oaks Boulevard, east of Kanan Road	62.1	62.5	0.4	3	No
Kanan Road, south of Thousand Oaks Boulevard	64.6	65.0	0.4	3	No
Driver Avenue, east of Argos Street	56.8	57.2	0.4	5	No
Agoura Road, east of Flintlock Lane	61.1	61.8	0.7	3	No
Reyes Adobe Road, north of Canwood Street	61.8	62.5	0.7	3	No
Canwood Street, west of Reyes Adobe Road	56.6	56.7	0.1	5	No
Canwood Street, east of Reyes Adobe Road	54.0	54.6	0.6	5	No

Table 4.9-10 Future (2035) Roadway Noise Levels Compared to Ambient Future Noise Levels

<i>Roadway Segment</i>	<i>Future Noise Levels without Development of the Proposed GP in dBA CNEL at 100 feet</i>	<i>Future Noise Levels with Development of the Proposed GP in dBA CNEL at 100 feet</i>	<i>Increase over future no-project noise levels at 100 feet</i>	<i>Threshold (dBA)</i>	<i>Exceeds Significance Threshold?</i>
Reyes Adobe Road, north of Agoura Road	61.7	63.6	1.9	3	No
Agoura Road, west of Reyes Adobe Road	61.4	63.0	1.6	3	No
Agoura Road, east of Reyes Adobe Road	62.4	63.9	1.5	3	No
Kanan Road, south of Canwood Street East	65.9	66.8	0.9	1.5	No
Canwood Street, west of Kanan Road	55.4	57.3	1.9	5	No
Canwood Street, east of Kanan Road	59.0	61.9	2.9	5	No
Kanan Road, north of Agoura Road	63.3	65.0	1.7	3	No
Agoura Road, west of Kanan Road	61.3	63.7	1.4	3	No
Agoura Road, east of Kanan Road	59.6	61.6	2.0	5	No
Kanan Road, south of Agoura Road	64.2	65.3	1.1	3	No
Roadside Drive, west of Lewis Road	53.6	54.7	1.1	5	No
Agoura Road, east of Cornell Road	59.0	61.2	2.2	5	No
Chesebro Road, north of Driver Avenue/Palo Comado Canyon Road	55.0	55.0	0.0	5	No
Driver Avenue, west of Chesebro Road	57.6	57.8	0.2	5	No
Palo Comado Canyon Road, east of Chesebro Road	60.1	61.6	1.5	3	No
Chesebro Road, south of Driver Avenue/Palo Comado Canyon Road	56.6	59.7	3.1	5	No
Dorothy Drive, Lewis Road to US-101 SB Ramps/Chesebro Road	54.4	56.2	1.8	5	No
Chesebro Road, south of Dorothy Drive	58.8	60.0	1.2	5	No
Agoura Road, west of Chesebro Road	59.2	61.0	1.8	5	No
Palo Comado Canyon Road, south of Dorothy Drive	59.6	61.4	1.8	5	No
Chesebro Road, north of Agoura Road	56.7	58.4	1.7	5	No
Liberty Canyon Road, US-101 NB ramps and US-101 SB ramps	59.3	59.4	0.1	5	No
Liberty Canyon Road, north of Agoura Road	60.4	60.5	0.1	3	No
Agoura Road, west of Liberty Canyon Road	58.4	59.7	1.3	5	No
Agoura Road, east of Liberty Canyon Road	59.5	59.5	0.0	5	No
Liberty Canyon Road, south of Agoura Road	58.7	59.7	1.0	5	No

SOURCE: PBS&J, 2008 (calculation data and results are provided in Appendix F)

a. Distances are in feet from roadway centerline. The identified noise level at 100 feet from the roadway centerline is for reference purposes only. This distance is used to account for variation in lane widths, and therefore does not reflect an actual building location or potential impact location.

Threshold	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
-----------	---

Impact 4.9-4 Construction activities associated with the proposed project would result in a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. This is a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact.

Construction activities associated with the General Plan Update could reach up to 98 dBA L_{eq} (up to 107 dBA L_{eq} if pile driving activities were required) at the property line of sensitive receptors in the vicinity of future projects that could be developed under the General Plan Update within the City. These construction activities would represent a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that an increase of 3.0 dBA (“barely perceptible”) or greater over ambient noise levels is substantial and significant. As shown in Table 4.9-3 (Existing Daytime Noise Levels at Selected Locations), the highest existing daytime ambient noise level monitored in the City was 77.1 dBA L_{eq} at Kanan Road and Roadside Drive. As such, the noise generated by construction activities (98 dBA) carried out under the General Plan Update could result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels of over 3 dBA at the existing noise-sensitive uses adjacent to a project site located within the City. However, the *City of Agoura Hills Municipal Code* (Article IX, Part 2, Division 6, Section 9666.4) allows for noise resulting from construction activities to be exempt from noise limits established in the Code. In accordance with the Noise Ordinance, construction activities would also be limited to the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 8:00 P.M. on Monday through Saturday and prohibited on Sundays and federal holidays, which would restrict construction activities from occurring during sleep hours for residences or days that residents are most sensitive to exterior noise (Sundays and federal holidays). As such, while the physical impact from an increase in ambient noise levels could occur from construction activities, an adverse effect on the nearby residents would not be significant. Therefore, this impact would be *less than significant* (Class II), and no mitigation measures are required.

Impact 4.9-5 Operation of the General Plan Update would result in temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels. This is a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact.







Operations under the General Plan Update could include special events or temporary activities, such as concerts and sporting events, which would cause an increase in ambient noise levels. However, these types of events already occur under existing conditions within the City, and would not be expected to increase substantially under the General Plan Update. In addition, operation of the General Plan Update would not require periodic use of special stationary equipment that would expose off-site sensitive receptors to an increase in ambient noise levels above those existing without the proposed project. Therefore, substantial (3.0 dBA L_{eq} or greater) temporary or periodic noise impacts to on- or off-site receptors due to operation of the proposed project are not anticipated. This impact would be *less than significant* (Class II), and no mitigation measures are required.


**CITY of AGOURA HILLS
General Plan Update EIR**

**NOISE CONTOURS-
FUTURE**


Legend

Future Roadway Noise Contours

-  70 CNEL
-  65 CNEL
-  60 CNEL
-  City Limits
-  County Boundary
-  Streams



Source: Fehr & Peers, June 2009
D21377_Agoura_Hills\EIR_noise.mxd



■ Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

Threshold	Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
-----------	--

Impact 4.9-6 Implementation of the General Plan Update would generate noise levels that exceed the noise standards established by the City of Agoura Hills Noise Regulations. This is a *significant and unavoidable* (Class I) impact.

Based on noise measurements (Table 4.9-3 [Existing Daytime Noise Levels at Selected Locations]) and on existing and future noise modeling (Figure 4.9-2 [Noise Contours—Existing] and Figure 4.9-3 [Noise Contours—Future]), noise levels in excess of City standards currently occur and would continue to occur in many residential areas and other noise-sensitive uses throughout the City. Along most roadway segments 2035 noise levels would exceed city standards (i.e., 60 dBA L_{dn} or CNEL) for single- and multi-family residential uses adjacent to existing roadways. In addition, along certain roadway segments, 2035 noise levels would also exceed City standards (i.e., 70 dBA L_{dn} or CNEL) for adjacent transient lodging (e.g., motels, hotels). However, it should be noted that the proposed General Plan Update would not, in and of itself, represent a substantial increase in ambient noise levels. Nonetheless, traffic noise would be higher or louder in the future with implementation of the proposed General Plan Update than it is now along all freeways and highways, and along most major arterial and collector roads in Agoura Hills (see Figure 4.9-3 [Noise Contours—Future] for the noise contours). The primary cause of an increase in noise would not be implementation of the General Plan Update, but development both inside and outside of the City that is anticipated to occur regardless of whether the General Plan is adopted or not. These noise increases have the potential for significantly increasing annoyance in communities adjacent to the roadways. It should be noted, however, that roadway noise levels/contours have been generated by a computer model, and the true levels may vary with specific conditions at particular locations. Intervening structures or other noise-attenuating obstacles between a roadway and a receptor may reduce roadway noise levels at the receptor, but such potential reductions are not assumed in the following judgments made regarding impact significance.

The General Plan Update includes a number of policies to address noise issues within City limits. For example, Policy N-1.2 (Compatibility of Noise-Generating Uses with Sensitive Receptors) through Policy N-1.6 (Noise Standards) and Policy N-2.4 (New Development) require noise mitigation for all development at locations where the exterior noise standards exceed City standards. Policy N-2.1 (State Motor Vehicle Noise Standards) encourages the enforcement of vehicle noise standards in cooperation with local law enforcement, while Policy N-2.2 (Roadway Mitigation Measures) and Policy N-2.3 (Noise Mitigation Along Major Arterials) require the use of design strategies and other methods along transportation corridors to attenuate noise in lieu of sound walls.

Implementation of the General Plan Update policies would, in most cases, reduce to a less-than-significant level the exterior noise levels and/or increments on future noise-sensitive land uses that could be developed under the General Plan Update. However, the proposed policies would do little to

remediate or reduce the magnitude of noise effects on many existing noise-sensitive land uses in areas with current high noise exposures or where additional noise increases are expected, some of which would be attributed to the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore, the continuing exposure of existing noise-sensitive land uses to noise levels in excess of City standards or to noise increases as a result of the future growth under the proposed General Plan Update is considered a potentially significant impact.

Exterior noise levels in existing and proposed noise-sensitive areas can be remediated by relocating roadways, building sound walls, providing buffer zones, retrofitting older homes with insulation or applying appropriate window treatments (i.e., double-paned windows, interior storm windows, etc.) or choosing development sites in quiet areas, etc. For new development it is anticipated that many City standards could be met and substantial noise increases could be avoided by incorporating some of the strategies listed above. However, it would not be possible to guarantee success in all cases because funding may not be available for sound wall construction, land may not be available for buffer zones, or it may be cost prohibitive to relocate existing roadways. For existing residences located in areas adjacent to roadways or other noise generating sources it may not be possible or feasible to include the necessary level of noise reduction strategies to address an increase in noise. Thus, this mitigation does not meet the CEQA standard of “potentially feasible.” Therefore, the impact would be considered ***significant and unavoidable*** (Class I).

Threshold	Would the project result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
-----------	--

Impact 4.9-7 Construction activities associated with the General Plan Update could generate or expose persons or structures to excessive groundborne vibration. This is a *significant and unavoidable* (Class I) impact.

Construction-related vibration has two potential impacts. First, vibration at high enough levels can result in human annoyance. Second, groundborne vibration can potentially damage the foundations and exteriors of historic structures. Groundborne vibration that can cause this kind of damage is typically limited to impact equipment, especially pile drivers. Construction activities that would occur have the potential to generate low levels of groundborne vibration. Table 4.9-11 (Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment) identifies various vibration velocity levels for the types of construction equipment that would operate within the City during construction.

Similar to noise, groundborne vibration would attenuate at a rate of approximately 6 VdB per doubling of distance. The groundborne vibration generated during construction activities would primarily impact existing sensitive uses (e.g., residences and schools) that are located adjacent to or within the vicinity of specific projects. These sensitive uses could sometimes be located as close as 25 feet to a construction site or as far as several hundred feet away. Based on the information presented in Table 4.9-11 (Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment), vibration levels could reach up to 87 VdB for typical construction activities (and up to 104 VdB if pile driving activities were to occur) at sensitive uses located within 25 feet of construction. For sensitive uses that are located at or within 25 feet of potential project construction sites, sensitive receptors (e.g., residents and school children) at these locations may

Table 4.9-11 Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

Equipment	Approximate VdB			
	25 Feet	50 Feet	75 Feet	100 Feet
Pile Driver (Impact)	104	98	94	92
Large Bulldozer	87	81	77	75
Loaded Trucks	86	80	76	74
Jackhammer	79	73	69	67
Small Bulldozer	58	52	48	46

SOURCE: Federal Railroad Administration 1998

The vibration levels are determined with the following equation from the HMMH *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report*: $L_v(D) = L_v(25 \text{ ft}) - 20 \log(D/25)$, where L_v = vibration level of equipment, D = distance from the equipment to the receiver, $L_v(25 \text{ ft})$ = vibration level of equipment at 25 feet.

experience vibration levels during construction activities that exceed the FTA's vibration impact threshold of 85 VdB for human annoyance. So long as construction occurs more than 50 feet from sensitive receptors, the impact associated with groundborne vibration generated by the typical construction equipment would be below 85 VdB and thus would be less than significant. However, as specific site plans, equipment types or constructions schedules are unknown at this time; it may be possible that construction activities could occur as close as 25 feet from sensitive receptors or that pile driving activities could occur. This would result in these sensitive receptors experiencing vibration levels beyond the 85 VdB threshold, thereby resulting in a potentially significant impact. Adherence to the City Noise Ordinance and implementation of Policy N-3.3 (Enforcement of Hours of Construction and Maintenance Activity) and Policy N-1.4 (Noise Mitigation Measures) would help to reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Impacts associated with construction-related groundborne vibration would continue to exceed the human annoyance threshold of 85 VdB, and would be considered *significant and unavoidable* (Class I).

■ Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts are only addressed for those thresholds that have a project-related impact, whether it is less than significant, significant, or significant and unavoidable. If "no impact" occurs, no cumulative analysis is provided for that threshold as the project would not contribute under these thresholds.

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative noise impacts depends on the impact being analyzed. For construction impacts, only the immediate area around a project site (in this case the City of Agoura Hills or adjacent area, where applicable) would be included in the cumulative context. For operational/roadway related impacts, the context is existing and future development in the City of Agoura Hills. This cumulative impact analysis considers development of the proposed project, in conjunction with ambient growth and other development within the vicinity of the City of Agoura Hills. Noise is, by definition, a localized phenomenon, and significantly reduces in magnitude as distance from the source increases. Consequently, only projects and growth due to occur in the City of Agoura Hills would be considered cumulatively considerable with regard to noise impacts. Traffic related noise increases are cumulative in nature, since both project-generated and regional traffic levels are analyzed.

Threshold	Would the project result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
-----------	--

Increases in noise levels at sensitive uses would occur as a result of construction carried out under the General Plan Update along with other construction in the vicinity. Construction activities associated with implementation of the General Plan Update, although temporary, could expose nearby sensitive receptors to noise levels above noise standards established by the City of Agoura Hills. Other construction that may occur in the vicinity of a particular site would contribute noise levels similar to those generated for the proposed project, which could result in multiple projects being constructed within Agoura Hills and adjacent areas concurrently. Where this development adjoins construction activities associated with the proposed project, the combined construction noise levels would have a cumulative effect on nearby sensitive uses. Noise is not strictly additive, and a doubling of noise sources would not cause a doubling of noise levels, but rather result in a 3 dBA increase over a single source. Cumulative construction noise levels could be in excess of the City of Agoura Hills Noise Standards.

The *City of Agoura Hills Municipal Code* (Article IX, Part 2, Division 6, Section 9666.4) allows for noise resulting from construction activities to be exempt from noise limits established in the Code. In accordance with the Noise Ordinance, construction activities would also be limited to the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 8:00 P.M. on Monday through Saturday and prohibited on Sundays and federal holidays. As compliance with Section 9666.4 would be required by the City Municipal Code for any development within City limits, implementation of the General Plan Update would not be cumulatively considerable with other development projects. Impacts would be ***less than significant*** (Class II). No mitigation is required.

Threshold	Would the project result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
-----------	--

The construction of future projects considered by the General Plan Update would produce temporary vibration impacts. However, the construction-related vibration impact would be significant and unavoidable. Cumulative development in the City of Agoura Hills is not considered likely to result in the exposure of on-site or off-site receptors to excessive groundborne vibration, due to the localized nature of vibration impacts and the fact that all construction would not occur at the same time and at the same location. Only receptors located in close proximity to each construction site would be potentially affected by each activity. There is a potential for sensitive uses in the City to be exposed to two sources of groundborne vibration from different development sites. However, for the combined vibration impact from the two projects to reach cumulatively significant levels, intense construction from both projects would have to occur simultaneously within 50 feet of a particular receptor. As individual development projects under the General Plan Update may be constructed concurrently with each other or other related projects, it is possible that intense construction from two or more projects would simultaneously occur at distances of 50 feet or less from existing nearby receptors. Therefore, for future development projects, one project could potentially combine with the construction vibration of the proposed project to result in a potentially significant cumulative impact. Therefore, the cumulative impact of the proposed project would be ***significant and unavoidable*** (Class I).

Groundborne vibration could conceivably be generated by operation of individual projects in the City. Since uses contemplated in the General Plan Update would not include uses that would generate substantial sources of groundborne vibration, no vibration impacts would occur during operation of the General Plan Update. Consequently, there would be no cumulative operational groundborne vibration impacts to any on-site or off-site receptor. This impact would be *less than significant* (Class II). No mitigation is required.

Threshold	Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
-----------	---

Substantial permanent increases in noise would occur primarily as a result of increased traffic on local roadways due to the General Plan Update, related projects, and ambient growth through Year 2035. Cumulative traffic-generated noise impacts have been assessed based on the contribution of the General Plan Update to the future cumulative base traffic volumes in the project vicinity. As shown in Table 4.9-10 (Future [2035] Roadway Noise Levels Compared to Ambient Future Noise Levels), cumulative traffic would not result in substantial increases in noise along any roadway segments compared to existing conditions. As no roadway segment would experience a substantial increase in noise over existing conditions with implementation of the General Plan Update, this impact is considered *less than significant* (Class II), and no mitigation measures are required.

Threshold	Would the project result in cumulatively considerable periodic or temporary noise levels above levels existing without the project?
-----------	---

Periodic and temporary noise levels would be generated by construction of the proposed project along with other construction in the vicinity. The General Plan Update by itself would expose some receptors to ambient noise levels in excess of acceptable City standards. Construction noise impacts are localized in nature and decrease substantially with distance. Consequently, in order to achieve a substantial cumulative increase in construction noise levels, more than one source emitting high levels of construction noise would need to be in close proximity to a noise receptor. Construction activity associated with individual projects may overlap with other construction activity proposed by the General Plan Update. Thus, the possibility exists that a substantial cumulative increase in construction noise levels could result from construction associated with multiple projects under the General Plan Update. The cumulative impact concurrent emission of high levels of construction noise, would likely be significant and unavoidable. As discussed previously, the City exempts construction noise from the provisions of the Municipal Code as long as construction occurs within certain hours of the day. All of the projects analyzed in the cumulative context that would be constructed concurrently with the General Plan Update growth would be required to comply with the provisions of the Municipal Code. Consequently, all projects analyzed in the cumulative context would fall under the Municipal Code exemption, and the cumulative impact of the General Plan Update would be *less than significant* (Class II). No additional mitigation is required.

Operation under the General Plan Update could include special events or temporary activities, such as concerts and sporting events, which would cause an increase in ambient noise levels. However, these events currently occur under existing conditions and would not increase in number or frequency with

adoption of the General Plan Update. Therefore, there would be no temporary or periodic noise impacts to on- or off-site receptors due to operation of the proposed project, and the cumulative impact of the proposed project would be *less than significant* (Class II). No mitigation is required.

■ Mitigation Measures

Although significant and unavoidable impacts have been identified, there are no additional mitigation measures that could feasibly be implemented to further reduce impacts.

■ Final Level of Significance

With the implementation of the General Plan Update policies and application of all local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to noise, the proposed project would result in *significant and unavoidable* (Class I) *impacts*. The proposed project would result in *significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts* (Class I).

4.9.4 Draft General Plan Goals and Policies

Policies relating to noise and excessive noise levels were identified in the General Plan Update Community Safety Chapter, Noise Section:

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| Goal N 1 | Land Use Conflicts. Minimized land use conflicts between various noise sources and other human activities. |
| Policy N-1.1 | Noise Standards. Require noise mitigation for all development where the projected noise levels exceed those shown in Table N-2 (Interior and Exterior Noise Standards), to the extent feasible. |
| Policy N-1.2 | Compatibility of Noise-Generating Uses with Sensitive Receptors. Require buildings and sites to be designed such that surrounding noise sensitive uses are adequately buffered from noise generating uses. |
| Policy N-1.3 | Mixed-Use Development Standards. Require, whenever physically possible, new mixed-use developments to locate noise sources away from the residential portion of the development, and apply physical construction standards to reduce noise between uses. |
| Policy N-1.4 | Noise Mitigation Measures. Ensure that all new development provides adequate sound insulation or other protection from existing and anticipated noise sources. |
| Policy N-1.5 | Sensitive Receptors. Incorporate ambient noise level considerations into land use decisions involving schools, hospitals, and similar noise-sensitive uses. |

Policy N-1.6 **Noise Standards.** Enforce standards that specify acceptable noise limits for various land uses throughout the City. Table N-1 (Noise/Land Use Compatibility Matrix) shows criteria used to assess the compatibility of proposed land uses with the noise environment. These criteria are the bases of specific Noise Standards. These standards, presented in Table N-2 (Interior and Exterior Noise Standards), define City policy related to land uses and acceptable noise levels.

Goal N-2 **Motor Vehicles.** Minimized motor vehicle traffic noise impacts on sensitive noise receptors.

Policy N-2.1 **State Motor Vehicle Noise Standards.** Encourage the enforcement of state motor vehicle noise standards for cars, trucks, and motorcycles through coordination with the California Highway Patrol and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

Policy N-2.2 **Roadway Mitigation Measures.** Ensure the employment of noise mitigation measures in the design of roadway improvement projects consistent with funding capability. Support efforts by the California Department of Transportation and others to provide for acoustical protection of existing noise-sensitive land uses affected by these projects.

Policy N-2.3 **Noise Mitigation Along Major Arterials.** Require sound-attenuating devices, such as walls and berms, in the design of residential and other noise-sensitive land uses that are adjacent to the Ventura Freeway and major arterials.

Policy N-2.4 **New Development.** New development along the freeway corridor and major thoroughfares will be required to prepare noise studies, as deemed necessary by the Planning Department.

Goal N-3 **Non-Transportation-Related Noise.** Minimized non-transportation-related noise impacts on sensitive noise receptors.

Policy N-3.1 **Protection from Stationary Noise Sources.** Continue to enforce interior and exterior noise standards to ensure that sensitive noise receptors are not exposed to excessive noise levels from stationary noise sources, such as machinery, equipment, fans, and air conditioning equipment.

Policy N-3.2 **Regulation of Sound-Amplifying Equipment.** Continue to regulate the use of sound-amplifying equipment.

Policy N-3.3 **Enforcement of Hours of Construction and Maintenance Activity.** Continue to enforce restrictions on hours of construction activities so as to minimize the impacts of noise and vibration from the use of trucks, heavy drilling equipment, and other heavy machinery, including property maintenance equipment, to adjacent uses, particularly in residential areas.

4.9.5 References

- Agoura Hills, City of. n.d. *Municipal Code*. Article IX, Part 2, Division 6.
- . 2009. *Agoura Hills Draft General Plan*.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. 1998. *Technical Noise Supplement*, October, p. 18.
- Harris Miller Miller & Hanson, Inc. 2006. *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report*, May.
- Hendriks, R. 1998. *Technical Noise Supplement: A Technical Supplement to the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol*. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Sacramento, California. October.
- United States Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT). Federal Highway Administration. 1980a. Highway Noise Fundamentals.
- . Federal Highway Administration. 1980b. Fundamentals and Abatement of Highway Traffic Noises. September.
- . Federal Highway Administration. 1980c. Highway Noise Mitigation.
- . Federal Railroad Administration. 1998. High-Speed Ground Transportation Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment.
- . Federal Highway Administration. n.d. Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108).
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 1971. Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment and Home Appliances.

4.10 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

This section describes the impacts of the Agoura Hills General Plan Update on population, housing, and employment. Data for this section was taken from the United States Census Bureau, the California Department of Finance (DOF), and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Since each of these organizations uses different methods of data collection and calculation, they do not always arrive at precisely the same results. Accordingly, the population, housing, and employment numbers used in this analysis may vary, depending upon the source cited. However, the sources are relatively consistent with each other and data from all of them have been incorporated into this analysis. Full bibliographic entries for all reference materials are provided in Section 4.10.5 (References) of this section.

One comment letter regarding population, housing, and employment was received from SCAG in response to the April 30, 2009, Notice of Preparation (NOP) circulated for the General Plan Update. This letter requested that a consistency analysis be included for the policies contained in SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Compass Growth Visioning (CGV). The analysis prepared for this section is based on the SCAG 2008 RTP Growth Forecasts, and has addressed the comment submitted by SCAG.

4.10.1 Environmental Setting

■ Population

The most recent United States Census was published in 2000. Over nine years have passed since the census data was collected. To allow for meaningful analysis, updated estimates from DOF and SCAG were used as a supplement. DOF provides annually updated estimates regarding population, housing, and employment. The most current population estimates are from January 1, 2009, collected by DOF. In 2008, as part of its mandated planning functions, SCAG developed and published population, household, and employment growth projections for each jurisdiction in the region. The most current available SCAG projections were incorporated into the agency's 2008 Regional Transportation Plan Growth Forecast (SCAG 2008 Growth Forecast). The SCAG 2008 Growth Forecast contains projections for each 5-year increment between 2005 and 2035. The numbers projected by SCAG may vary when compared to 2009 DOF estimates of population, households, and employment for the City of Agoura Hills. The SCAG 2008 Growth Forecast was used for purposes of future projection, while DOF estimates are used to provide a 2009 baseline for analysis.

United States Census 2000

The U.S. Census is taken and published every ten years and includes population and housing data for the entire United States. Census data is the baseline from which most demographic projections are calculated. As the City of Agoura Hills was incorporated in 1982, census data is not available for years prior to 1990. A review of census data collected since 1990 shows that, over the past nineteen years, Agoura Hills has experienced a modest increase in the level of growth. In the 2000 U.S. Census, the

population of Agoura Hills was approximately 20,537 persons, a 0.07 percent increase from the 1990 population of 20,390 persons.

California Department of Finance (DOF)

The City of Agoura Hills is located in Los Angeles County on the eastern border of Ventura County. The neighboring cities of Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks are located in Ventura County, while Calabasas and Westlake Village are located in Los Angeles County. Due to the close proximity of Agoura Hills to Ventura County, population changes within Ventura County have been included in this document.

Table 4.10-1 (Changes in Total Population, 1990–2009, Selected Jurisdictions) provides the City’s population as shown in the decennial censuses over the last eighteen years and compares its population changes with those of neighboring cities, Los Angeles County and Ventura County.

Table 4.10-1 Change in Total Population, 1990–2009, Selected Jurisdictions					
<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>1990 (Census)</i>	<i>2000 (Census)</i>	<i>% Change 1990–2000</i>	<i>2009 (DOF)</i>	<i>% Change 2000–2008</i>
Los Angeles County					
Agoura Hills	20,390	20,537	.07%	23,337	12.0
Calabasas	18,527	21,536	N/A	23,735	9.3
Westlake Village	7,455	8,368	10.9%	8,858	5.5
LA County Total	8,863,164	9,519,338	7.4%	10,393,185	8.4
Ventura County					
Simi Valley	100,218	111,351	10%	125,814	11.5
Thousand Oaks	104,381	117,005	10.7%	128,564	9.0
Ventura County Total	669,016	753,197	11.2%	836,080	9.9

SOURCE: U.S. Census of Population and Housing 1990 and 2000; California Department of Finance, January 2009

DOF provides annually updated population and housing estimates for cities and counties within California. In January 2009, the DOF estimated that the population of Agoura Hills was 23,337 persons, a 12.0 percent increase from the 2000 Census baseline population of 20,537 persons. As shown in Table 4.10-1 (Changes in Total Population, 1990–2009, Selected Jurisdictions), during this same time period Los Angeles County’s population increased 8.4 percent and Ventura County’s population increased 9.9 percent from the 2000 Census baseline. In 2009, the population of Agoura Hills constituted less than 0.02 percent of the total population of Los Angeles County.

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

SCAG is the federally designated metropolitan planning organization for the Southern California region, which covers six counties, including Los Angeles, Imperial, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura. Agoura Hills is located within Los Angeles County, in the Las Virgenes–Malibu Council of Governments Subregion. In 2008 SCAG developed and published population, household and employment projections for each jurisdiction within the region in 5-year increments, beginning in 2005

and extending to 2035, using the 2000 US Census data as the baseline. This information is presented in SCAG's 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Growth Forecast Projections. To determine the regional growth totals, SCAG analyzes historical population, housing and economic trends, and incorporates the future demographic rates and employment shift-share assumptions.⁶ SCAG's growth forecast projects a 12.6 percent growth in the population of Agoura Hills by 2035, an increase of 2,965 people between 2000 and 2035. As a matter of comparison, the 2009 DOF population estimate is equivalent to the population SCAG projected for the year 2010 (refer to Table 4.10-4 [SCAG 2008 Growth Forecast Projections for Population, Households, and Employment, 2005 to 2035]).

■ Household Type

According to the 2000 US Census, the City of Agoura Hills was home to 6,874 households. Of this number 5,591 households or 81 percent of all households were comprised of families. Households considered "non-family" accounted for 1,238 households or 19 percent of all households. Non-family households are unrelated people residing in the same dwelling unit. A single person household which is included under the "non-family" classification accounted for 14 percent of all households, or 77 percent of non-family households.⁷ Family relationships are determined by the relationship to the householder. Refer to Table 4.10-2 (Household Type, 1990 and 2000) for a detailed breakdown of housing types.

Household Type	1990		2000		Percent Change
	Households	Percent	Households	Percent	
Families	5,456	83%	5,591	81%	-2%
With children	3,462	53%	3,250	47%	-6%
With no children	1,994	30%	2,341	34%	+17%
Singles	798	12%	948	14%	+19%
Other Non-Families	356	5%	335	5%	-6%
Total Households	6,610	100%	6,874	100%	+4%
Average Household Size	3.08		2.98		-3%
Average Family Size	3.37		3.30		-2%

SOURCE: U.S. Census 1990 and 2000.

The City had an average household size of 2.98 people per household (pph) in 2000, and an average family size of 3.30. This figure represents a slight decrease from 1990 levels, but it is on par with the Los Angeles County average household size of 2.98 and lower than the average household size of 3.04 pph in Ventura County. According to the DOF 2009 estimates, the average household size in Agoura Hills is

⁶ Southern California Association of Governments website: <http://www.scag.ca.gov/forecast/methods.htm>. Accessed on October 19, 2009.

⁷ American FactFinder. Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data. Website: <http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf1u.htm>. Accessed on July 27, 2009.

3.12 pph which is consistent with the DOF estimates of Los Angeles County (3.12 pph) and in Ventura County (3.07 pph).⁸

■ Housing Growth

According to the City of Agoura Hills Planning Department, the City's housing inventory in early 2009 consisted of 5,312 single-family housing units, and 2,298 multi-family housing units for a total of 7,610 housing units (Agoura Hills Planning and Community Development Department 2009). The existing General Plan (1993) allowed for the development of up to 5,428 single-family housing units and 2,591 multi-family housing units for a total of 8,019 housing units. As such, Agoura Hills has not reached maximum permitted residential build-out under the existing General Plan (1993) and could permit the development of up to 116 single-family housing units, and 293 multi-family housing units for a total of 409 additional housing units under the existing General Plan (1993). It should be noted that the 2008 SCAG Growth Forecasts are based on maximum build out permitted under each City and County General Plans.

United States Census 2000

In 2000, the City of Agoura Hills had a housing stock of 6,993 units, a 0.09 percent increase from the 1990 housing stock of 6,927 units. In contrast during this same period of time, the housing stock in Los Angeles County grew by 3.3 percent and Ventura County grew by 9.2 percent. While housing growth in the neighboring City of Calabasas (3 percent) was comparable to that in Los Angeles County, both Westlake Village and Thousand Oaks, located in Ventura County experienced growth of levels of over 10 percent consistent with Ventura County.

Department of Finance

As shown in Table 4.10-3 (Housing Stock Growth), Agoura Hills' housing stock has grown at a rate of 7.9 percent from 2000 to 2009. DOF estimates that as of January 1, 2009, there are 7,590 housing units in the City, a gain of 597 housing units from the 2000 housing inventory of 6,993. Recent housing growth in Agoura Hills surpasses that of the County and most surrounding communities. This recent growth consists primarily of the construction of a single apartment building containing 336 units. Los Angeles County in this same time experienced lower levels of new housing construction and a lower residential growth rate (4.3 percent), while Ventura County experienced greater levels of new housing construction and residential growth (9.4 percent).

⁸ California Department of Finance. Table 2: E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates 1/1/2009 and 4/1/2000 DRU Benchmark.

Table 4.10-3 Housing Stock Growth					
<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>1990 (Census)</i>	<i>2000 (Census)</i>	<i>2009 (DOF)</i>	<i>%Change 1990–2000</i>	<i>% Change 2000–2009</i>
Agoura Hills	6,927	6,993	7,590	0.09	7.9
Calabasas	7,857	8,107	8,615	3.1	5.9
Westlake Village	3,006	3,347	3,384	10.2	1.1
Los Angeles County	3,163,343	3,270,906	3,418,698	3.3	4.3
Simi Valley	33,111	37,272	42,010	11.2	11.3
Thousand Oaks	37,765	42,958	47,119	12.1	8.8
Ventura County	228,478	251,711	277,895	9.2	9.4

SOURCE: 1990, 2000 Census and California Department of Finance January, 2009.

Southern California Association of Governments Projections

SCAG’s 2008 Growth Forecast projects that by 2010 the City’s housing inventory will grow to 7,486 housing units, and continue to grow to 7,736 housing units in 2035. This represents a 3.2 percent increase in the City’s housing stock or an increase of 250 housing units over the 25-year period. The City 2009 existing housing unit inventory of 7,610 housing units provided by City staff exceeds SCAG projections for the years 2010 through 2020. The DOF 2009 estimate of 7,590 housing units exceeds the SCAG projections for the years 2010 and 2015.

■ Regional Housing Needs

State law requires all regional councils of governments, including SCAG, to determine the existing and projected housing need for its region and determine the portion allocated to each jurisdiction within the SCAG region. This is known as the “Regional Housing Needs Assessment” (RHNA) process. As defined by the RHNA, Agoura Hills new construction need for the period of 2008–2014 has been established at 110 new housing units, distributed among the four income categories; very low, low, moderate, and above moderate (SCAG 2007). As stated in the City’s Housing Element, the City will continue to provide sites for a mix of single family, multi-family and mixed use housing, supported by a variety of programs to enhance affordability to accommodate its RHNA and contribute towards addressing the growing demand for housing in Southern California.

In order to address the housing needs identified in the RHNA, Agoura Hills has adopted a number of provisions in its Zoning Ordinance that facilitate a range of residential development types and encourage affordable housing. These provisions are described in detail in the City of Agoura Hills 2008-2014 Housing Element. An example of these provisions includes the revision to the City’s Inclusionary Housing Program, which requires all new residential development with greater than 10 units to provide at least 15 percent of the total units for low and moderate-income households, or pay an in-lieu fee for fulfillment of the inclusionary housing requirement.

■ Jobs-Household Ratio

The jobs-household ratio in a jurisdiction is an overall indicator of job availability within an area, providing residents with an opportunity to work locally. Total employment in the City in 2008 was estimated to be 11,773; this number is based on the interpolation of the SCAG 2008 Growth Forecast employment estimates for the City in 2005 and 2010 (refer to Table 4.10-4 [SCAG 2008 Growth Forecast Projections for Population, Households, and Employment, 2005 to 2035]) (Stanley R. Hoffman Associates 2009). Based on the 2008 employment estimate of 11,773 jobs and the existing housing inventory of 7,610 housing units provided by City staff, the City's jobs to household ratio is 1.55 jobs per household.

Table 4.10-4 SCAG 2008 Growth Forecast Projections for Population, Households, and Employment, 2005 to 2035

Jurisdiction	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	Change (2005 to 2035)	Avg. Annual Growth
City of Agoura Hills									
Population	23,211	23,347	23,357	23,400	23,440	23,472	23,502	291	0.04%
Households	7,424	7,486	7,544	7,605	7,652	7,698	7,736	312	0.13%
Employment	11,520	11,942	12,277	12,491	12,743	13,011	13,269	1,749	0.44%
Jobs/Household Ratio	1.55	1.60	1.62	1.64	1.67	1.69	1.72	-	-
Los Angeles County									
Population	10,206,001	10,615,730	10,971,602	11,329,829	11,678,552	12,015,889	12,338,620	2,132,619	0.06%
Households	3,212,434	3,357,798	3,509,580	3,666,631	3,788,732	3,906,851	4,003,501	791,067	0.07%
Employment	4,397,025	4,552,398	4,675,875	4,754,731	4,847,436	4,946,420	5,041,172	644,147	4.2%
Jobs/Household Ratio	1.36	1.36	1.33	1.30	1.27	1.27	1.26	-	-

SOURCE: SCAG 2008 Growth Forecast

■ Projections

Table 4.10-4 (SCAG 2008 Growth Forecast Projections for Population, Households, and Employment, 2005 to 2035) presents total population, household, and employment projections through 2035 for the City of Agoura Hills based on SCAG's 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Growth Forecast. The table also includes data for Los Angeles County, for purposes of comparison. According to the 2008 Growth Forecast, the number of households within the City limits will increase at a rate of 0.13 percent annually between the years of 2005 and 2035 to 7,736 housing units in 2035. This 2035 household projection represents a net increase of 743 households over the 2000 U.S. Census baseline or a growth rate of 1.2 percent annually between 2000 and 2035.

Under the General Plan Update, the housing inventory in the City will be increased by 529 housing units over the 2009 housing stock of 7,610 provided by City staff, for a total of 8,139 housing units in 2035.

Full build out of the General Plan Update would result in the exceedance of SCAG's 2035 household projection by 403 housing units. Based on the City's 2009 housing stock, the proposed increase of 529 housing units under the General Plan Update, and the average population per household (pph) of 3.12 in the City, the increase in the number of households would result in direct population growth of approximately 1,650 residents, bringing the City's total 2035 population to approximately 25,231 residents.⁹ This population estimate exceeds the SCAG 2035 population project of 23,502 residents by 1,729 residents.

It should be noted that the City has not yet developed the total units forecasted in the existing General Plan (1993). Similarly, it is possible that the City would not see the population and household and employment projections described in the General Plan Update by 2035. These estimates are considered to be maximum scenarios and are used primarily for CEQA analysis. Actual growth, then, may be more in line with that projected by SCAG and the DOF.

Available employment within the City is projected to increase at a rate of 0.44 percent annually by adding 1,749 new jobs by 2035, according to SCAG projections. Based on the proposed build out under the General Plan Update of 1,850,907 square feet of retail/service, 3,431,448 square feet of office/business park, and 1,118,126 square feet of business park/manufacturing, a total of approximately 16,258 employment opportunities would be available in the City in 2035. This employment estimate exceeds the SCAG 2035 employment projections by approximately 2,629 jobs. The City's jobs/housing ratio would increase from 0.64 jobs per household in 2005 to 2.0 jobs per household in 2035, compared to 1.72 jobs per household in 2035 projected by SCAG.

The SCAG projections differ slightly from the population numbers generated by the DOF (2009). While acknowledging the disparity between the two sources, for purposes of this analysis it is assumed that the 2008 SCAG projections for 2035 are reasonably accurate.

4.10.2 Regulatory Framework

■ Federal

There are no federal regulations that apply to population, housing, and employment

■ State

Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

State law requires that all cities and counties provide a certain amount of housing to accommodate the demands of growing population. The California Department of Housing and Community Development is responsible for determining the statewide housing need, while local governments and councils of governments determine the specific housing needs within their jurisdictions and prepare a Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). SCAG prepares the RHNA for the County of Los Angeles, of

⁹ 8,139 housing units x 3.12 pph=25,231 residents

which the City of Agoura Hills is a part. The housing needs identified for a particular city are based on four income categories: very low income, low income, moderate income and above moderate income households.

SCAG’s RHNA for the planning years January 1, 2006 through June 30, 2014, projected a need for 110 new housing units within the City of Agoura Hills, allocated as follows: very low income (29 units), low (18 units), moderate (19 units) and above moderate (43 units). Construction of new housing is not mandated by the RHNA, but rather the RHNA is used as a planning tool and a guide to an equitable distribution of housing, and a city must show that the number of units could reasonably be accommodated under zoning and other regulatory provisions.

■ **Local**

Agoura Hills General Plan

The existing Housing Element (adopted 2009) of the City of Agoura Hills provides some guidance regarding population, employment, and housing within the City. Below are relevant policies:

Housing Element (adopted 2009)

- Goal 2** Assist in the Development of a Range of Housing Types to Meet the Diverse Needs of the Community.
 - Policy 2.4** Maintain a Citywide Inclusionary Housing Ordinance to facilitate private sector production of affordable housing. Establish the following priorities for the fulfillment of the inclusionary housing requirement:
 - 1st Priority: Provide the affordable units on-site;
 - 2nd Priority: Provide the affordable units off-site;
 - 3rd Priority: Dedication of land for affordable housing;
 - 4th Priority: Pay an in-lieu fee contribution to the Housing Trust Fund.
 - Policy 2.5** Within the Redevelopment Project Area, require projects to fulfill Redevelopment inclusionary requirements on an individual project, rather than an aggregate Project Area basis.
 - Policy 2.8** Promote public and private investment partnerships in the City for the development of low and moderate-income housing to serve the City’s workforce.
 - Policy 2.9** Encourage the inclusion of three and four bedroom units in new developments to support large families.
- Goal 3** Provide Opportunities for New Housing in a Variety of Locations and Densities to Meet the Diverse Needs of Agoura Hills Residents.
 - Policy 3.1** Provide zoning to enable the construction of a minimum of 109 new housing units during the 2008-2014 planning period,

including 47 units affordable to lower income households, to address the City's regional housing needs.

Policy 3.3

Facilitate the development of higher density residential/commercial mixed-use in the Agoura Village Specific Plan, including stand-alone residential development (horizontal mixed-use) and housing above ground floor commercial (vertical mixed-use).

Consistency Analysis

The General Plan Update would be consistent with the goals and policies of the City of Agoura Hills Housing Element 2008–2014. Implementation of the General Plan Update would allow for the development of 529 housing units over the 2009 housing inventory provided by the City, and would provide greater employment opportunities through the development of areas which have previously been underutilized with retail, commercial, and manufacturing uses. The General Plan Update would expand on the existing uses in the City.

4.10.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

■ **Analytic Method**

This analysis considers the population, household, and employment growth which might occur with implementation of the General Plan Update and explores whether this potential growth in population and housing falls within parameters established by local or regional forecasts.

■ **Thresholds of Significance**

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the 2009 CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, implementation of the proposed project may have a significant adverse impact if it would do any of the following:

- Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere
- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere

■ Effects Not Found to Be Significant

Threshold	<p>Would the proposed project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p> <p>Would the proposed project displace substantial numbers of existing people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p>
-----------	--

The General Plan Update would not displace substantial numbers of people or housing units and would result in *no impact* (Class III).

The General Plan Update would allow for areas of focused change and the potential for an increased density of existing uses. In select locations, land use designations would be amended to accommodate mixed use which would allow for residential uses within existing commercial centers. However, existing uses within the City would be allowed to remain. No specific development plans are proposed as part of the General Plan Update. Policies in the General Plan Update apply only to new developments within the City. Accordingly, implementation of the General Plan Update would not require demolition of existing residential units or the displacement of substantial numbers of existing people. The General Plan Update incorporates focused growth and development of residential uses to accommodate the forecasted growth in population. Therefore, implementation of the General Plan Update would have ***no impact*** (Class III) to population and housing due to the displacement of a substantial number of people.

■ Less-Than-Significant Impacts

Threshold	<p>Would the proposed project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</p>
-----------	--

Impact 4.10-1 Implementation of the General Plan Update would induce growth in the City, both directly and indirectly. However, the extent of this growth is not considered to be substantial in light of the existing infrastructure and the proposed plan for growth under the General Plan Update. Therefore, the proposed project will result in a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact.

The General Plan Update would allow for areas of focused change and the potential for an increased density of existing uses. In select locations, land use designations would be amended to accommodate mixed use which would allow for residential uses within existing commercial centers. However, no specific development plans are proposed as part of the General Plan Update. Therefore, the analysis below assumes a conservative estimate of population and employment activity.

It is important to note that the SCAG projections are based substantially on City-approved documents such as General Plans, specific plans, and entitlement approvals that SCAG receives directly from jurisdictions within the region. As the regional agency responsible for such actions, SCAG compiles the growth estimates received from these individual jurisdictions and generates projections for the region. At such time as the SCAG projections are released, regulatory documents such as a General Plan are

considered to be in compliance with SCAG projections, as the information contained in such documents has at that point been incorporated into the SCAG projections. SCAG updates the regional forecasts and projections approximately every five years. As time passes, the SCAG updates continue but communities are not always undertaking the process of updating the information that they provide to SCAG (i.e., updating their General Plan) at the same time that SCAG is updating their projections. As such, while a General Plan may be considered consistent with SCAG projections at one point, if SCAG updates their projections on the five year cycle and a jurisdiction updates their General Plan on a longer cycle, the General Plan will most likely not be consistent with SCAG projections at the time of General Plan approval. However, when SCAG next updates their projections, information regarding said General Plan will be sought by SCAG and included in the updated projections and the same General Plan will then be considered consistent with SCAG projections. Therefore, the fact that a General Plan may plan for growth greater than that projected by SCAG does, by itself, not result in a significant impact.

Full build out of the General Plan Update would allow for a total of 8,139 housing units in the City in 2035. For purposes of this analysis, the housing inventory provided by City staff will be used. As shown in Table 4.10-3 (Housing Stock Growth), City records indicate an existing housing inventory of 7,610 housing units. Assuming a maximum scenario of full buildout of residential uses permitted under the General Plan Update, the City's housing stock would increase by 529 new housing units by 2035. This increase in housing units would result in an exceedance of SCAG's 2035 household projection of 7,736, by 403 housing units. However, this worst-case exceedance of 403 housing units equates to approximately 5 percent of the housing stock of the City of Agoura Hills in 2035 and approximately 0.05 percent of the housing stock of Los Angeles County in 2035, and is not considered to be substantial in either case.

As shown in Table 4.10-4 (SCAG 2008 Growth Forecast Projections for Population, Households, and Employment, 2005 to 2035), based on the SCAG population projection for 2035, population is anticipated to increase by approximately 165 residents through 2035 without implementation of the proposed project.¹⁰ Using the DOF published average household size for the City of Agoura Hills in 2009 (3.12 persons per household), the proposed increase of 529 housing units under the General Plan Update would result in approximately 1,650 new residents by 2035.¹¹ This would increase population from the 2009 DOF estimate of 23,337 residents to 24,987 residents in 2035 under the General Plan Update. However, as a worst-case scenario estimate, the total future housing stock within the City of 8,139 dwelling units could result in a total population of 25,394 residents.¹² Therefore, a worst case scenario population increase as a result of the General Plan Update would exceed SCAG 2035 population projections of 23,502 residents, by 1,892 new residents. However, this worst-case exceedance of 1,892 residents equates to approximately 8 percent of the population of the City of Agoura Hills in 2035 and approximately 0.01 percent of the population of Los Angeles County in 2035, and is not considered to be substantial in either case.

¹⁰ SCAG 2035 population (23,502) - DOF 2009 population (23,337) = 165 persons

¹¹ Calculated as 529 dwelling units multiplied by 3.12 pph = 1,650 persons

¹² Future (2035) population calculated as 8,139 dwelling units multiplied by 3.12 person per household = 25,394 persons.

Implementation of the General Plan Update would result in greater employment opportunities in the City. Based on the proposed build out under the General Plan Update of 1,850,907 square feet (sf) of retail/service, 3,431,448 sf of office/business park, and 1,118,126 sf of business park/manufacturing; approximately 16,258 employment opportunities would be available in City in 2035¹³. This employment estimate exceeds the SCAG 2035 employment projection by 2,629 jobs. The City's jobs/housing ratio would increase from 1.55 jobs per household in 2009 to 2.0 jobs per household in 2035, compared to 1.72 jobs per household in 2035 projected by SCAG.

Although implementation of the General Plan Update would result in an increase in population, housing and job opportunities within City, the anticipated increases are not considered to be substantial within the context of the immediate region or Los Angeles County. As such, the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact. No mitigation measures are required.

■ Cumulative Impacts

The geographic context for the cumulative impacts associated with population and housing is Los Angeles County. Cumulative impacts are only addressed for those thresholds that have a project-related impact, whether it is less than significant, significant or significant and unavoidable. If “no impact” occurs, no cumulative analysis is provided for that threshold.

SCAG's population projection of Los Angeles County in 2035 is 12,338,620 persons, an increase of 2,819,282 persons over the County's population of 9,519,338 in 2000. SCAG projects that the population of the City of Agoura Hills will be 23,502 in 2035. The General Plan Update would allow for development that could induce, directly or indirectly, population growth in the LA County Region. The proposed project would increase housing opportunities in the City, inducing direct population growth of approximately 1,650 residents. Further, SCAG projects that employment within the City will increase from 11,520 jobs in 2010 to 13,269 jobs by 2035, an increase of 1,749 jobs. The employment growth resulting from the General Plan Update would be significantly greater than that estimated by SCAG for 2035, and would be on the order of 2,629 jobs, due primarily to the proposed increase of approximately 625,794 square feet of retail space, 1,098,291 square feet of office space, and 273,445 square feet of manufacturing space not anticipated by SCAG. While the existing population of the City of Agoura Hills accounts for less than 0.02 percent of the County's total population, and the population increase within the City would not be considered substantial in a cumulative context, it was not anticipated in SCAG's Growth Forecast. No feasible mitigation exists to mitigate this potentially significant impact. This impact is *significant and unavoidable* (Class I).

■ Mitigation Measures

No feasible mitigation measures are available to further reduce the identified less-than-significant impacts.

¹³ Assumes 1 employee/500 sf. of retail, 1 employee/300 sf. of office, and 1 employee/1,000 sf. of manufacturing.

■ Final Level of Significance

With the implementation of the General Plan Update policies and application of all local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to population, housing, and employment, the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact. Cumulative impacts would remain *significant and unavoidable* (Class I).

4.10.4 Draft General Plan Goals and Policies

Goal LU-1 **Growth and Change.** Sustainable growth and change through orderly and well-planned development that provides for the needs of existing and future residents and businesses, ensures the effective and equitable provision of public services, and makes efficient use of land and infrastructure.

Policy LU-1.1 **Building Intensity and Population Density.** Regulate the levels of building intensity and population density according to the standards and land use designations specified by the General Plan and Agoura Hills Municipal Code. Within these designations, cumulative development shall not exceed 8,139 housing units, 1,850,907 square feet of retail services, 3,431,448 square feet of business park/office uses, and 1,118,126 square feet of business park manufacturing uses.

Goal LU-2 **City of Diverse Uses.** A mix of land uses that meets the diverse needs of Agoura Hills' residents, offers a variety of employment opportunities, and allows for the capture of regional population and employment growth.

Policy LU-2.1 **Housing.** Provide opportunities for a full range of housing types, locations, and densities to address the community's fair share of regional housing needs, and provide market support to economically sustain commercial land uses in Agoura Hills. The mix, density, size, and location shall be determined based on the projected needs specified in the Housing Element.

Policy LU-2.3 **Employment Opportunities.** Provide for a variety of commercial uses that offer job opportunities for Agoura Hills' residents, including retail, office, light industrial, and research and development.

4.10.5 References

Agoura Hills, City of. 1993. *Agoura Hills General Plan*.

———. 2009. *Agoura Hills Housing Element 2008–2014*.

Agoura Hills Planning and Community Development Department. 2009. *Agoura Hills Existing and Proposed General Plan Buildout by TAZ*, May 15.

California Department of Finance. 1980. Report 84 E-4, Population Estimates for California Counties and Cities: January 1, 1976, through January 1, 1980.

- . 2002. Revised Historical City, County and State Population Estimates, 1991–2000, with 1990 and 2000 Census Counts. Sacramento, California, March.
- . 2008. E-4, Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and State 2001–2008 with 2000 DRU Benchmark. Sacramento, California, May 2008.
- . 2009. E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates. January 1.
- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2007. Final Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan- Planning Period (January 1, 2006-June 30, 2014) for Jurisdictions within Six-County SCAG Region.
- . 2008. Growth Forecasts.
- Stanley R. Hoffman Associates. 2009. Fiscal Impact Analysis, General Plan Update City of Agoura Hills. Table 4-1 (General Demographic and Economic Assumptions, 2008 City of Agoura Hills), page 20, February 6.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2000. American Fact Finder, Census 2000 Demographic Profile Highlights
- U.S. Department of Commerce. U.S. Census Bureau. 1990. *United States Census 1990*.
- . 2000. *United States Census 2000*.

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

This section of the EIR analyzes the potential environmental effects on public services from implementation of the General Plan Update. For purposes of this EIR, the public service analysis is divided into four subsections: (1) fire and emergency response; (2) police protection; (3) schools; and (4) library services. Cumulative impacts associated with fire and emergency response, police protection, schools, and library services are addressed at the end of each respective subsection. Data for this section were taken from various sources, including several previous studies, planning documents, and environmental documents that have been prepared which address the public services and facilities that serve the City. These resources include the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD), the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD), the Las Virgenes Unified School District (LVUSD), the Agoura Hills Public Works Department, the County of Los Angeles Public Library, the City of Agoura Hills General Plan Implementation Report (2004) and other related data sources.

No comment letters regarding public services were received in response to the April 30, 2009, Notice of Preparation circulated for the General Plan Update. Full bibliographic entries for all reference materials are provided in Section 4.11.17 (References) of this section.

Fire and Emergency Response

This section describes the current status of fire and emergency services in the City of Agoura Hills. Included in this section is a discussion of current staffing levels, equipment, response times, the performance standards that apply to these services and the ability of the City's fire and emergency response services to meet the current needs of the City. Data for this section was taken from correspondence and discussions with the Los Angeles County Fire Department and the City of Agoura Hills, the Las Virgenes–Malibu Council of Governments Hazard Mitigation Plan, the SEMS/NIMS Emergency Operations Plan, and the County of Los Angeles Fire Department 2007 Statistical Summary.

4.11.1 Environmental Setting

LACoFD provides fire protection and emergency services to residents of the City of Agoura Hills. LACoFD is responsible for protecting lives and property in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County and 58 cities within the County. Within the Las Virgenes–Malibu Region, Battalions 1 and 5 are assigned to serve six cities and over 65,000 residents. Throughout the County, the Department has 159 fire stations, 255 fire engines, 27 quints, 86 paramedic squads, 10 fire suppression camps, 14 dozer tenders, 10 helicopters, 26 Fire Prevention Offices, 8 Emergency Response Teams, and numerous other response vehicles and facilities.

■ Location and Staffing

LACoFD's main office is located at 1320 N Eastern Avenue, Los Angeles, California, 90063. Operating 9 divisions, 20 battalions, 159 fire stations, and 10 fire suppression camps, LACoFD responded to over

252,000 emergency incidents in 2007, the most current year for data reporting. Additionally, LACoFD has Planning, Information Management, Fire Prevention, Air and Wildland, Lifeguard, Forestry and Health Hazardous Materials Divisions which provide valuable services to the more than 3.5 million people who reside in the 1.1 million housing units located throughout the Department’s 2,278 square mile service area. LACoFD employs approximately 2,559 firefighters and 4,767 total personnel.

LACoFD has three fire stations that serve the City of Agoura Hills. Figure 4.11-1 (Community Facilities) identifies the locations of the fire stations near the City, and Table 4.11-1 (Fire Station Facilities) below describes the equipment and staffing for each station.

<i>Station No.</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Equipment</i>	<i>Staffing</i>
89	29575 Canwood Street, Agoura Hills	1 engine and 1 paramedic unit	3-person engine company (1 Fire Captain, 1 Fire Fighter Specialist, and 1 Fire Fighter) and 2-person paramedic squad (2 Fire Fighter/Paramedics)
65	4206 N. Cornell Road, Agoura	1 engine	3-person engine company (1 Fire Captain, 1 Fire Fighter Specialist, and 1 Fire Fighter)
125	5215 N. Las Virgenes Road, Calabasas	1 engine and 1 quint	3-person engine company (1 Fire Captain, 1 Fire Fighter Specialist, and 1 Fire Fighter) and 4-person quint (1 Fire Captain, 1 Fire Fighter Specialist and 2 Fire Fighters)

SOURCE: Letter from Frank Vidales, Acting Chief Forestry Division Prevention Services Bureau, County of Los Angeles Fire Department, May 13, 2009.

■ Urban and Wildland Fires

Urban fires are those affecting people or property within a fully built, urban setting. In the City of Agoura Hills and throughout Los Angeles County, urban fires are relatively common in comparison to wildland fires. A wildland fire is any uncontrolled fire that occurs in the wilderness and is usually triggered by lightning, drought, or accidents. The hills and mountainous areas of Southern California are considered to be interface areas susceptible to wildland fires. Agoura Hills contains both the classic wildland/urban interface, with well-defined urban and suburban development pressing up against open expanses of wildland areas, and the mixed wildland/urban interface, with isolated homes, subdivisions, and small communities situated predominately in wildland settings. The hazard zones associated with the risk of wildfire can be seen in Figure 4.6-1 (Hazards).


The City’s Community Emergency Response Team advises citizens to reduce their risk of fire hazards by clearing weeds and brush around homes that border wildlands, educating their family on the dangers of wildfires, and creating an emergency plan to coordinate their family’s response to an emergency. Division VII of the LACoFD, encompassing Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Malibu, West Hollywood, and Westlake Village, takes many steps to prevent a wildland fire from occurring within the Las Virgenes–Malibu Region. These steps include prescribed burning, a pre-fire management plan, staffing a Special Operations Bureau, designating the Las Virgenes–Malibu Region as part of the LACoFD Fire Prevention Region, a fuel modification plan, a Vegetation Management Program, a brush clearance program, and a Teleminder system to assist with the early warning of residents.

**CITY of AGOURA HILLS
General Plan Update EIR**


COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Legend

- Schools
- Community Facilities
- City Limits
- Parcel Boundaries
- County Boundary
- ~ Streams



Source: City of Agoura Hills, January 2007
D21377_Agoura_Hills\Community_Facilities.mxd



■ Response Time

Response time is defined as the time that elapses between the moment a call is received by dispatch and the moment when the first unit assigned to the call arrives at the scene. The average emergency response time for Agoura Hills in 2008 for first arriving units was 5 minutes and 15 seconds and the average non-emergency response time was 7 minutes and 20 seconds (Vidales 2009).

■ Standardized Emergency Management System

The Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) is an organizational and command structure required by California Government Code Section 8607(a) for the purpose of managing response to multi-agency and multi-jurisdiction emergencies in California. SEMS consists of five organizational levels, which are activated as necessary, and include: field response, local government, operational area, Office of Emergency Services (OES) Mutual Aid Regions, and State OES. In addition, SEMS incorporates the use of the Incident Command System (ICS), the Master Mutual Aid Agreement and existing mutual aid systems, the Operational Area Concept, the Operational Area Satellite Information System (OASIS), and multi-agency or inter-agency coordination. Agoura Hills has adopted a SEMS/NIMS Emergency Operations Plan for managing its response to multi-department and multi-jurisdiction emergencies and to facilitate communications and coordination between all levels of the system and among all responding departments and agencies. The City of Agoura Hills is located within Area B, in Los Angeles County, of the Southern Administrative Region of the State OES.

■ Mutual Aid Agreements

The foundation of California's emergency planning and response is a statewide mutual aid system which is designed to ensure that adequate resources, facilities, and other support is provided to jurisdictions whenever their own resources are inadequate to cope with a given situation. The *California Emergency Services Act* mandates the use of the California Disaster and Civil Defense Master Mutual Aid Agreement as the standard form of agreement between jurisdictions. The Master Mutual Aid Agreement creates a formal structure wherein the City retains control of its own facilities, personnel, and resources but may also receive or render assistance to/from other jurisdictions within the state. State government is obligated to provide available resources to assist the City in emergencies, however responsibility for the negotiation and preparation of mutual aid agreements rest with the local jurisdictions. Mutual aid agreements exist in law enforcement, fire services, medical and public works, building and safety, and emergency management.

There are six mutual aid regions in California. The City of Agoura Hills is located in Region I—the Office of Emergency Services Southern Administrative Region. The LACoFD has Automatic Aid agreements with the Los Angeles City Fire Department and the Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County. These agreements authorize the exchange of resources on an as-needed basis.

The LACoFD can also call on agencies other than fire services for support. These include local law enforcement, and state and federal agencies involved in fire hazard mitigation, response, and recovery,

including: the Office of Emergency Services, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, U.S. Forest Service, Office of Aviation Services, National Weather Service, and National Association of State Foresters, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and, in extreme cases, the Department of Defense.

4.11.2 Regulatory Framework

■ Federal

Federal Emergency Management Agency

In March 2003, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) became part of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. FEMA's continuing mission is to lead the effort to prepare the nation for all hazards and effectively manage federal response and recovery efforts following any major national incident. FEMA also initiates proactive mitigation activities, trains first responders, and manages the National Flood Insurance Program and the U.S. Fire Administration.

Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000

In 2000, the *Disaster Mitigation Act* amended the *Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief Act of 1988*. Among other things, this new legislation reinforces the importance of pre-disaster infrastructure mitigation planning to reduce disaster losses nationwide by controlling and streamlining the administration of federal disaster relief and developing programs that promote hazard mitigation activities. Among the Act's major provisions:

- Funding for pre-disaster mitigation activities
- Developing experimental multi-hazard maps to better understand risk
- Establishing state and local government infrastructure mitigation planning requirements
- Defining how states can assume more responsibility in managing the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP)
- Adjusting ways in which management costs for projects are funded

The mitigation planning provisions outlined in Section 322 of the Act establish performance-based standards for mitigation plans. The Act further requires states to provide for a public assistance program (Advance Infrastructure Mitigation [AIM]) to develop County government plans. Counties which fail to develop an infrastructure mitigation plan risk significant reduction in federal government assistance for repair/replacement of damaged facilities if that facility has been damaged on more than one occasion during the preceding 10-year period by a similar event.

Uniform Fire Code

The Uniform Fire Code includes specialized technical fire and life safety regulations which apply to the construction and maintenance of buildings and land uses. Topics addressed in the Code include fire

department access, fire hydrants, automatic sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems, fire and explosion hazards safety, hazardous materials storage and use, provisions intended to protect and assist fire responders, industrial processes, and many other general and specialized fire-safety requirements for new and existing buildings.

■ State

California Fire Code (Title 24, Part 9, California Code of Regulations)

The *California Fire Code* is Part 9 of the *California Code of Regulations* (CCR), Title 24, and is also referred to as the *California Building Standards Code* (CBSC). The CBSC combines the *Uniform Fire Code* with amendments necessary to address California's unique needs. The CBSC includes regulations which are consistent with nationally recognized standards of good practice, intended to facilitate protection of life and property. Among other things, its regulations address the mitigation of the hazards of fire explosion, management and control of the storage, handling, and use of hazardous materials and devices, mitigation of conditions considered hazardous to life or property in the use or occupancy of buildings and provisions to assist emergency response personnel.

California Health and Safety Code

State fire regulations set forth in Section 13000 et seq. of the *California Health and Safety Code* include building standards, fire protection and notification systems, provision of fire protection devices such as extinguishers and smoke alarms, high-rise building and childcare facility standards, and fire suppression training.

Office of Emergency Services

OES is the state's lead state agency for emergency management. The OES coordinates state response to major emergencies in support of local government, mobilizing state resources and obtaining federal resources; it also maintains oversight of the state's mutual aid system. OES is responsible for collecting, verifying, evaluating, and disseminating information about a given emergency and facilitating communication with and between local jurisdictions.

California Code of Regulations, Title 19

Title 19, Chapters one through six, of the CCR establishes regulations related to emergency response and preparedness under the OES.

■ Regional

Las Virgenes–Malibu Council of Governments Hazard Mitigation Plan

The Council's Hazard Mitigation Plan describes wildfire threats to the Las Virgenes–Malibu region and details the programs and policies the City of Agoura Hills has implemented to manage those risks.

■ Local

Agoura Hills Municipal Code

Article III, Chapter 1 (Fire Prevention)

Article III, Chapter 1 of the Agoura Hills Municipal Code adopts the California Fire Code, with modifications as listed in Section 3101, as the *Fire Prevention Regulations* of the City of Agoura Hills.

City of Agoura Hills Emergency and Hazard Plans

The City of Agoura Hills has a number of emergency and hazard plans to prepare for and mitigate the impacts of natural disasters and catastrophic emergencies. These plans are kept on file with the City and outline prevention and response procedures as well as cooperation agreements. The plan applicable to this section is the Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS).

4.11.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

■ Analytic Method

Information on existing service levels of service, collected from the LACoFD, was compared against conditions reasonably expected to occur with implementation of the General Plan Update. The LACoFD has indicators of need for additional resources and staffing, which include response times, incident loads, resident and transient population, and square footage thresholds. Proposed policies and changes in land use types and intensities in the General Plan Update were compared against such indicators to determine if any significant impacts on fire protection services would occur.

■ Thresholds of Significance

For the purposes of this EIR, implementation of the General Plan Update would result in substantial adverse physical impacts if it would do the following:

- Result in the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection.

■ Effects Not Found to Be Significant

Threshold	Would the project result in the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection?
-----------	--

Implementation of the General Plan Update could result in an increased demand for fire protection services. However, it would not result in the provision of or need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection. Therefore, there would be *no impact* (Class III).

The General Plan Update would allow for the amendment of land use designations and the potential for an increase in densities of existing uses in select areas. In select locations, land use designations would be amended to accommodate mixed use, which would allow for residential uses in an area that is currently utilized for commercial purposes. In all cases, existing uses within the City would be allowed to remain under the General Plan Update.

As discussed in Section 4.10 (Population, Housing, and Employment), development under the General Plan Update would increase the population in the City by approximately 1,713 people to a total of 25,394 residents. However, an increase in population alone would not increase the need for additional fire protection services. The provision of fire stations varies more as a function of the geographic distribution of structures, vehicular incidents, and vacant land with combustible vegetation than an increase in population. The LACoFD's service goals are based on accepted service levels, such as response times, incident loads, resident and transient population, and square footage thresholds. The City is served by three fire stations with 2008 emergency response times estimated at approximately 5 minutes and 15 seconds (Vidales 2009). One of these, Fire Station No. 89 in the City, was recently constructed. Based on current service goals and levels of service, the LACoFD is operating at acceptable levels of fire protection service.

The increase in population and future new development in the City could require fire stations to compensate for additional demand for fire protection services. However, the Los Angeles County Fire Department's 5-Year Master Fire Station Plan does not indicate that additional station(s) are planned for the City of Agoura Hills (Vidales 2009). Policies contained in the General Plan Update require that adequate infrastructure be provided as new development occurs. For example, compliance with Goal CS-6 (Coordination of Fire and Emergency Services) and Policy CS-6.1 (Support the Los Angeles County Fire Department) would facilitate cooperation with the LACoFD to ensure that the City continues to receive adequate fire protection and prevention services. Policy CS-6.2 (Coordination with Other Agencies), Policy CS-6.3 (Agoura Hills CERT Response Team), Policy CS-6.4 (Emergency Response), CS-6.5 (Adequate Infrastructure), and Policy CS-6.6 (New Development) would further coordinate fire protection and emergency medical services to support the needs of residents and businesses in the community. Policy S-3.1 (Coordination with the Los Angeles County Fire Department),

Policy S-3.2 (Wildfire Mitigation), Policy S-3.3 (New Development), Policy S-3.4 (Fire Protection Systems), Policy S-3.5 (Funding), Policy S-3.6 (Fire Inspections), Policy S-3.7 (SEMS Plan), Policy S-3.8 (Fire Department Review), and Policy S-3.9 (Fuel Modification) would further ensure that increased development associated with the General Plan Update would comply with fire protection regulations. Any new development that would occur under the General Plan Update would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations governing the provision of fire protection services, including adequate fire access and fire hydrants. The *Fire Prevention Regulations* of the City of Agoura Hills have provisions that include construction standards for new structures and remodels, road configuration design standards to accommodate fire equipment, and requirements for minimum fire flow rates for water mains. Additionally, to comply with the County required fee schedule, the City has adopted a developer fee ordinance for new residential, commercial, and industrial construction that helps to mitigate impacts to fire protection and emergency services (Vidales 2009). The fee is given to the County, and is typically used for fire sprinkler inspection in new buildings and to support Fire Station 89, the primary fire station for the City of Agoura Hills (Adeva 2009).

The General Plan Update does not specifically identify the need for additional fire protection facilities in the City, the construction of which has the potential to result in significant environmental impacts. Similarly, no such facilities are currently planned by the County to serve the City. Therefore, the proposed General Plan would result in **no impact** (Class III) to the construction of new fire protection facilities that could cause a significant environmental impact, and no mitigation measures are necessary. If it is determined at a later date that new facilities would need to be constructed to accommodate increased demand on fire protection services, further environmental review beyond this EIR would be required as project-specific plans are developed. All new development would be subject to the City's environmental review process, which includes project-specific environmental review under CEQA.

■ **Less-Than-Significant Impacts**

There are no effects from implementation of the General Plan Update that would result in less-than-significant impacts with respect to fire services and emergency response.

■ **Significant and Unavoidable Impacts**

There are no significant and unavoidable impacts from implementation of the General Plan Update with regard to fire and emergency response.

■ **Cumulative Impacts**

The City of Agoura Hills is located within the County of Los Angeles, an area which is expected to continue to experience significant growth over the next twenty-five years. The regional context for the discussion of cumulative impacts is the western end of Los Angeles County, which is bordered by Topanga Canyon Boulevard (SR-27) to the east, the Pacific Ocean to the south, and Ventura County to the north and west. Cumulative impacts are only addressed for those thresholds that have a project-

related impact, whether it is less than significant, significant, or significant and unavoidable. If “no impact” occurs, no cumulative analysis is provided for that threshold.

The General Plan Update is anticipated to result in no impact relating to alteration of existing or construction of new fire protection facilities in the City of Agoura Hills. As such, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulative impact. The proposed project would result in *no cumulative impact* (Class III).

■ Mitigation Measures

With implementation of policies within the General Plan Update there would be no impact. No mitigation measures are necessary.

■ Final Level of Significance

With the implementation of the General Plan Update policies and application of all local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to fire services, the proposed project would result in *no impact* (Class III). The proposed project would result in *no cumulative impact* (Class III).

4.11.4 Draft General Plan Goals and Policies

Policies relating to fire protection were identified in the Infrastructure and Community Services Chapter and the Community Safety Chapter of the General Plan Update.

- Goal CS-6** **Coordination of Fire and Emergency Services.** Coordinated fire protection and emergency medical services that support the needs of residents and businesses and maintain a safe and healthy community.
- Policy CS-6.1** **Support the Los Angeles County Fire Department.** Continue to work with and support the Los Angeles County Fire Department to ensure adequate personnel, facilities, and infrastructure needs to maintain a high level of fire protection and emergency services within the City.
- Policy CS-6.2** **Coordination with Other Agencies.** Coordinate with the Ventura County Fire Department and Los Angeles County Fire Department to provide assistance during emergency situations that require outside help.
- Policy CS-6.3** **Agoura Hills CERT.** Support the efforts of the Agoura Hills Community Emergency Response Team (CERT).
- Policy CS-6.4** **Emergency Response.** Continue to monitor emergency response to citywide disasters to determine if service improvements are needed.
- Policy CS-6.5** **Adequate Infrastructure.** Continue to monitor the water pressure for fire suppression and evaluate and implement feasible solutions.

- Policy CS-6.6 New Development.** Require all new developments to implement measures to reduce the potential for fire hazards, including incorporating fire prevention suppression systems.
- Goal S-3 Protection from Fire Hazards.** Persons and property in Agoura Hills protected from urban and wildland fires.
- Policy S-3.1 Coordination with the Los Angeles County Fire Department.** Cooperate with the Los Angeles County Fire Department in periodically evaluating services and service criteria to ensure that the City continues to receive adequate fire protection and prevention services.
- Policy S-3.2 Wildfire Mitigation.** Coordinate with the Los Angeles County Fire Department on appropriate wildland fire mitigation.
- Policy S-3.3 New Development.** Continue to ensure that all new development incorporates current state, county, and City, fire safe building code requirements, as appropriate.
- Policy S-3.4 Fire Protection Systems.** Require all new commercial and multiple-unit residential developments to install fire protection systems, as required by the state and City buildings and fire codes, and encourage the use of automatic sprinkler systems in existing structures.
- Policy S-3.5 Funding.** Ensure that new developments pay a pro-rata share for increased fire protection as necessitated by that particular development.
- Policy S-3.6 Fire Inspection.** Work with the County Fire Department to ensure an ongoing fire inspection program to reduce fire hazards associated with critical facilities, public assembly facilities, industrial buildings, and nonresidential buildings.
- Policy S-3.7 SEMS Plan.** Incorporate and periodically review fire prevention and protection procedures in the City’s Standardized Emergency Management Systems (SEMS) Plan.
- Policy S-3.8 Fire Department Review.** Continue review by the Los Angeles County Fire Department of proposed structures and developments within the community, as applicable, to assure adequacy of structural fire protection, access for fire fighting, water supply, and vegetation management.
- Policy S-3.9 Fuel Modification.** Ensure that new development complies with fuel modification requirements of the Los Angeles County Fire Department while protecting natural resources and habitat to the extent feasible, and encouraging design that minimizes the need for fuel modification on public parklands, to the extent feasible.

Police Protection

This section defines the current status of police protective services in the City of Agoura Hills and describes the staffing levels, equipment, staffing standards, number of and types of calls received, and crime prevention programs available. The section assesses the impact of the General Plan Update and related public service policies on police services within the City. Data for this section were taken from correspondence with the City of Agoura Hills as well as the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) staff and website.

4.11.5 Environmental Setting

Law enforcement services in the City of Agoura Hills are provided through a contract with the LASD. Protection services include emergency and nonemergency police response, routine police patrols, investigative services, traffic enforcement and investigation, parking code enforcement, SWAT teams, specialized detective units, and air support.

■ Locations and Staffing

There is no police station located within the City of Agoura Hills. The LASD provides the City with police services from its Malibu/Lost Hills Station, located at 27050 Agoura Road, Calabasas, CA, 91301, approximately 0.5 mile from Agoura's eastern boundary. The Malibu/Lost Hills station serves 5 contract cities (including Agoura Hills) and the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County within an area encompassing approximately 180 square miles. One captain, 6 lieutenants, 19 sergeants, 48 deputies, and 33 non-sworn personnel are shared within the service area. Agoura Hills contracts for 13 deputies and ¼ of a non-sworn employee.

■ Level of Service

According to staff at the Malibu/Lost Hills Station, Agoura Hills is served with 1 deputy per 1,722 residents, which is considered an acceptable ratio (Smith 2009). The average emergency response time for the month of February, 2009, was 4.8 minutes. The average non-emergency response time during the same period was 17.7 minutes. Both these times are considered acceptable. The acceptable ratios are determined by the City Manager of Agoura Hills and the Unit Commander of the Malibu/Lost Hills Station, who meet quarterly to discuss response times, crime trends, vehicle break-ins, and the protection needs of the City. All contracted cities served by the Malibu/Lost Hills Station meet annually to discuss regional goals and needs (Hamburger 2009).

■ Future Expansion

There are no current plans for future expansion of the existing police facility, staff, or general equipment inventory.

4.11.6 Regulatory Framework

■ Federal

There are no federal policies that are directly applicable to police protection within the City of Agoura Hills.

■ State

There are no state policies that are directly applicable to police protection within the City of Agoura Hills.

■ Regional

Los Angeles County Code

Chapter 2.34

Chapter 2.34 of the Los Angeles County Code outlines certain duties of the office of sheriff and directs the sheriff to enforce the specified provisions.

■ Local

There are no local policies that are directly applicable to police protection within the City of Agoura Hills.

4.11.7 Project Impacts and Mitigation

■ Analytic Method

Information on existing service levels collected from the LASD was compared against conditions reasonably expected to occur with implementation of the General Plan Update. The Unit Commander of the Malibu/Lost Hills Station and the City Manager of Agoura Hills cooperate to develop criteria that determine the need for additional resources and staffing. Proposed policies and development changes in the General Plan Update were compared against current conditions to determine if any significant impacts on police protection would occur.

■ Thresholds of Significance

For the purposes of this EIR, implementation of the General Plan Update would result in substantial adverse physical impacts if it would do the following:

- Result in the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities, need for new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant

environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection.

■ Effects Not Found to Be Significant

Threshold	Would the project result in the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities, need for new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection?
-----------	--

Implementation of the General Plan Update could in an increased demand for police protection services. However, it would not result in the provision of or need for new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection. Therefore, there would be *no impact* (Class III).

The General Plan Update would allow for the amendment of land use designations and the potential for an increase in densities of existing uses in select locations. In certain areas, land use designations would be amended to accommodate mixed use, which would allow for residential uses in an area that is currently utilized for commercial purposes. In all cases, existing uses within the City would be allowed to remain under the General Plan Update.

The Unit Commander of the Malibu/Lost Hills Station works with the City Manager of Agoura Hills to develop a standard personnel-to-population ratio to determine optimum staffing levels (Smith 2009). The Malibu/Lost Hills Station currently maintains a ratio of 1 deputy per 1,722 residents for the City of Agoura Hills. Assuming the Malibu/Lost Hills Station would continue to have 13 deputies assigned to the City of Agoura Hills, implementation of the General Plan Update would result in a population increase of approximately 1,713 people, as identified in Section 4.10 (Population, Housing, and Employment), creating a personnel-to-population ratio of 1 deputy per 1,953 residents. The LASD's main indicator of effectiveness is its response time to emergency calls. The Malibu/Lost Hills Station's average emergency response time to Agoura Hills is 4.8 minutes, with an average non-emergency response time of 17.7 minutes. Both of these times are currently considered acceptable (Smith 2009). Other indicators of effectiveness include volume of calls for service and the number of available officers available at any given time. However, compliance with Goal CS-7 (Police and Emergency Services) and Policy CS-7.1 (Support Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department) would facilitate cooperation with the LASD to ensure that the City continues to receive adequate police protection and prevention services.

Based on the information provided in crime statistics, Agoura Hills is considered to be a generally safe city and the increase in population resulting from the proposed infill uses is not anticipated to substantially increase crime within the City, according to historical trends. Compliance with Goal CS-7 (Police and Emergency Services) and Policy CS-7.1 (Support Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department) would facilitate cooperation with the LASD to ensure that the City continues to receive adequate police protection and prevention services. Policy CS-7.2 (Coordination with Other Agencies), Policy CS-7.3

(Graffiti Removal), and Policy CS-7.4 (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design) would further coordinate police protection to support the needs of residents and businesses in the community. Policy S-4.1 (Support Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department), Policy S-4.2 (Agency Cooperation), Policy S-4.3 (Public Education), Policy S-4.4 (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design [CPTED]), Policy S-4.5 (Development Review) and Policy S-4.6 (Evacuation Planning) would further ensure that increased development associated with the General Plan Update would comply with police protection regulations. Therefore, according to these goals and policies, police staffing and facilities would likely be able to maintain adequate service levels while serving the needs of any new development associated with the General Plan Update, and any associated additional demands upon police protection services.

The General Plan Update does not specifically identify the need for additional police protection facilities in the City, the construction of which could result in potentially significant environmental impacts. The LASD also does not currently have plans for expansion of facilities, equipment, or staff. Therefore, the General Plan Update would result in **no impact** (Class III) to the construction of new facilities that could cause a significant environmental impact, and no mitigation measures are necessary. If new facilities would need to be constructed at a later date to accommodate increased demand on police protection services, further environmental review in addition to this EIR would be required as project-specific plans are developed. All new development would be subject to the City's environmental review process, which includes project-specific environmental review under CEQA.

■ **Less-Than-Significant Impacts**

There are no effects from implementation of the General Plan Update that would result in less-than-significant impacts with respect to police protection.

■ **Significant and Unavoidable Impacts**

There are no significant and unavoidable impacts from implementation of the General Plan Update with regard to police protection.

■ **Cumulative Impacts**

The City of Agoura Hills is located within the County of Los Angeles, an area which is expected to continue to experience significant growth over the next twenty-five years. The regional context for the discussion of cumulative impacts is the western end of Los Angeles County, which is bordered by Topanga Canyon Boulevard (SR-27) to the east, the Pacific Ocean to the south, and Ventura County to the north and west. This region is the service area of the LASD Malibu/Lost Hills Station, which includes Agoura Hills and the adjacent cities of Westlake Village and Calabasas. Cumulative impacts are only addressed for those thresholds that have a project-related impact, whether it is less than significant, significant, or significant and unavoidable. If "no impact" occurs, no cumulative analysis is provided for that threshold.

The General Plan Update is anticipated to result in no impact from the alteration of police protection facilities that currently serve the City of Agoura Hills, or from construction of new facilities, either which may cause significant environmental impacts. As such, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulative impact. The proposed project would result in *no cumulative impact* (Class III).

■ Mitigation Measures

With implementation of policies within the General Plan Update there would be no impact. No mitigation measures are necessary.

■ Final Level of Significance

With the implementation of the General Plan Update policies and application of all local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to fire services, the proposed project would result in *no impact* (Class III). The proposed project would result in *no cumulative impact* (Class III).

4.11.8 Draft General Plan Goals and Policies

Policies relating to police protection were identified in the Infrastructure and Community Services Chapter and the Community Safety Chapter of the General Plan Update.

Goal CS-6 **Coordination of Fire and Emergency Services.** Coordinated fire protection and emergency medical services that support the needs of residents and businesses and maintain a safe and healthy community.

Policy CS-6.1 **Support the Los Angeles County Fire Department.** Continue to work with and support the Los Angeles County Fire Department to ensure adequate personnel, facilities, and infrastructure needs to maintain a high level of fire protection and emergency services within the City.

Policy CS-6.2 **Coordination with Other Agencies.** Coordinate with the Ventura County Fire Department and Los Angeles County Fire Department to provide assistance during emergency situations that require outside help.

Policy CS-6.3 **Agoura Hills CERT Response Team.** Support the efforts of the Agoura Hills Community Emergency Response Team (CERT).

Goal CS-7 **Police and Emergency Services.** Quality police protection and emergency services that protect the long-term health, safety, and well-being of residents, businesses, and visitors.

Policy CS-7.1 **Support Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.** Continue to work with and support the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department to ensure adequate personnel, facility, and

infrastructure to provide police protection and emergency services.

Policy CS-7.2 Coordination with Other Agencies. Coordinate with the California Highway Patrol and other nearby law enforcement and emergency agencies to provide assistance during emergency situations requiring outside help.

Policy CS-7.3 Graffiti Removal. Continue to implement the City's graffiti removal program.

Policy CS-7.4 Crime Prevention through Environmental Design. Encourage the use of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED), or other comparable concepts, to increase the perception of public safety and decrease the opportunity for crime.

Goal S-4 Protection from Crime. Persons and property in Agoura Hills protected from criminal activities.

Policy S-4.1 Support Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. Support the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department in periodically evaluating services and service criteria to ensure that the City continues to receive adequate law enforcement services.

Policy S-4.2 Agency Cooperation. Continue to cooperate with the California Highway Patrol and other nearby law enforcement agencies, such as the Ventura County Sheriff's Department, to provide backup police assistance in emergency situations.

Policy S-4.3 Public Education. Encourage citizen participation in public safety programs, such as Neighborhood Watch, and facilitate educational programs dealing with personal safety awareness.

Policy S-4.4 Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED). Use defensible space concepts (site and building lighting, visual observation of open spaces, secured areas, etc.) in the design of all new development.

Policy S-4.5 Development Review. Provide for law enforcement review of applicable projects as part of the review process.

Policy S-4.6 Evacuation Planning. Coordinate evacuation planning among the Los Angeles County Fire and Sheriff's departments, the California Highway Patrol, the City of Agoura Hills Community Emergency Response Team (CERT), and law enforcement agencies in other local jurisdictions.

Schools

This section describes existing school facilities, education programs, and planned improvements within the Las Virgenes Unified School District (LVUSD). The section also reviews current state and regional policy regarding new school development. Data for this section was taken from correspondence with

representatives from the LVUSD, the California Department of Education and Office of Public School Construction websites, and the LVUSD website.

4.11.9 Environmental Setting

■ Schools

The City of Agoura Hills is served by the Las Virgenes Unified School District (LVUSD). The LVUSD serves the cities of Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, and Calabasas, as well as unincorporated County areas south of Agoura Hills. The District's main offices are located at 4111 N. Las Virgenes Road, Calabasas, California, 91302. The total K–12 enrollment in the district is approximately 11,627 students (California DOE 2009). As shown in Table 4.11-2 (Public Schools Located in the City of Agoura Hills), the LVUSD operates seven schools in the City of Agoura Hills: one high school, one continuation high school, one middle school, three elementary schools and one alternative elementary school, located on the campus of Sumac Elementary School. Currently, the LVUSD schools within the City of Agoura Hills are serving 4,745 students. All of the public schools in Agoura Hills are operating below maximum capacity. Table 4.11-2 (Public Schools Located in the City of Agoura Hills) includes capacity levels and total enrollment at the LVUSD schools within Agoura Hills. Figure 4.11-1 (Community Facilities) identifies the locations of all schools within Agoura Hills.

Table 4.11-2 Public Schools Located in the City of Agoura Hills

Map #	School	Address	Grades	Capacity	Enrollment (2008/09)
1	Agoura High School	28545 West Driver Ave.	9–12	2,284	2,136
2	Indian Hills High School	28545 West Driver Ave.	9–12	160	47
3	Lindero Canyon Middle School	5844 Larboard Lane	6–8	1,260	1,063
4	Willow Elementary School	29026 Laro Drive	K–5	624	505
5	Yerba Buena Elementary School	6098 Reyes Adobe Road	K–5	552	423
6	Sumac Elementary School	6050 North Calmfield Ave.	K–5	708	481
7	Mariposa Elementary School of Global Education	6050 North Calmfield Ave.	K–5	Shared w/Sumac	90

SOURCE: Las Virgenes Unified School District website 2009, Phone conversation with Kathy Petrash (March 2009). Enrollment figures are from the CDE California Public Schools Las Virgenes Unified School District Report dated May 26, 2009.

4.11.10 Regulatory Framework

■ Federal

There are no federal education regulations applicable to the proposed project.

■ State

California State Assembly Bill 2926 (AB 2926)—School Facilities Act of 1986

AB 2926 was passed in 1986 and is known as the *School Facilities Act*. The Act authorizes collection of school facilities fees by local districts in connection with new construction to generate revenue for capital acquisitions and improvements. AB 2926 also established the maximum fees (adjustable for inflation) that may be collected under this and any other school fee authorization program.

AB 1600, adopted in 1987, amended the *School Facilities Act of 1986*, adding Section 66000 et seq. of the Government Code. Under the terms of this statute, payment of statutory fees by a developer fully mitigates the potential impacts of a development on school facilities for purposes of CEQA. Subsequent legislative actions have alternatively expanded and contracted the limits placed on school fees by AB 2926.

Effective March 12, 2008, the Las Virgenes Unified School District notified the City of Agoura Hills that the school developer fees would increase to \$2.97 per square foot of residential construction and \$0.47 per square foot of commercial or industrial construction.

California Senate Bill 50 (SB 50)—Leroy Green School Facilities Program (1998)

SB 50 defined the Needs Analysis process in Government Code Sections 65995.5–65998. Under the provisions of SB 50, school districts may collect fees to offset the costs associated with increasing school capacity as a result of development. The fees (referred to as Level One fees) are assessed based upon the proposed square footage of residential, commercial/industrial, and/or parking structure uses.

Mello Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982

The *Mello Roos Act* allows school districts to establish a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD) to finance school construction through the issuance and sale of municipal bonds guaranteed through a Special Tax Lien against all properties within the CFD area.

■ Regional

Las Virgenes Unified School District

Measure G

On June 6, 2006, local voters approved Measure G, a \$128 million bond measure to make the following improvements throughout the District:

To maintain excellent local schools, repair and upgrade outdated science and technology facilities, classrooms and restrooms, replace aging trailers with modern classrooms, improve fire, security, and emergency systems, and upgrade computer and instructional technology.

The measure promised to upgrade the District’s older schools, particularly renovate Lindero Canyon Middle School, maintain district-wide technology upgrades, and install and upgrade fire prevention, security and emergency response systems at every school so that all students are safe.

■ Local

City of Agoura Hills Municipal Code

§6400: Adoption of Interim School Facilities’ Financing Ordinance

This section of the City’s Municipal Code adopts Title 4, Revenue and Finance, Chapter 4.52, Interim School Facilities’ Financing, as amended and in effect on April 1, 1983, as the interim school facilities’ financing ordinance of the City of Agoura Hills. This ordinance provides for interim classrooms and related facilities at overcrowded schools.

4.11.11 Project Impacts and Mitigation

■ Analytic Method

Information on existing levels of service collected from the LVUSD was compared against conditions reasonably expected to occur with implementation of the General Plan Update. Proposed policies and development changes in the General Plan Update were compared against current conditions to determine if significant impacts to schools would occur.

■ Thresholds of Significance

For the purposes of this EIR, implementation of the General Plan Update would result in substantial adverse physical impacts if it would do the following:

- Result in the provision of new or physically altered school facilities, need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for schools.

■ Effects Not Found to Be Significant

Threshold	Would the project result in the provision of new or physically altered school facilities, need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for schools?
-----------	--

Implementation of the General Plan Update could result in increased use of school facilities. However, it would not result in the provision of or need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for schools. Therefore, there would be *no impact* (Class III).

The General Plan Update would allow for the amendment of land use designations and the potential for an increase in densities of existing uses in specific areas. In select locations, land use designations would be amended to accommodate mixed use, which would allow for residential uses in an area that is currently utilized for commercial purposes. In all cases, existing uses within the City would be allowed to remain under the General Plan Update.

LVUSD enrollment has experienced a slight decline over the past five years, but remains consistent with enrollment numbers from ten years ago. As shown in Table 4.11-2 (Public Schools Located in the City of Agoura Hills), all of the public schools administered by the LVUSD within the City of Agoura Hills currently operate below the allowable capacity. Recent bond measures have encouraged renovation projects, remodeling, and classroom expansion.

Full build out of the General Plan Update could result in up to 413 additional multi-family dwelling units and 116 additional single-family units, for a total of 529 dwelling units. Based on the generation factors of 0.66 elementary school-age children per household, 0.12 middle school-age children per household, and 0.1367 high-school age children per household, the proposed project would result in approximately 484 additional school-age residents.¹⁴¹⁵ When combined with the 4,745 currently enrolled students, the expected increase of the General Plan Update would not exceed the student capacity of 5,588 within the City of Agoura Hills. This increase would be further addressed through the payment of school fees, required for all new development. These fees are based on the use and size of a project.

Additionally, policies contained in the General Plan Update require that adequate school infrastructure be provided as new development occurs. For example, compliance with Goal CS-8 (Educational System) and Policy CS-8.1 (Educational Services) would support the LVUSD and private schools to provide educational services to ensure that the City's school-aged residents continue to receive adequate access to schools. Policy CS-8.2 (Expand and Improve Facilities) and Policy CS-8.3 (Joint-Use Facilities) would further coordinate educational services to support the needs of residents in the community and ensure that increased development associated with the General Plan Update would not negatively impact the school system in Agoura Hills.

As school fees are collected from residential, commercial, and industrial uses, developers are required to fund necessary school service and facility improvements to accommodate anticipated population and school enrollment growth within the service area of the LVUSD. If new facilities would need to be constructed at a future date accommodate increased demand on schools, further environmental review separate from this EIR would be required as project-specific plans are developed. All new private development would be subject to the City's environmental review process which includes project-specific environmental review under CEQA. However, no new educational facilities are expected to be necessary to accommodate the growth proposed under the General Plan Update, and so the proposed General Plan would not result in school facility construction that has the potential to result in significant

¹⁴ Sebring, Nancy. 2008. The Ocean View School District uses generation rates based on single family detached units, Email correspondence with Ocean View School District, February.

¹⁵ Huntington Beach Union High School District. 2006. Development Fee Justification Report and School Facilities Needs Analysis.

environmental impacts. Therefore, the General Plan Update would result in *no impact* (Class III). No mitigation measures are necessary.

■ **Less-Than-Significant Impacts**

There are no effects from implementation of the General Plan Update that would result in less-than-significant impacts with respect to schools.

■ **Significant and Unavoidable Impacts**

There are no significant and unavoidable impacts from implementation of the General Plan Update with regard to schools.

■ **Cumulative Impacts**

The City of Agoura Hills is located within the County of Los Angeles, an area which is expected to continue to experience significant growth over the next twenty-five years. The regional context for the discussion of cumulative impacts is the western end of Los Angeles County, which is bordered by Topanga Canyon Boulevard (SR-27) to the east, the Pacific Ocean to the south, and Ventura County to the north and west. The LVUSD serves within this geographic area. Cumulative impacts are only addressed for those thresholds that have a project-related impact, whether it is less than significant, significant, or significant and unavoidable. If “no impact” occurs, no cumulative analysis is provided for that threshold.

The General Plan Update is anticipated to result in no impact to the construction of educational facilities currently serving the City of Agoura Hills that could have a significant environmental impact. As such, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulative impact. The proposed project would result in *no cumulative impact* (Class III).

■ **Mitigation Measures**

With implementation of policies within the General Plan Update there would be no impact with regards to schools. No mitigation measures are necessary.

■ **Final Level of Significance**

With the implementation of the General Plan Update policies and application of all local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to fire services, the proposed project would result in *no impact* (Class III). The proposed project would result in *no cumulative impact* (Class III).

4.11.12 Draft General Plan Goals and Policies

Policies relating to school services were identified in the Infrastructure and Community Services Chapter of the General Plan Update.

- Goal CS-8** **Educational System.** Quality education to all kindergarten-, elementary school-, middle school-, and high school-aged residents.
- Policy CS-8.1** **Educational Services.** Support the Las Virgenes Unified School District and private schools to provide educational services to all kindergarten-, elementary school-, middle school-, and high school-aged residents.
- Policy CS-8.2** **Expand and Improve Facilities.** Cooperate with the Las Virgenes Unified School District to expand or upgrade its facilities.
- Policy CS-8.3** **Joint-Use Facilities.** Continue to coordinate with the Las Virgenes Unified School District in the utilization of joint school/park facilities for recreational purposes.

Library Services

This section describes the City of Agoura Hills' existing library services, facilities, and staffing. Data for this section were taken from the City of Agoura Hills and the County of Los Angeles Public Library, as well as discussions with library staff.

4.11.13 Environmental Setting

■ Library Facilities

The Agoura Hills Library serves the City of Agoura Hills. This County of Los Angeles Public Library is located within the City of Agoura Hills and is part of the County of Los Angeles Public Library system. Figure 4.11-1 (Community Facilities) shows the location of the Agoura Hills Library, which is part of the City's Civic Center.

■ Library Services

The Agoura Hills Library offers a number of services to assist users. Computer services include an on-line library catalogue, access to a variety of research databases, as well as Internet and CD-ROM workstation access. The facility has a copy center, two conference rooms, and a children's program featuring Toddler and Preschool Storytimes and Summer Reading (County of Los Angeles Public Library 2008).

The Friends of the Agoura Hills Public Library is a self-organized and self-supported group consisting of people who are interested in promoting the library's welfare and growth. The group has an ongoing book

sale in the Book Cellar bookstore every Saturday, and also offers a rental bestseller collection and rental DVD program) (County of Los Angeles Public Library 2008).

Library Usage

The library has experienced a growing number of members recently due to the economic recession. Over the past six months, an increased number of residents have been using the library to borrow DVDs, use the internet to look for jobs, and attend free entertainment programming. Despite this recent growth, circulation levels have remained consistent over the past few years, with 221,266 items in circulation from July 2008 to June 2009 (Sagi 2009). Based on the January 2009 population reported in Section 4.10 (Population, Housing, and Employment), this equates to a 9.5 article/resident ratio. Books on CD are being acquired now instead of books on cassette and video titles are being acquired in DVD format instead of VHS. Electronic resources make accessing documents easier for patrons but have not caused a decreased interest in hard copies. Currently, library program attendance levels are up over historic levels.

Future Expansions

The Agoura Hills Library moved into the current facility at the new City Hall Civic Center in 2001. There are no plans for additional expansion at the library. Money is provided from the County for operations and materials.

4.11.14 Regulatory Framework

■ Federal

There are no federal library service regulations applicable to the proposed project.

■ State

There are no state library service regulations applicable to the proposed project.

■ Regional

There are no regional library service regulations applicable to the proposed project.

■ Local

There are no local library services regulations applicable to the proposed project.

4.11.15 Project Impacts and Mitigation

■ Analytic Method

Information on existing levels of service collected from the County was compared against conditions reasonably expected to occur with implementation of the General Plan Update. Proposed policies and development changes in the General Plan Update were compared against current conditions to determine if any significant impacts on library services would occur.

■ Thresholds of Significance

For the purposes of this EIR, implementation of the General Plan Update would result in substantial adverse physical impacts if it would do the following:

- Result in the provision of new or physically altered library facilities, need for new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for libraries.

■ Effects Not Found to Be Significant

Threshold	Would the project result in the provision of new or physically altered library facilities, need for new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for libraries?
-----------	--

Implementation of the General Plan Update could result in increased use of library facilities. However, it would not result in the provision of or need for new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for libraries. Therefore, there would be *no impact* (Class III).

The General Plan Update would allow for the amendment of land use designations and the potential for an increase in densities of existing uses in specific areas. In select locations, land use designations would be amended to accommodate mixed use, which would allow for residential uses in an area that is currently utilized for commercial purposes. In all cases, existing uses within the City would be allowed to remain under the General Plan Update.

Demand at the Agoura Hills Library for resources and programming remains strong, and any buildout under the General Plan Update could increase that demand. However, policies within the General Plan Update support providing library services to residents of Agoura Hills. For example, compliance with Goal CS-9 (Library System) and Policy CS-9.1 (Support Library Services) would facilitate the support of Los Angeles County in the provision of library services and programs to meet the needs of residents. No new library facilities are expected to be necessary to accommodate the growth proposed under the General Plan Update, and so the proposed General Plan would not result in library facility construction that has the potential to result in significant environmental impacts. If new facilities would need to be

constructed to accommodate increased demand on library services, further environmental review would be required as project-specific plans are developed. All new private development would be subject to the City's environmental review process which includes project-specific environmental review under CEQA. Therefore, the General Plan Update would result in *no impact* (Class III). No mitigation measures are necessary.

■ Less-Than-Significant Impacts

There are no effects from implementation of the General Plan Update that would result less-than-significant impacts.

■ Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

There are no significant and unavoidable impacts from implementation of the General Plan Update.

■ Cumulative Impacts

The City of Agoura Hills is located within the County of Los Angeles, an area which is expected to continue to experience significant growth over the next twenty-five years. The regional context for the discussion of cumulative impacts is the western end of Los Angeles County, which is bordered by Topanga Canyon Boulevard (SR-27) to the east, the Pacific Ocean to the south, and Ventura County to the north and west. This geographic region is served by the Agoura Hills Library, Westlake Village Library, and Malibu Library. Cumulative impacts are only addressed for those thresholds that have a project-related impact, whether it is less than significant, significant, or significant and unavoidable. If “no impact” occurs, no cumulative analysis is provided for that threshold.

The General Plan Update is anticipated to result in no impact with regard to library facility alteration or construction in the City of Agoura Hills. As such, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulative impact. The proposed project would result in *no cumulative impact* (Class III).

■ Mitigation Measures

With implementation of policies within the General Plan Update there would be no impact. No mitigation measures are necessary.

■ Final Level of Significance

With the implementation of the General Plan Update policies and application of all local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to fire services, the proposed project would result in *no impact* (Class III) to library services. The proposed project would result in *no cumulative impact* (Class III) to library services.

4.11.16 Draft General Plan Goals and Policies

Policies relating to library services are located in the Infrastructure and Community Services chapter of the General Plan Update:

- Goal CS-9** **Library System.** Library facilities that enhance Agoura Hills residents' and employees' quality of life and create opportunities for self-learning and cultural and academic enrichment.
- Policy CS-9.1** **Support Library Services.** Continue to support Los Angeles County in the provision of library services and programs to meet the needs of residents.

4.11.17 References

- Adeva, Ramiro. 2009. Phone conversation with City Engineer, City of Agoura Hills, July 15.
- Agoura Hills, City of. 2005. *Hazard Mitigation Plan*, April 25.
- . 2007. Emergency Operations Plan, February 14.
- . 2009a. Emergency Preparedness: Community Emergency Response Team. <http://www.ci.agoura-hills.ca.us/Index.aspx?page=167> (accessed July 2, 2009).
- . 2009b. The Agoura Hills Civic Center & Library. <http://www.ci.agoura-hills.ca.us/Index.aspx?page=103> (accessed July 12, 2009).
- . n.d. *SEMS/NIMS Emergency Operations Plan*.
- California Department of Education (California DOE). Educational Demographics Unit. 2009. 2008-09 District and School Enrollment by Grade, Las Virgenes Unified. *California Public Schools—District Report*, May 26. <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/DistEnr2.asp?TheName=las+virgenes&cSelect=1964683--LAS+VIRGENES+UNIFIED&cChoice=DistEnrGr2&cYear=2008-09&cLevel=District&cTopic=Enrollment&myTimeFrame=S&submit1=Submit> (accessed July 12, 2009).
- County of Los Angeles Public Library. 2008. Agoura Hills Public Library, June. <http://www.colapublib.org/lib/agourahills/> (accessed July 12, 2009).
- Dunn, Rose. 2009. Phone conversation with Director of Elementary Education, Las Virgenes Unified School District, July 14.
- Hamburger, Nathan. 2009. Phone conversation with Assistant City Manager, City of Agoura Hills, July 30.
- Kimmel, Karen. 2008. Las Virgenes Unified School District Notice: Increase in School Developer Fees, March 12.
- Las Virgenes Unified School District (LVUSD). 2006. Resolution No. 16-05: Resolution of the Board of Trustees of the Las Virgenes Unified School District Ordering an Election, and Establishing Specifications of the Election Order, February 28.
- . 2009. Home Webpage. <http://corp.lvusd.org/index.php> (accessed July 12, 2009).

- Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD). 2007 Statistical Summary.
- Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. 2008. Crime and Arrest Statistics 2008, Malibu/Lost Hills Station.
- . 2009. Home Webpage. <http://www.lasd.org> (accessed July 11, 2009).
- MLC & Associates, Inc. 2004. Las Virgenes–Malibu Council of Governments Hazard Mitigation Plan.
- Petrash, Kathy. 2009. Phone conversation with Assistant to Chief Business Official, Las Virgenes Unified School District, April 1.
- Sagi, Raya. 2009. Phone conversation with Community Library Manager, Agoura Hills Library. July 14.
- Smith, Steven. 2009. Email from Operations Lieutenant, Malibu/Lost Hills Station, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, April 2.
- Todd, Margaret Donnellan. 2005. Fiscal Year-End Report: County Library Facilities Mitigation Fee, January 11.
- Vidales, Frank. 2009. Letter from Acting Chief, Forestry Division Prevention Services Bureau, Los Angeles County Fire Department, May 13.

4.12 RECREATION

This section evaluates the impacts of the General Plan Update associated with recreation and parks within the City of Agoura Hills. Existing data sources used to prepare this section were taken from the existing General Plan (1993) Parks and Recreation Element and Open Space and Conservation Element (1993), the *City of Agoura Hills Parks Master Plan* (1988), the *Agoura Hills Citywide Trails and Pathways Master Plan* (2008), and the *City of Agoura Hills Open Space Preservation Action Plan* (1999), as well as other City-provided documents.

The proposed project could potentially cause impacts associated with the physical deterioration of recreational facilities. The proposed project also has the potential to cause impacts related to the construction or expansion of facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives.

No comment letters regarding recreation were received in response to the April 30, 2009, Notice of Preparation circulated for the General Plan Update. However, comments were provided verbally at the May 21, 2009, Scoping Meeting hosted for the General Plan Update. Full bibliographic entries for all reference materials are provided in Section 4.12.5 (References) of this section.

4.12.1 Environmental Setting

Parklands and recreational facilities are important land use components in an urban environment, providing both visual relief from the built environment and contributing to residents' and employees' quality of life through recreation and aesthetic value.

■ Regional Parks and Recreational Facilities

According to the Agoura Hills Citywide Trails and Pathways Master Plan prepared in 2008, a number of regional recreational facilities surround the City of Agoura Hills. The majority of these resources are situated within the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area (SMMNRA), which borders the City to the south and east. The SMMNRA comprises 153,075 acres and is one of the country's largest urban national parks. SMMNRA and state park facilities located in close proximity to Agoura Hills include the following:

- Chesebro/Palo Comado Canyon is located to the north and east of the City of Agoura Hills, and features hiking, biking, and equestrian routes through generally undisturbed areas. The area is joined to the east by the Upper Las Virgenes Canyon Open Space Preserver (formerly Ahmanson Ranch) in Ventura County, which consists of 2,983 acres of open space.
- Paramount Ranch is located south of the City of Agoura Hills, and offers hiking trails, a picnic area, and a western town movie set.
- Peter Strauss Ranch located south of Agoura Hills, and offers hiking, concerts, picnics and art exhibits.

- Malibu Creek State Park located to the south of Agoura Hills at Liberty Canyon, and offers hiking and equestrian trails that lead through this wilderness preserve and cross Mulholland Highway.

Park and recreation facilities located in the SMMNRA are operated and maintained by a variety of government agencies, including the National Parks Service (NPS), the state, and the counties of Los Angeles and Ventura. In addition to nearby national and state parks in close proximity to the City of Agoura Hills, the Simi Hills located to the north provides access to the open space and trail system of the Oak Park community. Parks within the Oak Park area include Chaparral, China Flat Trailhead, Eagle View, Mae Boyer, Oak Canyon Community, and Valley View Neighborhood Park; these parks are owned and managed by the Rancho Simi Recreation and Parks District.

■ Local Parks and Recreation Facilities

The City of Agoura Hills operates six active parks encompassing 47 acres. Table 4.12-1 (Recreational Facilities in the City of Agoura Hills) identifies the location and size of each of these parks. The City's *Parks Master Plan* has four classifications of local parks: neighborhood parks, community specialized facilities, playfields and urban open space. Neighborhood parks range in size from 2 to 5 acres and are intended to meet specific needs of a neighborhood and provide access from local streets and main walkways. Neighborhood parks in the City include Old Agoura Park, Sumac Park, Morrison Park, and Reyes Adobe Park. Community special use facilities are larger in size than neighborhood parks and are intended to provide services on a community level. They accommodate larger social and cultural activities and are located in areas accessible from collector streets and local arterials. Community special use parks in the City include Forest Cove Park and Chumash Park. Playfields are typically part of either a neighborhood park or a community special use park, and include all sports fields and specialized court games. Urban open space is any open space that would maintain or enhance the aesthetic quality of the community for public benefit. There are two City-owned open space recreation areas, totaling approximately 26 acres. One open space recreation area with a trail is located in the northwest corner of the City, adjacent to Yerba Buena School and one is located in the central part of the City, along Medea Creek. Additionally there is an open space recreation area in the northeast corner of the city, owned by the state. Figure 4.12-1 (Recreational Facilities) identifies the location of City parks and open space recreation areas and State Parks in the City and surrounding area.

■ Open Space

Aside from the two open space recreation areas, which are considered part of the park and recreation facilities of the City, Agoura Hills has an estimated 1,378.2 acres of protected open space within its borders, which is owned by the City, Santa Monica Mountains and Recreation and Conservation Authority or Homeowners Associations (HOA).¹⁶ Land included in this inventory of protected open space is the Lindero Canyon Country Club, which includes a golf course.

¹⁶ Total includes Restricted Open Space, Restricted Open Space/Deed Restricted, and Local Park land use categories.


**CITY of AGOURA HILLS
General Plan Update EIR**

**RECREATIONAL
FACILITIES**

Legend

City Parks

- 1. Chumash Park
- 2. Forest Cove Park
- 3. Morrison Park
- 4. Old Agoura Park
- 5. Reyes Adobe Park
- 6. Sumac Park
- Open Space Recreation Area
- School Playgrounds
- City Limits
- County Boundary
- Streams



Source: City of Agoura Hills, July 14, 2009
D21377_Agoura_Hills\Recreation.mxd




Table 4.12-1 Recreational Facilities in the City of Agoura Hills			
#	Park	Location	Acreage
1	Chumash	5550 Medea Valley Drive	12.3
2	Forest Cove	5451 Forest Cove Lane	9.5
3	Morrison	29909 Forest Cove Lane	4.4
4	Old Agoura	5301 Chesebro Road	13.0
5	Reyes Adobe	31400 Rainbow Crest Drive	4.4
6	Sumac	6000 Calmfield Avenue	3.6
Open Space Recreation Areas			
—		Yerba Buena Open Space	18.1
—		Medea Creek Open Space	8.2
—		Southeastern corner of the City*	107
Citywide Total			73.5
SOURCE: City of Agoura Hills, 2009			
*For reference purposes only. Not included in total citywide acreage as it is currently owned by the state.			

The City also operates the Agoura Hills Recreation Center and jointly operates the Agoura Hills/Calabasas Community Center. The Agoura Hills Recreation Center, located at 30610 Thousand Oaks Boulevard in the City of Agoura Hills, is an 1,800-square-foot (sf) multi-purpose facility, and offers a variety of classes and activities for all residents. The Agoura Hills/Calabasas Community Center, located at 27040 Malibu Hills Road in the City of Calabasas, is a 30,000 sf state-of-the-art recreational facility that offers a variety of recreational social, cultural and education programs and activities to meet the needs of the surrounding communities. The facility includes basketball courts, a fitness studio, rock-climbing wall, dance studio, multi-purpose room, and banquet hall.

In addition to the City-owned parks, local schools serve as joint recreational facilities for the City and other private athletic associations use City facilities. The Las Virgenes Unified School District includes five school sites that are available for recreational use after school hours and on weekends (refer to Section 4.11 [Public Services] for a description of school sites in the City). Each offers the use of open playfields. Agoura High School has specialized facilities, including a pool, tennis courts, and a gymnasium.

■ Trails and Pathways

In 2008, Agoura Hills adopted the *Citywide Trails and Pathways Master Plan*. The Plan provides a schematic network of pedestrian, equestrian, and mountain biking trails in the City, connecting to the extensive regional systems in adjoining jurisdictions. The Plan serves as a guide to future trail planning, design and construction in the City. A variety of different trail types are considered in the Plan. The neighborhood trail and pathway is a multi-use facility within urbanized areas, and serves as a link to open space trails. The open space trail provides access to open space areas, and would be designed to accommodate hikers, equestrian users, and mountain bicyclists. The equestrian bridle path would be located adjacent to the

streets in Old Agoura. Figure 4.12-2 (Trail Network) identifies the proposed and existing all-purpose trails and equestrian trails located throughout the City as identified by the Plan. The majority of the trails utilize open space areas that are owned by public entities and public right of way.

Trails planned and permitted under *Citywide Trails and Pathway Master Plan* include a trail that would traverse the length of Ladyface Mountain; completion of the existing equestrian bridle trail system in the Old Agoura neighborhood which currently provides a connection to the Palo Comado Chesebro Canyon park system; and the construction of the Medea Creek pathway along Medea Creek in the central part of Agoura Hills.

Currently, there are several equestrian trails in the Old Agoura community, including a trail along Driver Avenue that connects to Old Agoura Park, which includes a horse arena. The trail traverses the perimeter of Old Agoura Park and provides equestrian access from the park along a flood channel (Chesebro Creek) east of Colodny Drive, which continues under Highway 101. The trail then follows the flood channel in a westerly direction along Agoura Road to Agoura Village. The trail, which is part of the regional Zuma Ridge Trail, currently ends at the western edge of the Regency Theater Complex. The *Citywide Trails and Pathway Master Plan* includes the extension of the trail to the south along Medea Creek to the Santa Monica Mountains. The Zuma Ridge trail through the City also allows for pedestrians. There is a limited pedestrian trail along Medea Creek, south of Kanan Road and north of Canwood Street.


In addition to the above noted trails, designated bikeways are available in the City. Bikeways have three different types of classifications: Class I (Bike Path), Class II (Bike Lane), and Class III (Bike Route). The bikeways within the City of Agoura Hills are comprised of Class II and Class III facilities, which are shared facilities on the roadways and respectively delineated by either signage and striping or signage only. Figure 4.12-3 (Bikeways) displays the existing and proposed bikeways in the City of Agoura Hills. The following describes the existing facilities:

- **Kanan Road**—A Class II facility between the northern City limits and Hillrise Drive.
- **Reyes Adobe Road**—A mixed Class II and Class III facility between Lake Lindero Road and Canwood Street., Class II between Lake Lindero Road and Passageway Place and Class III section lies between Passageway Place and Canwood Street.
- **Forest Cove Lane**—A mixed Class II and Class III facility between Trail Creek Drive and Canwood Street. Class II facility between Rainbow Creek Drive and Canwood Street, and Class III between Trail Creek Drive and Rainbow Crest Drive.
- **Thousand Oaks Boulevard**—A Class II facility between the western City limits and Argos Street.
- **Agoura Road**—A Class II facility between the western and eastern City limits.
- **Rainbow Crest Drive**—A Class III facility that crosses Reyes Adobe Road and provides access between Forest Cove Lane and Mainmast Drive.
- **Canwood Street**—A mixed Class II and Class III facility that crosses Reyes Adobe Road. The Class II east of Reyes Adobe Road to Forest Cove Drive; and Class III facility west of Reyes Adobe Road to Lake Lindero Road.


TRAIL NETWORK

Legend

- Existing, All Purpose
- - - Future, All Purpose
- - - Future, All Purpose
(Final trail alignment subject to future trail study)
- Existing, Equestrian
- - - Future, Equestrian
- Santa Monica Mountains NRA**
- Existing, Multiple Use
- Existing, Hike & Equestrian Only
- Existing, Unofficial Trail
- - - Future, Multiple Use
- City Limits
- County Boundary
- ~ Streams








Source: City of Agoura Hills, 2009
 Agoura Hills Citywide Trails
 and Pathways Master Plan, 2008
 NPS TMP Conceptual Trail Policy
 Alternatives, 2009
 D21377_Agoura_Hills\Trails.mxd



**CITY of AGOURA HILLS
General Plan Update EIR**

BIKEWAYS

- Legend**
-  City Limits
 - Bicycle Routes**
 -  Existing Class II Facility
 -  Existing Class III Facility
 -  Proposed Class II Facility



Source: City of Agoura Hills, January 2007
Date Revised: September 2009
10225|JCS|09

Planned additions to the City’s system of bicycle routes include:

- **Reyes Adobe Road**—Extension of the existing Class II facility across the Reyes Adobe bridge; this will coincide with the Reyes Adobe Interchange Improvement Project.
- **Palo Comado Canyon Road**—Addition of a Class II facility across the Palo Comado Canyon bridge; this will coincide with the Palo Comado Canyon Interchange Improvement Project.

4.12.2 Regulatory Framework

■ Federal

There are no federal regulations applicable to parkland or recreational facilities.

■ State

Quimby Act

The *Quimby Act* was established by the California legislature in 1965 to provide parks for the growing communities in California. The Act authorizes cities to adopt ordinances addressing parkland and/or fees for residential subdivisions for the purpose of providing and preserving open space and recreational facilities and improvements. The Act requires the provision of 3 acres of park area per 1,000 persons residing within a subdivision, unless the amount of existing neighborhood and community park area exceeds that limit, in which case the City may adopt a higher standard not to exceed five acres per 1,000 residents. The Act also specifies acceptable uses and expenditures of such funds.

State Public Park Preservation Act

The primary instrument for protecting and preserving parkland is the *State Public Park Preservation Act*. Under the *Public Resource Code*, cities and counties may not acquire any real property that is in use as a public park for any non-park use unless compensation or land, or both, are provided to replace the parkland acquired. This provides no net loss of parkland and facilities.

State Street and Highway Code

The *State Street and Highway Code* assists in providing equestrian and hiking trails within the right-of-way of county roads, streets, and highways.

■ Local

Agoura Hills Citywide Trails and Pathways Master Plan

The *Citywide Trails and Pathways Master Plan* adopted in 2008 provides a schematic network of pedestrian, equestrian and mountain biking trails in the City. The Plan is a guide for future Citywide trails, and contains standards for trail development.

Agoura Hills Municipal Code

Article X, Chapter 8 (Parkland Dedication and Fees) of the *Agoura Hills Municipal Code* pursuant to Section 66477 of the *Subdivision Map Act* requires subdividers to dedicate land to the City, pay a fee to City in lieu thereof, or a combination of both for park or recreation purposes. Chapter 8 does not apply to commercial or industrial subdivisions, or any condominium project that consists of the subdivision of airspace in an existing apartment building that is more than five years old when no new dwelling units are added. Section 10802 of Chapter 8 includes a formula which determines the amount of land to be dedicated by project and is based on the number of dwelling units, and the type of residential development proposed. In the event that land would not be dedicated. Section 1803 of Chapter 8 requires that payment of an in lieu of fee which would be used only for the purpose of developing new, or rehabilitating existing, recreational facilities to serve the subdivisions for which the fees are paid. Only the payment of fees shall be required in subdivision containing 50 parcels or less. Future residential development permitted under the General Plan Update would be subject to Chapter 8 of the *Agoura Hills Municipal Code*.

4.12.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

■ Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the 2009 CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, implementation of the proposed project may have a significant adverse impact on parks and recreational facilities if it would result in any of the following:

- Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated
- Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment

■ Effects Not Found to Be Significant

There are no effects that were found to have no impacts related to recreation resulting from implementation of the General Plan Update.

■ Less-Than-Significant Impacts

Threshold	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
-----------	---

Impact 4.12-1 Implementation of the General Plan Update could result in increased use of existing parks or recreational facilities that could accelerate physical deterioration of those facilities. However, this impact would be *less than significant* (Class II).

The General Plan Update (Policy CS-1.1 [Service Level Goals]) recommends a standard of 8 acres of park and open space land per 1,000 residents. This standard is further broken down into 3 acres of local park and recreation space per 1,000 persons and five acres of open space per 1,000. Based on the DOF 2009 population estimate of 23,337 residents for the City, and the City's current park inventory of 73.5 acres, the City currently maintains 3.15 acres of parkland per 1,000 persons.

Under the General Plan Update, approximately 73.5 acres of parkland would be provided, as shown in Table 4.12-1 (Recreational Facilities in the City of Agoura Hills). Buildout of the General Plan Update could result in a maximum direct population increase of approximately 2,057 residents over the DOF 2009 population estimate of 23,337, for a total population of 25,394 residents in 2035. Based on this increase in residents, approximately 2.9 acres of parkland would be provided for every 1,000 residents, a shortfall of approximately 0.1 acre of parkland per 1,000 residents. However, it should be noted that the 73.5 acres of parkland is calculated based on parks currently owned and operated by the City of Agoura Hills. In addition to this 73.5 acres owned and operated by the City, as shown in Table 4.12-1 (Recreational Facilities in the City of Agoura Hills), there is an existing approximately 107 acres of parkland/active recreation space located within the City of Agoura Hills but owned and operated by the State of California. This facility is easily accessible and available to the residents of the City. However, the analysis above was prepared based on a worst-case scenario including only parklands owned by the City. When this additional acreage is counted toward the parkland acreage, the provision of parkland space is increased to approximately 7.1 acres per 1,000 residents, above the established standard.

Additionally, under the General Plan Update, approximately 1,304.7 acres of open space would be provided. Based on a maximum General Plan Update buildout population of 25,394 residents, approximately 51.4 acres of open space per 1,000 residents would be available. This would exceed the established standard of five acres per 1,000 residents. This large overage of open space may also help to make up for the small (0.1 acre) shortfall identified in parkland provision.

Furthermore, the General Plan Update provides goals and associated policies to address potential impacts associated with physical deterioration of the park and recreational facilities due to population growth. These include Goal CS-1 (Park and Recreation Facilities) through Goal CS-5 (Trail and Path Network) and their associated policies. Goal CS-1 (Park and Recreation Facilities) strives to achieve balanced and comprehensive recreation facilities for the Agoura Hills community. To accomplish this goal, Policy CS-1.1 (Service Level Goals) establishes a service level goal of 8 acres per 1,000 persons of all park and open space, of which three acres should be local park and recreational facilities while five acres should be open space. Policy CS-1.2 (Cooperation with External Agencies) requires that the City work with agencies outside of the City that control parklands, including Ventura and Los Angeles Counties, the National Park Service, and Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, to ensure maximum benefits to local residents. Goal CS-2 (Recreation Programs) and its associated policies would require that the City provide recreational programs and services for residents to promote personal enrichment, healthy

lifestyles, wellness, fun, lifelong learning, skill development, and community relationships. Goal CS-3 (Coordination of Park and Recreational Facilities) as well as Policy CS-3.1 (Use Agreements with Other Agencies) and Policy CS-3.2 (Work with Surrounding Communities) would ensure that park facilities and programs are coordinated among the City, Las Virgenes Unified School District, surrounding jurisdictions, the private sector, and regional resources. Coordination with other agencies and surrounding communities would help augment the park and recreation amenities of the City. Funding for the City's park and recreation facilities would be achieved through implementation of Goal CS-4 (Funding for Park and Recreation Facilities). Policy CS-4.1 (Funding Mechanism) would continue, or would establish, financing mechanisms, such as Quimby fees, user or service fees, or in-lieu fees, to acquire, obtain, improve, and maintain park facilities. Policy CS-4.2 (Service Agreements) encourages the shared use and maintenance services at City recreation facilities through service agreements.

Also, as described above, the availability of park and recreational opportunities in close proximity to the City within the SMMNRA serves to augment the available facilities in the City. Through implementation of Goal CS-5 (Trail and Path Network), these nearby park and recreation areas would be more accessible under the General Plan Update due to the improved trails system in the City. As such, implementation of the General Plan Update would ensure that Agoura Hills residents are well served by park and recreational opportunities easily accessible from the City.

In order to achieve the above mentioned goals and policies of the General Plan Update, the General Plan Update's Implementation Program would ensure that development and other programmatic actions by the City support and implement the intended actions. This involves monitoring, review, maintenance, and implementation in a systematic and consistent manner. Specifically, Community Services Implementation Program Measures 1 and 2 would require that the City's Community Services Department and Planning and Community Development Department as an ongoing action through the planning horizon of the General Plan Update shall strive to meet the goals for local park and recreation space through the creation of additional facilities, and an update of the Parks Master Plan shall be prepared. These actions would ensure that implementation of the General Plan Update would not deteriorate conditions, but would rather improve conditions in the City.

Per Chapter 8 (Parkland Dedication and Fees) of the Agoura Hills Municipal Code, the City requires that all private developers proposing residential projects within the City either dedicate land for park facilities or pay a fee in lieu of providing parkland. The current land dedication fee requirement equals the required acreage of local park space multiplied by the fair market value of the land, as determined by the last tax bill. These fees are collected by the City in association with the development application approval process and are to be used only for the purpose of developing new, or rehabilitating existing, recreational facilities to serve the development for which the fees are paid.

Aside from park and recreational areas, implementation of the General Plan Update would likely increase the use of recreational trails and bikeways throughout the City. Goal CS-5 (Trail and Path Network) and its associated policies would provide a comprehensive trail and pathway system that would link the local trail and pathway system to regional trail systems and provide linkages between neighborhoods, local parks, business, schools, and open space. Goal CS-5 would support the *Citywide Trails and Pathways Master Plan* adopted in 2008, which serves as a guide to future trail planning, design and construction.

Figure 4.12-2 (Trail Network) identifies the proposed and existing all-purpose trails and equestrian trails located throughout the City as identified in the Master Plan. Existing and proposed trails provides connections to open space areas.

In addition to these trails, designated bikeways are available in the City. Goal M-8 and its associated policies would ensure that the City continues to meet the demand for bikeway facilities by ensuring adequate facilities are provided. In particular, Measure 10 of the Mobility Implementation Program of the General Plan Update requires the City to prepare a Bikeways Master Plan to create a comprehensive bikeway system in the City, including identifying possible additions to existing facilities.

The implementation of the above-mentioned goals and policies in the General Plan Update, as well as Municipal Code requirement for the dedication of land or payment of an in-lieu fee for all applicable future residential development, would ensure that increased demand and use resulting from an increase in Citywide population would not significantly accelerate the deterioration of existing park and recreational facilities. This impact would be *less than significant* (Class II). No mitigation measures are required.

Additionally, any trail or bikeway facility proposed for development as part of the General Plan Update implementation, or any park or recreation area proposed for establishment at a later date, would require separate environmental review under CEQA as that particular project is designed and proposed, aside from this EIR.

Threshold	Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?
-----------	---

Impact 4.12-2 Implementation of the General Plan Update could lead to development of new parks and recreational facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios. The proposed project could result in adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of these facilities. However, with implementation of goals and policies of the General Plan Update, this impact would be *less than significant* (Class II).

Implementation of the General Plan Update does not include specific development plans for the construction of park or recreational areas within the City. Buildout of the proposed General Plan Update would result in a maximum, direct population increase of approximately 2,057 residents, through the creation of new housing opportunities in the City permitted under the General Plan Update. This population increase could result in additional demand for park and recreational areas, and possibly create the need for the construction or expansion of such areas. However, no such specific development projects have been proposed as part of the General Plan Update.

The General Plan Update strives to alleviate park and recreational deficits through implementation of goals and policies identified primarily within the Infrastructure and Community Services Chapter of the General Plan Update. The availability of park and recreational opportunities in close proximity to the City, which would be more accessible under the General Plan Update due the improved trails system in

the City, also serves to augment the available facilities and ensure that Agoura Hills residents are well served by park and recreational opportunities easily accessible from the City.

Additionally, the City requires that all future private developers proposing certain types of residential projects within the City either dedicate land for park facilities or pay a fee in lieu of providing parkland. The current land dedication fee requirement equals the required acreage of local park space multiplied by the fair market value of the land, as determined by the last tax bill. These fees are collected by the City in association with the development application approval process and shall be used only for the purpose of developing new, or rehabilitating existing, recreational facilities to serve the development for which the fees were paid.

It is possible that new development of park and recreational areas may be planned in the future to meet General Plan Update park and recreation standards. Such projects would be subject to the City's environmental review process, which includes project-specific environmental review under CEQA separate from this EIR. As the General Plan Update is a planning document and not a specific development proposal for park and recreational areas development, it would result in impacts that are *less than significant* (Class II). No mitigation measures are required.

As described in the discussion of Impact 4.12-1, the General Plan Update calls for the creation of recreational trails and a comprehensive bikeway system in the City. The implementation of such facilities is not expected to result in adverse effects on the environment, given the nature and limited extent of such development. Bikeways would be provided within existing developed City rights-of-way. Policy CS-5.5 (Sustainable Trails) of the proposed General Plan calls for locating trails and pathways in a manner that does not cause environmental degradation and protects environmentally sensitive areas. As such, the adverse effects of constructing trails and bikeways are expected to be *less than significant* (Class II), and no mitigation measures are required. It should also be noted that the particular trail and bikeway projects have not yet been identified or proposed. As they are, specific environmental review would be required under CEQA, separate from this EIR.

■ Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

There are no significant and unavoidable impacts from implementation of the General Plan Update with regard to recreation and parks.

■ Cumulative Impacts

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts associated with parks and recreational facilities is the Las Virgenes Sub-Region as defined by SCAG, including all cumulative growth therein, as represented by full implementation of the General Plan Update.

Development under the General Plan Update could have a significant adverse affect on existing parks and recreational facilities in the City due to increased use. However, the City requires that future private developers proposing specific types of residential projects within the City either dedicate land for park facilities or pay a fee in lieu of providing parkland. The current land dedication fee requirement equals

the required acreage of local park space multiplied by the fair market value of the land, as determined by the last tax bill. These fees are collected by the City in association with the development application approval process and shall be used only for the purpose of developing new, or rehabilitating existing, recreational facilities to serve the development for which the fees were paid. The dedication of land or the payment of in-lieu fees, in combination with policies contained in the General Plan Update, would reduce impacts related to deterioration of existing parks and recreation facilities. Thus, adverse physical impacts related to the expansion and construction of parks and recreational facilities would not be cumulatively considerable. Additionally, Policy CS-3.1 (Use Agreements with Other Agencies) and Policy CS-3.2 (Work with Surrounding Communities) would establish use agreements and encourage coordination with the Las Virgenes Unified School District, other agencies that provide recreational facilities and programs, and the surrounding communities, which include Westlake Village, Thousand Oaks, Oak Park, Calabasas, and Hidden Hills. Therefore, cumulative impacts of the General Plan Update would be *less than significant* (Class II).

■ Mitigation Measures

With implementation of policies within the General Plan Update and application of all local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to recreation, all impacts will be reduced to less-than-significant levels. No mitigation measures are necessary.

■ Final Level of Significance

With the implementation of the General Plan Update policies and application of all local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to recreation, impacts would be *less than significant* (Class II). Cumulative impacts would also be considered *less than significant* (Class II).

4.12.4 Draft General Plan Goals and Policies

- Goal M-8** **Bikeways.** Enhanced bicycle facilities throughout Agoura Hills for short trips and recreational uses.
- Policy M-8.1** **Bikeway Linkages.** Provide bikeway connectivity between residential areas and surrounding natural resource areas, parks, schools, employment centers, and other activity centers in the community.
- Policy M-8.2** **Continuous Bikeway Connectivity.** Provide a bicycle network that is continuous, closes gaps in the existing system, and permits easy bicycle travel throughout the community and the region.
- Policy M-8.3** **Recreational Biking.** Encourage recreational biking and promote the community's mountain biking trail system to residents and visitors.

- Policy M-8.4** **Bicycling Safety.** Establish a Bicycle Safety Program that aims to educate the public about the safe use of bicycles on the City’s bikeways.
- Policy M-8.5** **Bikeway Design.** Develop guidelines and standards for the design of bikeways.
- Policy M-8.6** **Bicycle Facility Design.** Develop guidelines and standards for the design of bicycle facilities, including bicycle racks.
- Policy M-8.7** **Bicycle Parking.** Developments shall provide for bicycle parking facilities.

- Goal CS-1** **Park and Recreation Facilities.** Balanced and comprehensive recreation facilities for the Agoura Hills community.
 - Policy CS-1.1** **Service Level Goals.** Develop and maintain parks and recreational areas in accordance with the goals in Table CS-1.
 - Policy CS-1.2** **Cooperation with External Agencies.** Work with agencies outside of the City that control park lands, including the counties of Ventura and Los Angeles, National Park Service, and Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, to ensure maximum benefits to local residents.
 - Policy CS-1.3** **Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections.** Connect recreational facilities with walking paths, trails, bikeways, and equestrian trails.
 - Policy CS-1.4** **Bicycle Racks.** Require the installation of bicycle racks at parks and community centers.
 - Policy CS-1.5** **Complementary Activities.** Ensure that the location and design of all parks, recreation, and community centers are compatible with existing adjoining uses.
 - Policy CS-1.6** **Location of Facilities.** Distribute parks and facilities so that they are well dispersed throughout the community, and include recreation opportunities for all residents.
 - Policy CS-1.7** **Accessible Facilities.** When renovating and creating new recreational facilities, ensure accessible standards as specified in state and federal laws, such as the *Americans with Disabilities Act* (ADA).
 - Policy CS-1.8** **Facilities in Residential Development.** Encourage the provision of recreation facilities within new residential developments, as appropriate.
 - Policy CS-1.9** **Maintenance.** Provide a high-quality maintenance program with regular inspections of facilities.

- Goal CS-2** **Park and Recreation Programs.** Recreational programs and services that promote personal enrichment, healthy lifestyles, wellness, fun, lifelong learning, skill development, and community relationships.

- Policy CS-2.1** **Variety of Services.** Provide a wide range of recreation opportunities designed to enrich the lives of all residents, including passive, active, individual, and organized recreational services, including reasonable accommodations for special needs individuals and groups.
- Policy CS-2.2** **Programs for Residents.** Provide community services and programs that meet social, recreational, and health needs of the population, including seniors and youth.
- Policy CS-2.3** **Monitor Recreation Programs.** Monitor and update existing recreation programs and services to ensure that programs keep pace with community needs.
- Policy CS-2.4** **Quality of Life.** Promote healthy lifestyles and activities for the entire family as important considerations for recreational programs and amenities.
- Policy CS-2.5** **Community Special Events.** Encourage community-wide special events that promote the City's history, family activities, cultural events, and educational outreach.

Goal CS-3 **Coordination of Park and Recreation Facilities.** Park facilities and programs that are coordinated between Agoura Hills and the Las Virgenes Unified School District (LVUSD), surrounding jurisdictions, the private sector, and regional resources.

- Policy CS-3.1** **Use Agreements with Other Agencies.** Continue to develop joint use and cooperative agreements with the Las Virgenes Unified School District and other agencies to provide recreational facilities and programs and services for residents and children.
- Policy CS-3.2** **Work with Surrounding Communities.** Coordinate with surrounding local businesses and communities, including Westlake Village, Thousand Oaks, Oak Park, Calabasas, and Hidden Hills to provide opportunities for intercommunity participation in city programs and facilities.
- Policy CS-3.3** **Volunteers.** Continue opportunities for citizen volunteers to participate in enhancing City programs.

Goal CS-4 **Funding for Park and Recreation Facilities.** A comprehensive park and recreation system that is well funded.

- Policy CS-4.1** **Funding Mechanisms.** Implement financing mechanisms, such as Quimby Fees, user or service fees, or in-lieu fees, to acquire, obtain improvements to, and maintain park facilities.
- Policy CS-4.2** **Service Agreements.** Continue to pursue agreements with local community services, sports organizations, and clubs to provide shared use and maintenance services at City recreational facilities.

- Goal CS-5** **Trail and Path Network.** A comprehensive trail and pathway system that makes pedestrian and equestrian travel healthy, feasible, safe, and enjoyable modes of transportation and forms of recreation in Agoura Hills.
- Policy CS-5.1** **Regional Trail Linkages.** Link the local trail and pathway system to existing and proposed regional trails.
- Policy CS-5.2** **Local Trail Linkages.** Create a pedestrian pathway system between neighborhoods and to local parks, businesses, schools, and open space, routing users off major roadways wherever possible.
- Policy CS-5.3** **Coordinated Trail Planning.** Coordinate the City’s trail system planning, implementation, and management efforts with those of regional jurisdictions and other public agencies.
- Policy CS-5.4** **Coordination with Agencies.** Partner with neighborhood groups, private individuals, and local businesses to acquire various trail amenities.
- Policy CS-5.5** **Sustainable Trails.** Locate trails and pathways in a manner that does not cause environmental degradation, and protects environmentally sensitive areas.
- Policy CS-5.6** **Trail System.** Implement the Citywide Trails and Pathway Master Plan, and complete the City’s Trail System as shown on Figure CS-3 (Trail System).
- Policy CS-5.7** **Funding Trail Development.** Pursue creative methods of trail easement acquisition, such as encouraging the donation of trail easements, working with property owners, and applying for grants and alternative funding sources.
- Policy CS-5.8** **Community Outreach.** Develop a trail promotion program that provides information on trail locations, connections, uses, and rules. Information can include a trail user’s guide and maps posted on the City’s webpage and at trailheads and activity centers, such as the City’s community centers and parks.
- Policy CS-5.9** **Connecting to Trail System.** Require that new development provide connections to adjacent trail systems, as applicable.
- Policy CS-5.10** **Trail Maintenance.** Pursue an ongoing trail and pathway maintenance program, including volunteer opportunities.

4.12.5 References

- Agoura Hills, City of. 1988. *Parks Master Plan*, September.
- . 1993. *Agoura Hills General Plan*.
- . 1999. *Open Space Preservation Action Plan*, June.
- . 2008. *Citywide Trails and Pathways Master Plan*, October.
- . 2009a. *Agoura Hills Draft General Plan*.

———. 2009b. Agoura Hills Recreation Center. <http://www.ci.agoura-hills.ca.us/Index.aspx?page=63> (accessed April 15, 2009).

California Department of Finance (California DOF). 2009. E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, January 1.

Cook, Allison. 2009. Email correspondence with Agoura Hills Planning Department, May.

4.13 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

This section of the EIR analyzes the potential environmental effects on traffic, circulation, access, and other transportation modes for the proposed implementation of the General Plan Update. This includes an analysis of the potential for the proposed General Plan Update to increase local and regional traffic volumes, exceed a level of service (LOS) standard, increase hazards due to a design feature, interfere with emergency access, result in an inadequate parking supply, or conflict with applicable alternative transportation programs. Data used to prepare this section were taken from the General Plan Update traffic study prepared by Fehr & Peers Associates (referred to as the City of Agoura Hills General Plan Update Mobility Element, found at Appendix B).

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the General Plan Update was published on April 30, 2009. Three comment letters regarding transportation/traffic were received in response to the NOP. The commenting agencies included Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the Ventura County Transportation Department.

4.13.1 Environmental Setting

This section provides an assessment of existing conditions in the City of Agoura Hills, including a description of the street and highway system, traffic volumes on these facilities, and operating conditions on selected roadways.

The City of Agoura Hills is located in western Los Angeles County near the southeastern edge of Ventura County. Generally, Agoura Hills is bordered by Westlake Village to the west, Thousand Oaks to the northwest, Oak Park (Ventura County) to the north, Calabasas and unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County to the east, and unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County to the south.

Regional access to the City is provided by U.S. Highway 101 (US-101), which runs east/west through the City of Agoura Hills. Local access within the City is provided primarily by Kanan Road and Reyes Adobe Road in the north/south direction, and Agoura Road and Thousand Oaks Boulevard in the east/west direction.

Figure 3-4 (Transportation Analysis Zone [TAZ] Map) illustrates the traffic analysis zones (TAZ) that correspond to the proposed development of the General Plan. Table 3-6 (Existing and Proposed General Plan Buildout by TAZ) quantifies the amount of development per TAZ, as laid out in the proposed General Plan.

■ Study Scope

The traffic study for the General Plan Update (Appendix B) evaluated the potential impacts to the City's circulation system associated with ultimate buildout of the General Plan Update, and then aided in the identification of specific physical improvements and strategies to maintain acceptable levels of traffic operation in the City, to the extent feasible. The study included collecting data on existing traffic

conditions to form the baseline current (2009) conditions; forecasting the future 2035 traffic scenario without the development assumed in the General Plan Update and also without any future development assumed in the City to provide a future (2035) baseline condition; and then forecasting a future 2035 scenario with the addition of the traffic expected to result from the General Plan Update buildout. These three scenarios, below, are described further:


- Existing (2009) Conditions: The analysis of existing traffic conditions was intended to provide a basis for the remainder of the study. The existing conditions analysis included a description of the citywide street system, current traffic volumes, and an assessment of the operating conditions at the analyzed locations.
- Future (2035) Base Conditions: Future traffic conditions without traffic growth associated with the proposed General Plan and with no future development in the City. The objective of this analysis was to project future traffic growth and operating conditions from specific known projects outside the City, and from traffic passing through the City from general growth in the region, by the year 2035.
- Future (2035) Conditions with proposed General Plan: Future base traffic conditions (as discussed above) plus traffic associated with growth from the proposed General Plan. The objective of this analysis was to forecast future traffic growth associated with development anticipated to occur under the proposed General Plan.

As shown in Figure 4.13-1 (Study Locations), forty-three street segments were identified for analysis. These segments include the following:

1. Lake Lindero Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard
2. Thousand Oaks Boulevard west of Lake Lindero Road
3. Lake Lindero Road south of Thousand Oaks Boulevard
4. Reyes Adobe Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard
5. Thousand Oaks Boulevard west of Reyes Adobe Road
6. Thousand Oaks Boulevard east of Reyes Adobe Road
7. Reyes Adobe Road south of Thousand Oaks Boulevard
8. Kanan Road south of Fountainwood Avenue
9. Kanan Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard
10. Thousand Oaks Boulevard west of Kanan Road
11. Thousand Oaks Boulevard east of Kanan Road
12. Kanan Road south of Thousand Oaks Boulevard
13. Driver Avenue east of Argos Street
14. Agoura Road east of Flintlock Lane
15. Reyes Adobe Road north of Canwood Street
16. Canwood Street west of Reyes Adobe Road
17. Canwood Street east of Reyes Adobe Road
18. Reyes Adobe Road north of Agoura Road
19. Agoura Road west of Reyes Adobe Road
20. Agoura Road east of Reyes Adobe Road

CITY of AGOURA HILLS General Plan Update EIR

STUDY LOCATIONS



Legend

- # Study Locations
- City Boundary



Source: Fehr & Peers, 2009.

10225|JCS|09



21. Kanan Road south of Canwood Street East
22. Canwood Street west of Kanan Road
23. Canwood Street east of Kanan Road
24. Kanan Road north of Agoura Road
25. Agoura Road west of Kanan Road
26. Agoura Road east of Kanan Road
27. Kanan Road south of Agoura Road
28. Roadside Drive west of Lewis Road
29. Agoura Road east of Cornell Road
30. Chesebro Road north of Driver Avenue/Palo Comado Canyon Road
31. Driver Avenue west of Chesebro Road
32. Palo Comado Canyon Road east of Chesebro Road
33. Chesebro Road south of Driver Avenue/Palo Comado Canyon Road
34. Dorothy Drive between Lewis Road & US-101 SB ramps/Chesebro Road
35. Chesebro Road south of Dorothy Drive
36. Agoura Road west of Chesebro Road
37. Palo Comado Canyon Road south of US-101
38. Chesebro Road north of Agoura Road
39. Liberty Canyon Road between US-101 NB ramps & US-101 SB ramps
40. Liberty Canyon Road north of Agoura Road
41. Agoura Road west of Liberty Canyon Road
42. Agoura Road east of Liberty Canyon Road
43. Liberty Canyon Road south of Agoura Road

In addition to the street segments analyzed, five sections along the Ventura Freeway (US-101) were selected for analysis:

1. US-101 north of Reyes Adobe Road (Los Angeles County CMP facility)
2. US-101 north of Kanan Road
3. US-101 north of Chesebro Road
4. US-101 south of Liberty Canyon Road
5. US-101 south of Liberty Canyon Road

■ Existing Conditions

Existing Street System

Primary regional access to the City is provided by US Highway 101 (US-101), which runs in an east/west direction generally through the southern portion of the City. US-101 provides access to Agoura Hills from Thousand Oaks and points north and west, as well as the San Fernando Valley and points south and east. Four primary interchanges provide access to the City: Reyes Adobe Road Interchange, Kanan Road Interchange, Liberty Canyon Road Interchange, and Chesebro/Palo Comado Canyon Interchange.

Four through lanes are provided in each direction on the freeway, plus one auxiliary lane in each direction between the freeway interchanges.

Secondary regional access is provided by Kanan Road, which runs in a north/south direction, providing access to Malibu to the south and Oak Park to the north; Thousand Oaks Boulevard, which runs in an east/west direction providing access to Westlake Village and Thousand Oaks to the west; and Agoura Road, which runs in an east/west direction providing access to Westlake Village to the west and Calabasas to the east.

Roadway Classification

The proposed General Plan defines the four roadway types available in the City:

- **Primary Arterials**—Streets and highways that are designed to move relatively high volumes of traffic between the freeway and local circulation system. Intersections along major arterials are at-grade and typically signalized. Access from private property and collector streets is limited, as is on-street parking.
- **Secondary Arterials**—Streets that are similar to primary arterials, but serving a more localized function. Secondary arterials generally have less access and parking restrictions and a narrower right-of-way than primary arterials.
- **Collector Streets**—Streets that are designed to distribute traffic from higher classified arterial streets to local access streets and adjacent properties.
- **Local Streets**—Streets that are designed to be low-volume and low-speed streets that provide access to individual properties. Residential streets are generally not intended to handle through traffic.

Street System

Based on these classifications, below is a description of the existing, primary streets that serve the City of Agoura Hills:

- **Kanan Road**—Kanan Road is a north/south primary arterial. Generally, Kanan Road has two travel lanes in each direction divided by a raised median between the northerly city limit and just south of Thousand Oaks Boulevard. As Kanan Road approaches US-101, there are three lanes in the southbound direction beginning at Canwood Street. Between the US-101 overpass and Agoura Road, Kanan Road has two through travel lanes in each direction. South of Agoura Road to the southerly city limit, Kanan Road is one lane in each direction. Limited access is provided to developments along this corridor and parking is prohibited. The posted speed limit is 45 miles per hour (mph) south of Agoura Road, 35 mph between Agoura Road and Canwood Street, 40 mph between Canwood Street and Laro Drive, and 45 mph north of Laro Drive. Bicycle lanes are provided on both sides of Kanan Road between the northern city limit and Hillrise Drive.
- **Agoura Road**—Agoura Road is an east/west secondary arterial. Generally, Agoura Road has one travel lane in each direction between the easterly city limits to just west of Kanan Road. From just west of Kanan Road to the westerly City limit, Agoura Road has two travel lanes in each direction. Most of the segment east of Cornell Road is semi-rural in nature with no curb, gutter, sidewalk, or streetlights. Parking is permitted along Agoura Road from Kanan Road to Cornell Road and in the

Old Agoura commercial area. The posted speed limit is 45 mph. Bicycle lanes are provided on both sides of Agoura Road between the western city limit and Liberty Canyon Road.

- **Thousand Oaks Boulevard**—Thousand Oaks Boulevard is an east/west primary arterial. Two travel lanes are provided in each direction between the westerly City limits and just east of Kanan Road. There is limited access to development along this corridor and parking is prohibited west of Kanan Road. The posted speed is 45 mph. Bicycle lanes are provided on both sides of Thousand Oaks Boulevard between the western City limit and Kanan Road. East of Kanan Road, a bike lane is provided on one side of Thousand Oaks Boulevard.
- **Reyes Adobe Road**—Reyes Adobe Road is a north/south secondary arterial. Two travel lanes are provided in each direction between Canwood Street and Lake Lindero Road. South of Canwood Street, there is one lane in each direction over the US-101 overcrossing and two lanes in each direction south of US-101. There are no driveways along Reyes Adobe Road north of US-101 and access is limited to cross streets. Street parking is prohibited along Reyes Adobe Road. The posted speed limit is 40 mph. Bicycle lanes are provided on both sides of Reyes Adobe Road between Canwood Street and Lake Lindero Road.
- **Canwood Street**—Canwood Street is an east/west secondary arterial east of Reyes Adobe Road. Between Lake Lindero Road and Chesebro Road there is one travel lane in each direction. Access to development along Canwood Street is provided. On-street parking is allowed west of Reyes Adobe Road but is prohibited between Reyes Adobe Road and Chesebro Road. The posted speed limit is 35 mph except between Reyes Adobe Road and Chesebro Road where it is 40 mph. Bicycle lanes are provided on both sides of Canwood Street between Lake Lindero Road and Forest Cove Lane. Due to the reconfiguration of the Kanan Road freeway interchange in 2005, Canwood Street was reconstructed and relocated 700 feet north on the east side where it intersects with Kanan Road.
- **Driver Avenue**—Driver Avenue is an east/west collector street with one travel lane in each direction between Argos Street and Chesebro Road. There is local access to the adjacent neighborhoods and on-street parking is allowed. The posted speed limit is 30 mph.
- **Palo Comado Canyon Road**—Palo Comado Canyon Road is a north/south secondary arterial connecting the Driver Avenue/Chesebro Road intersection north of the US-101 Freeway to Chesebro Road south of the US-101 Freeway. One travel lane is provided in each direction between Driver Avenue and Chesebro Road. There is limited development along Palo Comado Canyon Road and on-street parking is prohibited. The posted speed limit is 35 mph.
- **Liberty Canyon Road**—Liberty Canyon Road is a north/south secondary arterial between the US-101 and Agoura Road, and a collector street south of Agoura Road to Park Vista Road. One travel lane is provided in each direction between Canwood Street and Park Vista Road. Bike lanes and street parking is permitted along both sides of the facility. The posted speed limit is 40 mph.
- **Chesebro Road**—Chesebro Road is an east/west collector street between Canwood Street and Palo Comado Canyon Road north of the US-101 freeway and a north/south collector street between Agoura Road and the US-101 freeway eastbound on-ramp. One travel lane is provided in each direction. Sidewalk and street parking is provided on the north side of the road between Canwood Street and Palo Comado Canyon Road. Sidewalks and street parking are provided along both sides of the road south of Dorothy Drive and along the south side of the facility between Palo Comado Canyon Road south of the US-101 freeway and Agoura Road. The posted speed

limit is 35 miles per hour in some places, and 25 miles per hour in others, particularly for the segment that runs through Old Agoura.

Existing Bikeways

The City of Agoura Hills has a bikeways network. Figure 4.12-3 (Bikeways) illustrates the existing network, including the type of facility. In addition to connecting resources throughout the City of Agoura Hills, the bikeways link with similar facilities in surrounding communities, including Westlake Village and Oak Park.

The following describes the existing facilities:

- **Kanan Road**—A Class II facility between the northern City limits and Hillrise Drive.
- **Reyes Adobe Road**—A mixed Class II and Class III facility between Lake Lindero Road and Canwood Street. The Class II facility comprises the majority of the bicycle route on Reyes Adobe Road between Lake Lindero Road and Passageway Place; the Class III section lies between Passageway Place and Canwood Street.
- **Forest Cove Lane**—A mixed Class II and Class III facility between Trail Creek Drive and Canwood Street. The Class II facility is available between Rainbow Creek Drive and Canwood Street. The Class III facility is provided between Trail Creek Drive and Rainbow Crest Drive.
- **Thousand Oaks Boulevard**—A Class II facility that spans between the western City limits and Argos Street.
- **Agoura Road**—A Class II facility spanning the entire width of the City between the western and eastern City limits.
- **Rainbow Crest Drive**—A Class III facility that crosses Reyes Adobe Road and provides access between Forest Cove Lane and Mainmast Drive.
- **Canwood Street**—A mixed Class II and Class III facility that crosses Reyes Adobe Road. The Class II facility is provided east of Reyes Adobe Road to Forest Cove Drive; the Class III facility is available west of Reyes Adobe Road to Lake Lindero Road.

Planned additions to the City's system of bikeways include:

- **Reyes Adobe Road**—Extension of the existing Class II facility across the Reyes Adobe bridge; this will coincide with the Reyes Adobe Interchange improvement.
- **Palo Comado Canyon Road**—Addition of a Class II facility across the Palo Comado Canyon bridge; this will coincide with the Palo Comado Canyon Interchange improvement.

Existing Pedestrian Facilities

In addition to the bicycle routes, the City has various pedestrian facilities available, consisting of sidewalks, crosswalks, and a footbridge over the US-101. Sidewalks are generally available linking residential communities to the arterial roadways. However, several sections of roadway do not currently have sidewalks available, including the following:

- Driver Avenue between Easterly Road and Chesebro Road

- Kanan Road, west side between Laro Drive and the northern City limits
- Portions of Agoura Road between the western City limits and Kanan Road
- Agoura Road east of Kanan Road to the eastern City limits
- Reyes Adobe Road north of Rainbow Hill Road to Lake Lindero on the west side

Crosswalks exist at all signalized intersections. Pedestrian linkages between the north and south sides of the US-101 are available via sidewalks on the overpass bridges of Reyes Adobe Road, Kanan Road, and Palo Comado Canyon Road. A footbridge is also available joining Canwood Street and Roadside Drive just west of the Palo Comado Canyon/US-101 Interchange.

Existing Transit Service

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) and the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) provide existing regional public transit service to Agoura Hills. Metro service provides access between Thousand Oaks and Warner Center in the west San Fernando Valley; the LADOT Commuter Express provides service between Downtown Los Angeles and Thousand Oaks/Newbury Park. The following transit lines serve the City of Agoura Hills:

- **Metro Line 161**—Line 161 provides local service between Warner Center and Thousand Oaks. Within the City, this line generally runs along Agoura Road to Roadside Drive to Kanan Road to Thousand Oaks Boulevard. In the AM peak hour, the line operates with 15- to 50-minute headways depending on upon the direction of travel and 25- to 60-minute headways during the PM peak hour, depending on the direction of travel.
- **LADOT Commuter Express 422**—CE 422 is an express commuter line that travels from Downtown Los Angeles to Thousand Oaks. Within the City limits, the line operates on US-101, Kanan Road, and Thousand Oaks Boulevard. Stops are provided locally along Kanan Road and Thousand Oaks Boulevard. During the AM and PM peak periods, this line operates on a 20-minute headway.
- **LADOT Commuter Express 423**—CE 423 is an express commuter line that travels from Downtown Los Angeles to Newbury Park. Within the City limits, the line operates on US-101, Kanan Road, and Thousand Oaks Boulevard. Limited stops are provided at the US-101 park-and-ride lots and along Kanan Road and Thousand Oaks Boulevard. During the AM and PM peak periods, this line operates on a 20-minute headway.

The park-and-ride lots served by the Commuter Express lines are located in the northwest and southeast quadrants of the US-101/Kanan Road Interchange at the intersections of Kanan Road & Canwood Street and Kanan Road & Roadside Drive.

In addition to regional transit services (described above), the City of Agoura Hills operates two types of dial-a-ride service and two seasonal shuttle services:

- **Agoura Hills Dial-A-Ride (demand-responsive)**—The Dial-A-Ride service provides a demand-responsive door-to-door transportation service to the general public within the city limits. Destinations in the adjacent communities of Los Angeles and Ventura counties are allowed when one end of the trip is based within City limits. This service operates on weekdays between 7:00 A.M. and 7:00 P.M.; Saturday service is provided between 9:00 A.M. and 5:30 P.M.

- **Agoura Hills Dial-A-Ride (by appointment)**—The Dial-A-Ride service also provides a by-appointment transportation service to City residents only. There are several predetermined destinations available outside of the City limits. This service operates by appointment only Monday through Saturday.
- **Summer Shuttle Express**—The Summer Shuttle Express provides service in Agoura Hills during the summer season. Destinations generally include local activity centers, but are subject to change each summer season.
- **Summer Beach Bus**—The Summer Shuttle Express provides service between Agoura Hills and local beach communities during the summer season, typically Zuma and Leo Carrillo Beaches. This service operates Monday through Friday during the summer season. The bus makes four roundtrips each day.
- **Ladyface Loop**—The Ladyface Loop is a fixed-route service that connects Lindero Canyon Middle School, Agoura High School, the Agoura Hills Recreation Center, the Agoura Hills Library, and the Agoura Hills/Calabasas Community Center during the 3:00 P.M. to 4:00 P.M. hour.

Existing Traffic Volumes and Level of Service

Existing Traffic Volumes

Weekday 24-hour traffic counts on the analyzed street segments were collected in January and February 2009. Figure 4.13-2A (Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes) through Figure 4.13-2C (Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes) illustrate the existing AM and PM peak hour volumes for each study segment.

Level of Service Methodology

Traffic operations within the City of Agoura Hills are described in terms of weekday peak hour roadway segment capacities and level of service (LOS) for this study. Level of Service (LOS) is a qualitative measure used to describe the operating and traffic flow conditions, ranging from excellent (LOS A) to overloaded (LOS F) conditions. A LOS C is considered a stable flow. Table 4.13-1 (Street Segment Level of Service Definitions and Descriptions) and Table 4.13-2 (Description of Level of Service) provide definitions of the varying levels of service.


Table 4.13-1 Street Segment Level of Service Definitions and Descriptions						
Roadway Class	Number of Lanes	Median Type	Service Volume Thresholds for Level of Service (vehicles per hour) ^b			
			C or better	D	E	F
Collector	2	Undivided	≤ 450	≤ 950	≤ 1,200	> 1,200
	2	Undivided	≤ 870	≤ 1,390	≤ 1,480	> 1,480
Arterial	2.5 ^a	Undivided	≤ 1,087	≤ 1,737	≤ 1,942	≤ 1,942
	4	Undivided	≤ 1,929	≤ 2,803	≤ 2,964	> 2,964
	4	Divided	≤ 2,030	≤ 2,950	≤ 3,120	> 3,120
	5	Divided	≤ 2,600	≤ 3,700	≤ 3,905	> 3,905
	6	Divided	≤ 3,170	≤ 4,450	≤ 4,690	> 4,690

a. Denotes three lane cross section with one through lane in each direction and a continuous two-way left-turn lane.

b. Service volume thresholds for each level of service were derived and adapted from the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board, 2000, and Florida Department of Transportation Research, 2002.)

**CITY of AGOURA HILLS
General Plan Update EIR**

**EXISTING PEAK HOUR
TRAFFIC VOLUMES**




Source: Fehr & Peers, 2009.

10225|JCS|09



**CITY of AGOURA HILLS
General Plan Update EIR**

**EXISTING PEAK HOUR
TRAFFIC VOLUMES**



Legend

- # Analyzed Street Segment
- #(#) AM(PM) Peak Hour Traffic Volumes



Source: Fehr & Peers, 2009.

10225|JCS|09




**CITY of AGOURA HILLS
General Plan Update EIR**

**EXISTING PEAK HOUR
TRAFFIC VOLUMES**

Legend

- # Analyzed Street Segment
- #(##) AM(PM) Peak Hour Traffic Volumes



Source: Fehr & Peers, 2009.

10225|JCS|09



Table 4.13-2 Description of Level of Service

<i>Level of Service</i>	<i>Description</i>
A	Level of Service A represents free flow. Individual users are virtually unaffected by the presence of others in the traffic stream. Freedom to select desired speeds and to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely high. The general level of comfort and convenience is good.
B	Level of Service B is in the range of stable flow, but the presence of other users in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable. Freedom to select desired speeds is relatively unaffected, but there is a slight decline in the freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream. The general level of comfort and convenience is still relatively good.
C	Level of Service C is in the range of stable flow, but marks the beginning of the range of flow in which the operation of individual users becomes significantly affected by interactions with others in the traffic stream. The selection of speed is affected by the presence of others, and maneuvering within the traffic stream requires substantial vigilance on the part of the user. The general level of comfort and convenience declines noticeably at this level.
D	Level of Service D represents high-density, but stable, flow. Speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted and the driver or pedestrian experiences a generally poor level of comfort and convenience. Small increases in traffic flow will generally cause operational problems at this level.
E	Level of Service E represents operating conditions at or near the capacity level. All speeds are reduced to a low but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely difficult, and it is generally accomplished by forcing a vehicle or pedestrian to give way to accommodate such maneuvers. Comfort and convenience levels are extremely poor and driver or pedestrian frustration is generally high.
F	Level of Service F is used to define forced or breakdown flow. This condition exists wherever the amount of traffic approaching a point exceeds the amount that can traverse the point. Queues form behind such locations.

While the existing General Plan (1993) reflects analysis of traffic impacts by roadway intersections, the traffic study for the proposed General Plan Update assesses impacts to roadway segments, often referred to as a roadway link analysis. Roadway link analysis is now typically the level of detail used in long-term programmatic analyses, such as a General Plan. This level of detail is consistent with identification of street system capacity from a functional class perspective. Long-term land use projections evaluated as part of a General Plan are traditionally not developed to the level of detail required to produce project specific intersection turning movement forecasts, which would then allow for intersection capacity forecasts. This is the case in this particular General Plan Update, which is a long-range planning document that does not identify specific development projects.

Roadway capacities can be based on daily volume thresholds that reflect travel conditions for various facility types (e.g., two lane collectors, six-lane arterials, etc.). However, since peak hour traffic volumes are a better indication of roadway congestion during commute hours when traffic volumes are typically highest, peak hour roadway capacities were developed to reflect the roadway system within the City of Agoura Hills and roadway operations were analyzed during AM and PM peak hours. Roadway capacities were developed based on the concepts and procedures outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board, 2000) and the Florida Department of Transportation Research, 2002. Table 4.13-1 (Street Segment Level of Service Definitions and Descriptions) provides the peak hour service volumes for each level of service that was applied to the General Plan traffic analysis for the various roadway facility types.

Existing and future (Year 2035) peak hour traffic volumes on the study roadway segments were compared to the roadway service volumes and LOS thresholds presented in Table 4.13-1 (Street Segment Level of Service Definitions and Descriptions) and Table 4.13-2 (Description of Level of Service) to determine the operating conditions of the roadways during the AM and PM peak hours.

The Infrastructure and Community Services Chapter of the proposed General Plan identifies LOS C as the typical standard for roadways within the City. However, a reduced LOS standard of D, E, or F is considered acceptable on the following roadways:

- Kanan Road, due to heavy existing and projected volumes and the desire to maintain the existing four-lane cross-section with sidewalks, bicycle lanes and landscaped median islands
- Agoura Road east of Kanan Road, due to heavy projected volumes and a desire to maintain the two-lane cross-section with bicycle lanes, in order to minimize grading and encourage a semi-rural road appearance and to complement Agoura Village goals
- Canwood Street west of Reyes Adobe Road, due to both existing and projected volumes and the functional classification as a local street
- Dorothy Drive between Lewis Road and the US-101 ramps, due to projected volumes and direct access to/from the southbound US-101 ramps
- Roadway segments adjacent to schools, due to heavy usage before and after school hours (i.e., Driver Avenue between Argos Street and Chesebro Road and Lake Lindero Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard)
- Canwood Street east of Kanan Road Avenue, due to the heavy projected volumes under future conditions with development under the General Plan. Further widening beyond the proposed General Plan improvement (three-lane cross section with a continuous left-turn lane), is not possible within the available right-of-way.

Table 4.13-2 (Description of Level of Service) shows the adapted descriptions of LOS from the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board 2000).

Existing Levels of Service (LOS)

Traffic volumes presented in Figure 4.13-2A (Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes) through Figure 4.13-2C (Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes) were analyzed using the street segment analysis methodology described above to determine current operating conditions at the study segments. Table 4.13-3 (Existing Peak Hour & Daily Levels of Service) summarizes the existing weekday AM and PM peak hour LOS at each of the study locations. Figure 4.13-3A (Existing Level of Service—AM Peak Hour) and Figure 4.13-3B (Existing Level of Service—PM Peak Hour) illustrate the LOS at each study location during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

Table 4.13-3 Existing Peak Hour & Daily Levels of Service

<i>Street Segment</i>		<i>Classification</i>	<i># of Lanes</i>	<i>Peak Hour</i>	<i>Volume</i>	<i>LOS</i>
1	Lake Lindero Rd (n/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	Collector	2U	AM	595	D
			2U	PM	385	C or better
			—	Daily	3,700	—
2	Thousand Oaks Blvd (w/o Lake Lindero Rd)	Arterial	4D	AM	1,105	C or better
			4D	PM	1,535	C or better
			—	Daily	15,500	—
3	Lake Lindero Rd (s/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	Collector	2U	AM	300	C or better
			2U	PM	305	C or better
			—	Daily	3,300	—
4	Reyes Adobe Rd (n/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	Arterial	4U	AM	1,110	C or better
			4U	PM	515	C or better
			—	Daily	6,700	—
5	Thousand Oaks Blvd (w/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	4D	AM	840	C or better
			4D	PM	1,180	C or better
			—	Daily	12,550	—
6	Thousand Oaks Blvd (e/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	4D	AM	1,480	C or better
			4D	PM	1,270	C or better
			—	Daily	14,950	—
7	Reyes Adobe Rd (s/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	Arterial	4U	AM	1,130	C or better
			4U	PM	850	C or better
			—	Daily	10,750	—
8	Kanan Rd (s/o Fountainwood St)	Arterial	4D	AM	1,780	C or better
			4D	PM	1,890	C or better
			—	Daily	21,650	—
9	Kanan Rd (n/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	Arterial	4D	AM	2,455	D
			4D	PM	2,500	D
			—	Daily	29,150	—
10	Thousand Oaks Blvd (w/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	4D	AM	1,335	C or better
			4D	PM	1,205	C or better
			—	Daily	13,550	—
11	Thousand Oaks Blvd (e/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	4D	AM	1,525	C or better
			4D	PM	905	C or better
			—	Daily	10,600	—
12	Kanan Rd (s/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	Arterial	4D	AM	2,660	D
			4D	PM	2,360	D
			—	Daily	31,200	—

Table 4.13-3 Existing Peak Hour & Daily Levels of Service

Street Segment		Classification	# of Lanes	Peak Hour	Volume	LOS
13	Driver Ave (e/o Argos St)	Collector	2U	AM	1,005	D
			2U	PM	625	C or better
			—	Daily	6,800	—
14	Agoura Rd (e/o Flintlock Ln)	Arterial	4D	AM	680	C or better
			4D	PM	880	C or better
			—	Daily	8,600	—
15	Reyes Adobe Rd (n/o Canwood St)	Arterial	4U	AM	1,280	C or better
			4U	PM	1,110	C or better
			—	Daily	13,400	—
16	Canwood St (w/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Collector	2U	AM	420	C or better
			2U	PM	485	D
			—	Daily	5,500	—
17	Canwood St (e/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	245	C or better
			2U	PM	265	C or better
			—	Daily	3,100	—
18	Reyes Adobe Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	4D	AM	1,350	C or better
			4D	PM	1,165	C or better
			—	Daily	13,300	—
19	Agoura Rd (w/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	4D	AM	775	C or better
			4D	PM	800	C or better
			—	Daily	9,150	—
20	Agoura Rd (e/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	4D	AM	1,090	C or better
			4D	PM	1,095	C or better
			—	Daily	11,700	—
21	Kanan Rd (s/o Canwood St E)	Arterial	5D	AM	3,190	D
			5D	PM	3,065	D
			—	Daily	39,700	—
22	Canwood St (w/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	325	C or better
			2U	PM	380	C or better
			—	Daily	4,150	—
23	Canwood St (e/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	790	C or better
			2U	PM	855	C or better
			—	Daily	9,750	—
24	Kanan Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	4D	AM	1,705	C or better
			4D	PM	1,785	C or better
			—	Daily	21,800	—

Table 4.13-3 Existing Peak Hour & Daily Levels of Service

<i>Street Segment</i>		<i>Classification</i>	<i># of Lanes</i>	<i>Peak Hour</i>	<i>Volume</i>	<i>LOS</i>
25	Agoura Rd (w/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	765	C or better
			2U	PM	795	C or better
			—	Daily	9,050	—
26	Agoura Rd (e/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	390	C or better
			2U	PM	525	C or better
			—	Daily	6,250	—
27	Kanan Rd (s/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	1,310	D
			2U	PM	1,345	D
			—	Daily	15,500	—
28	Roadside Dr (w/o Lewis Rd)	Collector	2U	AM	225	C or better
			2U	PM	250	C or better
			—	Daily	2,800	—
29	Agoura Rd (e/o Cornell Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	385	C or better
			2U	PM	455	C or better
			—	Daily	5,300	—
30	Chesebro Rd (n/o Driver Ave)	Collector	2U	AM	255	C or better
			2U	PM	325	C or better
			—	Daily	3,450	—
31	Driver Ave (w/o Chesebro Rd)	Collector	2U	AM	1,100	D
			2U	PM	690	C or better
			—	Daily	8,200	—
32	Palo Comado Canyon (e/o Chesebro Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	1,490	F
			2U	PM	1,080	D
			—	Daily	12,550	—
33	Chesebro Rd (s/o Driver Ave)	Arterial	2U	AM	480	C or better
			2U	PM	520	C or better
			—	Daily	5,500	—
34	Dorothy Dr (b/t Lewis Rd & US-101 SB)	Collector	2U	AM	290	C or better
			2U	PM	325	C or better
			—	Daily	3,300	—
35	Chesebro Rd (s/o Dorothy Dr)	Arterial	2U	AM	930	D
			2U	PM	650	C or better
			—	Daily	8,400	—
36	Agoura Rd (w/o Chesebro Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	470	C or better
			2U	PM	515	C or better
			—	Daily	5,650	—

Table 4.13-3 Existing Peak Hour & Daily Levels of Service

Street Segment		Classification	# of Lanes	Peak Hour	Volume	LOS
37	Palo Comado Canyon (s/o Dorothy Dr)	Arterial	2U	AM	1,065	D
			2U	PM	855	C or better
			—	Daily	9,950	—
38	Chesebro Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	595	C or better
			2U	PM	490	C or better
			—	Daily	5,350	—
39	Liberty Canyon Rd (b/t US-101 NB & SB ramps)	Arterial	2U	AM	575	C or better
			2U	PM	640	C or better
			—	Daily	5,450	—
40	Liberty Canyon Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	725	C or better
			2U	PM	725	C or better
			—	Daily	7,050	—
41	Agoura Rd (w/o Liberty Canyon Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	450	C or better
			2U	PM	465	C or better
			—	Daily	4,700	—
42	Agoura Rd (e/o Liberty Canyon Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	590	C or better
			2U	PM	680	C or better
			—	Daily	6,050	—
43	Liberty Canyon Rd (s/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	440	C or better
			2U	PM	405	C or better
			—	Daily	4,750	—


Analysis of existing conditions determined that thirty-two of the forty-three street segments studied currently operate at LOS C or better during both AM and PM peak hours. Ten of the street segments studied currently operate at LOS D during at least one of the peak hours and one location currently operates at LOS F.¹⁷ Thus, in comparing these locations to the minimum acceptable level of service criteria established in the General Plan (LOS C), the following eleven locations currently operate below LOS C and are considered deficient in the existing conditions during at least one peak period:

1. Lake Lindero Drive north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard (AM peak hour)
9. Kanan Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard (AM and PM peak hours)
12. Kanan Road south of Thousand Oaks Boulevard (AM and PM peak hours)
13. Driver Avenue east of Argos Street (AM peak hour)
16. Canwood Street west of Reyes Adobe Road (PM peak hour)
21. Kanan Road south of Canwood Street East (AM and PM peak hour)

¹⁷ For the purposes of counting the number of deficient locations, only the worst performing peak period is counted (i.e., if a segment operates at LOS C or better in the AM peak and LOS E in the PM peak, it is counted as operating at LOS E).

**CITY of AGOURA HILLS
General Plan Update EIR**

**EXISTING
LEVEL OF SERVICE –
AM PEAK HOUR**



Legend

- LOS C or Better
- LOS D
- LOS E
- LOS F
- City Limits




Source: Fehr & Peers, 2009.

01207|JCS|10



**CITY of AGOURA HILLS
General Plan Update EIR**

**EXISTING
LEVEL OF SERVICE –
PM PEAK HOUR**



Legend

- LOS C or Better
- LOS D
- LOS E
- LOS F
- City Limits



Source: Fehr & Peers, 2009.

01207|JCS|10



- 27. Kanan Road south of Agoura Road (AM and PM peak hours)
- 31. Driver Avenue west of Chesebro Road (AM peak hour)
- 32. Palo Comado Canyon Road east of Chesebro Road (AM and PM peak hours)
- 35. Chesebro Road south of Dorothy Drive (AM peak hour)
- 37. Palo Comado Canyon Road south of US-101 (AM peak hour)

Of these eleven locations, one location (Segment 32, Palo Comado Canyon Road east of Chesebro Road) currently operates at LOS F during the AM peak hour. The remaining ten locations currently operate at LOS D.

4.13.2 Regulatory Framework

■ Federal

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990

Titles I, II, III, and V of the ADA have been codified in Title 42 of the United States Code, beginning at Section 12101. Title III prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in “places of public accommodation” (businesses and nonprofit agencies that serve the public) and “commercial facilities” (other businesses). The regulation includes Appendix A to Part 36 (Standards for Accessible Design) establishing minimum standards for ensuring accessibility when designing and constructing a new facility or altering an existing facility.

Examples of key guidelines include detectable warnings for pedestrians entering traffic where there is no curb, a clear zone of 48 inches for the pedestrian travelway, a vibration-free zone for pedestrians, etc.

■ State

Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) administers transportation programming. Transportation programming is the public decision-making process, which sets priorities and funds projects envisioned in long-range transportation plans. It commits expected revenues over a multi-year period to transportation projects. The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System, funded with revenues from the State Highway Account and other funding sources. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) manages the operation of State Highways, including the freeways passing through Agoura Hills.

■ Regional

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

Every three years, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) updates the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the six-county region that includes Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange, Ventura, and Imperial counties. The region is expected to grow from 17 million people to nearly 23 million by 2030. Despite heavy investments in transit over the past thirty years, transit ridership has not increased proportionally. Meanwhile, the region is facing a crisis in transporting goods, as severe congestion to truck traffic is expected to worsen.

Los Angeles County

The Long Range Transportation Plan for Los Angeles County notes that there is very limited ability to add capacity to the region's highways and freeways over the next twenty-five years. Key efforts would focus on increasing the efficiency of the existing network and encouraging greater reliance on carpooling and transit use. Additionally, efforts would be undertaken to increase the efficiency of major city streets (arterials) through technical enhancements (such as optimizing signal timing), providing bus priorities, and improving interchanges between freeways and arterial streets.

The Congestion Management Plan (CMP) for Los Angeles County designates certain arterial roadways and freeway segments as CMP facilities. The primary reasons for defining and monitoring a CMP highway and roadway system include the following:¹⁸

- To assess the overall performance of the highway system in Los Angeles County and track changes over time
- To allow local jurisdictions to measure their success at minimizing traffic congestion and provide “before and after” data for evaluating congestion mitigation measures
- To provide quantitative input into MTA programming (funding) decisions with consistent countywide data on current levels of traffic congestion
- To provide data for validating and updating MTA's countywide model
- To provide the baseline system levels of service used in the Deficiency Plan. This data is used to determine deficiencies countywide (not jurisdiction-specific)

The CMP freeway segments within the vicinity of Agoura Hills include the following:

- US-101 north of Reyes Adobe

The CMP specifies a standard of LOS E for CMP arterial streets.

¹⁸ Metropolitan Transportation Authority. Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County, 2004.

■ Local

City of Agoura Hills

The Mobility section of the Infrastructure and Community Services chapter of the proposed General Plan Update identifies flexible LOS objectives, addresses traffic growth in Agoura Hills, and promotes alternative modes of transportation and quality of life, as highlighted below.

- **Minimum Level of Service Standards**—Establish flexible criteria for the minimum acceptable level of service (LOS) based on the roadway characteristics. Maintain an LOS C standard on most roadways within the City. A reduced LOS standard of D, E, or F is considered acceptable on the following roadways: Kanan Road, Agoura Road east of Kanan Road, Canwood Street west of Reyes Adobe Road, Dorothy Drive between Lewis Road and US-101; roadway segments adjacent to schools on Driver Avenue and Lake Lindero Road; and Canwood Street east of Kanan Road
 - > Kanan Road, due to heavy existing and projected volumes and desire to maintain the existing four-lane cross-section with sidewalks, bicycle lanes and landscaped median islands
 - > Agoura Road east of Kanan Road, due to heavy projected volumes and desire to maintain two-lane cross-section with bicycle lanes and in order to minimize grading, encourage a semi-rural road appearance and to complement Agoura Village goals
 - > Canwood Street west of Reyes Adobe Road, due to existing and projected volumes and the functional classification as a local street
 - > Dorothy Drive between Lewis Road and US-101 ramps, due to projected volumes and direct access to/from the southbound US-101 ramps
 - > Roadway segments adjacent to schools, due to heavy usage before and after school hours (i.e., Driver Avenue between Argos Street and Chesebro Road and Lake Lindero Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard)
 - > Canwood Street east of Kanan Road Avenue, due to the heavy projected volumes under future conditions with development under the General Plan. Further widening beyond the proposed General Plan improvement (three-lane cross section with a continuous left-turn lane), is not possible within the available right-of-way.

Intersection impacts from development projects shall be mitigated to appropriate levels, but at least to the extent where the post development level of service shall not be less than the LOS existing prior to development.

- **Roadway Improvements**—Promote effective, innovative, and safe solutions that would facilitate reduced reliance on physical roadway improvements, where appropriate. Enhance freeway access through interchange improvements, such as the Reyes Adobe Road (currently underway) and Palo Comado Canyon Road/Chesebro Road interchanges; Explore Intelligent Transportation Systems technology; and explore Transportation Demand Management approaches.
- **Strive to provide a transportation system** that serves all modes of travel and meets the needs of all users, ensuring that the existing and future transportation system serves multiple modes of travel, such as driving, walking, biking, and transit. Encourage desired land use patterns, such as mixed-use walkable developments, through transportation planning and design.

4.13.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

■ Analytic Method

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) travel demand forecasting model was used to estimate the increase in traffic volumes between existing (Year 2009) and cumulative (Year 2035) conditions due to regional growth and development. Based on a review of the growth projections from the SCAG regional transportation demand forecasting model (TDFM), the average annual growth rate in the Agoura Hills subarea over the duration of this analysis is estimate to be approximately 0.75 percent per year. The SCAG TDFM takes into account the regional growth and development projected within the entire Southern California region. While the TDFM encompasses the projected growth of the entire region, the traffic analysis focused on the growth affecting the Agoura Hills subarea of the TDFM. The area-wide growth rate utilized in this analysis represents the growth that is projected outside of the immediate Agoura Hills city limits, but includes neighboring communities.

Development Assumptions

The proposed General Plan provides for the development of approximately 116 single-family residential dwelling units, 413 multifamily residential, 625,794 square feet of retail/service, 1,098,291 square feet of office/business park, and 273,445 square feet of business park/manufacturing uses by 2035.

The actual development patterns may occur differently than anticipated in this document due to market forces. For example, the pace of development may be faster or slower than anticipated by the analysis, or it could not occur at all. The General Plan Update does not include any site-specific development projects, so specific land use types or intensities are currently unknown. The analysis contained in this document should be considered as a guide to traffic impacts and recommended improvements and impacts, but is subject to subsequent analysis as specific development projects or improvements are proposed.

Peak Hour Performance

Roadway capacities are often based on daily volume thresholds that reflect travel conditions for various facility types (e.g., two-lane collectors, six-lane arterials, etc.). However, since peak hour traffic volumes are a better indication of roadway congestion during commute hours when traffic volumes are typically highest, peak hour roadway capacities were developed to reflect the roadway system within Agoura Hills, and roadway operations were analyzed during the AM and PM peak hours. Roadway capacities were based on the procedures outlined in Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board 2000) and Florida Department of Transportation Research (2002).

Existing and future (Year 2035) peak hour traffic volumes on the study roadway segments were compared to the roadway capacities and LOS thresholds to determine the operating conditions of roadways during the A.M. and P.M. peak hour with and without buildout of the General Plan.

■ Thresholds of Significance

For purposes of this EIR, implementation of the proposed project would have a significant impact if it would do any of the following:

- Cause an increase in traffic that 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 congestion on roadways)
- Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways
- Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in locations that results in substantial safety risks
- Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses
- Result in inadequate emergency access
- Result in inadequate parking capacity
- Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)

■ Effects Not Found to Be Significant

Threshold	Would the proposed project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in locations that results in substantial safety risks?
-----------	--

The City of Agoura Hills is not located within the sphere of influence of any major public airport. Furthermore, the proposed General Plan Update would not interfere with or alter air traffic patterns in or near the City of Agoura Hills. There would be ***no impact*** (Class III) to air traffic patterns.

Threshold	Would the proposed project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?
-----------	--

The City of Agoura Hills currently supports a variety of alternative transportation opportunities, including public transit (bus), Class II and Class III bikeways, and pedestrian facilities. The General Plan Update includes goals and policies that encourage, promote, and to some extent, require the use and provision of alternative modes of transportation (Goal M-6 [Alternative Transportation], Goal M-9 [Transit], Policy M-6.1 [Efficient System] through Policy M-6.6 [Alternative Mode Funding], Policy M-9.1 [Transit Commuting] through Policy M-9.5 [Funding]). In addition to promoting a balanced transportation system, the proposed General Plan Update calls for future provision of amenities, such as bicycle racks (Policy M-8.6 [Bicycle Facility Design] and Policy M-8.7 [Bicycle Parking]), additional bicycle lanes (Goal M-8 [Bikeways], Policy M-8.1 [Bikeway Linkages] through Policy M-8.5 [Bikeway design]), and pedestrian connections (Goal M-7 [Pedestrians]. Policy M-7.1 [Walkability] through

Policy M-7.7 [Design Standards]) will help to improve the quality of life of City residents. The General Plan Update goals and policies strive to support and expand upon the existing TDM Program outlined in the Municipal Code (Goal M-10 [Transportation Demand Management], Policy M-10.1 [Current Techniques] through Policy M-10.5 [Preferential Parking]). These goals and policies promote the incorporation of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) techniques that seek to reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicle trips and promote travel by alternative modes of transportation into future development. TDM is a set of strategies that are intended to reduce the number of single-occupant automobiles traveling during the peak hours of the day, which may include preferential carpool/vanpool parking, pedestrian circulation features, transit stop improvements, and amenities for bicycle commuters (e.g., bicycle lockers and showers). As such, the General Plan Update intends to promote and enhance the alternative modes of transportation within the City of Agoura Hills and would not conflict with adopted policies or plans, and would result in *no impact* (Class III). No mitigation measures are required.

■ Less-Than-Significant Impacts

Threshold	Would the proposed project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?
-----------	---

Impact 4.13-1 **Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in the potential intensification of existing uses that could result in increased hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses. However, implementation of the General Plan Update policies and compliance with existing regulations would ensure that this impact remains *less than significant* (Class II).**

The proposed General Plan Update does not identify any site-specific development plans. As such, details regarding future development, such as project layouts, emergency access, driveway locations, specific land uses, or actual intensities are unknown. Without such detail, it is not possible, using available traffic analysis procedures, to estimate certain types of impacts, including potential design features. Therefore, ongoing development proposals must be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as they arise, and as site specific details become known. The City cannot address these project impacts in this EIR, as it would be too speculative to try to determine the particular details of potential development projects. Such analysis would occur as specific development projects are proposed and project specific CEQA review is conducted.

The proposed General Plan Update and associated traffic analysis assumed a variety of already identified circulation improvements as well as newly identified circulation improvements necessary to reduce potential impacts resulting from the General Plan Update buildout. These improvements fall into the following four categories and are described below:

- Improvements proposed as part of the existing General Plan (1993) and are currently either under construction, in design, or planned
 - > **Palo Comado Canyon Road/Chesebro Road Interchange**—Improve the overpass to four lanes, improve Palo Comado Canyon Road to four lanes from Canwood Street to Chesebro Road, and reconfigure the ramp interface.
 - > **Reyes Adobe Road Interchange**—Improve the overpass to six lanes, improve Reyes Adobe Road from Canwood Street to Agoura Road to six lanes, and reconfigure the ramp interface. This improvement is currently underway.
 - > **Agoura Road (western City limits to Kanan Road)**—Widen Agoura Road between Kanan Road and the westerly city limits to a continuous four lanes.
 - > **Chesebro Road (Palo Comado Canyon Road to Agoura Road)**—Widen Chesebro Road between Palo Comado Canyon Road and Agoura Road to four lanes.
 - > **Kanan Road (Agoura Road to southerly City limits)**—Widen Kana Road between the southerly city limits and Agoura Road to four lanes.
- Improvements currently proposed as part of the General Plan Update
 - > **Chesebro Road (Dorothy Drive to Palo Comado Canyon Road)**—Widen Chesebro Road between Dorothy Drive and Palo Comado Canyon Road to a three-lane cross-section.
 - > **Canwood Street (Kanan Road to Chesebro Road)**—Widen Canwood Street between Kanan Road and Chesebro Road to a three-lane cross section including a continuous left-turn lane.
 - > **Chesebro Road (Canwood Street to Driver Avenue)**—Widen Chesebro Road between Canwood Street and Driver Avenue to a three-lane cross section including a continuous left-turn lane.
- Improvements identified under the existing General Plan (1993) that are no longer proposed
 - > **Liberty Canyon Road Interchange**—Improve underpass to four lanes, improve Liberty Canyon Road from US-101 to Agoura Road to four lanes. The improvement is not required to accommodate the projected traffic volumes.
 - > **Agoura Road (Kanan Road to eastern City limits)**—Improve to four lanes. Improvement deleted due to desire to maintain rural character. In approving the Agoura Village Specific Plan project, the City of Agoura Hills City Council determined that the widening of Agoura Road in the Specific Plan area would not be acceptable.
 - > **Kanan Road (Canwood Street to northern City limits)**—Improve to six lanes. Implementing the widening would likely require the narrowing and/or removal of bike lanes, sidewalks, medians, and/or median landscaping and the possible narrowing of existing travel lanes. City staff and GPAC have indicated that such widening would likely adversely affect the character of the Kanan Road corridor and its ability to serve bicycle and pedestrian modes, and as a result, the widening is no longer under consideration.
- Improvements identified under the existing General Plan (1993) that have been constructed
 - > **Kanan Road Interchange**—Reconfigure ramps in northeast and southwest quadrants.

However, none of these improvements would introduce new safety hazards at intersections or along roadway segments, as most would increase capacity, flow, and safety, and they would need to be designed

pursuant to state and/or County standards. In addition, several General Plan Update goals and policies provide for maintaining and enhancing existing roadways (Goal M-1 [Local Circulation System], Goal M-3 [Intelligent Transportation Systems], Policy M-1.3 [Level of Service Standard], Policy M-1.4 [Roadway Improvements], Policy M-1.7 [Maintenance], Policy M-1.9 [Development of Required Mobility Improvements], Policy M-3.1 [Intelligent Transportation Systems], Policy M-3.2 [Signal Timing Optimization]), increasing the safety of roadways (Policy M-1.1 [Safety], Policy M-1.2 [Collision Monitoring]), and balancing safety, quality of life (Goal M-4 [Ensuring Quality of Life], Goal M-5 [Neighborhood Traffic Management], Policy M-1.5 [Roadway Character], Policy M-4.1 [Arterial Traffic], Policy M-4.4 [Truck Routes], Policy M-4.5 [Trucking Impacts], Policy M-5.1 [Traffic Calming], Policy M-5.2 [Neighborhood Coordination]), and efficiency of design of circulation and access (Policy M-1.6 [Freeway Access], Policy M-1.8 [Timing of Improvements], Policy M-4.2 [Integrated Land Use and Transportation Planning], Policy M-4.3 [Traffic Control Devices], Policy M-4.6 [Energy Reduction]). Additionally, the goals and policies are intended to promote alternative modes of transportation, including the enhancement of community walkability, bicycle lanes and circulation, and transit (Policy M-2.1 [Complete Streets]). Therefore, the proposed General Plan Update goals and policies would help to reduce any potential hazards due to design features and would result in a *less-than-significant* impact (Class II). No mitigation measures are required.

Threshold	Would the proposed project result in inadequate emergency access?
-----------	---

Impact 4.13-2 Implementation of the General Plan Update has the potential to result in an impact that would cause inadequate emergency access. However, compliance with the General Plan Update goals and policies, and local and state regulations, would result in a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact.

The Proposed General Plan Update does not identify any site-specific development plans. As such, details regarding future development, such as project layouts, emergency access, driveway locations, specific land uses, or actual intensities are unknown. Without such detail, it is not possible, using available traffic analysis procedures, to estimate certain types of impacts, including potential design features. Therefore, ongoing development proposals must be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as they arise, and as site specific details become known. The City cannot address these project impacts in this EIR, as it would be too speculative to try to determine the particular details of potential development projects. Such analysis would occur as specific development projects are proposed and project specific CEQA review is conducted.

The General Plan Update, and any subsequent development, would be required to meet all applicable local and state regulatory standards for adequate emergency access. Goal M-1.1 (Local Circulation System) and Policy M-1.1 (Safety) and Policy M-1.2 (Collision Monitoring) of the General Plan Update aim to improve and provide adequate access for uses within the City, including for emergencies. The General Plan Update and all subsequent development projects would be required to comply with applicable Municipal Code and Fire Code requirements regarding emergency access. Compliance with all applicable laws would ensure that all potential impacts would be *less than significant* (Class II), and no mitigation measures are required.

Threshold	Would the proposed project result in inadequate parking capacity?
-----------	---

Impact 4.13-3 **Implementation of the General Plan Update has the potential to result in an impact that would cause inadequate parking capacity. However, compliance with General Plan Update goals and policies, and state and local regulations, would result in a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact.**

The proposed General Plan Update does not outline any site-specific development plans. As such, details regarding future development, such as specific land uses, actual intensities, and associated parking requirements and provisions are unknown. Therefore, ongoing development proposals must be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as they arise and undergo separate CEQA review. All future development projects would be subject to parking standards or requirements in the Municipal Code. Furthermore, implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would require implementation of parking standards and/or requirements in the Municipal Code. While goals and policies throughout the General Plan Update seek to encourage reductions in parking requirements via shared parking studies and facilities and adherence to parking standards and design (Goal M-11 [Parking], Policy M-11.1 [Parking Standards and Design], Policy M-11.2 [Shared Parking]), other policies are intended to facilitate multi-modal travel such as walking, bicycling, and transit use (Policy M-11.3 [Efficient Parking Design]) that could further reduce the demand for parking. These proposed policies combined with future project-level parking analyses for proposed development within the City, in addition to compliance with all Municipal Code requirements at the time of permitting, would ensure that parking impacts are *less than significant* (Class II). No mitigation measures are required.

Threshold	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?
-----------	--

Impact 4.13-4 **Implementation of the General Plan Update would increase the amount of traffic on CMP highways. However, it would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County CMP Agency for designated roadways and/or highways, and therefore would result in a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact.**

The following discussion relates to the County Congestion Management Plan (CMP). In addition to the surface street analysis of the General Plan Update, an analysis of operating conditions along the US-101 (Ventura Freeway) was also included in the traffic study. The freeway segment analysis included the following scenarios: existing conditions, future base conditions (without the General Plan Update), and future conditions with the proposed General Plan. Five freeway segments were selected, as shown below. However, only one segment (US-101 north of Reyes Adobe Road) is a CMP freeway facility. Furthermore, there are no CMP-designated roadways within the City of Agoura Hills.

- US-101 north of Reyes Adobe Road (Los Angeles County CMP Freeway Monitoring Station)
- US-101 north of Kanan Road
- US-101 north of Chesebro Road

- US-101 north of Liberty Canyon Road
- US-101 south of Liberty Canyon Road

Within Agoura Hills, ten total travel lanes are provided on the US-101: four mainline and one auxiliary lane per direction. Freeway volume data was utilized from *2007 Traffic Volumes on California State Highways* (Caltrans 2007) and the specific peak hour data in *2007 Peak Hour Volume Data Report* (Caltrans 2007) was applied. Table 4.13-4 (Freeway Peak Hour Levels of Service) summarizes the results of the freeway analysis and the traffic volumes at each freeway segment during the AM and PM peak hour, respectively.

Under the existing conditions, two segments operate at LOS C and LOS D during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively: north of Reyes Adobe Road and north of Kanan Road. The three remaining segments operate at LOS D during both peak hours.

The future freeway traffic projections were determined in a manner similar to the forecast of future street segment volumes. The annual growth rate was only applied to the portion of through traffic along the US-101 and the traffic from cumulative projects outside of the City was assigned to the freeway.

Analysis of future base conditions, without assuming buildout of the General Plan Update nor any future development in the City, indicates that the following segments are projected to operate at LOS E during either peak period:

- US-101 north of Liberty Canyon Road (PM peak hour)
- US-101 south of Liberty Canyon Road (AM peak hour)

The three remaining segments are projected to operate at LOS D during both peak hours.

With the addition of the proposed General Plan traffic to the freeway segments, three locations are projected to operate at LOS D and LOS E during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively, including the following:

- US-101 north of Reyes Adobe Road
- US-101 north of Kanan Road
- US-101 north of Chesebro Road

The two remaining segments are projected to operate at LOS E during both peak periods.

The CMP establishes LOS E as the minimum acceptable LOS for operations on the regional freeway system. Under the future base conditions, all segments are projected to operate at LOS D or E during all analyzed periods and meet the minimum operating standard. With the addition of the proposed General Plan traffic, each segment of US-101 within the Agoura Hills vicinity is projected to operate at LOS E in at least one analyzed period. Traffic associated with the proposed General Plan would not cause the five locations (including the one identified CMP facility) to exceed the LOS E operating standard established by the CMP. So, while trips would still be generated at these locations with the General Plan Update, the General Plan Update would not add substantial trips to CMP facilities such that the established threshold is exceeded. As such, the proposed General Plan Update would result in a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact on CMP highway and roadway facilities, and no mitigation measures are required.

Table 4.13-4 Freeway Peak Hour Levels of Service

Freeway Segment	Peak Hour	Existing Conditions			Year 2035 Base			Year 2035 with Proposed General Plan Land Use			
		Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	Volume	Increase	# of Lanes	LOS
1 US-101 north of Reyes Adobe Road	AM	13,000	10	C	15,700	10	D	16,600	900	10	D
	PM	13,550	10	D	16,250	10	D	17,650	1,400	10	E
2 US-101 north of Kanan Road	AM	13,000	10	C	15,700	10	D	16,500	800	10	D
	PM	13,550	10	D	16,250	10	D	17,500	1,250	10	E
3 US-101 north of Chesebro Road	AM	13,200	10	D	16,000	10	D	16,700	700	10	D
	PM	13,800	10	D	16,550	10	D	17,550	1,000	10	E
4 US-101 north of Liberty Canyon Road	AM	13,600	10	D	16,500	10	D	17,500	1,000	10	E
	PM	14,200	10	D	17,050	10	E	18,550	1,500	10	E
5 US-101 south of Liberty Canyon Road	AM	14,150	10	D	17,100	10	E	18,150	1,050	10	E
	PM	14,150	10	D	16,900	10	D	18,500	1,600	10	E

The US-101 provides four mainline lanes and one auxiliary lane in each direction through Agoura Hills.

Volumes are rounded to nearest 50 vehicles.

The following Level of Service criteria were derived and adapted from the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board, 2000) and the Florida DOT Research 2002:

Lanes	Volume Thresholds for Each Level of Service					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
10	≤ 5,600	≤ 9,070	≤ 13,130	≤ 16,980	≤ 19,310	> 19,310

■ Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

Threshold	Would the proposed project cause an increase in traffic that 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 congestion on roadways)?
-----------	--

Impact 4.13-5 **Implementation of the General Plan Update would result in an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system with respect to the number of vehicle trips or congestion along roadways. This is a potentially significant impact. As there is no feasible mitigation available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, this impact is considered a *significant and unavoidable (Class I)* impact.**

Estimates of future traffic conditions both without and with the proposed General Plan were necessary to evaluate potential impacts to the existing street system from development anticipated under the proposed General Plan. The future base conditions scenario represents future traffic conditions without the proposed General Plan growth, and assuming no other future development in the City by 2035 but including two other traffic sources: background regional traffic growth and specific cumulative projects outside the City. The future conditions with proposed General Plan scenario represents future base traffic conditions plus the proposed General Plan growth (Refer to Section 4.13.1 [Environmental Setting, Study Scope]). Year 2035 was used as the horizon year for future condition traffic analysis.

Background Regional Traffic Growth

Existing traffic is expected to increase between year 2009 and year 2035 as a result of general, area-wide, and regional growth and development. Based on a review of the growth projections from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) regional transportation demand forecasting model (TDFM), the average annual growth rate in the Agoura Hills subarea over the duration of this analysis is approximately 0.75 percent per year.

The SCAG TDFM takes into account the regional growth and development projected within the entire Southern California region. While the TDFM encompasses the projected growth of the entire region, the traffic analysis focused on the growth affecting the Agoura Hills subarea of the TDFM. The area-wide growth rate utilized in this analysis represents the growth that is projected outside of the immediate Agoura Hills city limits, but includes neighboring communities such as Calabasas, Westlake Village, and Oak Park.

For the purposes of this analysis, the area-wide growth rate was applied only to regional through trips in the Agoura Hills area. The regional through trips are a component of the total traffic that is regionally generated without an origin or destination inside the City limits. Trips with either an origin or destination within Agoura Hills are local in nature and are not considered as a regional through trip.

The SCAG TDFM was utilized to estimate the portion of traffic on the freeway and street network that is regional versus the portion that is local. Due to the nature of the Agoura Hills roadway system, regional through trips are generally confined to the major travel routes, including the US-101 freeway, Kanan Road and Thousand Oaks Boulevard. Based on the model, the following regional through-trip factors were estimated:

- Thousand Oaks Boulevard: 10 percent
- Kanan Road (north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard): 70 percent
- Kanan Road (US-101 interchange to Thousand Oaks Boulevard): 40 percent
- Kanan Road (south of US-101): 75 percent
- US-101 freeway: 85 percent

In developing the future traffic projections, the area-wide growth rate was only applied to the portion of traffic on the arterials that are regional through trips.

Related Projects

Future base conditions traffic forecasts include the effects of specific projects, called cumulative or related projects, expected to be implemented in the vicinity of the City. The list of related projects was developed with assistance from City staff. Related projects represent the anticipated development outside of City limits.

Table 4.13-5 (Related Projects) summarizes the trip generation estimates for the related projects. Where available, trip estimates were taken from previous environmental studies; otherwise, estimates were calculated using trip generation rates contained in *Trip Generation, 8th Edition* (Institute of Transportation Engineers 2008). Table 4.13-5 (Related Projects) shows that the four related projects would generate a combined projected total of approximately 10,900 daily trips. Approximately 1,407 vehicles per hour (vph) are estimated during the weekday AM peak hour and 974 vph are anticipated during the weekday PM peak hour. The location of the four identified related projects is shown in Figure 4.13-4 (Related Projects).

Using the trip generation estimates and trip distribution patterns of the proposed related-project land uses, the geographic distribution of population from which the employees and patrons of proposed commercial projects could be drawn, the geographic distribution of employment and activity centers to which residents could be attracted, and the location of the related projects in relation to the surrounding street system, related-project traffic was assigned to the street network. This related-project only traffic was then added to the existing traffic volumes after adjustment for background regional traffic growth (described above) to create future base conditions (i.e., future conditions without the proposed General Plan) and assuming no other future development in the City. Table 4.13-6 (Year 2035 Base Peak Hour & Traffic Volumes) provides the projected future base traffic conditions for the weekday AM and PM peak hours, as well as the future base daily traffic volumes, in 2035. Figure 4.13-5A (Year 2035 Base Level of Service—AM Peak Hour) and Figure 4.13-5B (Year 2035 Base Level of Service—PM Peak Hour) provide the weekday AM and PM peak hour trip generation.


Table 4.13-5 Related Projects

Related Project & Land Uses	Size	ITE Code	Trip Generation						
			Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
				In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
1. OPUS West—Russell Ranch^a									
Office	361,000 sf	710	3,975	495	65	560	90	445	535
Adjustment			(100)	(15)	0	(15)	0	(50)	(50)
Retail	8,000 sf	820	345	5	5	10	15	15	30
Adjustment			(25)	0	0	0	(5)	0	(5)
Restaurant	21,000 sf	931	1,890	10	10	20	105	50	155
Adjustment			(50)	0	0	0	(20)	0	(20)
Fitness Center	45,000 sf	492	1,480	25	35	60	95	90	185
Adjustment			(100)	0	(15)	(15)	(25)	0	(25)
<i>Russell Ranch Subtotal</i>			7,415	520	100	620	255	550	805
2. Heschel West School^b									
K-8 Students	660 students	n/a	2,231	382	265	647	0	40	40
Pre-school Students	90 students	n/a	407	39	34	73	18	21	39
<i>Heschel West School Subtotal</i>			2,638	421	299	720	18	61	79
3. Minder-Saratoga^c									
Single-Family Residential	23 units	210	220	4	13	17	14	9	23
<i>Minder-Saratoga Subtotal</i>			220	4	13	17	14	9	23
4. Triangle Ranch									
Single-Family Residential	66 units	210	632	12	38	50	42	25	67
<i>Triangle Ranch Subtotal</i>			632	12	38	50	42	25	67
Total			10,905	957	450	1,407	329	645	974



SOURCES: a. Land use and trip generation data from the *OPUS West Russell Ranch Project FEIR* (City of Westlake Village, 2007).
b. Land use and trip generation data from *Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report—Heschel West School* (Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 2005).
c. Land use data provided by the City of Agoura Hills. Trip generation prepared with ITE 8th Edition rates.

CITY of AGOURA HILLS General Plan Update EIR

RELATED PROJECTS



Legend

-  Cumulative Projects
-  City Boundary



Source: Fehr & Peers, 2009.

10225|JCS|09



Table 4.13-6 Year 2035 Base Peak Hour & Traffic Volumes

<i>Street Segment</i>		<i>Peak Hour</i>	<i>Volume</i>
1	Lake Lindero Rd (n/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	AM	610
		PM	400
		Daily	3,850
2	Thousand Oaks Blvd (w/o Lake Lindero Rd)	AM	1,170
		PM	1,625
		Daily	16,400
3	Lake Lindero Rd (s/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	AM	300
		PM	305
		Daily	3,300
4	Reyes Adobe Rd (n/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	AM	1,155
		PM	535
		Daily	6,950
5	Thousand Oaks Blvd (w/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	AM	890
		PM	1,245
		Daily	13,150
6	Thousand Oaks Blvd (e/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	AM	1,555
		PM	1,320
		Daily	15,550
7	Reyes Adobe Rd (s/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	AM	1,130
		PM	850
		Daily	10,750
8	Kanan Rd (s/o Fountainwood St)	AM	2,080
		PM	2,175
		Daily	24,950
9	Kanan Rd (n/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	AM	2,845
		PM	2,870
		Daily	33,500
10	Thousand Oaks Blvd (w/o Kanan Rd)	AM	1,405
		PM	1,255
		Daily	14,150
11	Thousand Oaks Blvd (e/o Kanan Rd)	AM	1,615
		PM	925
		Daily	11,000
12	Kanan Rd (s/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	AM	2,895
		PM	2,555
		Daily	33,800
13	Driver Ave (e/o Argos St)	AM	1,090
		PM	635
		Daily	7,150
14	Agoura Rd (e/o Flintock Ln)	AM	710
		PM	885
		Daily	8,700
15	Reyes Adobe Rd (n/o Canwood St)	AM	1,280
		PM	1,110
		Daily	13,400

Table 4.13-6 Year 2035 Base Peak Hour & Traffic Volumes


	<i>Street Segment</i>	<i>Peak Hour</i>	<i>Volume</i>
16	Canwood St (w/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	AM	445
		PM	490
		Daily	5,600
17	Canwood St (e/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	AM	245
		PM	265
		Daily	3,100
18	Reyes Adobe Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	AM	1,355
		PM	1,165
		Daily	13,350
19	Agoura Rd (w/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	AM	810
		PM	805
		Daily	9,300
20	Agoura Rd (e/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	AM	1,120
		PM	1,100
		Daily	11,800
21	Kanan Rd (s/o Canwood St E)	AM	3,470
		PM	3,315
		Daily	42,950
22	Canwood St (w/o Kanan Rd)	AM	345
		PM	385
		Daily	4,250
23	Canwood St (e/o Kanan Rd)	AM	790
		PM	855
		Daily	9,750
24	Kanan Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	AM	1,990
		PM	2,095
		Daily	25,450
25	Agoura Rd (w/o Kanan Rd)	AM	795
		PM	805
		Daily	9,200
26	Agoura Rd (e/o Kanan Rd)	AM	425
		PM	530
		Daily	6,350
27	Kanan Rd (s/o Agoura Rd)	AM	1,545
		PM	1,595
		Daily	18,300
28	Roadside Dr (w/o Lewis Rd)	AM	225
		PM	250
		Daily	2,800
29	Agoura Rd (e/o Cornell Rd)	AM	430
		PM	470
		Daily	5,550
30	Chesebro Rd (n/o Driver Ave)	AM	360
		PM	335
		Daily	3,850

Table 4.13-6 Year 2035 Base Peak Hour & Traffic Volumes

<i>Street Segment</i>		<i>Peak Hour</i>	<i>Volume</i>
31	Driver Ave (w/o Chesebro Rd)	AM	1,185
		PM	700
		Daily	8,550
32	Palo Comado Canyon (e/o Chesebro Rd)	AM	1,495
		PM	1,080
		Daily	12,600
33	Chesebro Rd (s/o Driver Ave)	AM	500
		PM	520
		Daily	5,600
34	Dorothy Dr (b/t Lewis Rd & US-101 SB)	AM	295
		PM	330
		Daily	3,350
35	Chesebro Rd (s/o Dorothy Dr)	AM	1,185
		PM	680
		Daily	9,350
36	Agoura Rd (w/o Chesebro Rd)	AM	510
		PM	525
		Daily	5,800
37	Palo Comado Canyon (s/o Dorothy Dr)	AM	1,410
		PM	900
		Daily	11,300
38	Chesebro Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	AM	680
		PM	510
		Daily	5,750
39	Liberty Canyon Rd (b/t US-101 NB & SB ramps)	AM	600
		PM	660
		Daily	5,650
40	Liberty Canyon Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	AM	745
		PM	750
		Daily	7,300
41	Agoura Rd (w/o Liberty Canyon Rd)	AM	500
		PM	470
		Daily	4,850
42	Agoura Rd (e/o Liberty Canyon Rd)	AM	640
		PM	685
		Daily	6,250
43	Liberty Canyon Rd (s/o Agoura Rd)	AM	455
		PM	430
		Daily	4,950

**CITY of AGOURA HILLS
General Plan Update EIR**

**YEAR 2035
BASE LEVEL OF SERVICE
– AM PEAK HOUR**



Legend

- LOS C or Better
- LOS D
- LOS E
- LOS F




Source: Fehr & Peers, 2009.

10225|JCS|09



**CITY of AGOURA HILLS
General Plan Update EIR**

**YEAR 2035
BASE LEVEL OF SERVICE
– PM PEAK HOUR**



Legend

- LOS C or Better
- LOS D
- LOS E
- LOS F



Source: Fehr & Peers, 2009.

10225|JCS|09



Proposed General Plan Traffic Volumes

Estimating traffic conditions with the proposed General Plan involves a three-step process consisting of traffic generation, trip distribution, and traffic assignment.

Trip Generation

Trip generation estimates were developed by applying the factors in Table 4.13-7 (Proposed General Plan—Trip Generation Rates) to the various land uses identified by the proposed General Plan. The analysis was conducted by Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ), with the City divided into 14 TAZs. The trip generation factors were applied to each category of land use in each TAZ to arrive at a total number of anticipated vehicle trips by TAZ. For TAZs that included portions of the AVSP area, the trip generation rates for these AVSP portions were obtained from the AVSP and associated EIR (2008).

TAZ & Land Uses	Units	ITE Code	Trip Generation						
			Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
				In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Single Family Residential	du	210	9.57	25%	75%	0.75	63%	37%	1.01
Multi Family Residential	du	230	5.81	17%	83%	0.44	67%	33%	0.52
Office/Business Park	ksf	750	b	89%	11%	b	14%	86%	b
Business Park/Manufacturing	ksf	770	c	84%	16%	c	23%	77%	c
Retail/Service	ksf	814 ^a	44.32	61%	39%	0.72	44%	56%	2.71
Retail/Service	ksf	820	d	61%	39%	d	48%	52%	d

Pass-by reductions for retail land uses were applied on a varying scale: <100 ksf—10%, 100 ksf to 300 ksf—30%. The varying pass-by reduction is related to the rate difference between the specialty retail and shopping center rates. The specialty retail rates are lower than the shopping center rate and some pass-by reduction is already inherent in the rate.

a. AM trip generation for ITE land use 814 is derived from the proportional relationship between the PM rates for specialty retail (ITE 814) and shopping center (ITE 820). The specialty retail rate was applied to the retail land uses that are <100 ksf in size. Land uses 750, 770, and 820 use logarithmic rather than linear equations in trip generation calculations as described below.

b. Office Park
ITE 750
Daily: $\ln(T) = 10.42 \ln(X) + 409.04$
AM: $\ln(T) = 0.84 \ln(X) + 1.51$
PM: $T = 1.21(X) + 106.22$

c. Business Park
ITE 770
Daily: $\ln(T) = 10.75 \ln(X) + 747.41$
AM: $\ln(T) = 0.98 \ln(X) + 0.45$
PM: $\ln(T) = 0.92 \ln(X) + 0.78$

d. Retail/Service
ITE 820
Daily: $\ln(T) + 0.65 \ln(X) + 5.83$
AM: $\ln(T) = 0.6 \ln(X) + 2.29$
PM: $\ln(T) + 0.66 \ln(X) + 3.4$

Trip Reduction Credits

Several trip reduction credits were applied in the traffic analysis prepared for the proposed General Plan: internal capture, pass-by, and Transportation Demand Management (TDM). The trip credits were applied to the appropriate land use in each TAZ, where applicable.

Internal Capture

Typically in development with mixed land uses, an internal capture credit can be applied to the trip generation estimates. This internal capture credit reflects the tendency of users of one land use to also visit other land uses within the development; this credit accounts for the interaction among the multiple

land uses. In the context of the Agoura Hills General Plan Update, each TAZ represents development with a varying mix of land use densities and types throughout the TAZ; therefore, an element of interaction among the land use types within the TAZ that would not leave the TAZ is assumed.

The internal capture rate refers to the tendency of users of one land use to also visit other land uses within the same development. Each TAZ represents development with a varying mix of land use densities and types throughout the TAZ; therefore, an element of interaction among the land use types within the TAZ that would not leave the TAZ is assumed. The calculation of internal capture credit was developed for each individual TAZ using the assumptions and methodology outlined in the *2nd Edition ITE Trip Generation Handbook* (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2004). The credits were developed based on the amount of planned business park, office, residential, and retail land use growth within each TAZ; the methodology provides an overall internal capture rate as well as individual internal capture rates specific to the proposed land uses. In order to achieve the overall internal reductions for each TAZ, the individual internal capture rates were applied to the appropriate land uses during the analyzed time periods. These internal capture credits ranged from one percent to 48 percent per land use; this ultimately achieved the overall reductions indicated by the ITE methodology.

Pass-by

Pass-by reductions represent those trips already on the roadway system expected to be attracted to the site once the proposed land uses are built. While these trips would be new to the site itself, they would not be new to the roadway system and are not considered new trips generated by the land use. Because these trips are already captured in the existing traffic counts, they are removed from the calculations to ensure that double counting these trips does not occur. Pass-by credits ranging from 10 percent to 30 percent were applied to the proposed retail land uses only.

In the analysis of the proposed General Plan trips, the pass-by credits were not taken into account on streets directly serving the future retail use; rather, the pass-by trips at these locations were assigned to the local street network to simulate diversion from their usual path of travel. This methodology results in a more conservative analysis.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

TDM is a set of strategies that are intended to reduce the number of single-occupant automobiles traveling during the peak hours of the day. Section 9654.4 of the *Agoura Hills Municipal Code* details the TDM measures currently required of new developments. Effectively, a series of development standards are required in support of the City's TDM efforts. These standards may include preferential carpool/vanpool parking, pedestrian circulation features, transit stop improvements, and amenities for bicycle commuters. The General Plan Update goals and policies strive to support and expand upon the existing TDM Program, including Goal M-10 (Transportation Demand Management) and Policy M-10.1 (Current Techniques) through Policy M-10.5 (Preferential Parking). The TDM credit is meant to acknowledge the ongoing and future TDM efforts in Agoura Hills per the General Plan Update; a TDM credit of five percent was applied to the office and business park uses proposed in the General Plan Update.

Table 4.13-8 (Proposed General Plan Trip Generation) provides a summary of the proposed General Plan trip generation estimates and rates, including TDM measures and credits. The development anticipated under the proposed General Plan in total is estimated to generate an increase of approximately 45,302 weekday trips, including approximately 3,026 weekday AM peak hour trips and approximately 4,775 weekday PM peak hour trips.

Table 4.13-8 Proposed General Plan Trip Generation											
TAZ & Land Uses	Size	Units	ITE Code	Trip Credit ^{d,e,f}	Trip Generation						
					Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
						In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
TAZ 1											
Retail/Service	141	sf	814		6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass-by Reduction				10%	(1)	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>TAZ 1 Subtotal</i>					5	0	0	0	0	0	0
TAZ 2											
Multi-family Residential	22	du	230		128	2	8	10	7	4	11
Internal Capture within TAZ				36%, 31%, 39%	(46)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(3)	(2)	(4)
Retail/Service	28,575	sf	814		1,266	13	8	21	34	43	77
Internal Capture within TAZ				4%, 16%, 6%	(51)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(3)	(5)
Pass-by Reduction				10%	(122)	(1)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(7)
<i>TAZ 2 Subtotal</i>					1,175	11	12	23	33	38	72
TAZ 3											
Single Family Residential	23	du	210		220	4	13	17	14	9	23
<i>TAZ 3 Subtotal</i>					220	4	13	17	14	9	23
TAZ 4											
Retail/Service	9,467	sf	814		420	4	3	7	11	15	26
Pass-by Reduction				10%	(42)	(1)	0	(1)	(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>TAZ 4 Subtotal</i>					378	3	3	6	10	13	23
TAZ 5											
Multi-Family Residential	22	du	220		128	2	8	10	7	4	11
Internal Capture within TAZ				37%, 49%, 40%	(47)	(1)	(4)	(5)	(3)	(2)	(4)
Retail/Service	53,919	sf	814		2,390	24	15	39	64	82	146
Internal Capture within TAZ				6%, 25%, 6%	(143)	(6)	(4)	(10)	(4)	(5)	(9)
Pass-by Reduction				10%	(225)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(6)	(8)	(14)
Office/Business Park	159,584	sf	750		2,072	286	35	321	42	257	299
Internal Capture within TAZ				4%, 2%, 1%	(83)	(6)	(1)	(6)	0	(3)	(3)
TDM Reduction				5%	(99)	(14)	(2)	(16)	(2)	(13)	(15)
<i>TAZ 5 Subtotal</i>					3,993	283	46	330	98	312	411

Table 4.13-8 Proposed General Plan Trip Generation

TAZ & Land Uses	Size	Units	ITE Code	Trip Credit ^{d,e,f}	Trip Generation						
					Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
						In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
TAZ 6											
Single-Family Residential	14	du	210		134	3	8	11	9	5	14
Internal Capture within TAZ				37%, 45%, 40%	(50)	(1)	(4)	(5)	(4)	(2)	(6)
Retail/Service	268,013	sf	820		12,890	173	110	283	576	624	1,200
Internal Capture within TAZ				4%, 15%, 3%	(516)	(26)	(17)	(42)	(17)	(19)	(36)
Pass-by Reduction ^a				30%	(3,712)	(44)	(28)	(72)	(168)	(182)	(349)
Office/Business Park	12,036	sf	750		534	33	4	37	17	104	121
Internal Capture within TAZ				10%, 8%, 5%	(53)	(3)	0	(3)	(1)	(5)	(6)
TDM Reduction				5%	(24)	(2)	0	(2)	(1)	(5)	(6)
Business Park/Manufacturing	205,465	sf	770		2,956	244	46	290	67	226	293
Internal Capture within TAZ				10%, 8%, 5%	(296)	(20)	(4)	(23)	(3)	(11)	(15)
TDM Reduction				5%	(133)	(11)	(2)	(13)	(3)	(11)	(14)
<i>TAZ 6 Subtotal</i>					<i>11,730</i>	<i>346</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>461</i>	<i>472</i>	<i>724</i>	<i>1,196</i>
TAZ 7											
Retail/Service	20,440	sf	814		906	9	6	15	24	31	55
Internal Capture within TAZ				4%, 13%, 3%	(36)	(1)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(1)	(2)
Pass-by Reduction				10%	(87)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(5)
Office/Business Park	32,992	sf	750		753	76	9	85	20	126	146
Internal Capture within TAZ				4%, 2%, 1%	(30)	(2)	(0)	(2)	(0)	(1)	(1)
TDM Reduction				5%	(36)	(4)	(0)	(4)	(1)	(6)	(7)
<i>TAZ 7 Subtotal</i>					<i>1,470</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>146</i>	<i>186</i>
TAZ 8											
Multi-Family Residential	76	du	230		442	6	27	33	27	13	40
Internal Capture within TAZ				37%, 30%, 37%	(164)	(2)	(8)	(10)	(10)	(5)	(15)
Specialty Retail (AVSP)	36,600	sf	— ^b		1,443	26	17	43	48	50	98
Internal Capture within TAZ				11%, 29%, 13%	(159)	(8)	(5)	(12)	(6)	(7)	(13)
Retail/Service	15,297	sf	814		678	7	4	11	18	23	41
Internal Capture within TAZ				11%, 29%, 13%	(75)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(3)	(5)
Pass-by Reduction				10%	(60)	(1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	(2)	(4)
Office/Business Park	153,028	sf	750		2,004	276	34	310	41	250	291
Internal Capture within TAZ				4%, 3%, 1%	(80)	(8)	(1)	(9)	(0)	(3)	(3)
TDM Reduction				5%	(96)	(13)	(2)	(15)	(2)	(12)	(14)
Business Park/Manufacturing	21,862	sf	770		982	27	5	32	9	28	37
Internal Capture within TAZ				4%, 3%, 1%	(39)	(1)	(0)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)
TDM Reduction				5%	(47)	(1)	(0)	(2)	(0)	(1)	(2)
<i>TAZ 8 Subtotal</i>					<i>4,829</i>	<i>306</i>	<i>70</i>	<i>376</i>	<i>121</i>	<i>331</i>	<i>451</i>

Table 4.13-8 Proposed General Plan Trip Generation

TAZ & Land Uses	Size	Units	ITE Code	Trip Credit ^{d,e,f}	Trip Generation						
					Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
						In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
TAZ 9											
Multi-Family Residential	19	du	— ^b		115	2	7	9	7	4	11
Internal Capture within TAZ				37%, 48%, 40%	(43)	(1)	(3)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(4)
Retail/Service	16,592	sf	820		2,113	32	21	53	92	99	191
Internal Capture within TAZ				6%, 21%, 5%	(127)	(7)	(4)	(11)	(5)	(5)	(10)
Pass-by Reduction				10%	(119)	(3)	(2)	(4)	(9)	(9)	(18)
Office/Business Park	71,539	sf	750		1,154	146	18	164	27	166	193
Internal Capture within TAZ				3%, 3%, 2%	(36)	(4)	(1)	(5)	(1)	(3)	(4)
TDM Reduction				5%	(56)	(7)	(1)	(8)	(1)	(8)	(9)
Business Park/Manufacturing	46,118	sf	770		1,243	56	11	67	17	57	74
Internal Capture within TAZ				3%, 3%, 2%	(37)	(2)	(0)	(2)	(0)	(1)	(1)
TDM Reduction				5%	(60)	(3)	(1)	(3)	(1)	(3)	(4)
<i>TAZ 9 Subtotal</i>					<i>4,068</i>	<i>209</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>256</i>	<i>123</i>	<i>295</i>	<i>419</i>
TAZ 10											
Office/Business Park	170,842	sf	750		2,189	303	37	340	44	269	313
TDM Reduction				5%	(109)	(15)	(2)	(17)	(2)	(14)	(16)
<i>TAZ 10 Subtotal</i>					<i>2,080</i>	<i>288</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>323</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>255</i>	<i>297</i>
TAZ 11											
Multi-Family Residential	112	du	— ^b		606	8	38	46	36	18	54
Internal Capture within TAZ				37%, 40%, 40%	(225)	(3)	(15)	(19)	(15)	(8)	(21)
Office (AVSP)	75,250	sf	— ^b		965	119	15	134	21	126	147
Internal Capture within TAZ				4%, 3%, 2%	(39)	(4)	(0)	(4)	(0)	(3)	(3)
Retail/Service	61,250	sf	820		4,938	71	46	117	217	236	453
Internal Capture within TAZ				8%, 28%, 8%	(395)	(20)	(13)	(33)	(17)	(19)	(36)
Pass-by Reduction				10%	(454)	(5)	(3)	(8)	(20)	(22)	(42)
Office/Business Park ^c	267,681	sf	750		3,198	441	54	495	60	370	430
Internal Capture within TAZ				4%, 3%, 2%	(128)	(13)	(2)	(15)	(1)	(7)	(9)
TDM Reduction				5%	(154)	(21)	(3)	(24)	(3)	(18)	(21)
<i>TAZ 11 Subtotal</i>					<i>8,312</i>	<i>573</i>	<i>117</i>	<i>689</i>	<i>278</i>	<i>673</i>	<i>952</i>

Table 4.13-8 Proposed General Plan Trip Generation

TAZ & Land Uses	Size	Units	ITE Code	Trip Credit ^{d,e,f}	Trip Generation						
					Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
						In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
TAZ 12											
Single-Family Residential	53	du	210		507	10	30	40	34	20	54
Internal Capture within TAZ				33%, 25%, 31%	(167)	(3)	(8)	(10)	(11)	(6)	(17)
Multi-Family Residential	131	du	— ^b		725	10	46	56	45	22	67
Internal Capture within TAZ				33%, 25%, 31%	(239)	(3)	(11)	(14)	(14)	(6)	(21)
Senior Housing (AVSP)	31	du	— ^b		97	0	2	2	2	1	3
Internal Capture within TAZ				33%, 25%, 31%	(32)	(0)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(0)	(1)
Specialty Retail (AVSP)	61,000	sf	— ^b		2,417	45	28	73	83	87	170
Internal Capture within TAZ				13%, 29%, 13%	(314)	(13)	(8)	(21)	(11)	(11)	(22)
Retail/Service ^c	54,500	sf	814		2,340	34	21	55	99	104	203
Internal Capture within TAZ				13%, 29%, 13%	(304)	(10)	(6)	(16)	(13)	(14)	(26)
Pass-by Reduction				10%	(204)	(2)	(2)	(4)	(9)	(9)	(18)
Office (AVSP)	100,000	sf	— ^b		1,201	150	19	169	24	148	172
Internal Capture within TAZ				8%, 7%, 3%	(96)	(11)	(1)	(12)	(1)	(4)	(5)
Office/Business Park ^c	55,339	sf	750		986	117	15	132	24	149	173
Internal Capture within TAZ				8%, 7%, 3%	(79)	(8)	(1)	(9)	(1)	(4)	(5)
TDM Reduction				5%	(45)	(5)	(1)	(6)	(1)	(7)	(8)
TAZ 12 Subtotal					6,793	311	122	434	249	470	719
TAZ 13											
Single-Family Residential	26	du	210		249	5	15	20	16	10	26
TAZ 13 Subtotal					249	5	15	20	16	10	26
TAZ 14											
No Change in Land Use Plan	n/a	n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
TAZ 14 Subtotal					0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total					45,302	2,416	604	3,026	1,496	3,276	4,775

SOURCE: Fehr & Peers 2009, October

Land use source: City of Agoura Hills, table entitled "Agoura Hills, Existing and Proposed General Plan Buildout by TAZ, 5-15-19." Trip generation equations and rates from Table 5 (Agoura Hills General Plan Update [Proposed General Plan Scenario] – Trip Generation Rates) from Fehr & Peers October 2009 report.

- a. Pass-by trips in TAZ 6 were assigned to the local street network to simulate diversion from their usual path of travel.
- b. Description, size, and trip generation taken from the Agoura Village Specific Plan (AVSP) Specific Plan EIR.
- c. Land use density reflects reduction of the Agoura Hills General Plan with the densities specified in the Agoura Village Specific Plan.
- d. Pass-by trips for retail land uses were applied on a varying scale: <100 ksf = 10%; 100 ksf to 300 ksf = 30%; and > 300 ksf = 20%.
- e. Internal capture credits represent trips between land uses within the TAZ and remaining internal to the TAZ. The credits were calculated based on the ITE internalization methodology and vary by time period. Credits were calculated by time period and the percentages are presented in the following order: Daily, AM peak hour, PM peak hour.
- f. TDM reduction credit of 5% applied to estimate the effects of the current TDM requirements in the Municipal Code.

Trip Distribution

The direction distribution of traffic generated in the City was estimated based on a review of the approved Agoura Village Specific Plan, the current Agoura Hills General Plan, and the SCAG regional transportation demand forecasting model. In applying the information from these sources, the geographic distribution of trips generated is dependent on several factors:

- The locations of employment and commercial centers to which residents would be drawn
- The locations of population centers from which employees and patrons would be drawn
- Characteristics of the street system
- The level of accessibility of the routes to and from the proposed land uses

The distribution applied in the analysis for Agoura Hills was adapted from those sources and is generally comprised of the following distribution:

- 20 percent internal to Agoura Hills
- 5 percent to/from the north
- 5 percent to/from the south
- 35 percent to/from the east
- 35 percent to/from the west

Trip Assignment

The project trip generation estimates summarized in Table 4.13-8 (Proposed General Plan Trip Generation) and the distribution patterns discussed above were used to assign the proposed General Plan traffic to the local and regional street system and through the forty-three study segments.

Year 2035 (Future) Base Traffic Conditions

The future base peak hour traffic volumes demonstrated in Table 4.13-6 (Year 2035 Base Peak Hour & Traffic Volumes) were analyzed to determine the LOS for each of the analyzed segments under year 2035 future base conditions. The Year 2035 conditions take into account regional growth and cumulative projects but do not include the traffic attributable to growth under the proposed General Plan. Table 4.13-9 (Future Peak Hour Levels of Service) summarizes these results. Under the future base conditions (without the proposed General Plan Update), the following thirteen analyzed locations are projected to be deficient with operations at LOS D or worse during either or both peak hour:

1. Lake Lindero Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard (AM peak hour)
8. Kanan Road south of Fountainwood Street (AM and PM peak hours)
9. Kanan Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard (AM and PM peak hours)
12. Kanan Road south of Thousand Oaks Boulevard (AM and PM peak hours)
13. Driver Avenue east of Argos Street (AM peak hour)
16. Canwood Street west of Reyes Adobe Road (PM peak hour)
21. Kanan Road south of Canwood Street East (AM and PM peak hours)
24. Kanan Road north of Agoura Road (PM peak hour)
27. Kanan Road south of Agoura Road (AM and PM peak hours)

Table 4.13-9 Future Peak Hour Levels of Service

Street Segment	Classification	Peak Hour	Year 2035 Base			Year 2035 with Proposed General Plan Land use					Less than LOS
			Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	Without Improvements			With Proposed Circulation Element		
						Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	# of Lanes	LOS	
1 Lake Lindero Rd (n/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	Collector	AM	610	2U	D	610	2U	D	2U	D	**
		PM	400	2U	C or better	405	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
2 Thousand Oaks Blvd (w/o Lake Lindero Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,170	4D	C or better	1,275	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
		PM	1,625	4D	C or better	1,765	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
3 Lake Lindero Rd (s/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	Collector	AM	300	2U	C or better	305	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
		PM	305	2U	C or better	310	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
4 Reyes Adobe Rd (n/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	Arterial	AM	1,155	4U	C or better	1,155	4U	C or better	4U	C or better	
		PM	535	4U	C or better	540	4U	C or better	4U	C or better	
5 Thousand Oaks Blvd (w/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	AM	890	4D	C or better	995	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
		PM	1,245	4D	C or better	1,390	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
6 Thousand Oaks Blvd (e/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,555	4D	C or better	1,585	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
		PM	1,320	4D	C or better	1,370	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
7 Reyes Adobe Rd (s/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	Arterial	AM	1,130	4U	C or better	1,225	4U	C or better	4U	C or better	
		PM	850	4U	C or better	995	4U	C or better	4U	C or better	
8 Kanan Rd (s/o Fountainwood St)	Arterial	AM	2,080	4D	D	2,245	4D	D	4D	D	**
		PM	2,175	4D	D	2,435	4D	D	4D	D	**
9 Kanan Rd (n/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	Arterial	AM	2,845	4D	D	3,050	4D	E	4D	E	**
		PM	2,870	4D	D	3,195	4D	F	4D	F	**
10 Thousand Oaks Blvd (w/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,405	4D	C or better	1,435	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
		PM	1,255	4D	C or better	1,310	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
11 Thousand Oaks Blvd (e/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,615	4D	C or better	1,665	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
		PM	925	4D	C or better	1,000	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
12 Kanan Rd (s/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	Arterial	AM	2,895	4D	D	3,130	4D	F	4D	F	**
		PM	2,555	4D	D	2,895	4D	D	4D	D	**

Table 4.13-9 Future Peak Hour Levels of Service

Street Segment	Classification	Peak Hour	Year 2035 Base		Year 2035 with Proposed General Plan Land use						Less than LOS
			Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	Without Improvements			With Proposed Circulation Element		
						Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	# of Lanes	LOS	
13 Driver Ave (e/o Argos St)	Collector	AM	1,090	2U	D	1,130	2U	D	2U	D	**
		PM	635	2U	C or better	700	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
14 Agoura Rd (e/o Flintock Ln)	Arterial	AM	710	4D	C or better	830	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
		PM	885	4D	C or better	1,045	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
15 Reyes Adobe Rd (n/o Canwood St)	Arterial	AM	1,280	4U	C or better	1,470	4U	C or better	4U	C or better	
		PM	1,110	4U	C or better	1,380	4U	C or better	4U	C or better	
16 Canwood St (w/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Collector	AM	445	2U	C or better	445	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
		PM	490	2U	D	490	2U	D	2U	D	**
17 Canwood St (e/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	AM	245	2U	C or better	285	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
		PM	265	2U	C or better	315	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
18 Reyes Adobe Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,355	4D	C or better	1,935	4D	C or better	5D	C or better	
		PM	1,165	4D	C or better	1,965	4D	C or better	5D	C or better	
19 Agoura Rd (w/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	AM	810	4D	C or better	1,110	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
		PM	805	4D	C or better	1,230	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
20 Agoura Rd (e/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,120	4D	C or better	1,505	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
		PM	1,100	4D	C or better	1,630	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
21 Kanan Rd (s/o Canwood St E)	Arterial	AM	3,470	5D	D	3,970	5D	F	5D	F	**
		PM	3,315	5D	D	4,180	5D	F	5D	F	**
22 Canwood St (w/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	AM	345	2U	C or better	630	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
		PM	385	2U	C or better	730	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
23 Canwood St (e/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	AM	790	2U	C or better	1,110	2U	D	2.5U*	C or better	
		PM	855	2U	C or better	1,560	2U	F	2.5U*	D	**
24 Kanan Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,990	4D	C or better	2,800	4D	D	4D	D	**
		PM	2,095	4D	D	3,300	4D	F	4D	F	**

Table 4.13-9 Future Peak Hour Levels of Service

Street Segment	Classification	Peak Hour	Year 2035 Base			Year 2035 with Proposed General Plan Land use					Less than LOS
			Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	Without Improvements			With Proposed Circulation Element		
						Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	# of Lanes	LOS	
25 Agoura Rd (w/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	AM	795	2U	C or better	1,325	2U	D	4D	C or better	
		PM	805	2U	C or better	1,535	2U	F	4D	C or better	
26 Agoura Rd (e/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	AM	425	2U	C or better	695	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
		PM	530	2U	C or better	930	2U	D	2U	D	**
27 Kanan Rd (s/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,545	2U	F	1,880	2U	F	4U	C or better	
		PM	1,595	2U	F	2,115	2U	F	4U	D	**
28 Roadside Dr (w/o Lewis Rd)	Collector	AM	225	2U	C or better	300	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
		PM	250	2U	C or better	350	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
29 Agoura Rd (e/o Cornell Rd)	Arterial	AM	430	2U	C or better	700	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
		PM	470	2U	C or better	875	2U	D	2U	D	**
30 Chesebro Rd (n/o Driver Ave)	Collector	AM	360	2U	C or better	360	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
		PM	335	2U	C or better	335	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
31 Driver Ave (w/o Chesebro Rd)	Collector	AM	1,185	2U	D	1,225	2U	D	2U	D	**
		PM	700	2U	C or better	755	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
32 Palo Comado Canyon (e/o Chesebro Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,495	2U	F	1,725	2U	F	4U	C or better	
		PM	1,080	2U	D	1,520	2U	F	4U	C or better	
33 Chesebro Rd (s/o Driver Ave)	Arterial	AM	500	2U	C or better	710	2U	C or better	2.5U*	C or better	
		PM	520	2U	C or better	975	2U	D	2.5U*	C or better	
34 Dorothy Dr (b/t Lewis Rd & US-101 SB)	Collector	AM	295	2U	C or better	390	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
		PM	330	2U	C or better	485	2U	D	2U	D	**
35 Chesebro Rd (s/o Dorothy Dr)	Arterial	AM	1,185	2U	D	1,360	2U	D	2.5U*	D	**
		PM	680	2U	C or better	1,005	2U	D	2.5U*	C or better	
36 Agoura Rd (w/o Chesebro Rd)	Arterial	AM	510	2U	C or better	760	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
		PM	525	2U	C or better	875	2U	D	2U	D	**

Table 4.13-9 Future Peak Hour Levels of Service

Street Segment	Classification	Peak Hour	Year 2035 Base			Year 2035 with Proposed General Plan Land use					Less than LOS
			Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	Without Improvements			With Proposed Circulation Element		
						Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	# of Lanes	LOS	
37 Palo Comado Canyon (s/o Dorothy Dr)	Arterial	AM	1,410	2U	E	1,785	2U	F	4U	C or better	
		PM	900	2U	D	1,510	2U	F	4U	C or better	
38 Chesebro Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	AM	680	2U	C or better	890	2U	D	4U	C or better	
		PM	510	2U	C or better	815	2U	C or better	4U	C or better	
39 Liberty Canyon Rd (b/t US-101 NB & SB ramps)	Arterial	AM	600	2U	C or better	635	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
		PM	660	2U	C or better	705	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
40 Liberty Canyon Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	AM	745	2U	C or better	785	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
		PM	750	2U	C or better	800	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
41 Agoura Rd (w/o Liberty Canyon Rd)	Arterial	AM	500	2U	C or better	615	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
		PM	470	2U	C or better	645	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
42 Agoura Rd (e/o Liberty Canyon Rd)	Arterial	AM	640	2U	C or better	640	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
		PM	685	2U	C or better	690	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
43 Liberty Canyon Rd (s/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	AM	455	2U	C or better	530	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
		PM	430	2U	C or better	550	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	

#U Denotes number of lanes on an undivided facility.

#D Denotes number of lanes on a divided facility.

* Denotes an undivided facility with a dual left turn cross section.

** Denotes facility that is less than LOS C.

31. Driver Avenue west of Chesebro Road (AM peak hour)
32. Palo Comado Canyon Road east of Chesebro Road (AM and PM peak hours)
35. Chesebro Road south of Dorothy Drive (AM peak hour)
37. Palo Comado Canyon Road south of US-101 (AM and PM peak hours)

Of these thirteen locations, three are projected to operate at LOS E or LOS F during either peak period:

27. Kanan Road south of Agoura Road (AM and PM peak hours)
32. Palo Comado Canyon Road east of Chesebro Road (AM and PM peak hours)
37. Palo Comado Canyon Road south of Dorothy Drive (AM and PM peak hours)

The remaining ten locations are projected to operate at LOS D. In total, this represents an increase of two locations operating below LOS C compared to the existing conditions and an increase of two locations projected to operate at LOS E.

Future Base Plus Proposed General Plan Conditions

The future plus proposed General Plan peak hour traffic volumes were analyzed under two future analysis scenarios relating to the implementation of potential future improvements on the Agoura Hills street system, including the following:

- Without roadway improvements: This is the analysis of the future traffic volumes on the existing street system without any roadway improvements.
- With proposed General Plan roadway improvements: This analyzes the effect of the roadway improvements for the proposed General Plan.

Future Conditions Without Improvements

This scenario assumes future traffic projections on the existing (unimproved) road system, that is, without the improvements listed in the first two categories in the discussion of Impact 4.13-1, which are identified in the Mobility Section of the Infrastructure and Community Services Chapter of the General Plan Update. Table 4.13-9 (Future Peak Hour Levels of Service) summarizes the results of this analysis. Twenty-one locations are projected to operate at LOS D or worse during either peak hour, representing an increase of eight deficient locations when compared against the future base conditions. The locations include:

1. Lake Lindero Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard (AM peak hour)
8. Kanan Road south of Fountainwood Street (AM and PM peak hours)
9. Kanan Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard (AM and PM peak hours)
12. Kanan Road south of Thousand Oaks Boulevard (AM and PM peak hours)
13. Driver Avenue east of Argos Street (AM peak hour)
16. Canwood Street west of Reyes Adobe Road (PM peak hour)
21. Kanan Road south of Canwood Street East (AM and PM peak hours)
23. Canwood Street east of Kanan Road (AM and PM peak hours)
24. Kanan Road north of Agoura Road (AM and PM peak hours)

25. Agoura Road west of Kanan Road (AM and PM peak hours)
26. Agoura Road east of Kanan Road (PM peak hour)
27. Kanan Road south of Agoura Road (AM and PM peak hours)
29. Agoura Road east of Cornell Road (PM peak hour)
31. Driver Avenue west of Chesebro Road (AM peak hour)
32. Palo Comado Canyon Road east of Chesebro Road (AM and PM peak hours)
33. Chesebro Road south of Driver Avenue (PM peak hour)
34. Dorothy Drive between Lewis Road & US-101 SB ramps (PM peak hour)
35. Chesebro Road south of Dorothy Drive (AM and PM peak hours)
36. Agoura Road west of Chesebro Road (PM peak hour)
37. Palo Comado Canyon Road south of US-101 (AM and PM peak hours)
38. Chesebro Road north of Agoura Road (AM peak hour)

The following nine locations are projected to operate at LOS E or F during either peak period:

9. Kanan Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard (AM and PM peak hours)
12. Kanan Road south of Thousand Oaks Boulevard (AM and PM peak hours)
21. Kanan Road south of Canwood Street East (AM and PM peak hours)
23. Canwood Street east of Kanan Road (AM and PM peak hours)
24. Kanan Road north of Agoura Road (PM peak hour)
25. Agoura Road west of Kanan Road (AM and PM peak hours)
27. Kanan Road south of Agoura Road (AM and PM peak hours)
32. Palo Comado Canyon Road east of Chesebro Road (AM and PM peak hours)
37. Palo Comado Canyon Road south of Dorothy Drive (AM and PM peak hours)

The remaining twelve locations are projected to operate at LOS D. This represents an increase of eight deficient locations in comparison to the future base conditions and an increase of seven locations projected to operate at LOS E/F.

Future Conditions with Proposed General Plan Improvements

This scenario assumes the addition of future traffic projections onto a road system with improvements identified in the proposed Mobility section of the Infrastructure and Community Services Chapter, and listed below.

Proposed Roadway Improvements

As part of the General Plan Update, certain roadway improvements have been proposed to improve circulation to those locations showing a LOS less than C, as identified in the “Future Conditions Without Improvements” condition. These improvements fall into the following four categories and are described below, as well as shown on Figure 4.13-6 (Proposed General Plan Roadway Improvements) according to the number that follows each impact listed below.



- Improvements proposed as part of the existing General Plan (1993) and are currently either under construction, in design, or planned
 - > Palo Comado Canyon Road/Chesebro Road Interchange—Improve the overpass to four lanes, improve Palo Comado Canyon Road to four lanes from Canwood Street to Chesebro Road, and reconfigure the ramp interface (1).
 - > Reyes Adobe Road Interchange—Improve the overpass to six lanes, improve Reyes Adobe Road from Canwood Street to Agoura Road to six lanes, and reconfigure the ramp interface. This improvement is currently underway (2).
 - > Agoura Road (western City limits to Kanan Road)—Widen Agoura Road between Kanan Road and the westerly city limits to a continuous four lanes (3).
 - > Chesebro Road (Palo Comado Canyon Road to Agoura Road)—Widen Chesebro Road between Palo Comado Canyon Road and Agoura Road to four lanes (6).
 - > Kanan Road (Agoura Road to southerly City limits)—Widen Kanan Road between the southerly city limits and Agoura Road to four lanes (8).
- Improvements currently proposed as part of the General Plan Update
 - > Chesebro Road (Dorothy Drive to Palo Comado Canyon Road)—Widen Chesebro Road between Dorothy Drive and Palo Comado Canyon Road to a three-lane cross-section. (7)
 - > Canwood Street (Kanan Road to Chesebro Road)—Widen Canwood Street between Kanan Road and Chesebro Road to a three-lane cross section including a continuous left-turn lane (4).
 - > Chesebro Road (Canwood Street to Driver Avenue)—Widen Chesebro Road between Canwood Street and Driver Avenue to a three-lane cross section including a continuous left-turn lane (5).
- Improvements identified under the existing General Plan (1993) that are no longer proposed
 - > Liberty Canyon Road Interchange—Improve underpass to four lanes, improve Liberty Canyon Road from US-101 to Agoura Road to four lanes. The improvement is not required to accommodate the projected traffic volumes. Agoura Road (Kanan Road to eastern City limits)—Improve to four lanes. Improvement deleted due to desire to maintain rural character. In approving the Agoura Village Specific Plan project, the City of Agoura Hills City Council determined that the widening of Agoura Road in the Specific Plan area would not be acceptable.
 - > Kanan Road (Canwood to northern City limits)—Improve to six lanes. Implementing the widening would likely require the narrowing and/or removal of bike lanes, sidewalks, medians, and/or median landscaping and the possible narrowing of existing travel lanes. City staff and the GPAC have indicated that such widening would likely adversely affect the character of the Kanan Road corridor and its ability to serve bicycle and pedestrian modes, and as a result, the widening is no longer under consideration.
- Improvements identified under the existing General Plan (1993) that have been constructed
 - > Kanan Road Interchange—Reconfigure ramps in northeast and southwest quadrants.


Figure 4.13-7 (Proposed Circulation Plan) illustrates the proposed circulation plan, including all improvements.

CITY of AGOURA HILLS General Plan Update EIR

PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS

Legend

-  Proposed Improvement
-  City Limits



Source: Fehr & Peers, 2009.


10225|JCS|09



0 0.125 0.25 0.5 0.75 Miles

**CITY of AGOURA HILLS
General Plan Update EIR**

**PROPOSED
CIRCULATION PLAN**



Legend

Road Classification

- Freeway
- Arterial
- Collector
- City Boundary

Number of Lanes

2° Two lanes plus continuous left-turn lanes



Source: Fehr & Peers, 2009.

01207|JCS|10



The effectiveness of the proposed roadway improvements was tested against the future traffic volume projections. As shown in Table 4.13-9 (Future Peak Hour Levels of Service), the proposed roadway improvements would result in the improvement of five of the twenty-one locations that are below LOS C identified in the “Future Conditions Without Improvements” to a condition of LOS C or better. The five locations at which conditions would improve are:

25. Agoura Road west of Kanan Road (AM and PM peak hours)
32. Palo Comado Canyon Road east of Chesebro Road (AM and PM peak hours)
33. Chesebro Road south of Driver Avenue (PM peak hour)
37. Palo Comado Canyon Road south of US-101 (AM and PM peak hours)
38. Chesebro Road north of Agoura Road (AM peak hour)

Although implementation of the proposed improvements may improve the LOS in some cases, the following sixteen locations still remain below LOS C:

1. Lake Lindero Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard (AM peak hour)
8. Kanan Road south of Fountainwood Street (AM and PM peak hours)
9. Kanan Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard (AM and PM peak hours)
12. Kanan Road south of Thousand Oaks Boulevard (AM and PM peak hours)
13. Driver Avenue east of Argos Street (AM peak hour)
16. Canwood Street west of Reyes Adobe Road (PM peak hour)
21. Kanan Road south of Canwood Street East (AM and PM peak hours)
23. Canwood Street east of Kanan Road (PM peak hour)
24. Kanan Road north of Agoura Road (AM and PM peak hours)
26. Agoura Road east of Kanan Road (PM peak hour)
27. Kanan Road south of Agoura Road (AM peak hours)
29. Agoura Road east of Cornell Road (PM peak hour)
31. Driver Avenue west of Chesebro Road (AM peak hour)
34. Dorothy Drive between Lewis Road & US-101 SB ramps (PM peak hour)
35. Chesebro Road south of Dorothy Drive (AM peak hour)
36. Agoura Road west of Chesebro Road (PM peak hour)


Figure 4.13-8A (Year 2035 with General Plan Land Use and Proposed Improvements Level of Service—AM Peak Hour) and Figure 4.13-8B (Year 2035 with General Plan Land Use and Proposed Improvements Level of Service—PM Peak Hour) illustrate the future operating conditions.

Year 2035 (Future) with Project Locations Below LOS C

At the locations that remain below LOS C after roadway improvements, several factors prevent the implementation of physical improvements, including physical constraints, adverse impacts to neighborhood character/quality of life, and general policy. The following is a discussion of the factors affecting these locations:

**CITY of AGOURA HILLS
General Plan Update EIR**

**YEAR 2035
WITH GENERAL PLAN
LAND USE AND
PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS
LEVEL OF SERVICE -
AM PEAK HOUR**



Legend

- LOS C or Better
- LOS D
- LOS E
- LOS F




Source: Fehr & Peers, 2009.

10225|JCS|09



CITY of AGOURA HILLS General Plan Update EIR

YEAR 2035 WITH GENERAL PLAN LAND USE AND PROPOSED IMPROVE- MENTS LEVEL OF SERVICE - PM PEAK HOUR



Legend

- LOS C or Better
- LOS D
- LOS E
- LOS F



Source: Fehr & Peers, 2009.

10225|JCS|09



- **Lake Lindero Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard**—This portion of Lake Lindero Road is located within a residential area with the Lindero Canyon Middle School nearby. The segment operates at LOS D during the AM peak hour under existing conditions, potentially due to traffic patterns currently generated by the middle school. Traffic volumes are not expected to increase significantly under future conditions. Due to the location within a residential neighborhood and the potential for adverse effects to neighborhood characteristics, such as the removal of on-street parking and narrowing of sidewalks, physical improvements are not preferred.
- **Kanan Road south of Fountainwood Street to City Limits**—Kanan Road is the major north/south connection within and through Agoura Hills. A large portion of the roadway is located in a primarily residential area south of Fountainwood Street and transitions into a mixed residential and commercial area between Thousand Oaks Boulevard and Agoura Road. The portion south of Agoura Road runs through an area that is currently vacant, but is proposed for mixed use development under the AVSP. Portions of Kanan Road operate at LOS D under existing conditions and operating conditions are projected to worsen to LOS E and F under future conditions. The existing General Plan (1993)—Circulation Element identifies a widening of Kanan Road to a six-lane facility between Fountainwood Street and Canwood Street. Implementing this widening would likely require the narrowing and/or removal of bike lanes, sidewalk, median, and/or median landscaping and the possible narrowing of existing travel lanes. City staff has indicated that such widening would adversely affect the character of the Kanan Road corridor and its ability to serve bicycle and pedestrian modes and, as a result, the widening is no longer under consideration. Note that the widening to four lanes of the segment south of Agoura Road, as originally proposed in the existing General Plan (1993) and in the General Plan Update would still leave the segment operating at LOS D in the PM peak hour. Widening to six lanes is not proposed due to conflicts with the Agoura Village Specific Plan (AVSP), as well as a desire to minimize roadway width in this transition area from urbanized portions of the City to the semi-rural areas south of the City
- **Driver Avenue between Argos Street and Chesebro Road**—Driver Avenue is located in the residential Old Agoura neighborhood and is adjacent to Agoura Hills High School. This segment operates at LOS D during the AM peak hour under existing conditions, primarily due to the traffic patterns currently created by the high school. Traffic volumes are not expected to increase significantly under future conditions. The surrounding neighborhood is low-density and the introduction of additional traffic lanes would detract from the overall character of the neighborhood.
- **Canwood Street west of Reyes Adobe Road**—This segment of Canwood Street is located in a residential area adjacent to the Lake Lindero neighborhood. The segment operates at LOS D during the PM peak hour under existing conditions, and traffic volumes are not expected to increase significantly under future conditions. To accommodate physical improvements, such actions as a reduction in sidewalk widths, the removal of street parking, or the removal of bike lanes would be necessary. Therefore, the opportunity for physical improvements is limited due to the potential adverse impacts to the residential neighborhood quality of life and the potential for accommodating alternative modes of travel.
- **Canwood Street east of Kanan Road**—This section is projected to operate below LOS C during the PM peak hour under future conditions with development under the proposed General Plan, even with improvement to a three-lane cross section including a continuous left-turn lane. Further widening to provide four lanes is not possible within the existing right-of-way.

- **Agoura Road between Kanan Road and Chesebro Road**—This section of Agoura Road is projected to operate at LOS D during the PM peak hour under future conditions with the proposed General Plan. This section is located within the Agoura Village Specific Plan east of Kanan Road and transitions to a mixed commercial and residential area between Cornell Road and Chesebro Road. The existing General Plan (1993)—Circulation Element identifies a widening of Agoura Road within these extents to a four-lane facility. However, the City Council has since given direction that Agoura Road should remain two lanes from Kanan Road to the eastern City limits. Implementation of the widening would adversely impact the existing bike lane along Agoura Road and alter the semi-rural character of the adjacent neighborhoods and would conflict with the Agoura Village Specific Plan. In certifying the Agoura Village Specific Plan EIR, the City of Agoura Hills City Council determined that widening of the road in the Specific Plan area was not acceptable and effectively agreed to accept the future operating conditions along this corridor worse than LOS C.
- **Dorothy Drive between Lewis Road and US-101 SB Ramps**—This area of Dorothy Drive is a primarily commercial/industrial area. This segment is projected to operate at LOS D during the PM peak hour under future conditions with the proposed General Plan. Any physical improvements such as the addition of travel lanes would be feasible but would likely require the removal of on-street parking.

Due to the limitations described above, the projected operating conditions for these segments would remain below LOS C. As an alternative to physical improvements at these locations, the General Plan Update proposes several goals and policies to minimize impacts to traffic load and street system capacity. Such goals and policies include the following:

- Utilizing advanced intelligent transportation system (ITS) and signal control technologies to maximize traffic flow (Goal M-3 [Intelligent Transportation Systems]; Policy M-3.1 [Intelligent Transportation Systems]; Policy M-3.2 [Signal Timing Optimization])
- Improving and promoting transit and non-motorized modes (Goal M-2 [Complete Streets], Goal-6 [Alternative Transportation], Goal M-7 [Pedestrians], Goal M-8 [Bikeways], Goal M-9 [Transit]; Policy M-2.1 [Complete Streets], Policy M-2.2 [Equal Mobility for all City Residents], Policy M-2.3 [Transportation Planning], Policy M-2.4 [Interconnected System], Policy M-2.5 [Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian System], Policy M-6.1 [Efficient System] through Policy M-6.6 [Alternative Mode Funding], Policy M-7.1 [Walkability] through Policy M-7.4 [Walkable Developments])
- Working with the local schools to encourage more children to walk and bicycle to school (Goal M-7 [Pedestrians], Policy M-7.5 [Safe Routes to School])
- Actively utilize TDM techniques to aid in the reduction of single-occupancy vehicle trips. (Goal M-10 [Transportation Demand Management], Policy M-10.1 [Current Techniques] through Policy M-10.5 [Preferential Parking]). Additionally, Policy M-1.3 (Level of Service Standard) reflects the anticipated traffic volumes on the City’s roadway segments upon buildout of the General Plan update, and establishes flexible criteria for the minimum acceptable LOS, which varies with a given roadway. The policy is to maintain a LOS C on most roadways within the City, but allow a reduced LOS of D, E, or F on the seven segments described above under the “Year 2035 (Future) with Project Locations Below LOS C”.

Additionally, Policy M-1.3 (Level of Service Standards) reflects the anticipated traffic volumes on the City’s roadway segments upon buildout of the General Plan Update, and establishes flexible criteria for

the minimum acceptable LOS, which varies with a given roadway. The policy intends to maintain a LOS C on most roadways within the City, but allow for a reduced LOS of D, E, or F on the seven segments described above under the “Year 2035 (Future) with Project Locations Below LOS C”. In many cases, these segments currently operate below LOS C.

Year 2035 (Future) Conditions

As discussed above, the proposed General Plan Update would result in future operating conditions at LOS D and below at sixteen locations, even after incorporation of the proposed roadway improvements. It is important to note that the LOS analysis did not assume implementation of the General Plan Update policies related to ITS, signal control, and alternative modes (e.g., transit, walking, bicycling). There is no clear methodology for quantifying to what extent alternative modes of travel, ITS, and signal control programs could improve the LOS on a roadway. Therefore, the actual effect of traffic on the roads may be eased somewhat by these policies, but the benefits of such use have not been assumed in the LOS analysis.

While the goals and policies in the proposed General Plan aim to reduce the potential traffic impacts on the City roadways, and while Policy M-1.3 (Level of Service Standards) would provide flexible LOS standards on certain segments, General Plan Update impacts would still be **significant and unavoidable** (Class I), as the proposed General Plan would add trips to already congested segments or create substantial new congestion on segments that currently operate at LOS C or better. There are no further feasible measures to reduce congestion, as discussed under “Year 2035 (Future) with Project Locations Below LOS C.”

■ Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts are only addressed for those thresholds that have a project-related impact, whether it is less than significant, significant, or significant and unavoidable. If “no impact” occurs, no cumulative analysis is provided for that threshold.

The analysis of Future (Year 2035) with the General Plan Update is based on growth in traffic over a 25-year period, including regional background growth on regional CMP freeway and arterial segments. Therefore, the traffic analysis provided has already accounted for cumulative traffic impacts. While the majority of impacts discussed above would be less than significant, cumulative impacts associated with volumes on local roadways would be **significant and unavoidable** (Class I).

■ Mitigation Measures

No additional feasible mitigation measures are available to further reduce impacts when the issues of physical constraints and adverse impacts to neighborhood character and quality of life are considered.

■ Final Level of Significance

With the implementation of the General Plan Update goals and policies and application of all local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to traffic, impacts of the proposed project would be still be ***significant and unavoidable*** (Class I). Cumulative impacts would also be considered ***significant and unavoidable*** (Class I).

4.13.4 Draft General Plan Goals and Policies

Implementation of policies within the Infrastructure and Community Services Chapter of the General Plan Update would reduce impacts associated with transportation and circulation.

General Plan Circulation System

Goal M-1 **Local Circulation System.** A safe and efficient roadway system in Agoura Hills that facilitates the movement of goods and people while utilizing advanced technologies to minimize travel delays.

Policy M-1.1 **Safety.** Maintain a safe and efficient system of circulation.

Policy M-1.2 **Collision Monitoring.** Conduct regular traffic collision monitoring and identify improvements for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians at the top collision locations to improve safety.

Policy M-1.3 **Level of Service Standards.** Establish flexible criteria for the minimum acceptable level of service (LOS) based on the roadway characteristics. Maintain an LOS C standard on most roadways within the City. A reduced LOS standard of D, E, or F is considered acceptable on the following roadways, as shown in Figure M-4 (Year 2035 Peak Hour Segment Level of Service) and described below:

- Kanan Road, due to heavy existing and projected volumes and desire to maintain the existing 4-lane cross-section with sidewalks, bicycle lanes and landscaped median islands
- Agoura Road east of Kanan Road, east of Kanan Road, due to heavy projected volumes and desire to maintain 2-lane cross-section with bicycle lanes and in order to minimize grading, encourage a semi-rural road appearance and to complement Agoura Village goals
- Canwood Street west of Reyes Adobe Road, due to existing and projected volumes and the functional classification as a local street
- Dorothy Drive between Lewis Road and US-101 ramps, due to projected volumes and direct access to/from the southbound US-101 ramps
- Roadway segments adjacent to schools, due to heavy usage before and after school hours (i.e., Driver Avenue between

Argos Street and Chesebro Road and Lake Lindero Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard)

- Canwood Street east of Kanan Road Avenue, due to the heavy projected volumes under future conditions with development under the General Plan. Further widening beyond the proposed General Plan improvement (three-lane cross section with a continuous left-turn lane), is not possible within the available right-of-way.

Intersection impacts from development projects shall be mitigated to appropriate levels, but at least to the extent where the post development level of service shall not be less than the LOS existing prior to development.

Policy M-1.4 Roadway Improvements. Promote effective, innovative, and safe solutions for roadway improvements and consider other solutions that would facilitate reduced reliance on physical roadway improvements, where appropriate.

Policy M-1.5 Roadway Character. Implement street beautification programs to improve roadway character and create City gateways.

Policy M-1.6 Freeway Access. Enhance freeway access through interchange improvements at Reyes Adobe Road and Palo Comado Canyon Road/Chesebro Roads.

Policy M-1.7 Maintenance. Explore and establish possible funding mechanisms to provide for the continued and future maintenance and repair of the roadway system.

Policy M-1.8 Timing of Improvements. Ensure that the identified mobility system is provided in a timely manner to meet the needs of the community.

Policy M-1.9 Development Required Mobility Improvements. Ensure any new development implements the mobility improvements required for that development, as necessary, and contributes a fee toward regional mobility improvements per the City approved TIF ordinance.

Goal M-2 Complete Streets. A transportation system that serves all modes of travel and meets the needs of all users, as specified in the Complete Streets Act of 2007.

Policy M-2.1 Complete Streets. Ensure that the existing and future transportation system serves multiple modes of travel, such as driving, walking, biking, and transit.

Policy M-2.2 Equal Mobility for all City Residents. Provide a transportation network that meets the needs of a wide range of users, including adults, children, seniors, and the disabled.

Policy M-2.3 Transportation Planning. Encourage desired land use patterns, such as mixed-use walkable developments, through transportation planning and design.

- Policy M-2.4** **Interconnected System.** Develop an interconnected mobility system that allows travel on alternative routes and multiple modes.
- Policy M-2.5** **Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian System.** Develop and maintain a safe, integrated, and comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian system that serves all ages and abilities in Agoura Hills.

Intelligent Transportation Systems

- Goal M-3** **Intelligent Transportation Systems.** A transportation system that utilizes advanced ITS technologies to maximize the efficiency and safety of the City’s transportation system.
- Policy M-3.1** **Intelligent Transportation Systems.** Utilize ITS for Agoura Hills to improve the efficiency and safety of the transportation network through advanced technologies.
- Policy M-3.2** **Signal Timing Optimization.** Optimize traffic signal timing and coordination to reduce travel time and delay and increase safety.

Neighborhood Quality of Life

- Goal M-4** **Ensuring Quality of Life.** A transportation system that meets existing and future demands by balancing the need to move traffic with the needs of residents.
- Policy M-4.1** **Arterial Traffic.** Maintain the separation of local and regional through traffic by routing traffic along the primary arterials and keeping through traffic out of residential neighborhoods.
- Policy M-4.2** **Integrated Land Use and Transportation Planning.** Encourage the development of sustainable land use patterns that offer compatibility between future development and roadways in consideration of existing neighborhoods.
- Policy M-4.3** **Traffic Control Devices.** Encourage the use of innovative methods for traffic control (such as roundabouts and traffic circles), which can add character and create opportunity for improved aesthetics while effectively managing entry, speed, and points of conflict, in addition to traditional traffic control methods (such as stop signs and traffic signals), where appropriate. Consider the use of these innovative traffic control devices based upon the physical context and street hierarchy.
- Policy M-4.4** **Truck Routes.** Maintain the designation of truck routes for commercial and industrial use to minimize impacts on residential neighborhoods. The City’s designated truck routes are shown in Figure M-6 (Truck Routes).
- Policy M-4.5** **Trucking Impacts.** Minimize noise and other impacts of truck traffic, deliveries, and staging on residential neighborhoods and mixed-use areas of the City.

- Policy M-4.6** **Energy Reduction.** Promote the use of alternative energy sources for transportation related programs and measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions within the City, including the use of low-emission vehicles in the City's fleet system.
- Goal M-5** **Neighborhood Traffic Management.** Minimized through traffic in neighborhoods adjacent to major travel routes.
- Policy M-5.1** **Traffic Calming.** Consider the application of traffic calming techniques, where needed, to minimize neighborhood intrusion by through traffic and promote a safe and pleasant neighborhood environment.
- Policy M-5.2** **Neighborhood Coordination.** Encourage neighborhood input on decisions related to the installation of traffic calming features.
- Policy M-5.3** **Traffic Calming Funding.** Provide for sufficient funding to undertake traffic calming measures.
- Policy M-5.4** **Private Street Design Standards.** Encourage private streets to be designed consistently with minimum street standards as deemed necessary and appropriate by the City for the particular neighborhood (e.g., roadway width, street lighting, sidewalks, parking, etc.), as well as to include traffic calming measures.

Alternative Modes of Transportation

- Goal M-6** **Alternative Transportation.** Reduced reliance on single-occupancy vehicle travel through the provision of alternative travel modes and enhanced system design.
- Policy M-6.1** **Efficient System.** Promote the most efficient use of the City's existing transportation network and encourage retention of alternative modes into design standards and future improvements.
- Policy M-6.2** **Mode Choice.** Expand the choices of available travel modes to increase the freedom of movement for residents and reduce reliance on the automobile. Ensure that existing and future infrastructure will be adequate for future transportation modes.
- Policy M-6.3** **Design of Alternative Modes.** New roadways and future street-improvement projects shall be bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly in design.
- Policy M-6.4** **Design Enhancements.** Enhance bus stops with amenities such as street trees, benches, bus shelters and waste receptacles, public art or other measures.
- Policy M-6.5** **Education.** Promote non-motorized transportation through encouragement and education.
- Policy M-6.6** **Alternative Mode Funding.** Identify funding sources and allocate funds, including the potential formation of assessment districts, for pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and streetscape improvements in existing neighborhoods.

- Goal M-7** **Pedestrians.** Transportation improvements and development enhancements that promote and support walking within the community.
- Policy M-7.1** **Walkability.** Create a pedestrian environment accessible to all that is safe, attractive, and encourages walking. Maintain and promote the walkability within the City by identifying and completing deficient links within the sidewalk system.
 - Policy M-7.2** **Pedestrian Connectivity.** Preserve and enhance pedestrian connectivity in existing neighborhoods and require a well-connected pedestrian network linking new and existing developments to adjacent land uses, including commercial uses, schools, and parks.
 - Policy M-7.3** **Pedestrian Experience.** Promote walking and improve the pedestrian experience with streetscape enhancements and by orienting future development toward the street, where appropriate.
 - Policy M-7.4** **Walkable Developments.** Encourage mixed-use development so that it is possible for a greater number of short trips to be made by walking.
 - Policy M-7.5** **Safe Routes to School.** Establish and implement appropriate recommendations of the National and State Safe Route to Schools Program, and work with local schools to encourage more children to walk and bicycle to school.
 - Policy M-7.6** **Inventory of Pedestrian Facilities.** Conduct an inventory of pedestrian facilities and routes in the City to identify missing or deficient links, such as pedestrian crossings or intersection treatments.
 - Policy M-7.7** **Design Standards.** Prioritize the need, and establish funding, for completing gaps in the sidewalk system, improving street crossings and installing curb ramps where needed to meet ADA requirements.
- Goal M-8** **Bikeways.** Enhanced bicycle facilities throughout Agoura Hills for short trips and recreational uses.
- Policy M-8.1** **Bikeway Linkages.** Provide bikeway connectivity between residential areas and surrounding natural resource areas, parks, schools, employment centers, and other activity centers in the community.
 - Policy M-8.2** **Continuous Bikeway Connectivity.** Provide a bicycle network that is continuous, closes gaps in the existing system, and permits easy bicycle travel throughout the community and the region.
 - Policy M-8.3** **Recreational Biking.** Encourage recreational biking and promote the community’s mountain biking trail system to residents and visitors.

- Policy M-8.4** **Bicycling Safety.** Establish a Bicycle Safety Program that aims to educate the public about the safe use of bicycles on the City’s bikeways.
- Policy M-8.5** **Bikeway Design.** Develop guidelines and standards for the design of bikeways.
- Policy M-8.6** **Bicycle Facility Design.** Develop guidelines and standards for the design of bicycle facilities, including bicycle racks.
- Policy M-8.7** **Bicycle Parking.** Developments shall provide for bicycle parking facilities.
- Goal M-9** **Transit.** Transit options that are a viable component of the City’s multi-modal transportation system.
- Policy M-9.1** **Transit Commuting.** Encourage the use of public transportation for commuting trips by collaborating with regional transit agencies to provide additional transit options for service to Agoura Hills.
- Policy M-9.2** **Transit Planning.** Encourage transit planning as an integral component of the development review process, and identify recommended transit routes and stations as part of long-range planning efforts.
- Policy M-9.3** **Citywide Shuttle Service.** Explore an intercity shuttle system to promote transit trips between residential, commercial, and community areas and enhance mobility for non-driving older adults, children, and persons with disabilities.
- Policy M-9.4** **Local Transit.** Explore the feasibility of expanding the services of the existing transit programs and other appropriate transit programs.
- Policy M-9.5** **Funding.** Identify funding sources for local transit operating costs and improvements.

Transportation Demand Management

- Goal M-10** **Transportation Demand Management.** The successful application of TDM measures to reduce reliance on single-occupancy vehicles for everyday travel.
- Policy M-10.1** **Current Techniques.** Actively utilize current TDM techniques to aid in the reduction of single-occupancy vehicle trips.
- Policy M-10.2** **Trip Reduction.** Encourage existing and new developments to participate in trip reducing activities.
- Policy M-10.3** **Ride Share.** Actively promote the use of ride-sharing and ride-matching services, for both residents and non-residents.
- Policy M-10.4** **City Employees.** Establish a TDM program for the City of Agoura Hills’ employees.

Policy M-10.5 Preferential Parking. Encourage the availability of preferential parking in selected areas for designated carpools.

Parking

Goal M-11 Parking. Parking that is convenient and efficient for the use of residents, workers, and visitors.

Policy M-11.1 Parking Standards and Design. Ensure that off-street parking and on-street parking requirements are adequate and that parking is designed to be sensitive to both context and environment. Include safety considerations (i.e., lighting and landscape design) in the parking standards and design.

Policy M-11.2 Shared Parking. Maximize shared parking opportunities for uses with varied peak parking periods and for developments providing a TDM program.

Policy M-11.3 Efficient Parking Design. Strive to provide an appropriate balance between providing adequate amounts of parking and reducing the amount of land devoted to parking through measures such as parking structures, underground parking, and shared parking.

Regional Transportation

Goal M-12 Regional Circulation System. A comprehensive transportation system that is coordinated with adjacent jurisdictions and regional planning efforts.

Policy M-12.1 Cooperation. Maintain the collaborative and cooperative relationships with neighboring jurisdictions and the County of Los Angeles to solve regional transportation issues.

Policy M-12.2 Regional Coordination. Support regional efforts by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro or MTA) and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) to reduce single-occupancy vehicle travel, such as goals and measures identified in Metro’s Long Range Transportation Plan and SCAG’s Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

Policy M-12.3 Efficiency. Support regional planning efforts that maximize the efficiency of existing transportation facilities.

Policy M-12.4 Regional Transit Planning. Collaborate with regional transportation and transit agencies for the efficient allocation of transit and transportation resources.

Policy M-12.5 Freeway Enhancements. Work with regional agencies and Caltrans to achieve timely implementation of programmed freeway and interchange improvements.

Policy M-12.6 Capital Improvements Program. Identify and prioritize transportation improvement projects for inclusion in the City’s

Capital Improvements Program (CIP) and to guide the City's applications for regional, state or federal funds.

Community Districts and Subareas

Planned Development District/Ladyface Mountain Specific Plan (West End)

- Goal LU-23** **Business Park and Natural Open Spaces.** An economically viable business park that is scaled and designed to reflect its natural setting at the base of Ladyface Mountain, while providing high-quality jobs and incorporating a diversity of uses that minimize the need for employees to travel off site.
- Policy LU-23.1 Supporting Uses.** Allow and encourage the development of limited ancillary uses that support existing businesses and their employees, such as restaurants, personal services, and financial institutions, to lessen the need to travel off-site for these during the workday.
- Policy LU-23.2 Site Development.** Require that buildings be located and designed to reflect the area's hillside topography and natural landscapes, with building footprints conforming to topographic contours, setbacks of upper stories to conform to slope, and orientation to preserve view corridors.
- Policy LU-23.3 Development Clustering and Location.** Require that buildings be clustered to minimize grading and modifications of the natural topography, with development located below the 1,100-foot elevation
- Policy LU-23.4 Landscapes.** Require that landscapes incorporated into development projects respect and transition with those of surrounding natural open spaces.
- Policy LU-23.5 Trail Connectivity.** Require that developers provide pedestrian linkages to trails in the Ladyface Mountain Specific Plan area, as prescribed by the Citywide Trails and Parkways Master Plan.
- Policy LU-23.6 Specific Plan.** Require that development be managed in accordance with the design guidelines, development regulations and requirements, and implementation processes specified by the Ladyface Mountain Specific Plan.

Planned Development District/West of Kanan Road & North of Agoura Road

- Goal LU-24** **Mixed-Use Center.** Cohesive and integrated redevelopment of the properties as a center of community commerce and living with a distinct community identity that transitions from and complements the uses and development character of Agoura Village.
- Policy LU-24.1 Development Transformation.** Allow for a mix of uses and development densities that provide economic value, inducing the re-use and transformation of the existing fragmented uses and buildings into a well-planned and designed center.

- Policy LU-24.2 Land Use Mix.** Allow for the development of a diversity of uses including retail, office, commercial recreation, entertainment, and residential. Housing units shall be permitted on inclusion in and adoption of a special planning document, as stipulated by Policy LU-24.6.
- Policy LU-24.3 Internal Street Network.** Consider the development of an internal street and sidewalk network that breaks up the block into a smaller street grid, promoting pedestrian activity.
- Policy LU-24.4 Site Development.** Promote the development of shared parking facilities and a network of attractively landscaped internal walkways with public amenities, to the extent feasible, in consideration of parcel configuration and the street network.
- Policy LU-24.5 Connectivity.** Require that new buildings, pedestrian walkways, and open spaces be located and designed to promote connectivity internally and with adjoining land uses, including Agoura Village.
- Policy LU-24.6 Plan for Cohesive Development.** Require the preparation of a specific plan, master plan, design guidelines, or other regulatory document that provides for the cohesive development of the properties, addressing land uses to be permitted, density, street and sidewalk network, building heights and setbacks, architectural design principles, parking facilities, streetscape and landscape guidelines and standards, implementation actions and responsibilities, and other pertinent elements. In the interim, allow the development of uses consistent with the *Business Park—Manufacturing* designation.

Kanan Road–Freeway Interchange Gateway

- Goal LU-25 Gateway to Agoura Hills.** A distinctively identifiable gateway to the City and Santa Monica Mountains from the Ventura Freeway as defined by its buildings, landscapes, and amenities.
- Policy LU-25.1 Property Improvements.** Require that, where substantial improvements are proposed for buildings that do not meet current City standards, the improvements shall comply with contemporary City standards for building materials and colors, signage, lighting, and landscape.
- Policy LU-25.2 Creating Identity.** Consider the installation of signage, monuments, street trees, plantings, lighting, paving materials, art, and other improvements in the public right of way to establish a distinct identity for the area.

Planned Development District/Agoura Village

- Goal LU-26 Pedestrian-Oriented Mixed-Use Village.** Transformation into a pedestrian-oriented village containing a mix of retail shops, restaurants, theaters,

entertainment, and housing that serves as a destination for residents and visitors to Agoura Hills.

Policy LU-26.1 Diversity of Uses. Accommodate a range of uses, including community-serving retail, entertainment, office, public and quasi-public, visitor-serving hotel, housing, and complementary uses

Policy LU-26.2 Site Development and Design. Create a walkable, vibrant pedestrian-oriented district through such techniques as:

- Breaking of the superblocks into a smaller grid of streets and sidewalks.
- Location of buildings along street frontages, with parking located to the rear or in structures, with building heights transitioning to adjoining districts and open spaces.
- Targeting the development of vertical mixed-use buildings along primary street frontages.
- Development of a unified streetscape and pedestrian-oriented sidewalk improvements along Agoura Road and intersecting streets.
- Development of shared parking facilities.
- Reduction of the width of the Agoura Road right-of-way to two lanes with a landscaped median.
- Minimization of grading and preservation of oak trees and other native landscapes.

Policy LU-26.3 Connectivity. Require that new buildings, pedestrian walkways, and open spaces be located and designed to promote connectivity internally and with adjoining land uses and the nearby trail networks.

Policy LU-26.4 Specific Plan. Require that development be managed in accordance with the land use and development standards, design guidelines, public improvements and public infrastructure and services plans, and implementation processes specified by the Agoura Village Specific Plan.

4.13.5 References

Agoura Hills, City of. 2009. *Agoura Hills Draft General Plan*.

Fehr & Peers. October 2009. *Mobility Element (Traffic Study)*, *City of Agoura Hills General Plan Update*.

4.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

This section of the EIR analyzes impacts to utility and service systems that may result from the implementation of the General Plan Update. The section identifies existing and planned service availability and anticipated demands. The utilities addressed in this section include water supply, storage, and distribution; wastewater collection, transmission, and treatment; solid waste collection and disposal; and energy and natural gas use. Cumulative impacts associated with water supply, wastewater, solid waste, and gas and electricity are addressed at the end of each respective analysis. Data used to prepare this section was taken from various sources, including the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD), the City of Agoura Hills' Solid Waste Management Program, Southern California Edison (SCE), Southern California Gas Company (SCGC), online resources and other project data sources as identified in each subsection.

No comment letters regarding utilities and service systems were received in response to the April 30, 2009, Notice of Preparation circulated for the General Plan Update. Full bibliographic entries for all reference materials are provided in Section 4.14.17 (References) of this section.

Water Supply

This section describes the City of Agoura Hills's existing water system and provides information on local water conservation initiatives. The section also identifies and describes applicable local, regional, and state policies. Data for this section were taken from the City's Public Works Department, the LVMWD, *2005 Urban Water Management Plan* (UWMP), *2007 Integrated Water System Master Plan Update* (IWSMPU), *2007 Recycled Water System Master Plan Update* (RWSMPU), *Agoura Village Specific Plan EIR*, *City of Agoura Hills General Plan Implementation Report* (AH GP Implementation Report), and the *California Water Code*.

4.14.1 Environmental Setting

■ Water Sources

The LVMWD owns and operates a potable water system that serves the cities of Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, and Westlake Village, as well as unincorporated areas in the western portions of Los Angeles County near Ventura County. The total service area of the District covers approximately 125 square miles, with topography varying from a few feet above sea level to elevations exceeding 2,500 feet. The topography and geography of the District have resulted in a complex delivery system, including a 15-million-gallons-per-day (mgd) potable water filtration plant (Westlake Filtration Plant), a 9,600 acre-foot¹⁹ open storage reservoir (Las Virgenes Reservoir), 25 storage tanks, 24 pump stations, and about 339 miles of water mains.²⁰

¹⁹ One acre-foot is defined as the volume of water covering one acre of surface area to a depth of one foot. This equates to approximately 43,560 cubic feet or 325,851 gallons.

²⁰ Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD). 2007b. *Recycled Water System Master Plan Update 2007*. Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Report No. 2389.01, October.

LVMWD has four sources of water supply:

1. Imported treated, potable water from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD)
2. Recycled water from the Tapia Water Recycling Facility (TWRF)
3. Groundwater from Russell Valley Basin (currently used only to supplement the recycled water system)
4. Surface water runoff to Las Virgenes Reservoir

Due to its location in the Santa Monica Mountains and its coverage of nearly 80,000 acres, LVMWD has very limited natural water resources. However, LVMWD provides aggressive recycled water infrastructure to increase water reliability, as well as promote and implement water conservation methods. Recent and projected water supplies from imported water, recycled water, and groundwater are shown in Table 4.14-1 (Recent and Projected Water Supply [AFY]).

Table 4.14-1 Recent and Projected Water Supply (AFY)						
Source	Year					
	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
Imported—MWD ^a	21,837	31,090	31,400	34,250	33,820	32,920
Recycled	4,587	5,260	5,490	5,730	5,970	6,180
Groundwater	240	240	240	240	240	240
Total Water Supply	26,664	36,590	37,130	40,490	40,030	39,340

SOURCE: Urban Water Management Plan 2005.

a. Includes water purchases from the City of Simi Valley and Ventura County Waterworks District. Also includes imported water that meets recycled water demands during peak irrigation times when quantities of recycled water are insufficient.

Imported Water

The MWD was formed in 1928 by thirteen Southern California cities to acquire and manage a water supply to promote economic development. MWD imports water from northern California through the State Water Project (SWP), which is stored at Castaic Lake. Currently, LVMWD receives SWP water from the northern California supply system originating from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Bay-Delta that is delivered to the service area by MWD.

The overwhelming majority of the LVMWD’s water comes directly from the MWD. However, LVMWD also receives approximately 150 AFY of treated water from the City of Simi Valley and the Ventura County Waterworks District, and has contract agreements to purchase surplus water when available.²¹ The inter-tie connections with these agencies provide potable water to small communities in the hills west of the San Fernando Valley. Although the water comes from a different network, its ultimate source is the MWD.

²¹ Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD). 2007b. *Recycled Water System Master Plan Update 2007*. Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Report No. 2389.01, October.

The LVMWD does not have a set water allocation from the MWD. Instead, the amount of water allotted to the LVMWD from the MWD is based on long-term (usually 3 to 5 year) demand projections from the LVMWD. These projections are based on buildout projections in the LVMWD's Water Master Plan, which in turn are based on cumulative buildout of the jurisdictions served by the LVMWD.²²

Recycled Water

Recycled, or reclaimed, water is produced at the TWRP. Recycled water comprised about 20 percent of LVMWD's total water use on an annual basis in 2005. Most of this recycled water is consumed in the summer when irrigation demands are high. Therefore, recycled water is a major source of water for LVMWD and will continue to be a vital source into the future. Within the City of Agoura Hills, reclaimed water lines are located along Agoura Road, Thousand Oaks Boulevard, and Kanan Road. This water is used to irrigate street medians and landscape planters of all public facilities and private facilities where possible.²³ The LVMWD is currently planning an expansion of its recycled water pipeline system, including within the City of Agoura Hills. Expansion would include installing pipes along Agoura Road, east and west of Kanan Road.²⁴

Groundwater

Groundwater within the City of Agoura Hills and surrounding areas occurs primarily within the alluvium and the permeable, weathered, or fractured portions of the underlying bedrock formations. The groundwater is primarily unconfined, although multiple or localized, shallow perched water zones may be present. Depths to the water table, primarily in the major canyons, have ranged from about 20 feet to more than 240 feet during the early 1960s and 1970s, based on available well records.

Groundwater underlying LVMWD's service area is of poor quality and is not currently used for the potable water system. However, it is used to augment supplies for the recycled water system. As of 2005, LVMWD operated two wells in the Russell Valley groundwater basin: Westlake Well 1 and Westlake Well 2. Both wells pump water from the Russell Valley groundwater basin with a maximum projected yield of 400 AFY.

Surface Water

There are no significant surface water sources in the service area. The Las Virgenes Reservoir (9,600 AF) serves as a balancing and emergency storage reservoir with imported water withdrawn and replenished as needed. While the reservoir's watershed area does not supply a significant source of water in most years, it provides runoff sufficient to offset evaporative losses. In wet years, significant inventories can be realized.

²² Agoura Hills, City of. 2008. *Agoura Village Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*.

²³ Agoura Hills, City of. 2004. *General Plan Implementation Report*. Department of Planning and Community Development, September.

²⁴ Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD). 2007a. *Integrated Water System Master Plan Update 2007*. Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Report No. 2389.02, October.

■ Water Distribution System

The Agoura Hills water distribution system is operated by the LVMWD. The system consists of a complex system of pumps, pressure zones, supply connections, and reservoirs/tanks. There are 22 main pressure zones created by numerous facilities.²⁵ The topography plays a large role in the complexity of the water delivery system of the District. Proposed improvements include enhancing the east-to-west transmission of water and raising the gradients at Cornell Pump Station. Upgrades to transmission pipelines will enable additional utilization of the recycled water system though supplement from potable sources.²⁶

Water Storage Capacity

The District's water distribution system includes 21 water storage facilities. These include 20 tanks with a combined capacity of approximately 34 million gallons and the Las Virgenes Reservoir, with an approximately 3,094-million-gallon storage capacity. The LVMWD has a combined total storage capacity of approximately 3,129 million gallons.²⁷

■ Water Demand and Supply

As noted in the 2005 UWMP, water use within the LVMWD depends on land use, population, types of water fixtures, water loss, irrigation, and availability. Changes in demand would be affected by changes in the type and intensity of land uses, household size, population growth, landscape areas, rainfall, and conservation efforts. In making its projections regarding future water demand in the 2005 UWMP, the LVMWD relied on statistics compiled from a review of over 102,000 billing records in the LVMWD service area from the years 2000 through 2005.

The LVMWD water system provides water to a variety of different end users. In 2005, Single Family Residential accounted for the most water use by sector in the LVMWD, utilizing 59.8 percent of the total water use. The next largest water user by sector was Recycled and Non-Domestic, which consumed 16.5 percent of the total water use. The remaining 23.7 percent showed Multi Family Residential, Landscape, and Commercial and Industrial all taking approximately 5 percent each with Agriculture and Other Uses consuming the balance.²⁸

Table 4.14-2 (LVMWD Water Supply and Demand Comparison [AFY]) identifies the projected supply and demand through year 2030, as well as the difference between the two scenarios. Table 4.14-2 (LVMWD Water Supply and Demand Comparison [AFY]) demonstrates that in average precipitation years the LVMWD has sufficient water to meet its customer's needs through 2030.

²⁵ Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD). 2007a. *Integrated Water System Master Plan Update 2007*. Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Report No. 2389.02, October.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD). 2007b. *Recycled Water System Master Plan Update 2007*. Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Report No. 2389.01, October. Table 5.1-1.

Table 4.14-2 LVMWD Water Supply and Demand Comparison (AFY)

	Year				
	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
Supply	36,590	37,130	40,490	40,030	39,340
Demand	29,270	30,530	31,850	33,160	34,320
Difference	7,320	6,600	8,640	6,870	5,020

SOURCE: Table 4.2-5, UWMP 2005

Water Conservation

Pursuant to state legislation in 1993, the City established a Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance to promote climate adaptive and native plants, to establish water conservation maintenance practices, and to establish a structure for designing, installing, and maintaining water efficient landscapes in new projects.²⁹ The LVMWD's Water Conservation Ordinance requires that developers install water efficient plumbing fixtures, such as low flow toilets and showerheads, in new developments. The City utilizes reclaimed wastewater provided by the LVMWD to irrigate public lands where feasible, and encourages the use of reclaimed water, drought resistant landscaping, and water efficient irrigation in both public and private development projects to reduce overall City water use.

Existing Deficiencies and Planned Improvements

There are four storage facilities that currently have water deficiencies totaling 4.64 million gallons, as identified in the 2007 IWSMPU. These facilities are Jed Smith, McCoy, Saddle Tree, and 1235-Zone West. Tank deficiencies at these facilities indicate that not enough water is available at certain distribution points in the system, but does not mean that supplies are deficient at the original source. These local distribution deficits are overcome with additional pumping from main supply facilities and do not indicate a system-wide shortage. Within the IWSMPU, a number of improvements are recommended for future build out. These include a connection to Calleguas MWD, an expansion of the Mountain Gate Pump Station, a pipeline from Mureau Road to Las Virgenes Road and a pipeline from Cornell Pump Station, running westward and northward, toward Morrison Tank, terminating at Thousand Oaks Boulevard.³⁰ These upgrades would further improve east-to-west water transmission, improve potable water storage capabilities, and improve potable water supplement to the recycled water system. These improvements would address the deficiencies mentioned above, although the 1235-Zone West deficiency would continue to grow until the Calleguas MWD connection is completed.

²⁹ Agoura Hills, City of. 2004. *General Plan Implementation Report*. Department of Planning and Community Development, September.

³⁰ Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD). 2007a. *Integrated Water System Master Plan Update 2007*. Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Report No. 2389.02, October.

4.14.2 Regulatory Framework

■ Federal

Clean Water Act (1972)

The federal *Clean Water Act* (CWA, 33 U.S.C. §1251 et seq.) establishes regulatory requirements for potable water supplies, including treated water quality criteria. The LVMWD is required to monitor water quality and conform to the regulatory requirements of the CWA.

Safe Drinking Water Act (1974)

The federal *Safe Drinking Water Act* (SDWA, 42 U.S.C. §300f et seq.) establishes standards for contaminants in drinking water supplies. Maximum contaminant levels and treatment techniques are established for each of the contaminants. The listed contaminants include metals, nitrates, asbestos, total dissolved solids, and microbes. These standards are discussed further in Section 4.7 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

■ State

Safe Drinking Water Act (1976)

California enacted its own *Safe Drinking Water Act* (CASDWA, Health and Safety Code, Division 104, Part 12, Chapter 4, Section 116270 et seq.). The California Department of Public Health (CDPH) has been granted primary enforcement responsibility for the SDWA. Title 22 of the California Administrative Code establishes CDPH authority, and stipulates drinking water quality and monitoring standards. These standards are equal to, or more stringent than, federal standards.

Urban Water Management Planning Act (1983)

The *Urban Water Management Planning Act* (California Water Code, Division 6, Part 2.6, Section 10610 et seq.) was enacted in 1983 and has been amended many times since. The Act applies to municipal water suppliers, such as the LVMWD, which serves more than 3,000 customers or provides more than 3,000 AFY of water. The Act requires identified water suppliers to update their urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) every five years to identify short-term and long-term water demand management measures to meet growing water demands during normal, dry, and multiple-dry years.

Senate Bill 610 and Senate Bill 221

Senate Bill (SB) 610 and Senate Bill (SB) 221, amended into state law effective January 1, 2002, improve the linkage between certain land use decisions made by cities and counties and water supply availability.

Under SB 610, a water supply assessment must be furnished to local government for inclusion in any environmental documentation for certain types of projects, as defined in Water Code Section 10912[a] and subject to the *California Environmental Quality Act* (CEQA). A fundamental source document for

compliance with SB 610 is the Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The UWMP can be used by the water supplier to meet the standard set for in SB 610.

SB 221 applies to the *Subdivision Map Act*, conditioning a tentative map to document that the public water supplier has sufficient water supply available to serve the proposed development.

The General Plan Update is not subject to either SB 610 or SB 221 because the Plan itself does not grant entitlements; instead, it provides a planning framework for future development in the City. However, as individual projects are implemented under the General Plan Update, they would be reviewed for compliance with the requirements of SB 610 and/or with SB 221, as applicable. Adequate water availability must be demonstrated at the time of application, as required by SB 610 or SB 221.

Recycled Water Regulations

Within the State of California, recycled water is regulated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB), Department of Health Services (DHS), and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW). The SWRCB has adopted Resolution No. 77-1, Policy with Respect to Water Reclamation in California. This policy states that the SWRCB and RWQCB would encourage and consider or recommend for funding water reclamation projects that do not impair water rights or beneficial instream uses, such as maintaining certain riparian habitats or supporting recreational activities.

The RWQCB implements the SWRCB's Guidelines for Regulation of Water Reclamation and issues waste discharge permits that serve to regulate the quality of recycled water based on stringent water quality requirements. The State Department of Health Services develops policies protecting human health, and comments and advises on Regional Water Quality Control Board permits (RCIP Existing Setting Report and Resolution No. 77-1, Policy with Respect to Water Reclamation in California).

Title 22

The *California Water Code* requires the DHS to establish water reclamation criteria. In 1975, the DHS prepared Title 22 to fulfill this requirement. Title 22 regulates the production and use of reclaimed water in California by establishing three categories of reclaimed water: primary effluent, which typically includes grit removal and initial sedimentation or settling tanks; adequately disinfected, oxidized effluent (secondary effluent) which typically involves aeration and additional settling basins; and adequately disinfected, oxidized, coagulated, clarified, filtered effluent (tertiary effluent) which typically involves filtration and chlorination. In addition to defining reclaimed water uses, Title 22 also defines requirements for sampling and analysis of effluent and requires specific design requirements for facilities.

■ Regional

Las Virgenes Municipal Water District

The LVMWD has published multiple plans and reports which outline the state of the District's infrastructure, capacity, resources, and projected levels of supply and demand. Documents relevant to

this section include the IWSMPU (2007), Recycled Water Master Plan Update (RWMPU) (2007), and the UWMP (2005).

■ Local

Integrated Resources Plan

The Integrated Resources Plan (IRP), approved by MWD in May 2004, establishes regional targets for developing water supply. Portions of the IRP address conservation, local supplies, SWP supplies, Colorado River Aqueduct supplies, water drawn from regional storage, and Central Valley water transfers. The 2003 Update of the IRP ensures that MWD would have a reliable supply of water through 2025.

Agoura Hills Municipal Code

The Health Code of the County of Los Angeles, listed as Title 11 (Health and Safety), has been adopted by reference as the health code for the City of Agoura Hills pursuant to Section 5100 of the City's municipal code. Section 11.38.130 of the County Health Code states that every person supplying water for domestic or human consumption shall supply water free from contamination or pollution so as to comply with the bacteriological drinking water standards as set forth in the United States Public Health Service Drinking Water Standards.³¹

Pursuant to state legislation in 1993, the City established a Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance to promote use of climate adaptive and native plants, to establish water conservation maintenance practices, and to establish a structure for designing, installing, and maintaining water efficient landscapes in new projects.³² This Ordinance can be found in Section 9658.6 of the City's Municipal Code.

4.14.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

■ **Thresholds of Significance**

For purposes of this EIR, implementation of the General Plan Update would result in substantial adverse physical impacts if it would do any of the following:

- Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.
- Require new or expanded entitlements in order to have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project in addition to existing entitlements and resources.

³¹ Los Angeles, County of. 2009. *Los Angeles County Code*.

³² Agoura Hills, City of. 2004. *General Plan Implementation Report*. Department of Planning and Community Development, September.

■ Effects Not Found to Be Significant

There are no effects from implementation of the General Plan Update that would result in no impact with respect to water.

■ Less-Than-Significant Impacts

Threshold	Would the project require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?
-----------	---

Impact 4.14-1 **Implementation of the General Plan Update would increase the demand for water treatment. However, the General Plan Update would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. This is a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact.**

In certain areas of the City, the General Plan Update would allow for the amendment of land use designations and/or the potential for an increase in densities of existing uses. In select locations, land use designations would be amended to accommodate mixed use, which would allow for residential uses in an area that is currently utilized for commercial purposes. In all cases, existing uses within the City would be allowed to remain. Additional development throughout the City accommodated under the General Plan Update, such as infill and redevelopment, would increase water use within the City, thus increasing the need for water treatment services. As shown in Table 4.14-3 (Water Demand Associated with General Plan Update Buildout), water use within the City would increase by approximately 321,380 gallons per day (gpd) by 2035.

The City's water supply is provided by MWD, which is conveyed via the SWP from northern California. The imported water is treated at the Joseph Jensen Filtration Plant (Jensen Filtration Plant) in Granada Hills.³³ Jensen Filtration Plant sits at an elevation of 1,290 feet in the foothills of the Santa Susana Mountains. The water filtered through the plant originates in northern California's mountains, rivers, and streams. Jensen recently completed the construction of two additional treatment modules, a second covered treated-water storage reservoir, and a second watershed treatment plant and tank.³⁴ This expansion occurred on the existing footprint of the 125-acre plant site, with additional available space for one more treatment module should future expansion become necessary. The project added 250 million gallons per day (mgd) of capacity, enabling the plant to deliver up to 750 mgd. Additional future expansion could increase capacity to 1,000 mgd. However, there is already more than enough water for the 321,380 gpd increase associated with implementation of the General Plan Update. With a current capacity of 750 mgd, Jensen typically operates with a minimum flow of 100 mgd, but has operated as

³³ Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD). 2007b. *Recycled Water System Master Plan Update 2007*. Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Report No. 2389.01, October.

³⁴ Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). 2007. Joseph Jensen Treatment Plant, July 19. <http://www.mwdh2o.com/mwdh2o/pages/yourwater/plants/jensen01.html> (accessed August 19, 2009).

high as 610 mgd over the past 8 years.³⁵ Under typical conditions, the General Plan Update would account for a 0.3 percent increase in demand at Jensen, and a 0.05 percent increase under historical high-demand conditions.

Table 4.14-3 Water Demand Associated with General Plan Update Buildout

Land Use	Water Use Rates	Existing Use		General Plan Buildout		Net Difference	
			Water Consumed (gpd)		Water Consumed (gpd)		Water Consumed (gpd)
Single Family Dwelling Unit	532 gpd/DU	5,312 DU	2,825,984 gpd	5,428 DU	2,887,696 gpd	116 DU	61,712 gpd
Multi-Family Dwelling Unit	532 gpd/DU	2,298 DU	1,222,536 gpd	2,711 DU	1,442,252 gpd	413 DU	219,716 gpd
Retail/Service	20 gpd/1000 sf	1,225,113 sf	24,502 gpd	1,850,907 sf	37,018 gpd	625,794 sf	12,516 gpd
Office/BP	20 gpd/1000 sf	2,333,157 sf	46,663 gpd	3,431,448 sf	68,629 gpd	1,098,291 sf	21,966 gpd
BP/Manufacturing	20 gpd/1000 sf	844,681 sf	16,893 gpd	1,118,126 sf	22,363 gpd	273,445 sf	5,470 gpd
School*	16.5 gpd/student	4,189 students	69,119 gpd	4,189 students	69,119 gpd	0 students	0 gpd
Hotel*	165 gpd/room	519 rooms	85,635 gpd	519 rooms	85,635 gpd	0 rooms	0 gpd
Institutional	20 gpd/1000 sf	92,011 sf	1,840 gpd	92,011 sf	1,840 gpd	0 acres	0 gpd
Commercial Recreation**	20 gpd/1000 sf	22,000 sf	519 gpd***	22,000 sf	519 gpd***	0 acres	0 gpd
Total			4,293,691 gpd		4,615,071 gpd		321,380 gpd

SOURCE: LVMWD Integrated Water System Master Plan Update 2007.

City of Los Angeles Wastewater Program Management, Sewer Facilities Charge Guide and Generation Rates, August 1988.

1 acre = 43,560 square feet.

* These rates were taken from Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Draft Master Environmental Impact Report, Corbin and Nordhoff, September 2003. All other rates were taken from the 2007 IWSMPU.

** The Commercial/Business Park generation rate was assumed for existing and proposed Retail/Service, Office/BP, BP/Manufacturing, Institutional, and Commercial Recreation uses.

*** An additional 18% was added to Commercial Recreation to account for outdoor water use (LADWP WSA for Cascade Ranch Project, LADWP Water Resources Business Unit, 2004).

The General Plan Update does not specifically identify the need for additional water treatment facilities, the construction of which would result in potentially significant impacts. Further, as discussed above, the existing treatment facility is expected to be able to accommodate the additional treatment demands from General Plan Update buildout. If it is determined that new facilities would need to be constructed at a later date, a project specific environmental evaluation would be required under CEQA to analyze any potential adverse environmental effects that might result from such facilities. Therefore, the General Plan Update’s impact to water treatment facilities would be *less than significant* (Class II). No mitigation measures are required.

³⁵ Wilkins, Glenn. 2009. Email correspondence with Metropolitan Water District, September 14.

Threshold	Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
-----------	---

Impact 4.14-2 The General Plan Update would result in an increase in water demand. However, existing water supply entitlements and resources are sufficient to serve the implementation of the General Plan Update. New or expanded entitlements are not needed. Therefore, this is a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact.

In certain areas of the City, the General Plan Update would allow for the amendment of land use designations and/or the potential for an increase in densities of existing uses. In select locations, land use designations would be amended to accommodate mixed use, which would allow for residential uses in an area that is currently utilized for commercial purposes. In all cases, existing uses within the City would be allowed to remain. Additional development throughout the City accommodated under the General Plan Update, such as infill and redevelopment, would increase water use within the City, thus increasing the need for available water supplies.

The LVMWD 2007 IWSMPU identifies the average day demand for potable water in the City of Agoura Hills based on land use type. As shown in Table 4.14-3 (Water Demand Associated with General Plan Update Buildout), buildout of the GPU would result in a 321,380 gpd, or 360 afy, increase in water demand over existing demand. According to Table 4.14-2 (LVMWD Water Supply and Demand Comparison [AFY]), projected water demand within the LVMWD per the 2005 UWMP would be 34,320 afy in 2030, with an expected supply of 39,340 afy by 2030. (Note that the current UWMP does not project beyond 2030). As a result of full buildout of the General Plan Update, District-wide demand would increase to 34,680 afy. This would be considered a minor increase in water demand over that anticipated in the 2005 UWMP. This is within the available LVMWD supply of 39,340 afy by 2030, although this additional City demand would not be expected until 2035.

It is important to note that population projections utilized in the 2007 IWSMPU show the City reaching a population of 24,965 in 2030. In the IWSMPU, demand on the water system was determined based on the estimated future population of the cities within the LVMWD. The General Plan Update buildout estimates a total population of 25,394 in 2035 (refer to Section 4.10 [Population, Housing, Employment]). This is an increase of 429 residents (about 1.7 percent) over the population of 24,965 assumed for the City by 2030 in the 2007 IWSMPU. The projection of 24,965 residents in 2030, therefore, appears reasonable, assuming the addition of 429 more residents in 2035 to reach the full buildout population of 25,394. The anticipated growth in population in the City by the LVMWD, then, appears similar to that of the General Plan Update buildout estimates by 2035. As a result, it is possible that the additional demand of 360 afy with the General Plan Update buildout may have already been accounted for by the District in its 2007 IWSMPU for what the City demand would be in 2030.

An analysis using the 2008 SCAG population projections utilized in Table 4.10-4 (SCAG 2008 Growth Forecast Projections for Population, Households, and Employment, 2005 to 2035) of Section 4.10 (Population, Housing, and Employment) show the City of Agoura Hills reaching a population of 23,472 in 2030. Using this scenario, the estimated water demand in 2030 would be less than what was projected

for when the LVMWD calculated the water demand in the 2007 IWSMPU, by approximately 1,493 people. According to sources that helped prepare the 2007 IWSMPU^{36,37,38}, the reduced demand associated with the reduced population projections can be held consistent for water supply demand in 2035, leaving the District utilizing 88 percent of its projected supply and negating the estimated demand increase of 360 afy necessary to accommodate full buildout of the General Plan Update.

In any case, the LVMWD is engaged in adding capacity on the site of the Las Virgenes Reservoir, expanding the Las Virgenes Reservoir Filtration Plant, adding an intertie with Calleguas MWD, and constructing east/west transmission improvements.³⁹ Therefore, as additional water becomes available to serve the LVMWD, adequate infrastructure would be provided for that water, and no additional facilities would be required.

Policies contained in the General Plan Update would help to reduce future water demand and ensure adequate future supplies. For example, compliance with Goal NR-5 (Water Conservation) and Policy NR-5.2 (Water Conservation Measures) would minimize water consumption through required water conservation measures such as water-efficient landscaping and irrigation, on-site stormwater capture as feasible, low-flow and efficient plumbing fixtures, and the use of recycled water for irrigation. Policy NR-5.1 (Water Conservation and Education), Policy NR-5.3 (Water-Efficient Landscaping and Irrigation), Policy NR-5.4 (Optimum Timing for Water Irrigation), and Policy NR-5.5 (Recycled Water) would further ensure that increased development associated with the General Plan Update would comply with water supply and demand regulations. Pursuant to state legislation in 1993, the City established a Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance to promote climate adaptive and native plants, to establish water conservation maintenance practices, and to establish a structure for designing, installing, and maintaining water efficient landscapes in new projects. Also, all new development projects are required to comply with the Las Virgenes Water District's Water Conservation Ordinance requiring utilization of low flow toilets and showerheads. The City is also required to comply with all District water rationing requirements that may be in effect.

Under the General Plan Update scenario, there would be a minimal increase in water demand associated with the General Plan Update, and it appears that population growth estimates used by the LVMWD to determine future water demand are similar to that used for the proposed General Plan maximum buildout scenario. Given this minor increase in water demand, the possibility that the additional water use has already been accounted for, as well as compliance with applicable regulations and the goals and policies contained in the General Plan Update to minimize water use, the impact on water supplies would be *less-than-significant* (Class II) level. No mitigation measures are required.

³⁶ Brown, Mike. 2009. Phone conversation with Civil Engineering Associate, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, April 9 and November 2.

³⁷ Ellison, Dan. 2009. Phone conversation with Principal Engineer, AECOM. November 2.

³⁸ Swan, Mike. 2009. Phone conversation with Senior Project Manager, Psomas. November 2.

³⁹ Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD). 2007a. *Integrated Water System Master Plan Update 2007*. Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Report No. 2389.02, October.

■ Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

There are no significant and unavoidable impacts related to water supply from implementation of the General Plan Update.

■ Cumulative Impacts

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts associated with water systems would be the service area of the City's water provider, LVMWD. Cumulative impacts are only addressed for those thresholds that have a project-related impact, whether it is less than significant, significant, or significant and unavoidable. If "no impact" occurs, no cumulative analysis is provided for that threshold.

The LVMWD, which provides water service to the City of Agoura Hills, has prepared the IWSMPU to address the potable and recycled water systems of LVMWD and examine the ability of existing facilities to adequately meet water demands over the next 25 years. As part of the IWSMPU, water supply and demand for the entire service area is accounted for. The General Plan Update would result in only a small increase in the demand for water. Population projections for the City by the LVMWD and those estimated for the General Plan Update buildout, which the LVMWD bases its water demand forecasts on, are similar. Also, the Jensen Filtration Plant is currently operating well below its design capacity and is able to handle water demand generated by cumulative new development within its service area to 2035. Buildout under the General Plan Update would not exceed LVMWD projections, and any development increases in other cities within the District have already been taken into account in the LVMWD projections.

Buildout of the General Plan Update would place additional demand on LVMWD's water conveyance system. Portions of the water conveyance infrastructure serving related site-specific projects may not have adequate capacity to handle additional water loads, which has the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact. However, LVMWD and the City would require capacity upgrades to the water conveyance system on a project-by-project basis prior to occupancy of each project to avoid overloading the system. Developer fees would also be assessed for each project to pay for these improvements. The General Plan Update's 0.3 percent increase in typical water demand at Jensen Filtration Plant and the 360 afy increase in water demand are not large enough to be considered cumulatively considerable and the cumulative water supply and treatment impact would be *less than significant* (Class II).

■ Mitigation Measures

There are no feasible mitigation measures that would further reduce the less-than-significant impact identified to water.

■ Final Level of Significance

With the implementation of the General Plan Update policies and application of all local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to water, the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant*

impact (Class II). The proposed project would result in a *less than significant* cumulative impact (Class II).

4.14.4 Draft General Plan Goals and Policies

Policies relating to water sources were identified in the Infrastructure and Community Services Chapter and the Natural Resources Chapter of the General Plan Update.

- Goal U-1** **Water Supply System.** High-quality reliable water supply, water treatment, distribution, pumping, and storage systems to meet the current and projected future daily and peak water demands of the community.
- Policy U-1.1** **Future Water Demands.** Work closely with the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD) and other appropriate agencies in determining the future potable and reclaimed water needs of the City.
- Policy U-1.2** **Water Treatment Capacity and Infrastructure.** Work with the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD) and other applicable agencies to develop sufficient water-treatment capacity and infrastructure to meet projected water demands.
- Policy U-1.3** **Growth and Level of Service.** Require new development to provide adequate facilities or pay its share of the cost for facilities required to support growth.
- Policy U-1.4** **Water Conservation Programs.** Coordinate the implementation of water conservation programs with the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD).
- Policy U-1.5** **Water Supply During Emergencies.** Work with the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD) to maintain an adequate water supply during emergencies.
- Policy U-1.6** **Reclaimed Wastewater.** Encourage the use of reclaimed wastewater provided by the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD) for irrigating public and private land.
- Goal NR-5** **Water Conservation.** Minimization of water consumption through conservation methods and other techniques.
- Policy NR-5.1** **Water Conservation and Education.** Continue to support the efforts of the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District in water conservation in the City, both through minimizing the consumption of water and through public education.
- Policy NR-5.2** **Water Conservation Measures.** Require water conservation measures/devices that limit water usage for all new construction projects, including public facilities, such as the use of water-efficient landscaping and irrigation, on-site stormwater capture as feasible, low-flow and efficient plumbing fixtures, and the use of recycled water for irrigation.

- Policy NR-5.3 Water-Efficient Landscaping and Irrigation.** Require that drought-tolerant landscaping, water-efficient irrigation systems be installed, and recycled water be used for landscaping, as feasible, for all private and City landscaping and parkways. Encourage such landscaping and irrigation, as appropriate, in private development.
- Policy NR-5.4 Optimum Timing for Water Irrigation.** Require that all irrigation systems irrigate at optimum times of the day, as recommended by the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, and consider the use of weather sensors, to facilitate optimum irrigation and other technology for monitoring and control. Encourage such irrigation timing for private development.
- Policy NR-5.5 Recycled Water.** Work with the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District in further creating opportunities for recycled water to irrigate the public landscape, provided that the heavy metal and salt content of recycled water will not interfere with plant growth.

Wastewater

This section describes the City of Agoura Hills' existing wastewater system. Information for this section was obtained from the City's Public Works Department, the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, and the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD or District).

4.14.5 Environmental Setting

■ Collection System

The local sewer lines are owned by the City, and operated and maintained by the County, while the LVMWD owns, operates, and maintains the trunk lines and associated manholes. These entities work together to provide the City of Agoura Hills with sufficient infrastructure and capacity to serve its sewer needs. Of the entire 400 miles of pipes comprising the LVMWD sewer system, Agoura Hills accounts for approximately 50 miles worth. The system has the capacity to serve approximately 260,000 people, and is currently serving approximately 95,000 throughout the LVMWD.⁴⁰

■ Treatment System

All of the wastewater collected from the City of Agoura Hills is treated at the Tapia Water Reclamation Facility (TWRF), located south of Agoura Hills along Malibu Canyon Road in unincorporated Los Angeles County. TWRF is operated under a Joint Powers Authority between the LVMWD and the Triunfo Sanitation District (TSD), located in eastern Ventura County. TWRF serves residents living

⁴⁰ Brown, Mike. 2009. Phone conversation with Civil Engineering Associate, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, April 9 and November 2.

across 120 square miles of western Los Angeles and southeastern Ventura counties, including flows from the LVMWD and the TSD. Tapia has a capacity to process up to 16 million gallons of wastewater per day, but currently averages about 9.5 million.

Wastewater entering Tapia is 99 percent water and 1 percent solids and inert materials. The first step of the treatment process is to remove inert materials. Larger items are removed by passing the waste stream through a vertical slatted bar screen. Finer materials are removed in a “grit chamber.” The flow is then slowed and air is injected to keep small, organic particles suspended while the heavier, inert materials fall to the bottom. Items removed from the wastewater to this point in treatment go to a landfill. The remaining wastewater is then pumped to primary sedimentation tanks. Primary treatment is a separation process using gravity, where the solids in the wastewater are allowed to settle to the bottom of the tank. Oil and grease, which are lighter than water, float to the surface. Large paddles skim the water surface and the bottom of the tanks to remove these materials, which are then pumped to the Rancho Las Virgenes Composting Facility.

Secondary treatment is a biological process. The wastewater is put through aeration tanks to be “cleaned up” by beneficial microorganisms. This is similar to the natural water-purification cycle, but is accomplished in less time. As in nature, microorganisms remove contaminants and clean the water as they feed, grow, and multiply. Oxygen is injected into the tanks, which helps speed the process. The partially treated wastewater then flows to the secondary sedimentation tanks, where the microorganisms are allowed to settle out. They are then collected and returned to the aeration tanks, to work on another batch of wastewater. Meanwhile, the liquid portion goes on to tertiary treatment, which is a filtration process designed to remove any remaining extremely small particles. Chemicals are added to flocculate, or clump the particles together, making them easier to filter out. The water is then disinfected with chlorine and neutralized. An on-site, state-certified water quality laboratory conducts testing to assure that all potable and recycled water provided by LVMWD meets stringent state and federal health standards. The laboratory also monitors water quality in Malibu Creek, as part of the District’s commitment to watershed stewardship.

4.14.6 Regulatory Framework

■ Federal and State

National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits

The NPDES permit system was established as part of the *Clean Water Act* (CWA) to regulate both point source discharges (a municipal or industrial discharge at a specific location or pipe) and nonpoint source discharges (diffuse runoff of water from adjacent land uses) to surface waters of the United States. For point source discharges, such as sewer outfalls, each NPDES permit contains limits on allowable concentrations and mass emissions of pollutants contained in the discharge.

Disposal of Biosolids

Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 503, Title 23 California Code of Regulations, and standards established by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) regulate the disposal of biosolids.

Also, the federal *Clean Water Act* and regulations set forth by the California Department of Health Services and State Water Resources Control Board are aimed primarily at discharges of effluent to surface waters and are addressed in Section 4.7 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

■ **Regional**

Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) National Pollution Discharge Elimination System

Under the RWQCB NPDES, all existing and future municipal and industrial discharges to surface waters within the City of Agoura Hills are subject to regulations. NPDES permits are required for operators of municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s), construction projects, and industrial facilities. These permits contain limits on the amount of pollutants that can be contained in each facility's discharge.

The federal EPA's Capacity, Management, Operations, and Maintenance Regulations are proposed to be adopted by the RWQCB, affecting Agoura Hills' capacity, management, operations, and maintenance of wastewater facilities. Future waste discharge requirements would have greater emphasis on the control of fats, oils, and grease (FOG) in the City's waste discharge. As part of the regulations, the RWQCB may require the City to complete a sewer system management plan which would address emergency spill response, preventative maintenance program, establish legal authority, and FOG mitigation measures.

■ **Local**

There are no local wastewater regulations applicable to the proposed project.

4.14.7 Project Impacts and Mitigation

■ **Thresholds of Significance**

For purposes of this EIR, implementation of the General Plan Update would result in substantial adverse physical impacts if it would do any of the following:

- Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

- Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments.

■ Effects Not Found to Be Significant

There are no effects from implementation of the General Plan Update that would result in no impact with respect to wastewater.

■ Less-Than-Significant Impacts

Threshold	Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
-----------	--

Impact 4.14-3 **Implementation of the General Plan Update would increase the amount of wastewater needing treatment, but would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. This is a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact.**

In certain areas of the City, the General Plan Update would allow for the amendment of land use designations and/or the potential for an increase in densities of existing uses. In select locations, land use designations would be amended to accommodate mixed use, which would allow for residential uses in an area that is currently utilized for commercial purposes. In all cases, existing uses within the City would be allowed to remain. Additional development throughout the City accommodated under the General Plan Update, such as infill and redevelopment, would increase wastewater treatment demand.

New development under implementation of the General Plan Update would continue to comply with all provisions of the NPDES program, as enforced by the RWQCB. Therefore, implementation of the General Plan Update would not result in an exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements. All future projects under the General Plan Update would be required to comply with all applicable wastewater discharge requirements issued by the SWRCB and RWQCB.

The General Plan Update includes Goal U-2 (Wastewater System), Policy U-2.1 (Sufficient Service) and Policy U-2.5 (Service Inadequacies), which would maintain the adequacy of the City’s sewer system by working closely with LVMWD and the LACDPW and addressing any inadequacies, while Policy U-2.4 (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)) calls for the continued implementation of NPDES and RWQCB regulations, including the use of Best Management Practices by businesses in the City. Policy U-2.2 (Old Agoura Area), Policy U-2.3 (Monitoring of Toxins), and Policy U-2.6 (Septic Tanks) would further ensure that increased development associated with the General Plan Update would comply with RWQCB regulations. Future development under the General Plan Update would be required to adhere to federal, state, regional, and local regulations, and the proposed goals and policies identified above. Implementation of the General Plan Update would therefore have a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact pursuant to this threshold. No mitigation measures are required.

Threshold	Would the project require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
Threshold	Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Impact 4.14-4 Implementation of the General Plan Update would require additional wastewater to be treated, but would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects, and would not would result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. This is a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact.

In certain areas of the City, the General Plan Update would allow for the amendment of land use designations and/or the potential for an increase in densities of existing uses. In select locations, land use designations would be amended to accommodate mixed use, which would allow for residential uses in an area that is currently utilized for commercial purposes. In all cases, existing uses within the City would be allowed to remain. Additional development throughout the City accommodated under the General Plan Update, such as infill and redevelopment, would increase wastewater treatment demand.. Implementation of the General Plan Update could generate additional demand on the sewer system from increased sewage flows, as reflected by Table 4.14-4 (Wastewater Generated from General Plan Update Buildout).

TWRF has a capacity to process up to 16 million gallons of wastewater per day (mgd), but currently averages about 9.5 million, well below the facility's design capacity. The City of Agoura Hills currently sends approximately 3.4 MGD to TWRF.

Implementation of the General Plan Update is anticipated to result in an increase of 484,154 gallons of wastewater per day (or 0.48 MGD), for a total of 3.8 MGD. Based on current treatment levels at TWRF and the design capacity, TWRF has ample capacity to treat the full increase in sewage attributable to growth anticipated under in the General Plan Update by 2035.

Increased wastewater generation due to implementation of the General Plan Update could be accommodated within the existing treatment infrastructure; therefore expansion of existing facilities would not be required. As discussed above, wastewater from the City's system is collected and treated at TWRF which has a capacity to process up to 16 million gallons of wastewater per day, but currently averages about 9.5 million gallons per day. The current wastewater generation from City of Agoura Hills is approximately 3.4 MGD, and would increase to approximately 3.8 MGD, an increase of approximately 0.4 MGD or 146 MGY. However, TWRF has ample capacity to treat the full increase in sewage attributable to land use changes and growth proposed in the General Plan Update. In any case, if it is

Land Use	Wastewater Generation Rates	Existing Use		General Plan Buildout		Net Difference	
			Wastewater Generated (gpd)		Wastewater Generated (gpd)		Wastewater Generated (gpd)
Single Family Dwelling Unit	330 gpd/DU	5,312 DU	1,752,960 gpd	5,428 DU	1,791,240 gpd	116 DU	38,280 gpd
Multi-Family Dwelling Unit	330 gpd/DU	2,298 DU	758,340 gpd	2,711 DU	894,630 gpd	413 DU	136,290 gpd
Retail/Service	0.1 gpd/sf	1,225,113 sf	122,511 gpd	1,850,907 sf	185,091 gpd	625,794 sf	62,580 gpd
Office/BP	0.2 gpd/sf	2,333,157 sf	466,631 gpd	3,431,448 sf	686,290 gpd	1,098,291 sf	219,659 gpd
BP/ Manufacturing	0.1 gpd/sf	844,681 sf	84,468 gpd	1,118,126 sf	111,813 gpd	273,445 sf	27,345 gpd
School	15 gpd/student	4,189 students	62,835 gpd	4,189 students	62,835 gpd	0 students	0 gpd
Hotel	150 gpd/room	519 rooms	77,850 gpd	519 rooms	77,850 gpd	0 rooms	0 gpd
Institutional	0.3 gpd/sf	92,011 sf	27,603 gpd	92,011 sf	27,603 gpd	0 sf	0 gpd
Commercial Recreation*	0.1 gpd/sf	22,000 sf	2,200 gpd	22,000 sf	2,200 gpd	0 sf	0 gpd
Total			3,355,398 gpd		3,839,552 gpd		484,154 gpd

SOURCE: City of Los Angeles Wastewater Program Management, 1988.

1 acre = 43,560 square feet.

* The Retail/Service generation rate was assumed for existing and proposed Commercial Recreation uses.

determined at a later date that new facilities would need to be constructed, a project specific environmental evaluation would be required under CEQA to analyze any potential adverse environmental effects that might result from such a facility.

In addition, Policy U-2.1 (Sufficient Service) and Policy U-2.5 (Service Inadequacies) under Goal U-2 (Wastewater System) of the General Plan Update require that service inadequacies be identified and addressed and that sufficient sewer service be maintained. Future development under the General Plan Update would be required to adhere to federal, state, regional, and local regulations, and the proposed goals and policies identified above. Therefore, given existing and anticipated future capacity at the TWRP, wastewater generation expected from the General Plan Update buildout, and General Plan Update goals and policies, impacts to the wastewater treatment facilities associated with implementation of the General Plan Update would be *less than significant* (Class II). No mitigation measures are required.

■ Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

There are no significant and unavoidable impacts related to wastewater from implementation of the General Plan Update.

■ Cumulative Impacts

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts associated with sewage treatment systems and recycled water conveyance systems would be the service area of the wastewater service and treatment service provider, LVMWD. Cumulative impacts are only addressed for those thresholds that have a project-related impact, whether it is less than significant, significant, or significant and unavoidable. If “no impact” occurs, no cumulative analysis is provided for that threshold.

The LVMWD provides wastewater infrastructure within the City of Agoura Hills, which conducts effluent to the TWRP. TWRP provides regional wastewater treatment services. The cumulative impacts of development projects within the TWRP service area would generate additional quantities of wastewater. Cumulative projects in the City of Agoura Hills would contribute to the overall regional demand for wastewater treatment service and any development increases in other cities within the District have already been taken into account in the LVMWD projections.

The design capacities of TWRP are based on the regional growth forecast adopted by SCAG, which in turn is based on cities’ general plans and other forecasts of SCAG’s member cities. Although the General Plan Update is not included within SCAG’s growth forecast, the current General Plan of the City is, and buildout of the existing General Plan (1993) would result in more wastewater generation than buildout of the General Plan Update. Additionally, the existing treatment plants currently operate well below their design capacity. Thus, it is anticipated that cumulative development would not exceed the capacity of the wastewater treatment system.

The City would continue to implement water conservation measures that would result in a decrease in wastewater generation, and TWRP would still have excess capacity. Consequently, the General Plan Update would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to an impact on wastewater treatment. Cumulative growth in the LVMWD wastewater service area could result in the need for additional wastewater conveyance infrastructure, which could result in significant cumulative impacts depending upon the nature and extent of the proposed improvements. Existing regulations ensure that all users pay their fair share for any necessary expansion of the system, including expansion to wastewater treatment facilities and would ensure that the cumulative impact is less than significant. Therefore, the project’s cumulative impact would be *less than significant* (Class II).

The increase in wastewater demand anticipated under the General Plan Update, a 2.5 percent increase compared to TWRP’s total capacity, is not large enough to be considered cumulatively considerable and the cumulative impact is considered *less than significant*.

■ Mitigation Measures

There are no feasible mitigation measures that would further reduce the less-than-significant impact identified to wastewater.

■ Final Level of Significance

With the implementation of the General Plan Update policies and application of all local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to wastewater, the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* impact (Class II). The proposed project would result in a *less than significant* cumulative impact (Class II).

4.14.8 Draft General Plan Goals and Policies

Policies relating to wastewater are identified in the Infrastructure and Community Services Chapter and the Natural Resources Chapter of the General Plan Update.

- Goal U-2** **Wastewater System.** A wastewater collection and treatment system that supports existing and planned development and minimizes adverse effects to water quality.
- Policy U-2.1** **Sufficient Service.** Maintain the adequacy of the City’s sewer system, including working closely with the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD) and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
- Policy U-2.2** **Old Agoura Area.** Explore the potential for extending sewer lines into the Old Agoura area with the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD), Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, and Old Agoura Homeowners Association.
- Policy U-2.3** **Monitoring of Toxins.** Continue to monitor businesses or uses that may generate toxic or potentially hazardous substances to prevent contamination of water and wastewater.
- Policy U-2.4** **National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).** Continue to implement the requirements of the NPDES and RWQCB regulations, including the use of Best Management Practices (BMP) by businesses in the City.
- Policy U-2.5** **Service Inadequacies.** Identify service inadequacies within the City’s wastewater system, including working with the LVMWD and County Department of Public Works to address this.

Solid Waste

This section discusses the potential impacts of the General Plan Update on solid waste services. Solid waste is defined as refuse requiring collection, recycling or disposal into a landfill. The section describes Agoura Hills’ existing solid waste management and resource recovery systems, identifies current federal, state, regional, and local regulations regarding the collection and disposal of solid waste, and forecasts potential impacts on solid waste systems attributable to the General Plan Update. Information for this section is taken from data provided by correspondence with the City staff and the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB).

4.14.9 Environmental Setting

In 2007, approximately 28,105 tons of trash, including recyclables, food, construction debris, and green waste was generated from all sources in Agoura Hills.⁴¹ Business land uses contributed approximately 26 percent of the total waste stream, while residential uses contributed approximately 74 percent.

■ Residential Collection

The City's Solid Waste Management Program Staff coordinates the collection of waste for the City of Agoura Hills, contracting with independent haulers to pick-up and dispose of waste throughout the City. The current residential solid waste program is a curbside source separation system where residents are provided three carts for collection: a black can for refuse, a blue can for recycling, and a green can for green/yard waste. Residents have the option to select from different service levels depending on the amount of refuse they generate, including a mini can service that provides a 32 gallon refuse cart that encourages more recycling. The most common cart ordered by residents is a 65-gallon refuse cart, followed by a 65-gallon recycling cart and a 96-gallon green waste cart. Residential waste is collected and disposed of by a single vendor via a residential franchise agreement. The waste is sent to the vendor's private facility where it is sorted and distributed to the Calabasas Sanitary Landfill, Simi Valley Landfill & Recycling Center, and Burbank Landfill Site No. 3. Residential customers who own horses may also elect for manure disposal. The manure waste is collected and disposed of by Waste Management/G.I. Industries. Residents are also provided a bulky item collection service, which allows for pick up of four bulky items per year.

■ Commercial and Industrial Collection

The majority of commercial and industrial waste is hauled by a single vendor. However, ten other haulers are permitted as additional providers for construction and demolition recycling (C&D) and residential construction projects. The majority of commercial and industrial waste is taken to the Calabasas Sanitary Landfill by the private haulers.

■ Hazardous Waste Collection

The City provides door-to-door Household Hazardous Waste (HHW)/E-Waste collection as part of residential service. The service is free and occurs three times per year in April, August, and December. Residents contact the vendor on the first day of the collection month and schedule an appointment. The residents then receive a kit with instructions before the items are collected from their home.

The City provides a limited HHW collection once a month for collection of used oil, oil filters, water-based paint, antifreeze, and automobile batteries. The service is provided on the first Saturday of the month and is open to residents of Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Malibu, and Westlake Village.

⁴¹ California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB). 2009. Jurisdiction Profile for City of Agoura Hills. <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles/Juris/JurProfile1.asp?RG=C&JURID=2&JUR=Agoura+Hills> (accessed July 13, 2009).

The Agoura Hills City Hall parking lot is used as the drop-off point, and a single vendor under contract to the City collects and processes the waste.

■ Waste Reduction Programs

The City of Agoura Hills, in collaboration with the County of Los Angeles, is engaged in a number of activities and programs designed to reduce the waste stream and increase recycling. Under the *California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989* (AB 939), the City must demonstrate the diversion of 50 percent of its disposable waste stream from landfills by 2000. This is accomplished in the residential sector through curbside recycling. All residential services include a 65-gallon recycling cart and a 95-gallon green waste cart.

In order to comply with AB 939 for commercial uses, the City has mandated that 50 percent of all commercial waste must be diverted as recyclable each quarter. If this goal is not being met, the City has written authority to mandate that commercial waste be sent to a material recovery facility (MRF) to achieve its AB 939 goal. The private haulers described above fulfill this service for the businesses.

The City requires recycling of construction debris from certain types of development, as follows:

- Demolition of over 1,000 square feet
- All new construction (non-residential and non residential)
- Additions/alterations of over 1,000 square feet
- Projects that are reviewed by the Planning Commission

If a project triggers the construction and demolition (C&D) recycling requirement, at least 50 percent of the project's C&D waste must be diverted from a landfill. The City coordinates this program and contracts with various haulers to provide the service.

■ Regional Landfills

Over 250 private waste haulers and several City governments dispose of solid waste at various landfills within Los Angeles County. Los Angeles County has two primary classifications of landfill disposal sites: Class III landfills and Unclassified (Inert) landfills. Class III landfills accept all types of non-hazardous solid waste. Unclassified landfills accept only inert waste, including soil, concrete, asphalt, and other construction and demolition debris. The following County landfills receive solid waste from the City of Agoura Hills:

- Calabasas Sanitary Landfill: This landfill currently accepts 3,500 tons per day; has a permitted capacity of 69,700,000 cubic yards, and a remaining capacity of 16,900,400 cubic yards. At present rates of disposal, the landfill would reach its capacity in January 1, 2028.
- Simi Valley Landfill & Recycling Center (SVLRC): This landfill currently accepts 3,000 tons per day; has a permitted total capacity of 43,500,000 cubic yards, and a remaining capacity of 23,201,173 cubic yards. At current rates of disposal, the landfill would reach its capacity and close on December 1, 2033. SVLRC is currently seeking approval for a proposed expansion project that would allow the landfill to accept 6,000 tons per day, increase its permitted total capacity to 130.2 million cubic yards, and extend the life of the landfill to 2054.

- The Burbank Landfill Site No. 3: This landfill currently accepts 240 tons per day; has a design capacity of 5,933,365 cubic yards and a remaining capacity of 5,107,465 cubic yards. At current rates of disposal, the landfill would reach capacity and close on January 1, 2053.

As of July 13, 2009, the combined remaining capacity of the three landfills was approximately 45,209,038 cubic yards.⁴²

4.14.10 Regulatory Framework

■ Federal

Volume 40 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 258 (*Resource Conservation and Recovery Act* [RCRA, Subtitle D]) contains regulations for municipal solid waste landfills and requires states to implement their own permitting programs incorporating the federal landfill criteria. The federal regulations address the location, operation, design, groundwater monitoring, and closure of landfills.

■ State

AB 939—California Integrated Waste Management Act

In 1989, the Legislature adopted the *California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989* (AB 939). The Act requires every city and county in the state to prepare a Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) in addition to a Solid Waste Management Plan to identify how the jurisdiction would meet mandatory 2000 state waste diversion goal. Senate Bill 2202 mandates that jurisdictions continue the 50 percent diversion achieved in 2000 beyond January 1, 2000. The City of Agoura Hills has achieved this reduction through recycling and collection of green waste, and diverted approximately 60 percent of its solid waste in 2008.⁴³

■ Regional

There are no regional solid waste regulations applicable to the proposed project.

■ Local

City of Agoura Hills Municipal Code

Article V, Chapter 3 of the *Agoura Hills Municipal Code* regulates the collection, recycling, and disposal of solid waste from residential and commercial premises in order to meet the statutory obligations imposed by AB 939.

⁴² California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB). 2009. Jurisdiction Profile for City of Agoura Hills. <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles/Juris/JurProfile1.asp?RG=C&JURID=2&JUR=Agoura+Hills> (accessed July 13, 2009).

⁴³ Celaya, Louis. 2009. Phone conversation with Assistant to the City Manager, City of Agoura Hills, July 13 and November 5.

4.14.11 Project Impacts and Mitigation

■ Thresholds of Significance

For purposes of this EIR, implementation of the General Plan Update would result in a substantial adverse physical impact if it would do any of the following:

- Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.
- Fail to comply with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

■ Effects Not Found to Be Significant

There are no effects from implementation of the General Plan Update that would result in no impact with respect to solid waste.

■ Less-Than-Significant Impacts

Threshold	Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
-----------	---

Impact 4.14-5 **Implementation of the General Plan Update would result in the project being served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. This is a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact.**

In certain areas of the City, the General Plan Update would allow for the amendment of land use designations and/or the potential for an increase in densities of existing uses. In select locations, land use designations would be amended to accommodate mixed use, which would allow for residential uses in an area that is currently utilized for commercial purposes. In all cases, existing uses within the City would be allowed to remain. Additional development throughout the City accommodated under the General Plan Update, such as infill and redevelopment, would increase solid waste generation within the City, thus increasing the need for solid waste disposal services.

Three landfills currently serve the City of Agoura Hills, including the Calabasas Sanitary Landfill, the Simi Valley Landfill & Recycling Center (SVLRC), and the Burbank Landfill Site No. 3. Calabasas Sanitary Landfill is planned to close on January 1, 2028; the Simi Valley Landfill & Recycling Center has an anticipated closure date of December 1, 2033, and the Burbank Landfill Site No. 3 is expected to remain open until January 1, 2053. These landfills have a combined remaining capacity of 45,209,038 cubic yards.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB). 2009. Jurisdiction Profile for City of Agoura Hills. <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles/Juris/JurProfile1.asp?RG=C&JURID=2&JUR=Agoura+Hills> (accessed July 13, 2009).

As shown in Table 4.14-5 (Solid Waste Generated from General Plan Buildout), buildout under the General Plan Update would generate approximately 16 tons/day (32,099 lbs/day) of additional solid waste over what currently is generated in the City (nearly 77 tons/day or 153,943 lbs/day).

Land Use	Solid Waste Generation Rates	Existing Use		General Plan Buildout		Net Difference	
			Solid Waste Generated (lb/day)		Solid Waste Generated (lb/day)		Solid Waste Generated (lb/day)
Single Family Dwelling Unit	10 lb/du/day	5,312 DU	53,120 lb/day	5,428 DU	54,280 lb/day	116 DU	1,160 lb/day
Multi-Family Dwelling Unit	10 lb/du/day	2,298 DU	22,980 lb/day	2,711 DU	27,110 lb/day	413 DU	4,130 lb/day
Retail/Service	0.005 lb/sf/day	1,225,113 sf	6,126 lb/day	1,850,907 sf	9,255 lb/day	625,794 sf	3,129 lb/day
Office/BP	0.006 lbs/sf/day	2,333,157 sf	13,999 lb/day	3,431,448 sf	20,589 lb/day	1,098,291 sf	6,590 lb/day
BP/ Manufacturing	0.0625 lb/sf/day	844,681 sf	52,793 lb/day	1,118,126 sf	69,883 lb/day	273,445 sf	17,090 lb/day
School	0.5 lb/student/day	4,189 students	2,095 lb/day	4,189 students	2,095 lb/day	0 students	0 lb/day
Hotel	4 lb/room/day	519 rooms	2,076 lb/day	519 rooms	2,076 lb/day	0 rooms	0 lb/day
Institutional	0.007 lb/sf/day	92,011 sf	644 lb/day	92,011 sf	644 lb/day	0 sf	0 lb/day
Commercial Recreation*	0.005 lbs/sf/day	22,000 sf	110 lb/day	22,000 sf	110 lb/day	0 sf	0 lb/day
Total			153,943 lb/day		186,042 lb/day		32,099 lb/day

SOURCE: City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation, 1981

1 acre = 43,560 square feet. 1 ton = 2000 pounds.

* The Retail/Service generation rate was assumed for existing and proposed Commercial Recreation uses.

At present, the City generates less than one percent of the total countywide waste stream. The 93 total tons of solid waste anticipated to be generated per day by full buildout of the General Plan Update would comprise approximately 1.4 percent of the 6,740-ton daily permitted capacity of the three landfills serving the City of Agoura Hills. Additionally, the SVLRC is planning to expand its permitted daily capacity to 6,000 tons per day, increasing the daily limit of the landfills serving the City of Agoura Hills to 9,740 tons per day. If approved and permitted, this increase would reduce the City's contribution at General Plan Update buildout to 1.0 percent of permitted daily capacity. Therefore, waste generated by additional growth under the General Plan Update would be accommodated by existing and likely future landfill capacities.

The Calabasas landfill is expected to close prior to the 2035 General Plan Update buildout year. If approved and permitted, the proposed improvements at SVLRC would extend its closure date to 2054 and increase its permitted daily disposal to 6,000 tons per day. The third landfill currently serving Agoura Hills, Burbank Landfill Site No. 3, is schedule to remain open after the General Plan Update buildout until approximately 2053. The Burbank Landfill Site No. 3 accepts 240 tons per day. The total 93 tons per day anticipated to be generated at buildout of the General Plan Update would comprise approximately 1.5 percent of the daily permitted landfill capacity at the two landfills remaining open after

full buildout of the General Plan Update. Therefore, it is anticipated that waste generated by additional growth under the General Plan Update would be accommodated by existing and future landfill capacities.

In addition, Policy U-4.1 (Waste Collection Services) and Policy U-4.2 (Diversion of Waste) under Goal U-4 (Solid Waste Collection and Disposal Operations) of the General Plan Update require that adequate solid waste collection be maintained and recycling be required to divert nonhazardous waste from landfills. Therefore, as the General Plan Update would be adequately served by existing and future landfill facilities serving the City, and as compliance with federal, state, and local requirements and the General Plan Update goals and policies above would serve to reduce waste and minimize waste received at landfills, implementation of the General Plan Update would result in a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact to solid waste. No mitigation measures are required.

Threshold	Would the project comply with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?
-----------	---

Impact 4.14-6 Implementation of the General Plan Update would comply with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. This is a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact.

State law currently requires a 50 percent diversion of solid waste from landfills. The City of Agoura Hills has achieved this diversion through recycling and collection of green waste, and diverted 55 percent of its solid waste in 2006, 60 percent in 2007, and 60 percent in 2008.⁴⁵ Therefore, the City is in compliance with state law.

The General Plan Update would not result in a substantial increase in the demand for solid waste services compared to existing conditions. Solid waste generated on-site would be disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to solid waste, including AB 939. Specifically, AB 939 requires city and county jurisdictions to identify an implementation schedule to divert 50 percent of the total waste stream from landfill disposal by the year 2000 and seventy percent by the year 2020. The City currently meets the requirements and is working to further reduce waste entering landfills to meet future mandates. In addition, Policy U-4.1 (Waste Collection Services) and Policy U-4.2 (Diversion of Waste) under Goal U-4 (Solid Waste Collection and Disposal Operations) of the General Plan Update require that adequate solid waste collection be maintained and recycling be required to divert nonhazardous waste from landfills. Thus, implementation of the General Plan Update, with adherence to the policies of Goal U-4 (Solid Waste Collection and Disposal Operations), would ensure that no conflict with federal, state, or local statutes or regulations related to solid waste disposal would occur. This would result in a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact. No mitigation measures are required.

■ Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

There are no significant and unavoidable impacts related to solid waste from implementation of the General Plan Update.

⁴⁵ Celaya, Louis. 2009. Phone conversation with Assistant to the City Manager, City of Agoura Hills, July 13 and November 5.

■ Cumulative Impacts

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts associated with solid waste systems would be the service area of the solid waste service provider, the Los Angeles County region of the CIWMB. Cumulative impacts are only addressed for those thresholds that have a project-related impact, whether it is less than significant, significant, or significant and unavoidable. If “no impact” occurs, no cumulative analysis is provided for that threshold.

Despite the anticipated sufficient capacity of the SVLRC (if approved and permitted) and Burbank Landfill Site No. 3 discussed above, any existing capacity that currently exists within the landfill’s service boundary is finite. Thus, it is considered that, without approved specific plans for substantial expansion of the landfill facilities that serve the County, solid waste generation from approved and foreseeable cumulative projects in the General Plan Update area would exacerbate regional landfill capacity issues in the future. That is, any additional solid waste incrementally added to existing facilities would decrease the amount of time until they are completely full. The implementation of source reduction measures would be required on a project-specific basis as development projects are proposed, and requirements for recycling would partially address landfill capacity issues by diverting additional solid waste at the source of generation. However, the Burbank Landfill Site No. 3 is the only disposal facility approved to be operating at the time of General Plan Update buildout (2035), which would reduce the permitted daily disposal tonnage available to the City. The SVLRC expansion is currently in the planning process. Although the project itself would have a less-than-significant impact to solid waste, development associated with projects both within and outside of the City would be cumulatively considerable, and impacts associated with cumulative development would be ***significant and unavoidable*** (Class I) due to the unknown status of landfills serving the City of Agoura Hills at the time of General Plan Update buildout (2035).

■ Mitigation Measures

There are no feasible mitigation measures that would further reduce the less-than-significant impact identified to solid waste.

■ Final Level of Significance

With the implementation of the General Plan Update policies and application of all local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to water, the proposed project would result in a ***less-than-significant*** impact (Class II). The proposed project would result in a ***significant and unavoidable*** cumulative impact (Class I).

4.14.12 Draft General Plan Goals and Policies

Policies relating to solid waste were identified in the Infrastructure and Community Services Chapter of the General Plan Update.

- Goal U-4** **Solid Waste Collection and Disposal Operations.** Control and reduction of solid waste generation and disposal.
- Policy U-4.1** **Waste Collection Services.** Maintain adequate solid waste collection for commercial, industrial, and residential developments in accordance with state law.
- Policy U-4.2** **Diversion of Waste.** Require recycling, green recycling/composting, and waste separation to reduce the volume and toxicity of solid wastes sent to landfill facilities, with the objective of diverting nonhazardous waste to a certified recycling processor, consistent with state mandates for landfill diversion.
- Policy U-4.3** **Waste Collection Performance.** Periodically review waste collection performance to verify adequacy of service.
- Policy U-4.4** **Community Education.** Continue to publicize and educate the public about waste reduction techniques, programs, and facilities.
- Policy U-4.5** **Recycling for New Development.** Require new development to incorporate recycling locations into the project.
- Policy U-4.6** **Hazardous Waste.** Continue the collection programs that provide disposal of household hazardous waste and electronic items to City residents throughout the year.
- Policy U-4.7** **Recycling and Reuse of Construction Wastes.** Continue the commercial solid waste/recycling program, consistent with state requirements for diversion, for waste collection from all commercial program providers, including recycling materials generated by the demolition and remodeling of buildings.
- Policy U-4.8** **Residential Waste Recycling.** Continue to provide recycling as part of regular residential curbside service, including green and equestrian waste recycling.
- Policy U-4.9** **Non-Residential Waste Recycling.** Continue to require non-residential uses and businesses to participate in the City's commercial recycling program.
- Policy U-4.10** **Community Clean-Up Events.** Continue to sponsor and help coordinate annual clean-up events, in which volunteers and community organizers help pick up litter at parks and other public areas.

Energy

4.14.13 Environmental Setting

This section describes the existing electricity and natural gas service providers for the City of Agoura Hills. Information was obtained from correspondence with Southern California Edison and Southern California Gas Company, and correspondence with the City of Agoura Hills staff.

■ Electricity

Electricity Supply

The City of Agoura Hills receives its electricity from Southern California Edison (SCE). SCE generates its electricity from various sources throughout the state and transmits it to the City through a series of high-transmission power lines. It is down-converted at substations and distributed to residential, commercial, and institutional uses throughout Agoura.

SCE provides electricity to six different rate groups within the City:⁴⁶

- Domestic (Domestic Service): All residential service, including lighting, heating, cooking, and power or combination thereof in a single-family accommodation.
- GS-1 (General Service Non-Demand): Includes general service, including lighting and power, for the customer whose monthly maximum demand is expected to exceed or has exceeded 20 kW in any three months during the preceding 12 months.
- GS-2 (General Service Demand): Includes general service, including lighting and power, for customers whose monthly maximum demand is expected to register or has registered above 20 kW and below 200 kW.
- Street Lighting (Street and Highway Company-Owned System): Includes service for the lighting of streets, highways, and publicly owned and publicly operated automobile parking lots.
- TC-1 (Traffic Control Service): Includes service for traffic directional signs or traffic signal systems on streets, highways, and other public thoroughfares and railway crossing and track signals.
- TOU-8 (General Time-Of-Use Service—Large): Includes general service, including lighting and power, for all customers whose monthly maximum demand is expected to exceed or has exceeded 500 kW in any three months during the preceding 12 months.

Energy Conservation Programs

SCE engages in a wide variety of energy efficiency programs, including services for lighting, appliances, heating and cooling, multi-family housing, pools, and customer generation. SCE is the nation's largest purchaser of renewable energy, buying and delivering approximately 13 billion kilowatt hours (kWh) from wind, solar, biomass, geothermal and small hydro suppliers. SCE's Edison SmartConnect system, an advanced metering initiative, allows SCE's customers with smart thermostats and appliances to

automatically respond during critical peak pricing and grid reliability events, and is expected to reduce overall peak power consumption by an estimated 1,000 megawatts.⁴⁷

■ Natural Gas

The City of Agoura Hills receives its natural gas from the Southern California Gas Company (SCGC) through a series of steel and plastic pipelines of various sizes and pressures.

4.14.14 Regulatory Framework

■ Federal

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) duties include the regulation of the transmission and sale of electricity in interstate commerce, licensing of hydroelectric projects, and oversight of related environmental matters.

■ State

California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)

CPUC Decision 95-08-038 contains the rules for the planning and construction of new transmission facilities, distribution facilities, and substations. The Decision requires permits for the construction of certain power line facilities or substations if the voltages would exceed 50 kV or the substation would require the acquisition of land or an increase in voltage rating above 50 kV. Distribution lines and substations with voltages less than 50 kV need not comply with this Decision; however, the utility must obtain any nondiscretionary local permits required for the construction and operation of these projects. CEQA compliance is required for construction of facilities constructed in accordance with the Decision.

Title 20 and Title 24, California Code of Regulations (CCR)

Title 20, Public Utilities and Energy, contains the regulations related to power plant siting certification. Title 24, California Building Standards, contains the energy efficiency standards related to residential and nonresidential buildings. Title 24 standards are based, in part, on a state mandate to reduce California's energy demand.

■ Local

There are no local energy regulations applicable to the proposed project.

⁴⁶ Southern California Edison (SCE). 2009. *Electricity User Report for City of Agoura Hills Year 2008*. Version 5.0, June 26.

⁴⁷ Southern California Edison (SCE). 2008. *Environmental Commitment Brochure*. May.

4.14.15 Project Impacts and Mitigation

■ Thresholds of Significance

For purposes of this EIR, implementation of the General Plan Update would result in a substantial adverse physical impact if it would do any of the following:

- Require or result in the construction of new energy production or transmission facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental impact.

■ Effects Not Found to Be Significant

There are no effects from implementation of the General Plan Update that would result in no impact with respect to energy.

■ Less-Than-Significant Impacts

Threshold	Would the project require or result in the construction of new energy production or transmission facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental impact?
-----------	---

Impact 4.14-7 Implementation of the General Plan Update would increase the amount of energy used, but would not require or result in the construction of new energy production or transmission facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental impact. This is a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact.

In certain areas of the City, the General Plan Update would allow for the amendment of land use designations and/or the potential for an increase in densities of existing uses. In select locations, land use designations would be amended to accommodate mixed use, which would allow for residential uses in an area that is currently utilized for commercial purposes. In all cases, existing uses within the City would be allowed to remain. Additional development throughout the City accommodated under the General Plan Update, such as infill and redevelopment, would increase energy use within the City, thus increasing the need for energy services.

Table 4.14-6 (Electricity Demand Associated with General Plan Update Buildout) identifies the electricity usage associated with implementation of the General Plan Update. Southern California Edison provided the City of Agoura Hills with 188,418,397 annual kWh in 2008.⁴⁸ The additional 28,549,969 kWh/year required under General Plan Update buildout equates to a 15 percent increase in electricity demand for the City. SCE is a reactive agency and would expand its energy infrastructure to serve the growth associated with buildout of the General Plan Update. No proposals for energy production facilities or transmission facilities are proposed as part of the General Plan Update. If SCE determines that such

⁴⁸ Southern California Edison (SCE). 2009. *Electricity User Report for City of Agoura Hills Year 2008*. Version 5.0, June 26.

facilities are needed at a later date, such projects would be required to undergo separate CEQA review, and their impacts assessed at that time. General Plan Update includes goals and policies such as Goal U-5 (Energy Provision and Conservation), Policy U-5.2 (Adequate Facilities), Policy U-5.4 (Energy Efficient Incentives), and Policy U-5.6 (Energy Conservation), which would ensure provision of adequate energy facilities to serve the General Plan Update buildout and conservation measures to reduce the energy demand on SCE. In addition, Policy U-5.1 (New Development Requirements), Policy U-5.3 (Solar Access), Policy U-5.5 (Undergrounding of Utilities), Policy U-5.7 (Solar Panels in Projects), and Policies NR-9.1 (Public Outreach) and NR-9.2 (Energy Conservation for City Facilities) of Goal NR-9 (Energy Conservation) would further ensure that increased development associated with the General Plan Update would comply with energy regulations and coordinate with SCE to ensure adequate electricity services would be available to the City. This would be a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact. No mitigation measures are required.

Land Use	Electricity Use Rates	Existing Use		General Plan Buildout		Net Difference	
			Electricity Consumed (kWh/year)		Electricity Consumed (kWh/year)		Electricity Consumed (kWh/year)
Single Family Dwelling Unit	5,626.50 kWh/year/unit	5,312 DU	29,887,968 kWh/year	5,428 DU	30,540,642 kWh/year	116 DU	652,674 kWh/year
Multi-Family Dwelling Unit	5,626.50 kWh/year/unit	2,298 DU	12,929,697 kWh/year	2,711 DU	15,253,442 kWh/year	413 DU	2,323,745 kWh/year
Retail/Service	13.55 kWh/sf/year	1,225,113 sf	16,600,281 kWh/year	1,850,907 sf	25,079,790 kWh/year	625,794 sf	8,479,509 kWh/year
Office/BP	12.95 kWh/sf/year	2,333,157 sf	30,214,383 kWh/year	3,431,448 sf	44,437,252 kWh/year	1,098,291 sf	14,222,868 kWh/year
BP/ Manufacturing	10.5 kWh/sf/year	844,681 sf	8,869,151 kWh/year	1,118,126 sf	11,740,323 kWh/year	273,445 sf	2,871,173 kWh/year
School	1,100 kWh/student/year ^a	4,189 students	4,607,900 kWh/year	4,189 students	4,607,900 kWh/year	0 students	0 kWh/year
Hotel	9,825 kWh/room/year ^b	519 rooms	5,099,175 kWh/year	519 rooms	5,099,175 kWh/year	0 rooms	0 kWh/year
Institutional	6.0 kWh/sf/year	92,011 sf	552,066 kWh/year	92,011 sf	552,066 kWh/year	0 sf	0 kWh/year
Commercial Recreation*	13.55 kWh/sf/year	22,000 sf	298,100 kWh/year	22,000 sf	298,100 kWh/year	0 sf	0 kWh/year
Total			109,058,721 kWh/year		137,608,690 kWh/year		28,549,969 kWh/year

SOURCE: SCAQMD, CEQA Handbook, Table A9-11-A, page A9-114, 1993

1 acre = 43,560 square feet

a. Assumes 200 square feet per student.

b. Assumes 750 square feet per hotel room.

* The Retail/Service generation rate was assumed for existing and proposed Commercial Recreation uses.

Table 4.14-7 (Natural Gas Demand Associated with General Plan Update Buildout) displays the natural gas usage associated with implementation of the General Plan Update.

Table 4.14-7 Natural Gas Demand Associated with General Plan Update Buildout

Land Use	Natural Gas Use Rates	Existing Use		General Plan Buildout		Net Difference	
			Natural Gas Consumed (cf/month)		Natural Gas Consumed (cf/month)		Natural Gas Consumed (cf/month)
Single Family Dwelling Unit	6,665 cf/unit/month	5,312 DU	35,404,480 cf/month	5,428 DU	36,177,620 cf/month	116 DU	773,140 cf/month
Multi-Family Dwelling Unit	6,665 cf/unit/month	2,298 DU	15,316,170 cf/month	2,711 DU	18,068,815 cf/month	413 DU	2,752,645 cf/month
Retail/Service	2.9 cf/sf/month	1,225,113 sf	3,552,828 cf/month	1,850,907 sf	5,367,630 cf/month	625,794 sf	1,814,802 cf/month
Office/BP	2.0 cf/sf/month	2,333,157 sf	4,666,314 cf/month	3,431,448 sf	6,862,896 cf/month	1,098,291 sf	2,196,582 cf/month
BP/ Manufacturing	3.3 cf/sf/month	844,681 sf	2,787,447 cf/month	1,118,126 sf	3,689,816 cf/month	273,445 sf	902,369 cf/month
School	580 cf/student/month ^a	4,189 students	2,429,620 cf/month	4,189 students	2,429,620 cf/month	0 students	0 cf/month
Hotel	3,600 cf/room/month ^b	519 rooms	1,868,400 cf/month	519 rooms	1,868,400 cf/month	0 rooms	0 cf/month
Institutional	2.0 cf/sf/month	92,011 sf	184,022 cf/month	92,011 sf	184,022 cf/month	0 sf	0 cf/month
Commercial Recreation*	2.9 cf/sf/month	22,000 sf	63,800 cf/month	22,000 sf	63,800 cf/month	0 sf	0 cf/month
Total			66,273,081 cf/month		74,712,619 cf/month		8,439,538 cf/month

SOURCE: SCAQMD, CEQA Handbook, Table A9-12-A, page A9-117, 1993

1 acre = 43,560 square feet; 100 cubic feet = 1 therm.

a. Assumes 200 square feet per student.

b. Assumes 750 square feet per hotel room.

* The Retail/Service generation rate was assumed for existing and proposed Commercial Recreation uses.

The Southern California Gas Company (SCGC) provided customers in the City of Agoura Hills with 5,254,138 annual therms in 2008.⁴⁹ The additional 1,012,744 therms/year (8,439,538 cf/month) required under General Plan Update buildout equates to a 19 percent increase in natural gas demand for the City. SCGC is a reactive agency and would expand its energy infrastructure to serve the growth associated with buildout of the General Plan Update. No proposals for energy production facilities or transmission facilities are proposed as part of the General Plan Update. If SCGC determines that such facilities are needed at a later date, such projects would be required to undergo separate CEQA review and their impacts assessed at that time. The General Plan Update includes goals and policies such as Goal U-5 (Energy Provision and Conservation), Policies U-5.2 (Adequate Facilities), U-5.4 (Energy Efficient Incentives), and U-5.6 (Energy Conservation), which would ensure provision of adequate energy facilities to serve the General Plan Update buildout and conservation measures to reduce the energy demand on SCGC. In addition, Policy U-5.1 (New Development Requirements), Policy U-5.3 (Solar Access), Policy U-5.5 (Undergrounding of Utilities), Policy U-5.7 (Solar Panels in Projects), and Policies NR-9.1

⁴⁹ Sifuentes, Sam. 2009. Email correspondence with Technical Services Supervisor, Southern California Gas Company, November 6.

(Public Outreach) and NR-9.2 (Energy Conservation for City Facilities) of Goal NR-9 (Energy Conservation) would further ensure that increased development associated with the General Plan Update would comply with energy regulations and coordinate with SCGC to ensure adequate natural gas services would be available to the City. This would be a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact. No mitigation measures are required.

■ Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

There are no significant and unavoidable impacts related to energy from implementation of the General Plan Update.

■ Cumulative Impacts

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts associated with energy would be the service area of the City's energy providers, SCE and SCGC. Cumulative impacts are only addressed for those thresholds that have a project-related impact, whether it is less than significant, significant, or significant and unavoidable. If "no impact" occurs, no cumulative analysis is provided for that threshold.

Development under the General Plan Update, in combination with all other development within the SCE and SCGC service areas, would result in the permanent and continued use of electricity and natural gas resources. However, as both SCE and SCGC are reactive providers, which supply electricity and natural gas services to customers at their request, they would invest in infrastructure expansion as future development applications are submitted. With implementation of the goals and policies in the General Plan Update and coordination with SCE and SCGC, it is expected that both companies would be able to service future developments under the General Plan Update buildout in combination with all projected future developments within their service boundaries. Therefore, the project's contribution to these impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and cumulative impacts to energy demand within SCE and SCGC service boundaries would be *less than significant* (Class II).

■ Mitigation Measures

There are no feasible mitigation measures that would further reduce the less-than-significant impact identified to energy.

■ Final Level of Significance

With the implementation of the General Plan Update policies and application of all local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to energy, the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* impact (Class II). The proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* (Class II) cumulative impact.

4.14.16 Draft General Plan Goals and Policies

Policies relating to energy were identified in the Infrastructure and Community Services Chapter and Natural Resources Chapter of the General Plan Update.

- Goal U-5** **Energy Provision and Conservation.** Adequate, efficient, and environmentally sensitive energy service for all residents and businesses.
- Policy U-5.1** **New Development Requirements.** Require that new development be approved contingent upon its ability to be served by adequate natural gas and electric facilities and infrastructure.
- Policy U-5.2** **Adequate Facilities.** Coordinate with Southern California Edison (SCE) and Southern California Gas Company (SCGC) to ensure that adequate electric and natural gas facilities are available to meet the demands of existing and future development, and to encourage conservation techniques.
- Policy U-5.3** **Solar Access.** Ensure that sites, landscaping, and buildings are configured and designed to maximize and protect solar access.
- Policy U-5.4** **Energy Efficient Incentives.** Coordinate with relevant utilities and agencies to promote energy rebate and incentive programs offered by local energy providers to increase energy efficiency in older neighborhoods and developments.
- Policy U-5.5** **Undergrounding of Utilities.** Require applicants to comply with the City's undergrounding of utilities ordinances and policies and pursue a variety of funding opportunities to assist in supporting future efforts to underground existing utilities.
- Policy U-5.6** **Energy Conservation.** Install energy-efficient appliances and alternative-energy infrastructure, such as solar energy panels (photovoltaic panels) within all new City facilities and within existing facilities, as feasible.
- Policy U-5.7** **Solar Panels in Projects.** Provide incentives for use of solar energy in new development.
- Goal NR-9** **Energy Conservation.** Provision of affordable, reliable, and sustainable energy resources to residents and businesses.
- Policy NR-9.1** **Public Outreach.** Promote energy conservation measures and options to all residents, businesses, contractors, and consultants.
- Policy NR-9.2** **Energy Conservation for City Facilities.** Implement energy-conserving measures for all existing City facilities, as feasible. For new City facilities, incorporate energy-conserving measures to the extent practical.

4.14.17 References

- Agoura Hills, City of. 2004. *General Plan Implementation Report*. Department of Planning and Community Development, September.
- . 2008. *Agoura Village Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*.
- . 2009. Solid Waste Management. <http://www.ci.agoura-hills.ca.us/Index.aspx?page=33> (accessed July 13, 2009).
- Brown, Mike. 2009. Phone conversation with Civil Engineering Associate, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, April 9 and November 2.
- California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB). 2009. Jurisdiction Profile for City of Agoura Hills. <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles/Juris/JurProfile1.asp?RG=C&JURID=2&JUR=Agoura+Hills> (accessed July 13, 2009).
- Celaya, Louis. 2009. Phone conversation with Assistant to the City Manager, City of Agoura Hills, July 13 and November 5.
- Ellison, Dan. 2009. Phone conversation with Principal Engineer, AECOM. November 2.
- Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD). 2005. *Urban Water Management Plan 2005*. Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Report No. 2340.00, November 8.
- . 2007a. *Integrated Water System Master Plan Update 2007*. Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Report No. 2389.02, October.
- . 2007b. *Recycled Water System Master Plan Update 2007*. Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Report No. 2389.01, October.
- . 2008. Tapia Wastewater Reclamation Facility. <http://www.lvmwd.com/index.aspx?page=72> (accessed July 19, 2009).
- Los Angeles, County of. 2009. *Los Angeles County Code*.
- Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). 2007. Joseph Jensen Treatment Plant, July 19. <http://www.mwdh2o.com/mwdh2o/pages/yourwater/plants/jensen01.html> (accessed August 19, 2009).
- Sifuentes, Sam. 2009. Email correspondence with Technical Services Supervisor, Southern California Gas Company, November 6.
- Southern California Edison (SCE). 2008. Environmental Commitment Brochure. May.
- . 2009. *Electricity User Report for City of Agoura Hills Year 2008*. Version 5.0, June 26.
- Swan, Mike. 2009. Phone conversation with Senior Project Manager, Psomas. November 2.
- Wilkins, Glenn. 2009. Email correspondence with Metropolitan Water District, September 14.

4.15 CLIMATE CHANGE

It is widely recognized that anthropogenic (man-made) emissions of greenhouse gases⁵⁰ (GHGs) and aerosols are contributing to changes in the global climate, and that such changes are having and will have adverse effects on the environment, the economy, and public health. These are cumulative effects of past, present, and future actions worldwide. While worldwide contributions of GHG emissions are expected to have widespread consequences, it is not possible to link particular changes to the environment of California to GHGs emitted from a particular source or location. However, when considering a project's contribution to impacts from climate change, it is possible to examine the quantity of GHG emissions that would be emitted either directly from project sources or indirectly from other sources, such as production of electricity. However, that quantity cannot be tied to a particular adverse effect on the environment of California associated with climate change.

During buildout of the General Plan Update, GHGs would be emitted as the result of (1) construction activities and deliveries; (2) new direct operational sources, such as operation of emergency generators, natural gas usage, and operation of vehicles attributed to uses within the City, including residences; and (3) indirect operational sources, such as production of electricity, steam and chilled water, transport of water, and decomposition of project-related wastes. GHGs would also be emitted by visitors and employees travelling to and from the City. This EIR section discusses how buildout of the General Plan Update would contribute to GHG emissions.

The State of California, through Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and Executive Order S-3-05, has set statewide targets for the reduction of GHG emissions. The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association's (CAPCOA) technical report, *CEQA and Climate Change*, states: "The goal of AB 32 and S-3-05 is the significant reduction of future GHG emissions in a state that is expected to rapidly grow in both population and economic output" (CAPCOA 2008). Accordingly, to achieve the state's goals, there will have to be a significant reduction in per capita GHG emissions. While CEQA focuses on emissions associated with new development, other regulatory means will need to be implemented to address reductions in existing emissions.

For this EIR, emissions from sources such as construction activities, vehicle usage, energy consumption, and solid waste generation are inventoried and discussed quantitatively and qualitatively. Emissions associated with the water supply and wastewater treatment are also discussed, although these sources could not be quantified due to data limitations. All emissions inventories are presented in metric tons unless otherwise indicated.

Data used to prepare this section were taken from various sources, including the General Plan Update for the City of Agoura Hills, recent guidance by the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) (California Governor's OPR 2008) for the preparation of CEQA climate change analyses, as well as approaches prepared by a number of professional associations and agencies that have published

⁵⁰ For the purposes of this analysis, the term "greenhouse gases" refers to carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride, those gases regulated under California Assembly Bill 32 and the Kyoto Protocol of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

suggested approaches and strategies for complying with CEQA’s environmental disclosure requirements. Such organizations include the California Attorney General’s Office (AGO), CAPCOA, the United Nations, and World Meteorological Organization’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and the Association of Environmental Professionals (AEP). Full bibliographic entries for all reference materials are provided in Section 4.15.5 (References) at the end of this section.

No comment letters regarding climate change were received in response to the April 30, 2009, Notice of Preparation (NOP) circulated for the General Plan Update. Full bibliographic entries for all reference materials are provided in Section 4.15.5 (References) of this section.

4.15.1 Environmental Setting

■ Overview

The term “climate change” refers to global and regional variations in the normal⁵¹ weather of the earth (wind patterns, storm intensity, precipitation, and temperature) that occur over time. It is widely accepted that GHG emissions, aerosols, and changes in land cover associated with development are accelerating global climate change and that adverse environmental impacts would likely result.

Over time, the Earth’s climate has undergone significant change which can be traced and documented through fossil isotopes, ice core samples, and other measurement techniques. Recent climate change studies use the historical record to predict future climate variations and what level of fluctuation might be considered statistically “normal,” given historical trends. Temperature records from the last 150 years deviate from normal predictions in both rate and magnitude. Most climatologists predict an unprecedented warming period during the next century and beyond. This warming trend is increasingly attributed to human-generated GHG emissions resulting from the industrial processes, transportation, solid waste generation, and land use patterns of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. According to the IPCC, GHG emissions associated with human activities have grown since pre-industrial times. GHG emissions have increased by 70 percent in the 34 years between 1970 and 2004 (IPCC 2007).

The IPCC has constructed several emission trajectories of GHG emissions needed to stabilize global temperatures and minimize climate change impacts. The IPCC predicted that the range of global mean temperature change from 1990 to 2100, given six scenarios, could range from 1.1 degrees Celsius (°C) to 6.4°C. The IPCC projects an increase of global GHG emissions by 25 to 90 percent between 2000 and 2030, depending on the reduction thresholds, mitigation, and alternative fuel development that are pursued around the world during this period. It should be noted that regardless of the analytical methodology used and the level of GHG reductions that are assumed, global average temperature and sea level are expected to rise under all scenarios modeled by the IPCC (IPCC 2007).

⁵¹ “Normal” weather patterns include statistically normal variations within a specified range.

■ Potential Effects of Climate Change

The climate in California is expected to become increasingly warmer during the twenty-first century due to the accumulation of GHGs in the atmosphere. Exactly how much warmer the climate would become depends on the rate at which human activities, such as the burning of fossil fuels, continues. The IPCC Special Report on Emissions Scenarios (SRES) has developed a set of possible future GHG emissions scenarios based on different assumptions about global development. Based on a recent SRES for California, there are three general emissions scenarios: a higher emissions scenario, a medium-high emissions scenario, and a lower emissions scenario.

The higher emissions scenario represents rapid fossil-fuel intensive economic growth, global population that peaks mid-century then declines, and the introduction of new and more efficient technologies toward the end of the 21st century. Global warming emissions increase rapidly, anticipated to reach about 25 gigatonnes per year (Gt/yr), which is more than three times the present rate of emissions, by 2050. The medium-high emissions scenario is based on a projection of continuous population growth combined with slower economic growth and technological changes than in the other scenarios. In contrast, the lower emissions scenario represents a world with population growth similar to the highest emissions scenarios, but with rapid changes towards a service and information economy with the introduction of clean and resource-efficient technologies. The lower emissions scenario has CO₂ emissions peaking just below 10 Gt/yr in mid-century before dropping below the current-day level of 7 Gt/yr by 2100. Under this scenario, despite a reduction in CO₂ emissions, the global CO₂ concentration would double, relative to its pre-industrial level, by the end of this century. It is important to note that even at the lower emissions scenario, increase in global temperatures is predicted to be between 1.7 and 3.0 °C (3 to 5.5 degrees Fahrenheit). In the medium-high emissions scenario and the higher emissions scenario, temperatures are predicted to increase between 3.1 and 4.3°C (5.5 to 8 degrees Fahrenheit) and 4.4 to 5.8°C (8 to 10.5 degrees Fahrenheit), respectively (CCAT 2006).

Water Resources

Global climate change is playing an increasingly important role in scientific and policy debates related to water management. The most consequential impacts of climate change on water resources in the United States are likely to occur in the mid-latitudes of the west, such as California, where the runoff cycle is largely determined by snow accumulation and subsequent melt patterns. It is well documented that the effects of a warmer climate on the timing of runoff in these regions likely would shift a portion of spring and summer runoff to periods earlier in the year. Despite the high degree of regulation in many water supply systems throughout the western United States, the effects of these shifts on runoff seasonality generally are considered to be undesirable, because the amount of water stored in snowpack can be substantial and, under normal (i.e., historical) conditions, this stored water is relied upon to augment low stream flows during the relatively dry summers (VanRheenen et al. 2004).

Decreasing Sierra Nevada Snowpack

As increased GHG emissions accumulate in the atmosphere and average global temperatures rise, more precipitation would fall as rain instead of snow. In addition, the snow that does fall would melt earlier in

the year, reducing the Sierra Nevada snowpack. Between 2070 and 2099, the Sierra Nevada is predicted to have a 30 to 60 percent loss of snowpack at the lower emissions scenario. Snowpack losses at the medium high emissions scenario are expected between 70 and 80 percent; at the higher emissions scenario, the Sierra Nevada Mountains would have losses of approximately 90 percent (CCAT 2006). The decreasing snowpack would have negative implications for water managers, hydropower generation, and seriously curtail or even eliminate snow-related recreational activities. A potential loss of 5 million acre-feet or more of average annual water storage is expected in the state's snowpack according to the California Department of Water Resources (California DWR 2006). The decrease in snowpack has the potential to affect the Sacramento area through a potential in increased flooding. Further, impacts to fish and wildlife are anticipated due to the loss of snow based habitat and drought-like conditions due to earlier snow melt. For example, as deep, cold pools become increasingly shallow and warm, many steelhead trout habitat and potentially all spring-run salmon habitat within the Sierra Nevada Mountains may disappear.

Sea Level Rise

The warming of the planet has resulted in an incremental increase in sea levels which has been observed in San Francisco and San Diego during the last century. Sea levels have risen an average of 7.6 inches from 1900 to 2000 (CCAT 2006). California's coast and estuaries would experience increasing sea levels during the next century. In the lower emissions scenario, sea levels are expected to rise 6 to 14 inches; in the medium high emissions scenario, sea levels are expected to rise 14 to 22 inches; and in the higher emission scenario, sea levels are expected to rise 22 to 30 inches (CCAT 2006). As sea level rises, beaches could be eroded and coastal wetlands and estuaries that abut developed areas along the south coast of California will be blocked from moving inland. Habitat for the Western snowy plover, light-footed clapper rail, California least tern, and other species prized by birdwatchers would be especially at risk.

Seawater Incursion

Seawater (or saltwater) incursion involves contamination of freshwater aquifers with saltwater. Fresh water floats as a lens on denser salt water. If too much fresh water is removed, a cone of depression is created in the fresh water lens. Through potential effects of global warming, an increase in groundwater withdrawal may be required due to a lowering of snow melt. As a result, rising sea levels could potentially contaminate the groundwater basins below Los Angeles County, as well as other California groundwater basins along the Pacific coast.

Sea level rise is a product of two main processes: thermal expansion of sea water and widespread melting of ice sheets. The thermal expansion of water refers to an increase in the volume of water at constant mass due to heating. Sea level rise would also be affected by melting ice sheets. The only remaining ice sheets on Earth are in Antarctica and Greenland. The IPCC projects that ice mass loss from melting of the Greenland ice sheet would continue to outpace accumulation from snowfall. Accumulation from snowfall on the Antarctic ice sheet is projected to outpace losses from melting. However, loss of ice mass on the Antarctic ice sheet may continue, if there is sufficient loss of ice mass via outlet glaciers (IPCC 2007).

Increasing Wildfires

Wildfire risk is determined by a combination of factors including precipitation, winds, temperature, and landscape and vegetation conditions. Thus, future risks would not be uniform through the state. For example, if precipitation increases as temperatures rise, wildfires in the grasslands and chaparral ecosystems of southern California are expected to increase by 30 percent toward the end of the 21st century because more winter rain would stimulate the growth of more plant “fuel” available to burn in the hot and dry seasons, assuming late fall, winter, and early spring remain wet. Alternatively, a hotter, drier climate could promote up to 90 percent more northern California fires by the end of the century by drying out and increasing the flammability of forest vegetation (CEC 2006c). Statewide, in the lower emissions scenario, a 10 to 35 percent increase in wildfire frequency is estimated. For the medium high emissions scenario, a 55 percent increase in wildfire frequency is expected (CEC 2006c). The potential increase in wildfires could impact Southern California and the City of Agoura Hills, where residential uses are located adjacent to undeveloped vegetated hillside areas.

Public Health

Global warming under any of the three emissions scenarios would affect public health by exacerbating air pollution, intensifying heat waves, and expanding the range of infectious diseases. The IPCC warned that rising temperatures may result in altered spatial distribution of some infectious disease vectors and could have mixed effects, such as the decrease or increase of the range and transmission potential of malaria in Africa and other parts of the world. The primary concern in this case is not the change in average climate but the projected increase in extreme conditions, which poses the most serious health risks.

Severe Heat

As temperatures rise, there could be greater incidences of death due to dehydration, heat stroke and exhaustion, heart attack, stroke, and respiratory distress caused by extreme heat. Those that are most vulnerable to the effects of extreme heat are children, the elderly, people with existing health problems, and the poor. In all emissions scenarios, it is expected that there would be two to four times as many heat wave days in major urban centers. There could also be a 3 to 20 percent increase in electricity demands in order to provide air conditioning to businesses and residences (CEC 2006d).

■ Greenhouse Gases

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are called GHGs because they act to transform the light of the sun into heat and to trap that heat in the lower atmosphere, in a manner similar to the glass walls of a greenhouse. Common GHGs include water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxides, chlorofluorocarbons, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, sulfur hexafluoride, ozone, and aerosols. Without the natural heat trapping effect of GHGs, the earth’s surface would be about 34°C cooler (CCAT 2006). However, it is believed that emissions from human activities, such as electricity production and vehicle use, have elevated the concentration of these gases in the atmosphere beyond the level of naturally occurring concentrations. Global atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide have increased markedly since 1750 as a result of human activities introduced

with the advent of the Industrial Age, and these concentrations now far exceed pre-industrial values as determined from ice core samples that contain trapped gases spanning many thousands of years.

As shown in Table 4.15-1 (Global Warming Potentials and Atmospheric Lifetimes of Select GHGs), individual GHGs have varying global warming potentials and atmospheric lifetimes. The carbon dioxide equivalent is a consistent methodology for comparing GHG emissions since it normalizes various GHG emissions to a consistent metric. The reference gas for global warming potential is carbon dioxide, which has a global warming potential of one. By comparison, methane’s global warming potential is 21, since methane has a greater global warming effect than carbon dioxide on a molecule to molecule basis. One teragram (Tg) (equal to one million metric tons) of carbon dioxide equivalent (Tg CO₂e) is the mass emissions of an individual GHG multiplied by its global warming potential.

Table 4.15-1 Global Warming Potentials and Atmospheric Lifetimes of Select GHGs		
Gas	Atmospheric Lifetime (years)	Global Warming Potential (100 year time horizon)
Carbon Dioxide	50–200	1
Methane	12±3	21
Nitrous Oxide	120	310
HFC-23	264	11,700
HFC-134a	14.6	1,300
HFC-152a	1.5	140
PFC: Tetrafluoromethane (CF ₄)	50,000	6,500
PFC: Hexafluoroethane (C ₂ F ₆)	10,000	9,200
Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF ₆)	3,200	23,900

SOURCE: Environmental Protection Agency, 2006.

Of all GHGs in the atmosphere, water vapor is the most abundant, important, and variable. It is not considered a pollutant. In the atmosphere, it maintains a climate necessary for life. The main source of water vapor is evaporation from the oceans (approximately 85 percent). Other sources include evaporation from other water bodies, sublimation (change from solid to gas) from ice and snow, and transpiration from plant leaves.

Carbon dioxide (CO₂) is an odorless, colorless gas, which has both natural and anthropogenic sources. Natural sources include the following: decomposition of dead organic matter; respiration of bacteria, plants, animals, and fungus; evaporation from oceans; and volcanic outgassing. Anthropogenic sources of carbon dioxide are from burning coal, oil, natural gas, and wood. CO₂ emissions in California are mainly associated with in-state fossil fuel combustion and with fossil fuel combustion in out-of-state power plants supplying electricity to California. Other activities that produce CO₂ emissions include mineral production, waste combustion, and land use changes that reduce vegetative cover.

Concentrations of carbon dioxide were 379 parts per million (ppm) in 2005, which equates to an increase of 1.4 ppm per year since 1960 (IPCC 2007). CO₂ is the most common GHG generated by California activities, constituting approximately 84 percent of all GHG emissions (CEC 2006b).

Methane (CH_4) is a flammable gas and is the main component of natural gas. When one molecule of methane is burned in the presence of oxygen, one molecule of carbon dioxide and two molecules of water are released. There are no ill health effects from methane. A natural source of methane is from the anaerobic decay of organic matter. Geological deposits, known as natural gas fields, also contain methane, which is extracted for fuel. Other sources are from landfills, fermentation of manure, and cattle.

Nitrous oxide (N_2O), also known as “laughing gas,” is a colorless GHG. Higher concentrations can cause dizziness, euphoria, and sometimes slight hallucinations. Nitrous oxide is produced by microbial processes in soil and water, including those reactions that occur in fertilizer containing nitrogen. In addition to agricultural sources, some industrial processes (fossil fuel-fired power plants, nylon production, nitric acid production, and vehicle emissions) also contribute to its atmospheric load. It is used in rocket engines, racecars, and as an aerosol spray propellant.

Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) are gases formed synthetically by replacing all hydrogen atoms in methane or ethane with chlorine and/or fluorine atoms. CFCs are nontoxic, nonflammable, insoluble, and chemically unreactive in the troposphere (the level of air at the earth’s surface). CFCs were first synthesized in 1928 for use as refrigerants, aerosol propellants, and cleaning solvents. Because they destroy stratospheric ozone, their production was stopped as required by the Montreal Protocol in 1987.

Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) are synthetic man-made chemicals that are used as a substitute for CFCs for automobile air conditioners and refrigerants. They contain no chlorine; only carbon, hydrogen, and fluorine. Although not known as an ozone depleting chemical, HFCs are considered a GHG.

Perfluorocarbons (PFCs) have stable molecular structures and do not break down through the chemical processes in the lower atmosphere. High-energy ultraviolet rays about 60 kilometers above the earth’s surface are able to destroy the compounds. PFCs have very long lifetimes, between 10,000 and 50,000 years. Two common PFCs are tetrafluoromethane and hexafluoroethane. Concentrations of tetrafluoromethane in the atmosphere are over 70 parts per trillion (ppt). The two main sources of PFCs are primary aluminum production and semiconductor manufacture.

Sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6) is an inorganic, odorless, colorless, nontoxic, nonflammable gas. It has the highest global warming potential of any gas evaluated, 23,900. Concentrations in the 1990s were about four ppt. Sulfur hexafluoride is used for insulation in electric power transmission and distribution equipment, in the magnesium industry, in semiconductor manufacturing, and as a tracer gas for leak detection.

Ozone (O_3) is a GHG; however, unlike other GHG, ozone in the troposphere is relatively short-lived and, therefore, its effects are not globally important. It is difficult to make an accurate determination of the contribution of ozone precursors (nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds) to global climate change (Cal EPA 2004).

Aerosols are suspensions of particulate matter in a gas emitted into the air through burning biomass (plant material) and fossil fuels. Aerosols can warm the atmosphere by absorbing and emitting heat and can cool the atmosphere by reflecting light. Aerosols can also affect cloud formation. Sulfate aerosols are

emitted when fuel-containing sulfur is burned. Black carbon (or soot) is emitted during bio mass burning or incomplete combustion of fossil fuels. Particulate matter regulation has been lowering aerosol concentrations in the United States; however, global concentrations are likely increasing.

Generally, this analysis focuses on the major sources of GHGs including Carbon Dioxide (CO₂), Nitrous Oxide (N₂O), and methane (CH₄). Transportation related emissions, energy consumption emissions, and solid waste emissions are quantified and other potential sources of GHGs are discussed qualitatively in this section.

■ Global, Federal, and State Greenhouse Gas Inventories

Worldwide anthropogenic emissions of GHGs in 2006 were approximately 49,000 million metric tons of CO₂e, including ongoing emissions from industrial and agricultural sources and emissions from land use changes (i.e., deforestation, biomass decay) (IPCC 2007). CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel use accounts for 56.6 percent of the total emissions. CH₄ emissions account for 14 percent and N₂O emissions for 8 percent of worldwide GHGs (IPCC 2007).

The US EPA publication, *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2006*, provides a comprehensive emissions inventory of the nation's primary anthropogenic sources of GHGs. In 2006, total nationwide GHG emissions were 7,054 million metric tons of CO₂e (U.S. EPA 2008). Overall, total US emissions have risen by about 15 percent from 1990 to 2006; however, emissions fell by 1 percent from 2005 to 2006. According to the EPA, the primary contributors to the decrease were increased fuel prices and warmer weather conditions, which resulted in a decreased consumption of fossil fuels.

California is the second largest contributor of GHG emissions in the U.S. and the sixteenth largest in the world (CEC 2006b). In 2004, California produced 427 Tg CO₂e (CEC 2006b), which is approximately 6 percent of 2004 U.S. emissions and 0.9 percent of global emissions. In California, the most common GHG is CO₂ from fossil fuel combustion, which constitutes approximately 81 percent of all GHG emissions (CEC 2006b). The remainder of GHGs only makes up a small percentage of the total: nitrous oxide constitutes 6.8 percent, methane 6.4 percent, high global warming potential (GWP) gases 3.5 percent, and non-fossil fuel CO₂ emissions constitute 2.3 percent (CEC 2006b). CO₂ emissions in California are mainly associated with fossil fuel consumption in the transportation sector (41.2 percent) with the industrial sector as the second-largest source (22.8 percent) (CEC 2006b). Electricity production, from both in-state and out-of-state sources, agriculture, forestry, commercial, and residential activities comprise the balance of California's GHG emissions.

As part of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32), discussed below, the California Air Resources Board (California ARB) is required to establish a statewide GHG emissions limit for 2020 equivalent to 1990 emissions. In addition, Executive Order S-3-05 sets the following statewide emissions targets: a reduction of GHG emissions to 2000 levels by 2010, a reduction of GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and a reduction of GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. The California ARB estimates that California's annual emissions were equivalent to 427 Tg CO₂e in 1990 and 452 Tg CO₂e in 2000 (California ARB 2007).

Table 4.15-2 (California Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets) shows quantified California statewide emissions targets (AB 32 and Executive Order S-3-05 targets) based on the California Energy Commission's (CEC) 2007 Inventory of Greenhouse Gases and Sinks. Table 4.15-2 (California Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets) also indicates how these thresholds compare to future population projections by showing how the reduction thresholds would translate on a per capita basis as California's population increases. This is provided for informational purposes only; there is no adopted per capita goal for GHG reductions.

<i>Year^a</i>	<i>Estimated California Population</i>	<i>Reduction Goal</i>	<i>Greenhouse Gas Target (Tg CO₂e)</i>	<i>Per Capita Target (metric tons CO₂e per person)^b</i>
1990	29,828,000	N/A	427.0	14.3
2000	34,105,437	N/A	452.3	13.3
2010	39,135,676	GHG emissions at or below 2000 levels ^c	452.3	11.6
2020	44,135,923	GHG emissions at or below 1990 levels	427.0	9.7
2050	59,507,876	GHG emissions 80% below 1990 levels ^d	341.6	5.7

SOURCE: Population data are from California Department of Finance, 2007; greenhouse gas targets are derived from California ARB, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory Summary (1990–2004)*, 2007.

- a. Target years specified in Executive Order S-3-05 and/or AB 32. 1990 and 2000 data are provided as a baseline.
- b. Calculated by dividing the statewide GHG target by the projected population for each target year. 1 teragram (Tg) = 1 million metric tons = 1.1023 million short tons CO₂e.
- c. Based on 2004 estimate.
- d. Calculated by taking 80 percent of 427.0.

City of Agoura Hills. Currently, the City of Agoura Hills does not have a completed inventory of GHG emissions in terms of CO₂e. Table 4.15-3 (Estimated Annual Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions Attributed to the City of Agoura Hills, 2009) presents a preliminary estimate of GHG emissions attributable to the City, consistent with the methodology listed below under Section 4.15.3 (Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures). The estimate provided below is not intended as a comprehensive inventory but rather to provide a baseline of evaluating the increase in land uses anticipated under the General Plan Update. Policy NR-10.1 (Climate Change) requires the City to comply with all state requirements regarding climate change and GHG reduction. A formal citywide GHG emissions inventory is likely to be a statewide requirement in the near future. In that case, the City would conduct such an inventory.

■ Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Development

Sources of GHGs associated with new development include direct residential and nonresidential energy consumption, transportation emissions, electricity generation, landfill emissions, construction emissions, and the energy consumed to supply and distribute water, specifically to areas located in southern

California.⁵² For example, the CEC estimates that it takes approximately 3,000 kilowatt-hours to transport 1 acre-foot of water from northern to southern California.

Table 4.15-3 Estimated Annual Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions Attributed to the City of Agoura Hills, 2009

Source of Emissions	CO ₂ e (metric tons)	Percent of Total
Vehicular Use ^a	248,643	69
Electricity Use	34,477	10
Natural Gas Use	49,111	14
Solid Waste	23,805	7
Water Use/Distribution	6,735	2
Annual Total	362,771	100

SOURCE: URBEMIS 2007 (Version 9.2.4), California Climate Action Registry General Reporting Protocol, Reporting Entity-Wide Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Version 3.1, January 2009.

a. Vehicular emissions are based on an estimate of 154,346 daily trips generated by existing uses. Trip rates were modified based on the Traffic Study prepared by Fehr and Peers for the General Plan Update.

California's transportation sector is heavily dependent upon oil, with petroleum-based fuels currently supplying 96 percent of California's transportation energy needs. By percentage, the transportation sector is the largest contributor to GHG emissions in California. The nearly 26 million registered vehicles operating in California produce between 27 and 41 percent of the State's GHG emissions. Within the transportation sector, light vehicles (i.e., cars, light trucks, and motorcycles) account for about 60 percent of the petroleum-based energy consumption. Dispersed development patterns, which require higher per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMTs), can exacerbate the generation of GHGs by requiring longer and more frequent vehicle trips. By contrast, compact development containing a mix of residential and nonresidential land uses provides opportunities for residents to live and work within close proximity, thus reducing VMT.

Electricity generation is California's second largest source of GHG emissions. While some emissions are generated out of state, California GHG inventories consider all GHG emissions released during generation of the electricity used in California (even emissions released out of state) to be California emissions. Out-of-state electricity generation accounts for a large portion of the electricity generation emissions because out-of-state fuel sources have higher carbon intensity than in-state sources. While imported electricity is a relatively small share of California's electricity mix (ranging from 22 to 32 percent of total electrical energy used), out-of-state electricity generation sources contribute 39 to 57 percent of

⁵² It is difficult to trace GHGs by source and economic sector. For example, the CEC greenhouse gas inventory (CEC 2006f) reports landfill methane emissions in the methane portion of the inventory and CO₂ sinks associated with landfills in the CO₂ portion of the inventory. Fuel-related greenhouse gas emissions from transporting wastes to landfills are reported in the transportation category, while landfill emissions (which are largely composed of methane) are often reported in the agricultural category. In addition, there are both direct and indirect sources of emissions associated with new development. For example, the natural gas burned to heat homes is considered a direct source of emissions, while the natural gas burned to produce electricity may be considered an indirect source. Standards for reporting emissions by source and economic sector have yet to be fully developed. The percentages reported in this section are estimates based on the current CEC inventory.

the GHG emissions associated with electricity consumption in California. Electricity imported to California from the Southwest is often generated by coal-fired plants, while imports from the Pacific Northwest are commonly from hydroelectric dams.

Direct residential energy consumption (electricity and natural gas) accounts for approximately 14 percent of California’s GHG emissions (NAHB 2003). Industrial energy use accounts for about 20.5 percent (CEC 2006f). Other sources of GHGs not explicitly quantified in the 2006 CEC inventory include solid waste emissions, emissions from the extraction and processing of raw materials, and emissions from construction processes.

■ Land Cover Changes

Sinks play an important role in a GHG inventory. Forests, certain agricultural crops, and other carbon-storing land uses are considered sinks (i.e. reservoirs that remove and store atmospheric CO₂.) Sinks help to regulate temperature fluctuations associated with the greenhouse effect. Land cover conversions may result in the production of additional GHG emissions, but those changes can also affect the earth’s ability to offset such emissions by reducing its carbon storage capacity.

4.15.2 Regulatory Framework

■ Federal/International

The following summarizes the international and federal regulations that have been put forth to assess and reduce the potential impacts of human induced climate change, as well as reducing human-produced GHGs. However, at this point, none of these international treaties or federal plans has been shown to reduce GHG production or limit the process of global climate change. Further, none of the treaties or plans pertains directly to the proposed project. They are listed to give the reader context regarding the current national regulatory and judiciary response to the climate change issue.

Montreal Protocol

The Montreal Protocol was signed in 1987 and amended in 1990 and 1992. The Montreal Protocol governs compounds that deplete ozone in the stratosphere—chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), halons, carbon tetrachloride, and methyl chloroform. The Protocol provided that these compounds were to be phased out by 2000 (2005 for methyl chloroform). In 1988, the United Nations and the World Meteorological Organization established the IPCC to assess “the scientific, technical and socioeconomic information relevant to understanding the scientific basis of risk of human-induced climate change, its potential impacts, and options for adaptation and mitigation.”

Kyoto Protocol

On March 21, 1994, the United States joined a number of countries around the world in signing the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Under the Convention, governments: “gather and share information on GHG emissions, national policies, and best practices;

launch national strategies for addressing GHG emissions and adapting to expected impacts, including the provision of financial and technological support to developing countries; and cooperate in preparing for adaptation to the impacts of climate change” (IPCC 2004).

The treaty known as the Kyoto Protocol was created as a result of UNFCCC efforts. Countries sign the treaty to demonstrate their commitment to reducing GHG emissions or to engage in emissions trading. More than 160 countries representing 55 percent of global emissions (not including the United States) are currently participating in the protocol. In 1998, former U.S. Vice President, Al Gore, symbolically signed the Protocol; however, in order for the Protocol to be formally ratified the U.S. Congress must adopt it, which has not occurred.

Climate Change Action Plan

In October 1993, President Clinton announced his *Climate Change Action Plan*, with the goal of returning GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000. This was to be accomplished through fifty initiatives, relying on innovative voluntary partnerships between the private sector and government aimed at producing cost-effective reductions in GHG emissions. As of September 2007, twenty states have completed comprehensive climate action plans that detail the steps each state can take to reduce their contribution to climate change. However, without specific targets for emissions reductions, incentives for cleaner technologies, or other clear policies, climate action plans cannot achieve real reductions in GHG emissions (IPCC 2004).

Supreme Court Case 05-1120

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) currently does not regulate GHG emissions from motor vehicles. *Massachusetts v. EPA* (Supreme Court Case 05-1120) was argued before the U.S. Supreme Court on November 29, 2006, in which it was petitioned that EPA regulate four GHG, including carbon dioxide, under Section 202(a)(1) of the *Clean Air Act*. A decision was rendered on April 2, 2007, in which the Court held that petitioners have standing to challenge the EPA and that the EPA has statutory authority to regulate emission of GHG from motor vehicles.

■ State

California Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32)

In 2006, the California State Legislature adopted AB 32, the *California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006*. AB 32 focuses on reducing GHG in California. GHG as defined under AB 32 include carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. AB 32 requires that the California ARB adopt rules and regulations that would achieve GHG emissions equivalent to statewide levels in 1990 by 2020. The law further requires that the California ARB develop measures to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost effective reductions in GHGs from sources or categories of sources to achieve the statewide GHG emissions limit for 2020.

Under AB 32, the California ARB is required to establish a statewide GHG emissions cap for 2020 based on 1990 emissions. The California ARB estimates that California’s annual emissions were equivalent to

427 million metric tons CO₂e in 1990 (CEC 2006b). The California ARB published its final report for Proposed Early Actions to Mitigate Climate Change in California, which describes recommendations for discrete early action measures to reduce GHG emissions in October 2007. The measures included are part of California's strategy for achieving GHG reductions under AB 32. Three new regulations are proposed to meet the definition of "discrete early action greenhouse gas reduction measures," which include the following: a low carbon fuel standard; reduction of HFC-134a emissions from non-professional servicing of motor vehicle air conditioning systems; and improved landfill methane capture. The California ARB estimates that by 2020, the reductions from those three measures will be approximately 13 to 26 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent.

Under AB 32, the California ARB has the primary responsibility for reducing GHG emissions. However, the California Climate Action Team (CCAT) Report contains strategies that can be undertaken by many other California agencies. In addition, the California ARB staff is working on several nonregulatory measures including guidance documents and protocols to encourage the public, local government and businesses to take positive steps to reduce GHG emissions.

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA)

CAPCOA has released a new document to serve as a guide and resource tool for local governments in addressing GHGs emissions in general plans. The new document, "Model Policies for GHG in General Plans," provides background information, examples, references, links, and a systematic worksheet to help local governments in moving toward GHG considerations in general plan updates or in the development of specific CAPs. The Model Policies guide is offered to provide tools and information for coordination and collaboration for local governments.

California Code of Regulations Title 24

Although it was not originally intended to reduce GHGs, *California Code of Regulations* Title 24 Part 6 (California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings) was first established in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption. The standards are updated periodically to allow consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods. The latest amendments, made in October 2005, currently require new homes to use half the energy they used only a decade ago. Energy efficient buildings require less electricity, and electricity production by fossil fuels results in GHG emissions. Therefore, increased energy efficiency results in decreased GHG emissions.

Executive Order S-3-05

California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger announced on June 1, 2005, through Executive Order S-3-05, the following GHG emission reduction targets: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels; by 2020, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; by 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels. The California Climate Action Team's (CAT) Report to the Governor in 2006, contains recommendations and strategies to help ensure the targets in Executive Order S-3-05 are met.

Executive Order S-01-07

Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger enacted Executive Order S-01-07 on January 18, 2007. The order mandates that a statewide goal shall be established to reduce the carbon intensity of California's transportation fuels by at least 10 percent by 2020. The process for meeting the 2020 target includes coordination between the California Environmental Protection Agency, the University of California, the California Energy Commission to develop and propose, a draft compliance schedule to meet the 2020 Target by June 30, 2007. The order also requires that a Low Carbon Fuel Standard for transportation be established for California.

Executive Order S-13-08

On November 18, 2008, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger issued Executive Order S-13-08, which mandates four particular items: (1) initiation of a statewide Climate Change Adaptation Strategy; (2) an evaluation of sea level rise impacts by the National Academy of Science; (3) issuance of interim guidance regarding sea level rise for coastal and floodplain areas; and (4) initiate studies of areas (specifically infrastructure projects and land use policies) vulnerable to sea level rise.

Assembly Bill 1493

Assembly Bill 1493, enacted on July 22, 2002, requires the California ARB to develop and adopt regulations that reduce GHGs emitted by passenger vehicles and light duty trucks. Regulations adopted by the California ARB would apply to 2009 and later model year vehicles. The California ARB estimates that the regulation would reduce climate change emissions from the light duty passenger vehicle fleet by an estimated 18 percent in 2020 and by 27 percent in 2030 (California ARB 2004).

Senate Bill 1368

Senate Bill (SB) 1368 is the companion bill of AB 32 and was signed by Governor Schwarzenegger in September 2006. SB 1368 requires the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to establish a GHG emission performance standard for baseload generation from investor-owned utilities by February 1, 2007. Similarly, the CEC was tasked with establishing a similar standard for local publicly-owned utilities by June 30, 2007. These standards cannot exceed the GHG emission rate from a baseload combined-cycle natural gas fired plant. The legislation further requires that all electricity provided to California, including imported electricity, must be generated from plants that meet the standards set by the PUC and the CEC. In January 2007, the PUC adopted an interim GHG Emissions Performance Standard, which requires that all new long-term commitments for baseload generation entered into by investor-owned utilities have emissions no greater than a combined cycle gas turbine plant (i.e., 1,100 pounds of CO₂ per megawatt-hour). A “new long-term commitment” refers to new plant investments (new construction), new or renewal contracts with a term of five years or more, or major investments by the utility in its existing baseload power plants. In May 2007, the CEC approved regulations that prohibit the state's publicly owned utilities from entering into long-term financial commitments with plants that exceed the standard adopted by the PUC of 1,100 pounds of CO per megawatt hour.

Senate Bill 1078

SB 1078 establishes a renewable portfolio standard (RPS) for electricity supply. The RPS requires that retail sellers of electricity, including investor-owned utilities and community choice aggregators, provide 20 percent of their supply from renewable sources by 2017. This target date was moved forward by SB 1078 to require compliance by 2010. In addition, electricity providers subject to the RPS must increase their renewable share by at least 1 percent each year. The outcomes of this legislation will impact regional transportation powered by electricity.

Senate Bill 97

The provisions of Senate Bill 97 enacted in August 2007 as part of the State Budget negotiations, direct the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to propose CEQA Guidelines advising lead agencies how to mitigate the impacts of GHG emissions. OPR has been directed to promulgate such guidelines by July 2009, and the Resources Agency has been directed to adopt such guidelines by January 2010. The preliminary OPR guidelines, titled *CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change Through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review*, were published June 19, 2008, and guide the analysis in this EIR. On January 8, 2009, the OPR published preliminary draft regulatory guidance with respect to the analysis and mitigation of the potential effects of GHG emissions. OPR recently held two public workshops (August 2009) to discuss the preliminary draft guidance before submitting its proposal to the California Resources Agency.

CEQA Guideline Amendments for Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As of December 31, 2009, the California Natural Resources Agency has adopted revisions to the CEQA Guidelines addressing “the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions and the effects of greenhouse gas emissions, including, but not limited to, effects associated with transportation or energy sources.” (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21083.05.) These regulations are expected to become effective, perhaps with modest changes, by early February 2010, after a 30-day review period by the Office of Administrative Law (OAL). Under CEQA Guidelines section 15007(b), public agencies need only comply with new CEQA Guidelines that “apply to steps in the CEQA process not yet undertaken by the date when agencies must comply with the amendments. That date, according to section 15007(d), is 120 days after the amendments are final. For these amendments, that date would be in late May or early June, depending on the date on which OAL takes its final action. Here, then, the Draft EIR was not required to comply with the new amendments. Even so, the City has done its best, based on the Guidelines as adopted by the Natural Resources Agency, to comply with provisions apparently applicable to draft EIRs.

The CEQA Guideline Amendments amend or add new text pertaining to GHG emissions to fourteen sections of the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Chapter 3 of the *California Code of Regulations*). A brief summary of the proposed text revisions is provided below.

Section 15064.4. Determining the Significance of Impacts from Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This section clarifies that a lead agency’s responsibility in assessing GHG impacts. The text identifies general considerations that should be weighed when determining the significance of an effect:

- The extent to which the project may increase or reduce greenhouse gas emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting
- The extent to which the project emissions exceed any threshold of significance that applies to the project
- The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions. Such regulations must be adopted by the relevant public agency through a public review process and must include specific requirements that reduce or mitigate the project's incremental contribution of greenhouse gas emissions. If there is substantial evidence that the possible effects of a particular project are still cumulatively considerable notwithstanding compliance with the adopted regulations or requirements, an EIR must be prepared for the project.

The CEQA Guideline Amendments require that lead agencies “describe, calculate or estimate the amount of greenhouse emissions associated with a project” but leave the choice of a preferred methodology to the lead agency’s discretion. Qualitative or other performance-based standards may also be weighed.

Section 15126.4 Consideration and Discussion of Mitigation Measures Proposed to Minimize Significant Effects. The text in this section states that lead agencies shall consider feasible means of mitigating GHG emissions that may include but not be limited to the following:

- Measures in an existing plan or mitigation program for the reduction of emissions that are required as part of the lead agency’s decision
- Reductions in emissions resulting from a project through implementation of project features, project design, or other measures, such as those described in [CEQA Guidelines] Appendix F
- Off-site measures, including offsets, to mitigation a project’s emissions
- Measures that sequester greenhouse gases
- In the case of adoption of a plan, such as a general plan, long range development plan, or greenhouse gas reduction plan, mitigation may include the identification of specific measures that may be implemented on a project-by-project basis. Mitigation may also include the incorporation of specific measures or policies found in an adopted ordinance or regulation that reduces the cumulative effect of emissions.

Section 15130. Discussion of Cumulative Impacts. The text in this section simply states that the project should be considered in the context of past, current and foreseeable development to determine if a cumulatively considerable impact would result.

Section 15183.5. Tiering and Streamlining the Analysis of Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This section identifies the method by which a programmatic GHG analysis (i.e., General Plan, Long Range Development Plan, or other plan) may be used for tiering purposes for project-level analyses. This section also identifies the manner in which GHG reduction plans or climate action plans may be applied to project-level analyses.

Proposed CEQA Checklist Questions. Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines contains a sample checklist that may be used by lead agencies when considering environmental impacts. Two new checklist questions have been added for GHG emissions:

- Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

However, the CEQA Guidelines Amendment also proposes new cautionary text to clarify that the checklist must be used with discretion and may not cover all environmental impacts. The checklist questions are not necessarily intended to serve as significance criteria. Development of significance criteria is left to the discretion of local lead agencies.

OPR Technical Advisory, CEQA, and Climate Change

On June 19, 2008, OPR published a technical advisory on CEQA and Climate Change. The technical advisory is one in a series of advisories published by OPR as a service to professional planners, land use officials, and CEQA practitioners. The advisory provides OPR’s perspective on the emerging role of CEQA in addressing climate change and GHG emissions, while recognizing that approaches and methodologies for calculating GHG emissions and addressing environmental impacts through CEQA review are rapidly evolving. The advisory recognizes that OPR will develop, and the Resources Agency will adopt, amendments to the CEQA Guidelines pursuant to SB 97. In the interim, the technical advisory “offers informal guidance regarding the steps lead agencies should take to address climate change in their CEQA documents” (California Governor’s OPR 2008, 2).

The technical advisory points out that neither CEQA nor the CEQA Guidelines prescribe thresholds of significance or particular methodologies for performing an impact analysis. As stated, “[t]his is left to lead agency judgment and discretion, based upon factual data and guidance from regulatory agencies and other sources where available and applicable” (California Governor’s OPR 2008, 4). OPR recommends that “the global nature of climate change warrants investigation of a statewide threshold of significance for GHG emissions” (California Governor’s OPR 2008, 4). Until such a standard is established, OPR advises that each lead agency should develop its own approach to performing an analysis for projects that generate GHG emissions (California Governor’s OPR 2008, 5).

OPR sets out the following process for evaluating GHG emissions. First, agencies should determine whether GHG emissions may be generated by a proposed project, and if so, they should quantify or estimate the emission by type or source. Calculation, modeling, or estimation of GHG emissions should include the emissions associated with vehicular traffic, energy consumption, water usage, and construction activities (California Governor’s OPR 2008, 5).

Agencies should then assess whether the emissions are “cumulatively considerable” even though a project’s GHG emissions may be individually limited. OPR states: “Although climate change is ultimately a cumulative impact, not every individual project that emits greenhouse gases must necessarily be found to contribute to a significant cumulative impact on the environment” (California Governor’s OPR 2008,

6). Individual lead agencies may undertake a project-by-project analysis, consistent with available guidance and current CEQA practice (California Governor’s OPR 2008, 6).

Finally, if the lead agency determines emissions are a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact, the lead agency must investigate and implement ways to mitigate the emissions (California Governor’s OPR 2008, 6). OPR states:

Mitigation measures will vary with the type of project being contemplated, but include alternative project designs or locations that conserve energy and water, measures that reduce vehicle miles travelled (VMT) by fossil-fueled vehicles, measures that contribute to established regional or programmatic mitigation strategies, and measures that sequester carbon to offset the emissions from the project. [California Governor’s OPR 2008, 6]

OPR concludes that “[a] lead agency is not responsible for wholly eliminating all greenhouse gas emissions from a project; the CEQA standard is to mitigate to a level that is ‘less than significant’” (California Governor’s OPR 2008, 7). The technical advisory includes a list of mitigation measures that can be applied on a project-by-project basis.

Senate Bill 375

Senate Bill (SB) 375, which establishes mechanisms for the development of regional targets for reducing passenger vehicle greenhouse gas emissions, was adopted by the state on September 30, 2008. SB 375 requires the California ARB to develop vehicular GHG emission reduction targets for 2020 and 2035 by September 30, 2010 in consultation with metropolitan planning organizations. SB 375 recognizes the importance of achieving significant greenhouse gas reductions by changing land use patterns and improving transportation alternatives. Through the SB 375 process, regions will develop sustainable communities plans designed to integrate development patterns and the transportation network in a way that reduces greenhouse gas emissions while meeting housing needs and other regional planning objectives. No sustainable communities plans have been adopted as of yet; therefore, no such plan would apply to the project.

■ Regional

There are no regional statutes related to global climate change that would apply to the proposed project.

■ Local

There are no local statutes related to global climate change that would apply to the proposed project.

4.15.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

■ Analytic Method

The impact analysis for this project estimates and compares project GHG emissions with available data on statewide GHG emissions to determine whether the project’s GHG emissions would be cumulatively

considerable. The analysis also discusses characteristics of the project—energy efficiency measures, trip reduction features, etc.—which would help to reduce GHG emissions and achieve state GHG reductions targets. An inventory of the project’s three most relevant GHG emissions (i.e., CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O) is presented below. The emissions of the individual gases were estimated and then converted to their CO₂ equivalents (CO₂e) in metric tons using the individually determined global warming potential (GWP) of each gas.

The analysis methodology used for the inventory conservatively assumes that all emissions sources are new sources and that emissions from these sources are 100 percent additive to existing conditions. This is a standard approach taken for air quality analyses and represents a worst-case, “business as usual” scenario. The inventory does not take into account the effect that the emissions reducing features of the proposed project and the mitigation measures applied at the end of the analysis would have on the total emissions generated by the proposed project.

Construction Emissions

Construction of future new development and infill projects allowed by the General Plan Update would result in GHG emissions from the use of construction equipment. However, the details of these future construction activities are unknown at this time because no specific development projects have been identified and, therefore, cannot be quantified without details relating to demolition requirements, construction time frames, and total size of projects. Further, future development projects resulting from implementation of the General Plan Update would be required to undergo separate environmental review as individual project applications are submitted to the City, at which time GHG emissions would be quantified.

Operational Emissions

Operational emissions include both direct sources, such as vehicles, natural gas consumption for heating/cooling buildings, and indirect sources, such as water supply demand and power plants outside the incentive area that would supply the City’s electricity. GHG emission estimates for operation of the proposed project are based on total buildout summaries under the General Plan Update. URBEMIS 2007 was used to predict potential CO₂ emissions, and emissions were also estimated by applying emission factors to the estimated energy use and solid waste for each of the specific land uses proposed for expansion under the General Plan Update. These assumptions are preliminary and meant to illustrate the potential GHG emissions from operation of the General Plan Update. Further, the following analysis identifies policies that could be applied to projects within the City of Agoura Hills to reduce emissions of GHGs. However, operational emissions (including vehicle emissions) are based on the estimated maximum buildout allowed by the General Plan Update and conservatively, do not assume implementation of the identified policies and their corresponding implementation measures, as it is not currently known which policies and measures would apply to individual projects.

■ Thresholds of Significance

Currently, no state or regional regulatory agency has formally adopted or widely agreed upon thresholds of significance for GHG emissions. CEQA Guidelines §15064.7 states that, “each public agency is encouraged to develop and publish thresholds of significance that the agency uses in the determination of the significance of environmental effects.” This provides justification for lead agencies to determine their own climate change thresholds. AEP recommends that, “If a Lead Agency chooses to address GCC [Global Climate Change] in a [CEQA] document, it should be addressed in the context of a cumulative (versus project-specific) impact.”

As mentioned above, on January 8, 2009, the OPR issued preliminary draft regulatory guidance with respect to the analysis and mitigation of the potential effects of GHG emissions. While not yet formally adopted, the following thresholds of significance are based on the draft amendments to Appendix G of the 2009 CEQA Guidelines. For the purposes of this EIR, implementation of the proposed project may have a significant adverse impact on GHG emissions if it would result in any of the following:

- Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, based on any applicable threshold of significance
- Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases

Section 15064.4 of the draft guidelines provides direction for lead agencies for assessing the significance of impacts of GHG emissions:

- (1) The extent to which the project could help or hinder attainment of the state’s goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020 as stated in the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. A project may be considered to help attainment of the state’s goals by being consistent with an adopted statewide 2020 greenhouse gas emissions limit or the plans, programs, and regulations adopted to implement the *Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006*;
- (2) The extent to which the project may increase the consumption of fuels or other energy resources, especially fossil fuels that contribute to greenhouse gas emissions when consumed;
- (3) The extent to which the project may result in increased energy efficiency of and a reduction in overall greenhouse gas emissions from an existing facility;
- (4) The extent to which the project impacts or emissions exceed any threshold of significance that applies to the project.

A lead agency should make a good-faith effort, based on available information, to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of GHG emissions associated with a project, including emissions associated with energy consumption and vehicular traffic. Because the methodologies for performing this assessment are anticipated to evolve over time, a lead agency shall have discretion to determine, in the context of a particular project, whether to:

- (1) Use a model or methodology to quantify GHG emissions associated with a project and which of any available model or methodology to use. The lead agency may include a qualitative discussion or analysis regarding the limitations of the particular model or methodology selected for use.

- (2) Rely on qualitative or other performance based standards for estimating the significance of GHG emissions.

Refer to Analytical Method above for methodology discussion for the proposed project.

■ Effects Not Found to Be Significant

No Effects Not Found to Be Significant have been identified with respect to climate change.

■ Less-Than-Significant Impacts

Threshold	Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, based on any applicable threshold of significance for substantially contributing to greenhouse gas emissions in the State of California?
-----------	---

	Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?
--	---

Impact 4.15-1 Implementation of the General Plan Update would not substantially contribute to GHG emissions in the State of California and would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. This is a *less-than-significant* (Class II) impact.

In California, the most common GHG pollutant is CO₂, which constitutes approximately 84 percent of all GHG emissions. CO₂ emissions in California are mainly associated with in-state fossil fuel combustion and with fossil fuel combustion in out-of-state power plants supplying electricity to California. Other activities that produce CO₂ emissions include mineral production, waste combustion, and land use changes that reduce vegetation as well as water distribution to southern California.

Implementation of the General Plan Update could generate GHGs through the construction and operation of new residential, commercial, or office facilities and the related increase in vehicle traffic within the City. GHG emissions from the proposed project would specifically arise from individual construction projects and from sources associated with individual project operation, including direct sources such as motor vehicles, natural gas consumption, solid waste handling/treatment, and indirect sources such as electricity generation.

Since no individual development or infill projects have been identified in the General Plan Update, no specific construction-related emissions can be determined. In order to determine construction-related emissions, specific information, including, but not necessarily limited to, the amount and duration of grading and demolition activities, must be available. Typically, this is conducted during a project-level CEQA analysis. Such specific analysis would be conducted, as necessary, as individual development project applications are submitted to the City in the future.

Construction Emissions

Construction of future new development and infill projects would result in GHG emissions from the use of construction equipment. However, as discussed above, the details of these future construction activities are unknown at this time and, therefore, cannot be quantified without details relating to demolition requirements, construction time frames, and total size of projects. Further, development projects resulting from implementation of the General Plan Update would be required to undergo separate environmental review, at which time GHG emissions would be quantified. However, several policies contained within the General Plan Update would serve to reduce the effects of construction activities within the City on climate change. Policy U-4.7 (Recycling and Reuse of Construction Wastes) requires that construction waste be diverted in compliance with state requirements (currently 50 percent). Policy M-4.6 (Energy Reduction) involves the promotion of alternative energy sources, including for construction vehicles, to reduce emissions. In addition, Policy LU-5.1 (Sustainable Building Practices) involves the promotion of sustainable building practices that utilize materials, architectural design features, and interior fixtures and finishings to reduce energy and water consumption, toxic and chemical pollution, and waste, including construction waste.

Operational Emissions

Total land use buildout under the General Plan Update was determined for the proposed project (identified in Table 3-4 [Proposed General Plan Land Uses] in Chapter 3 [Project Description] of this DEIR).

Vehicle Use. The largest source of GHG emissions associated with the proposed General Plan would be on- and off-site motor vehicle use. CO₂ emissions, the primary GHG associated with mobile sources, are directly related to the quantity of fuel consumed. Two important determinants of transportation-related GHG emissions are vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle fuel efficiency. VMT in California has steadily increased over the last quarter-century (CEC n.d.).

The vehicular CO₂ emissions from operation of the General Plan Update at full build-out (2035) were estimated using URBEMIS 2007, an air quality modeling program recommended by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). Vehicular source emissions are based on a net increase of 45,302 daily trips calculated from land uses and intensities allowed by the General Plan Update. Traffic data is based on the *Transportation Impact Analysis* prepared by Fehr & Peers (October 2009). At build-out, a net increase of 74,220 metric tons of CO₂e per year would be attributed to the proposed project (Appendix G). When considered in connection with existing annual mobile GHG emissions citywide which would be 253,723 metric tons of CO₂e (Appendix G), the City would be anticipated to generate approximately 327,943 metric tons of CO₂e per year in 2035.⁵³

Electricity Use. Fuels that generate GHG emissions are combusted to produce electricity. Therefore, all projects that would result in an increase in electricity consumption also result in an indirect increase in electricity emissions. The generation of electricity through the combustion of fossil fuels typically yields

⁵³ Existing emissions were modified to account for 2035 analysis year using URBEMIS 2007 due to changes in emission rates over time that are reflected in the URBEMIS 2007 model.

CO₂ and, to a much smaller extent, CH₄ and N₂O. The project-related electricity emissions were estimated by applying emission factors to the estimated electricity use, which is expected to result in a net increase of approximately 29.86 million kWh per year over existing uses. Annual GHG emissions from indirect electricity generation are estimated to be 9,418 metric tons CO₂e (Appendix G). Table 4.15-4 (Estimated Net Increase in Electrical Demand and Associated Greenhouse Gas Emissions at Project Buildout) identifies the projected annual emissions attributed to electricity use by the General Plan Update. When considered in conjunction with the electricity usage emissions associated with existing uses in the City, which total 34,477 metric tons of CO₂e (Appendix G), approximately 43,895 metric tons of CO₂e would be attributed to the City of Agoura Hills on an annual basis at buildout of the General Plan Update. It is important to note that this estimate is conservative and does not include any reductions from energy usage reduction practices, including those identified in the General Plan Update that are commonly employed to reduce energy demands.

Table 4.15-4 Estimated Net Increase in Electrical Demand and Associated Greenhouse Gas Emissions at Project Buildout

<i>Source of Emissions</i>	<i>Electricity Usage Rate (kWh/year/unit)</i>	<i>Electricity Use (kWh/year)</i>	<i>Annual CO₂e (metric tons)</i>
Single-family dwelling unit	5,626.50 kWh/year/unit	652,674	
Multi-family dwelling unit	5,626.50 kWh/year/unit	2,323,745	
Retail/Service	13.55 kWh/sf/year	8,479,509	
Office/Business Park	12.95 kWh/sf/year	14,222,868	
Business Park/ Manufacturing	10.5 kWh/sf/year	2,871,173	
	Annual Total	28,549,969	9,418

SOURCE: SCAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 1993; California Climate Action Registry General Reporting Protocol, Reporting Entity-Wide Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Version 3.1, Appendix C, January 2009.

Natural Gas Use. The project would generate direct emissions from on-site sources such as natural gas usage and, to a much smaller extent, landscaping equipment. The project-related natural gas emissions were estimated by applying emission factors to the estimated natural gas use, which is expected to result in a net increase of approximately 84,430,039 cubic feet per year over existing uses (Appendix G). GHG emissions associated with the net increase in natural gas usage are estimated to be 4,480 metric tons CO₂e per year. Table 4.15-5 (Estimated Net Increase in Natural Gas Demand and Associated Greenhouse Gas Emissions at Project Buildout) identifies the projected annual emissions attributed to natural gas use at buildout of the General Plan Update. When considered in conjunction with the natural gas emissions associated with existing uses in the City which total 49,111 metric tons of CO₂e (Appendix G), approximately 53,591 metric tons CO₂e would be attributed to the City of Agoura Hills on an annual basis with implementation of the proposed project. It is important to note that this estimate is conservative and does not include any reductions from energy usage reduction practices including those identified in the General Plan Update that are commonly employed to reduce energy demands.

Table 4.15-5 Estimated Net Increase in Natural Gas Demand and Associated Greenhouse Gas Emissions at Project Buildout

Source of Emissions	Natural Gas Usage Rate (cf/month/unit or cf/month/sf)	Natural Gas Use (cf/year)	Annual CO ₂ e (metric tons)
Single-family dwelling unit	4,011.5 cf/unit/month	5,584,008	
Multi-family dwelling unit	4,011.5 cf/unit/month	19,880,994	
Retail/Service	2.9 cf/sf/month	21,777,631	
Office/Business Park	2.0 cf/sf/month	26,358,984	
Business Park/ Manufacturing	3.3 cf/sf/month	10,828,422	
Annual Total		84,430,039	4,480

SOURCE: SCAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 1993; California Climate Action Registry General Reporting Protocol, Reporting Entity-Wide Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Version 3.1, Appendix C, January 2009.

Solid Waste. Solid waste generated by the project would also contribute to GHG emissions. Treatment and disposal of municipal, industrial, and other solid waste produces significant amounts of CH₄. In addition to CH₄, solid waste disposal sites also produce biogenic CO₂ and nonmethane volatile organic compounds (NMVOCs) as well as smaller amounts of N₂O, nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and carbon monoxide (CO). CH₄ produced at solid waste sites contributes approximately 3 to 4 percent to the annual global anthropogenic GHG emissions (IPCC 2006).

GHG emissions from solid waste generated by the project were estimated based on formulas provided in the *State Workbook: Methodologies for Estimating Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, which provides generation factors of GHGs from degradation and outgassing of landfill material (U.S. EPA 1998). Landfill gas is approximately 50 percent CH₄ and 50 percent CO₂. According to the Workbook, N₂O emissions from landfills are considered negligible. The project-related solid waste is expected to result in a net increase of approximately 5,279 tons of solid waste per year. In terms of GHG emissions, the proposed General Plan Update would result in an additional 4,496 metric tons CO₂e per year, compared to the 23,805 annual metric tons CO₂e generated by existing uses. At project buildout (2035), estimated annual citywide emissions of GHGs from solid waste would be 28,301 metric tons CO₂e per year (Appendix G). It is important to note that this estimate is conservative and does not include any reductions from waste minimization practices and recycling/reuse policies including those identified in the General Plan Update that are commonly employed to reduce solid waste. Also, landfill gas recovery has become more common as a measure to reduce CH₄ emissions from solid waste disposal sites.

Water. While not as substantial as the contributions related to mobile sources, electricity, natural gas, and solid waste, the proposed project would contribute GHG emissions related to the distribution and treatment of domestic water supplies to the proposed uses. Based on the annual net increase in water demand that could result from buildout of the General Plan Update (117 million gallons per year), estimated annual emissions of GHGs attributable to the proposed project from water supplies would be 516 metric tons CO₂e per year. When considered in conjunction with the water-related emissions associated with existing uses in the City, approximately 7,251 metric tons CO₂e would be attributed to the City of Agoura Hills on an annual basis with implementation of the proposed project.

Other Greenhouse Gas Emissions. GHG emissions would also be generated during the treatment of wastewater generated by the project. However, it is not anticipated that such emissions would be substantial relative to other project emissions. According to the *Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks*, wastewater treatment emissions represent only 0.6 percent of total statewide emissions (CEC 2006b). Given this minor contribution, further analysis is not necessary at this time.

Ozone is also a GHG; however, unlike the other GHGs, ozone in the troposphere is relatively short-lived and therefore is not global in nature. According to the California ARB, it is difficult to make an accurate determination of the contribution of ozone precursors (NO_x and ROG_s) to global warming (California ARB 2004). Therefore, it is assumed that project emissions of ozone precursors would not significantly contribute to global climate change. At present, there is a federal ban on chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs); therefore, it is assumed the project would not generate emissions of these GHGs. The project may emit a small amount of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) emissions from leakage and service of refrigeration and air conditioning equipment and from disposal at the end of the life of the equipment, as well as PFCs and sulfur hexafluoride in certain industrial applications. However, the details regarding refrigerants to be used in the project and the capacity of these are unknown at this time.

Total Emissions. As shown in Table 4.15-6 (Estimated Net and Gross Annual Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions at Project Buildout), at project buildout, the net increase in emissions of GHGs from operational sources is estimated at 93,130 metric tons of CO₂e per year. The largest contributor of GHGs is vehicular use, which contributes over three-quarters (80 percent) of the overall total. The second largest contributor is electricity use (10 percent), followed by natural gas use (5 percent), solid waste generation (5 percent), and water treatment/distribution (1 percent). Estimates do not take into account any GHG reducing policies set forth by the General Plan Update.

Table 4.15-6 Estimated Net and Gross Annual Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions at Project Buildout

Source of Emissions	Net Emissions		Gross Emissions	
	CO ₂ e (metric tons)	Percent of Total	CO ₂ e (metric tons)	Percent of Total**
Vehicular Use*	74,220	80	327,943	71
Electricity Use	9,418	10	43,895	10
Natural Gas Use	4,480	5	53,591	12
Solid Waste	4,496	5	28,301	6
Water	516	1	7,251	2
Annual Total	93,130	100	460,981	100

SOURCE: URBEMIS 2007 (Version 9.2.4), California Climate Action Registry General Reporting Protocol, Reporting Entity-Wide Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Version 3.1, January 2009.

* Vehicular emissions for existing land uses reflect an adjustment to reflect 2035 conditions. As a result, it will not match the data contained in Table 4.15-3 [Estimated Annual Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions Attributed to the City of Agoura Hills (2009)].

** The difference shown in percent of total net emissions versus gross emissions reflects a shift in the balance of land uses within the City away from land uses that use more natural gas.

Based on project operational GHG emissions estimates, it is not anticipated that the project emissions alone will substantially add to the global inventory of GHG emissions. However, on a statewide level, the

net increase in annual GHG emissions from the project (93,130 metric tons), in relation to California’s current GHG emissions (484 million metric tons, according to the California ARB’s most recent 2004 inventory), would be 0.019 percent at build-out. It is clear that the proposed project’s net contribution of CO₂e on a statewide basis would be substantial. In addition, while the California ARB and OPR are continuing in their efforts to define the standards of analysis for GHGs, it is still uncertain as to how current regulations might affect CO₂e emissions attributable to the project and cumulative CO₂e from other sources in the cumulative global context. As such, impacts are considered *potentially significant*.

Project Incorporation of Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures for Operation

The proposed Draft CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(c) states that mitigation measures may include measures that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in a previously approved plan or program for the reduction of GHG emissions. The reduction strategies contained within the CCAT Report to the Governor outline strategies for meeting the Governor’s emission reduction targets contained in Executive Order S-3-05 (CCAT 2006). The project design features and mitigation measures that are in compliance with CCAT strategies have been described in Table 4.15-7 (GHG Reducing Measures). Many of the CCAT strategies are applicable only to agencies such as the California ARB. Therefore, other sources including the California Attorney General, CAPCOA, and the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification program have been used to identify additional measures that would be available to the project to reduce emissions of GHGs. It should be noted that the General Plan Update goals and policies shown below were also formulated and evaluated in light of CAPCOA’s *Model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans* (CAPCOA 2009).

Table 4.15-7 GHG Reducing Measures	
<i>GHG Emissions Reduction Strategy</i>	<i>Proposed Project Design/Mitigation Measure for Compliance</i>
CALIFORNIA CLIMATE ACTION TEAM (CCAT) RECOMMENDATIONS	
<p>CCAT Standard Other Light Duty Vehicle Technology: New standards would be adopted to phase in beginning in the 2017 model.</p>	<p>These are the California ARB–enforced standards and vehicles that access the project are required to comply with the standards. Therefore, the General Plan Update would be required to be consistent with these strategies, as appropriate.</p>
<p>CCAT Standard Heavy-Duty Vehicle Emission Reduction Measures: Increased efficiency in the design of heavy-duty vehicles and an education program for the heavy-duty vehicle sector.</p>	
<p>CCAT Standard Diesel Anti-Idling: In July 2004, the California ARB adopted a measure to limit diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicle idling. Post signs that restrict idling; education for truck drivers regarding diesel health impacts.</p>	<p>Policy M-4.5 (Trucking Impacts) would minimize noise and other impacts of truck traffic, deliveries, and staging on residential neighborhoods and mixed-use areas of the City. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>

Table 4.15-7 GHG Reducing Measures

GHG Emissions Reduction Strategy	Proposed Project Design/Mitigation Measure for Compliance
<p>CCAT Standard</p> <p>Water Use Efficiency: Approximately 19 percent of all electricity, 30 percent of all natural gas, and 88 million gallons of diesel are used to convey, treat, distribute and use water and wastewater. Increasing the efficiency of water transport and reducing water use would reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Use both potable and non-potable water to the maximum extent practicable; low flow appliances (i.e., toilets, dishwashers, shower heads, washing machines, etc.); automatic shut off valves for sinks in restrooms; drought resistant landscaping; Place “Save Water” signs near water faucets.</p>	<p>Goal NR-5 (Water Conservation) aims to minimize water consumption through conservation methods and other techniques. Policy NR-5.2 (Water Conservation Measures) would require water conservation measures/devices that limit water usage for all new construction projects including public facilities, such as the use of water-efficient landscaping and irrigation, on-site stormwater capture as feasible, low-flow and efficient plumbing fixtures and use of recycled water for irrigation. Policy NR-5.3 (Water-Efficient Landscaping and Irrigation) would require that drought-tolerant landscaping, water-efficient irrigation systems be installed, and recycled water be used for landscaping as feasible, for all private and City landscaping and parkways. Encourage such landscaping and irrigation, as appropriate, be used in private development. Policy NR-5.4 (Optimum Timing for Water Irrigation) would require that all public and private irrigation systems irrigate at optimum times of the day, such as early mornings or late afternoon, and use weather sensors to facilitate optimum irrigation and other technology for monitoring and control. Encourage such irrigation timing for private development. Policy NR-5.5 (Recycled Water) would work with LVMWD in further creating opportunities for recycled water to irrigate the public landscape, provided that the heavy metal and salt content of recycled water will not interfere with plant growth. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>CCAT Standard</p> <p>Green Buildings Initiative: Green Building Executive Order, S-20-04 (CA 2004), sets a goal of reducing energy use in public and private buildings by 20 percent by the year 2015, as compared with 2003 levels.</p>	<p>Goal NR-8 (Energy Conservation) would require provision of affordable and reliable energy resources to residents and businesses that minimize energy use. Policy NR-8.1 (Public Outreach) would promote energy conservation measures and options to all residents, businesses, contractors, and consultants. Policy NR-8.2 (Energy Conservation for City Facilities) would implement energy-conserving measures for all existing City facilities, as feasible. For new City facilities, incorporate energy-conserving measures to the extent practical. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>CCAT Standard</p> <p>Building Energy Efficiency Standards in Place and in Progress: Public Resources Code 25402 authorizes the CEC to adopt and periodically update its building energy efficiency standards (that apply to newly constructed buildings and additions to and alterations to existing buildings).</p> <p>Projects required to achieve a greater reduction in combined space heating, cooling and water heating energy compared to the current Title 24 Standards.</p>	<p>Policy U-5.6 (Energy Conservation) would require installation energy-efficient appliances and alternative-energy infrastructure, such as solar energy panels (photovoltaic panels) within all new City facilities and within existing facilities, as feasible. In addition, Policy U-5.4 (Energy Efficient Incentives) would require coordination with relevant utilities and agencies to promote energy rebate and incentive programs offered by local energy providers to increase energy efficiency in older neighborhoods and developments. Policy LU-5.4 (Sustainable Land Development Practices) would promote land development practices that reduce energy and water consumption, pollution, GHG emissions, and wastes. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>CCAT Standard</p> <p>Appliance Energy Efficiency Standards in Place and in Progress: Public Resources Code 25402 authorizes the Energy Commission to adopt and periodically update its appliance energy efficiency standards (that apply to devices and equipment using energy that are sold or offered for sale in California).</p>	<p>Measure above would apply. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>

Table 4.15-7 GHG Reducing Measures

<i>GHG Emissions Reduction Strategy</i>	<i>Proposed Project Design/Mitigation Measure for Compliance</i>
<p>CCAT Standard</p> <p>Transportation Refrigeration Units (TRU), Off-Road Electrification, Port Electrification: Strategies to reduce emissions from TRUs, increase off-road electrification, and increase use of shore-side/port electrification.</p> <p>If TRUs access the site, implement measures to reduce emissions; install electrification in applicable projects (i.e., truck stops, warehouses, etc.)</p>	<p>Policy M-4.5 (Trucking Impacts) would minimize noise and other impacts of truck traffic, deliveries, and staging on residential neighborhoods and mixed-use areas of the City. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>CCAT Standard</p> <p>Urban Forestry: A new statewide goal of planting 5 million trees in urban areas by 2020 would be achieved through the expansion of local urban forestry programs.</p> <p>Trees near structures shall be planted to act as insulators from weather, thereby decreasing energy requirements. Trees also store carbon.</p>	<p>Policy M-6.4 (Design Enhancements) would enhance City roadways and other public areas with amenities such as street trees, benches, plazas, bus shelters with benches and waste receptacles, public art or other measures. Policy NR-4.2 (Conserve Natural Resources) would continue to enforce the ordinances for new and existing development in the City’s hillside areas, such that development maintains an appropriate distance from ridgelines, creek and natural drainage beds and banks, oak trees, and other environmental resources, to prevent erosion, preserve viewsheds, and protect the natural contours and resources of the land. Policy NR-4.10 (Oak Trees) would continue to sustain the City’s oak trees, which are an integral part of the character of the City. Continue to plant and maintain these trees in a manner that will allow them to mature and thrive. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>CCAT Standard</p> <p>Smart Land Use and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS): Smart land use strategies encourage jobs/housing proximity, promote transit-oriented development, and encourage high-density residential/commercial development along transit corridors. ITS is the application of advanced technology systems and management strategies to improve operational efficiency of transportation systems and movement of people, goods and services.</p>	<p>Policy M-3.1 (Intelligent Transportation Systems Plan) would develop an ITS plan for Agoura Hills to improve the efficiency of the transportation network through advanced technologies such as adaptive signal controls, a centralized traffic signal control system, real-time transit information and real-time parking availability. The ITS Plan should identify and prioritize specific short- and long-term projects, which are strategically implemented as funding becomes available. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL’S OFFICE RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES	
<p>Diesel Anti-Idling:</p> <p>Set specific limits on idling time for commercial vehicles, including delivery vehicles.</p>	<p>Policy M-4.5 (Trucking Impacts) would minimize noise and other impacts (including air emissions) of truck traffic, deliveries, and staging on residential neighborhoods and mixed-use areas of the City. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>Alternative Fuels—General:</p> <p>The project shall include the necessary infrastructure to encourage the use of alternative fuel vehicles (e.g., electric vehicle charging facilities and conveniently located alternative fueling stations).</p>	<p>Policy U-5.6 (Energy Conservation) would install energy-efficient appliances and alternative-energy infrastructure, such as solar energy panels (photovoltaic panels) within all new City facilities and within existing facilities, as feasible. Policy NR-8.2 (Energy Conservation for City Facilities) would Implement energy-conserving measures for all existing City facilities, as feasible. For new City facilities, incorporate energy-conserving measures to the extent practical. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>

Table 4.15-7 GHG Reducing Measures

GHG Emissions Reduction Strategy	Proposed Project Design/Mitigation Measure for Compliance
<p>Transportation Emissions Reduction:</p> <p>Coordinate controlled intersections so that traffic passes more efficiently through congested areas. Where signals are installed, require the use of Light Emitting Diode (LED) traffic lights.</p>	<p>Policy M-4.3 (Traffic Control Devices) would encourage the use of innovative methods for traffic control (such as roundabouts and traffic circles) and deemphasize the reliance on traditional traffic control methods (such as stop signs and traffic signals), where appropriate. Consider the use of these devices based upon the physical context and street hierarchy. Policy M-3.2 (Signal Timing Optimization) would regularly optimize traffic signal timing and coordination to reduce travel time and delay, and implement new signal and intersection technologies that improve pedestrian. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>Transportation Emissions Reduction:</p> <p>The project applicant shall promote ride sharing programs e.g., by designating a certain percentage of parking spaces for high-occupancy vehicles, providing larger parking spaces to accommodate vans used for ride-sharing, and designating adequate passenger loading and unloading and waiting areas.</p>	<p>Policy M-10.7 (Preferential Parking) would encourage the availability of preferential parking in selected areas for designated carpools. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>Transportation Emissions Reduction:</p> <p>Design a regional transportation center where public transportation of various modes intersects.</p>	<p>Policy M-12.2 (Regional Coordination) would support regional efforts by Metro and SCAG to reduce single-occupancy vehicle travel, such as goals and measures identified in Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan and SCAG's Regional Transportation Improvement Program. Policy M-12.3 (Efficiency) would support regional planning efforts that maximize the efficiency of existing transportation facilities and promote increased development density within existing transportation corridors. Policy M-12.4 (Regional Transit Planning) would collaborate with regional transportation and transit agencies for the efficient allocation of transit and transportation resources. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>Transportation Emissions Reduction:</p> <p>Provide shuttle service to public transit.</p>	<p>Policy M-9.3 (Citywide Shuttle Service) would explore an intercity shuttle system to promote transit trips between residential, commercial, and community areas and enhance mobility for non-driving older adults, children, and persons with disabilities. Policy M-9.4 (Local Transit) would explore the feasibility of expanding the services of the existing transit programs and other appropriate transit programs. Policy M-10.5 (Ride Share) would actively promote the use of ride-sharing and ride-matching services, for both residents and non-residents. Policy M-12.3 (Efficiency) would support regional planning efforts that maximize the efficiency of existing transportation facilities and promote increased development density within existing transportation corridors. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>Transportation Emissions Reduction:</p> <p>Incorporate bicycle lanes into the project circulation system.</p>	<p>Policy M-8.1 (Bikeway Linkages) would provide bikeway connectivity between residential areas and surrounding natural resource areas, parks, schools, employment centers, and other activity centers in the community. Policy M-8.2 (Continuous Bikeway Connectivity) would provide a bicycle network that is continuous, closes gaps in the existing system, and permits easy bicycle travel throughout the community and the region. Policy M-8.4 (Bicycling Safety) would establish a citywide Bicycle Safety Program, including educational materials, preferred routes, and a regularly updated bicycle safety report. Policy M-8.7 (Bicycle Parking) would require developments to provide for bicycle parking facilities. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>

Table 4.15-7 GHG Reducing Measures

<i>GHG Emissions Reduction Strategy</i>	<i>Proposed Project Design/Mitigation Measure for Compliance</i>
<p>Transportation Emissions Reduction: Provide on-site bicycle and pedestrian facilities (showers, bicycle parking, etc.) for commercial uses, to encourage employees to bicycle or walk to work.</p>	<p>Policy LU-16.6 (Bicycle Facilities) would encourage developers of commercial centers to incorporate facilities that promote customer and employee access by bicycles, such as secured storage, showers, and lockers. Policy LU-18.5 (Bicycle Facilities) would encourage major business park and industrial business park projects to incorporate facilities that promote employee access by bicycles, such as secured storage, showers, and lockers. Policy M-8.7 (Bicycle Parking) would require developments to provide for bicycle parking facilities. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>Transportation Emissions Reduction: Provide public education and publicity about public transportation services.</p>	<p>Policy M-6.5 (Education) would promote non-motorized transportation through encouragement and education and the associated infrastructure improvements. Policy M-8.4 (Bicycling Safety) would Establish a citywide Bicycle Safety Program, including educational materials, preferred routes, and a regularly updated bicycle safety report. Policy M-10.5 (Ride Share) would actively promote the use of ride-sharing and ride-matching services, for both residents and non-residents. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>Water Use Efficiency: Require measures that reduce the amount of water sent to the sewer system-see examples in CCAT standard (Water Use Efficiency) above. (Reduction in water volume sent to the sewer system means less water has to be treated and pumped to the end user, thereby saving energy.)</p>	<p>Goal NR-5 (Water Conservation) aims to minimize water consumption through conservation methods and other techniques. Policy NR-5.2 (Water Conservation Measures) would require water conservation measures/devices that limit water usage for all new construction projects including public facilities, such as the use of water-efficient landscaping and irrigation, on-site stormwater capture as feasible, low-flow and efficient plumbing fixtures and use of recycled water for irrigation. Policy NR-5.3 (Water-Efficient Landscaping and Irrigation) would require that drought-tolerant landscaping, water-efficient irrigation systems be installed, and recycled water be used for landscaping as feasible, for all private and City landscaping and parkways. Encourage such landscaping and irrigation, as appropriate, be used in private development. Policy NR-5.4 (Optimum Timing for Water Irrigation) would require that all public and private irrigation systems irrigate at optimum times of the day, such as early mornings or late afternoon, and use weather sensors to facilitate optimum irrigation and other technology for monitoring and control. Encourage such irrigation timing for private development. Policy NR-5.5 (Recycled Water) would work with LVMWD in further creating opportunities for recycled water to irrigate the public landscape, provided that the heavy metal and salt content of recycled water will not interfere with plant growth. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Standards: Project shall comply with LEED certified green building standards.</p>	<p>Policy LU-5.2 (Existing Structure Reuse) would encourage the retention of existing structures and promote their adaptive reuse and renovation of existing buildings with “green” building technologies in accordance with a green building standard such as Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED™). The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Standards: Fund and schedule energy efficiency “tune-ups” of existing buildings by checking, repairing, and readjusting heating, ventilation, air conditioning, lighting, hot water equipment, insulation and weatherization. (Improvement of energy efficiency in existing buildings could offset in part the global warming impacts of new development.)</p>	<p>Policy LU-5.1 (Sustainable Building Practices) would promote sustainable building practices that utilize materials, architectural design features, and interior fixtures and finishings to reduce energy and water consumption, toxic and chemical pollution, and waste, not only in the design and construction of buildings. Policy LU-5.3 (Heat Island Effect) would Seek to reduce the “heat island effect” by promoting such features as white roofs, light-colored hardscape paving, and shade trees and by reducing the unshaded extent of parking lots. Policy LU-5.4 (Sustainable Land Development Practices) would promote land development practices that reduce energy and water consumption, pollution, GHG emissions, and wastes The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>

Table 4.15-7 GHG Reducing Measures

<i>GHG Emissions Reduction Strategy</i>	<i>Proposed Project Design/Mitigation Measure for Compliance</i>
<p>Lighting Efficiency Standards:</p> <p>Require that the project include efficient lighting. (Fluorescent lighting uses approximately 75 percent less energy than incandescent lighting to deliver the same amount of light.)</p>	<p>Policy LU-5.4 (Sustainable Land Development Practices) would promote land development practices that reduce energy and water consumption, pollution, GHG emissions, and wastes incorporating such techniques as: Orientation of buildings to maximize opportunities for solar energy use, daylighting, and ventilation. Policy U-5.4 (Energy Efficient Incentives) would coordinate with relevant utilities and agencies to promote energy rebate and incentive programs offered by local energy providers to increase energy efficiency in older neighborhoods and developments. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>Smart Land Use and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS):</p> <p>Encourage mixed-use and high-density development to reduce vehicle trips, promote alternatives to vehicle travel, and promote efficient delivery of services and goods.</p>	<p>Policy LU-1.2 (Development Locations) would prioritize future growth as infill of existing developed areas re-using and, where appropriate, intensifying development of vacant and underutilized properties, in lieu of expanded development outward into natural areas and open spaces. Allow for growth on the immediate periphery of existing development in limited designated areas, where this is guided by standards to assure seamless integration and connectivity with adjoining areas and open spaces. Policy M-12.3 (Efficiency) would support regional planning efforts that maximize the efficiency of existing transportation facilities and promote increased development density within existing transportation corridors. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>Smart Land Use and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS):</p> <p>Impose measures to address the “urban heat island” effect by, e.g., requiring light-colored and reflective roofing materials and paint; light-colored roads and parking lots; shade trees in parking lots; and shade trees on the south and west sides of new or renovated buildings.</p>	<p>Policy LU-5.3 (Heat Island Effect) would Seek to reduce the “heat island effect” by promoting such features as white roofs, light-colored hardscape paving, and shade trees and by reducing the unshaded extent of parking lots. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>Smart Land Use and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS): Incorporate public transit into project design.</p>	<p>Policy M-3.1 (Intelligent Transportation Systems Plan) would develop an ITS plan for Agoura Hills to improve the efficiency of the transportation network through advanced technologies such as adaptive signal controls, a centralized traffic signal control system, real-time transit information and real-time parking availability. The ITS Plan should identify and prioritize specific short- and long-term projects, which are strategically implemented as funding becomes available. Policy M-12.3 (Efficiency) would support regional planning efforts that maximize the efficiency of existing transportation facilities and promote increased development density within existing transportation corridors. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>Smart Land Use and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS):</p> <p>Require pedestrian-only streets and plazas within the project site and destinations that may be reached conveniently by public transportation, walking, or bicycling.</p>	<p>Policy LU-10.5 (Walkable Neighborhoods) would maintain sidewalks, parkways, street tree canopies, and landscaping throughout the residential neighborhoods to promote walking as an enjoyable and healthy activity and alternative to automobile use. Policy M-6.3 (Design of Alternative Modes) would require new roadways and future street-improvement projects shall be bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly in design. Policy M-7.1 (Walkability) would create a pedestrian environment accessible to all that is safe, attractive, and encourages walking. Maintain and promote the walkability within the City by identifying and completing deficient links within the sidewalk system. Policy M-7.2 (Pedestrian Connectivity) would preserve and enhance pedestrian connectivity in existing neighborhoods and require a well-connected pedestrian network linking new and existing developments to adjacent land uses, including commercial uses, schools, and parks. Policy M-7.3 (Pedestrian Experience) would promote walking and improve the pedestrian experience with streetscape enhancements and by orienting future development toward the street, where appropriate. Policy M-7.4 (Walkable Developments) would encourage mixed-use development so that it is possible for a greater number of short trips to be made by walking. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>

Table 4.15-7 GHG Reducing Measures

<i>GHG Emissions Reduction Strategy</i>	<i>Proposed Project Design/Mitigation Measure for Compliance</i>
<p>Smart Land Use and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS):</p> <p>Discourage “leapfrog” development. Enact ordinances and programs to limit sprawl.</p>	<p>Policy LU-1.2 (Development Locations) would prioritize future growth as infill of existing developed areas re-using and, where appropriate, intensifying development of vacant and underutilized properties, in lieu of expanded development outward into natural areas and open spaces. Allow for growth on the immediate periphery of existing development in limited designated areas, where this is guided by standards to assure seamless integration and connectivity with adjoining areas and open spaces. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
CAPCOA MEASURES	
<p>MM T-1: Bike Parking</p>	<p>Policy LU-16.6 (Bicycle Facilities) would encourage developers of commercial centers to incorporate facilities that promote customer and employee access by bicycles, such as secured storage, showers, and lockers. Policy LU-18.5 (Bicycle Facilities) would encourage major business park and industrial business park projects to incorporate facilities that promote employee access by bicycles, such as secured storage, showers, and lockers. Policy M-8.7 (Bicycle Parking) would require developments to provide for bicycle parking facilities. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>MM T-2 End of Trip Facilities</p>	<p>Policy LU-16.6 (Bicycle Facilities) would encourage developers of commercial centers to incorporate facilities that promote customer and employee access by bicycles, such as secured storage, showers, and lockers. Policy LU-18.5 (Bicycle Facilities) would encourage major business park and industrial business park projects to incorporate facilities that promote employee access by bicycles, such as secured storage, showers, and lockers. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>MM T-4: Proximity to Bike Path/Bike Lanes</p>	<p>Policy M-8.1 (Bikeway Linkages) would provide bikeway connectivity between residential areas and surrounding natural resource areas, parks, schools, employment centers, and other activity centers in the community. Policy M-8.2 (Continuous Bikeway Connectivity) would provide a bicycle network that is continuous, closes gaps in the existing system, and permits easy bicycle travel throughout the community and the region. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>MM T-5: Pedestrian Network</p>	<p>Policy M-7.1 (Walkability) would create a pedestrian environment accessible to all that is safe, attractive, and encourages walking. Maintain and promote the walkability within the City by identifying and completing deficient links within the sidewalk system. Policy M-7.2 (Pedestrian Connectivity) would preserve and enhance pedestrian connectivity in existing neighborhoods and require a well-connected pedestrian network linking new and existing developments to adjacent land uses, including commercial uses, schools, and parks. Policy M-7.3 (Pedestrian Experience) would promote walking and improve the pedestrian experience with streetscape enhancements and by orienting future development toward the street, where appropriate. Policy M-7.4 (Walkable Developments) would encourage mixed-use development so that it is possible for a greater number of short trips to be made by walking. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>MM T-6: Pedestrian Barriers Minimized</p>	<p>Policy M-7.3 (Pedestrian Experience) would promote walking and improve the pedestrian experience with streetscape enhancements and by orienting future development toward the street, where appropriate. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>
<p>MM T-8: Traffic Calming</p>	<p>Policy M-5.1 (Traffic Calming) would consider the application of traffic calming techniques, where needed, to minimize neighborhood intrusion by through traffic and promote the safety and livability of collector and local streets. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.</p>

Table 4.15-7 GHG Reducing Measures

<i>GHG Emissions Reduction Strategy</i>	<i>Proposed Project Design/Mitigation Measure for Compliance</i>
MM T-12: Pedestrian Pathway Through Parking	Policy M-11.1 (Parking Standards and Design) would ensure that off-street parking and on-street parking requirements are adequate and that parking is designed to be sensitive to both context and environment. Include safety considerations (i.e., lighting and landscape design) in the parking standards and design. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.
MM D-1: Office/Mixed-Use Density	Policy LU-1.2 (Development Locations) would prioritize future growth as infill of existing developed areas re-using and, where appropriate, intensifying development of vacant and underutilized properties, in lieu of expanded development outward into natural areas and open spaces. Allow for growth on the immediate periphery of existing development in limited designated areas, where this is guided by standards to assure seamless integration and connectivity with adjoining areas and open spaces. Policy M-8.1 (Bikeway Linkages) and Policy M-7.2 (Pedestrian Connectivity) would provide bikeway connectivity and Pedestrian Connectivity between residential areas and surrounding natural resource areas, parks, schools, employment centers, and other activity centers in the community. In addition, Policy LU-16.6 (Bicycle Facilities) would encourage developers of commercial centers to incorporate facilities that promote customer and employee access by bicycles, such as secured storage, showers, and lockers; and Policy LU-18.5 (Bicycle Facilities) would encourage major business park and industrial business park projects to incorporate facilities that promote employee access by bicycles, such as secured storage, showers, and lockers. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.
MM D-2: Orientation to Existing/Planned Transit Bikeway, or Pedestrian Corridor	Policy M-8.2 (Continuous Bikeway Connectivity) would provide a bicycle network that is continuous, closes gaps in the existing system, and permits easy bicycle travel throughout the community and the region. Policy M-7.2 (Pedestrian Connectivity) would preserve and enhance pedestrian connectivity in existing neighborhoods and require a well-connected pedestrian network linking new and existing developments to adjacent land uses, including commercial uses, schools, and parks. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.
MM D-12: Infill Development	Policy LU-1.2 (Development Locations) would prioritize future growth as infill of existing developed areas re-using and, where appropriate, intensifying development of vacant and underutilized properties, in lieu of expanded development outward into natural areas and open spaces. Allow for growth on the immediate periphery of existing development in limited designated areas, where this is guided by standards to assure seamless integration and connectivity with adjoining areas and open spaces. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.
MM D-17: Landscaping	Policy LU-5.4 (Sustainable Land Development Practices) would promote land development practices that reduce energy and water consumption, pollution, GHG emissions, and wastes incorporating such techniques as use of landscapes that protect native soil, conserve water, provide for wildlife, and reduce green waste. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.
MM E-13: Cool Roof Surfaces	Policy LU-5.3 (Heat Island Effect) would seek to reduce the “heat island effect” by promoting such features as white roofs, light-colored hardscape paving, and shade trees and by reducing the unshaded extent of parking lots. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.
MM E-23: Low-Water Use Appliances	Policy NR-5.1 through Policy NR-5.5 (Water Conservation) involve measures and strategies to reduce the overall water consumption of uses within the City. This includes the use of low-flow and water efficient fixtures and appliances, as well as optimum timing for landscaping activities, thereby reducing the amount of water necessary to effectively irrigate a landscaped area. The General Plan Update would not conflict with this strategy.

SOURCE: CCAAT, 2006, CAPCOA, January 2008, California Attorney General, December 2008.

As shown in Table 4.15-7 (GHG Reducing Measures), the project complies with all feasible and applicable measures recommended by the CCAT, California Attorney General, and CAPCOA. Incorporation of the above measures would reduce overall GHG emissions from the proposed project. CAPCOA provides some basic estimates of GHG emission reductions that may be expected with incorporation of measures listed in Appendix B, Table 16 of the January 2008 report, *CEQA and Climate Change*. It should be noted that reduction estimates vary widely and not all recommended measures have reduction estimates associated with them. Further reductions may be expected through incorporation of the measures recommended by the CCAT and California Attorney General, though the extent of the reduction is not readily quantifiable at this time. Table 4.15-8 (Estimated GHG Emission Reductions) provides estimated reductions that may be expected with project-incorporated CAPCOA measures.

In addition, the City of Agoura Hills would support the regional efforts by Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) and SCAG to reduce single-occupancy vehicle travel, such as goals and measures identified in MTA’s Long Range Transportation Plan and SCAG’s Regional Transportation Improvement Program through Policy M-12.2 (Regional Coordination). MTA’s Long Range Transportation Plan provides a regional vision for all modes of surface transportation and a guide for regional transportation investments. The RTP uses state and federal funds that come to the region for programs designed to meet goals which include: clean air; design of communities to encourage local walk, bicycle, and transit travel; and for improvements to main routes that serve longer distance travel around the region.

Table 4.15-8 Estimated GHG Emission Reductions	
<i>Project-Incorporated CAPCOA Measure</i>	<i>Reduction</i>
MM T-1: Bike Parking	1%
MM T-2: End of Trip Facilities	1%
MM T-4: Proximity to Bike Path/Bike Lanes	1%
MM T-5: Pedestrian Network	1–5%
MM T-6: Pedestrian Barriers Minimized	
MM T-8: Traffic Calming	1–10%
MM T-12: Pedestrian Pathway Through Parking	1–4%
MM D-1: Office/Mixed-Use Density	0.1–2%
MM D-2: Orientation to Existing/Planned Transit Bikeway, or Pedestrian Corridor	0.4–1%
MM D-12: Infill Development	3–30%
MM D-17: Landscaping	0.05–1%
MM E-13: Cool Roof Surfaces	0.05–1%
MM E-23: Low-Water Use Appliances	0.05–1%
Total	9.6–58%

SOURCE: CAPCOA, January 2008

According to the 2008 OPR technical advisory, although climate change is ultimately a cumulative impact, not every individual project that emits GHGs must necessarily be found to contribute to a

significant cumulative impact on the environment. Reliance on previously approved plans and mitigation programs that have adequately analyzed and mitigated GHG emissions may be used as a means to avoid or substantially reduce the cumulative impact of a project. The project would incorporate all feasible GHG reduction measures recommended by the CCAT, CAPCOA, and the California Attorney General. Incorporation of General Plan Update policies as well as measures outlined by CCAT, CAPCOA, and the California Attorney General is estimated to reduce overall GHG emissions by between 9.6 and 58 percent in future developments within the City of Agoura Hills. However, the details of these future developments are unknown at this time, and it is not currently known which policies and measures would apply to individual projects. Therefore, emissions (including vehicle emissions) are based on the estimated maximum buildout allowed by the General Plan Update. Development projects resulting from implementation of the General Plan Update would be required to undergo separate environmental review as development project applications are submitted to the City, at which time GHG emissions would be quantified.

According to the guidance in the draft CEQA Guideline Section 15064.4, a project may be considered to help attainment of the state's goals (AB 32) by being consistent with the plans, programs, and regulations adopted to implement AB 32. The reduction strategies contained within the CCAT Report to the Governor outline strategies for meeting the Governor's emission reduction targets contained in Executive Order S-3-05. The General Plan Update goals and policies that are in compliance with CCAT strategies have been described in Table 4.15-7 (GHG Reducing Measures). Many of the CCAT strategies are applicable only to agencies such as the California ARB. Therefore, other sources, including the California Attorney General and CAPCOA, have been used to identify additional measures that would be available to the project to reduce emissions of GHGs.

To provide some quantification of the magnitude of reduction that incorporation of the draft goals and policies would provide, a summary of estimated reduction provided by incorporation of CCAT, CAPCOA, and California Attorney General measures demonstrates an estimated reduction of GHG emissions between 9.6 and 58 percent. Further, Draft CEQA Guideline 15064.4(b)(2) states that a lead agency may rely on qualitative or other performance-based standards for estimating the significance of GHG emissions. Therefore, since the project includes measures/policies that are consistent with strategies recommended by the CCAT, CAPCOA, and the California Attorney General and Policy NR-10.1 (Climate Change) requires that the City comply with all state requirements for climate change and GHG reduction (which may include conducting any baseline emissions inventory or preparing specific GHG reduction plans), the impacts associated with GHG emissions during project operation are considered *less than significant* (Class II). No mitigation measures are required.

■ Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

There are no significant and unavoidable impacts from implementation of the General Plan Update with regard to green house gases and/or climate change.

■ Cumulative Impacts

Due to the nature of assessment of GHG emissions and the effects of global climate change, impacts can currently only be analyzed from a cumulative context. Therefore, the analysis provided above includes the analysis of both the project and cumulative impacts. Impacts are considered *less than significant* (Class II).

■ Mitigation Measures

With implementation of policies within the General Plan Update, all impacts will be reduced to less-than-significant levels. No mitigation measures are necessary.

■ Final Level of Significance

With the implementation of the General Plan Update policies and application of all local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to green house gases and climate change, impacts would be *less than significant* (Class II). Cumulative impacts would also be considered *less than significant* (Class II).

4.15.4 Draft General Plan Goals and Policies

Policies relating to energy were identified in the Community Conservation and Development Chapter; Infrastructure and Community Services Chapter; and Natural Resources Chapter of the General Plan Update.

- Goal LU-1** **Growth and Change.** Sustainable growth and change through orderly and well-planned development that provides for the needs of existing and future residents and businesses, ensures the effective and equitable provision of public services, and makes efficient use of land and infrastructure.
- Policy LU-1.2** **Development Locations.** Prioritize future growth as infill of existing developed areas re-using and, where appropriate, increasing the intensity of development on vacant and underutilized properties, in lieu of expanded development outward into natural areas and open spaces. Allow for growth on the immediate periphery of existing development in limited designated areas, where this is guided by standards to assure seamless integration and connectivity with adjoining areas and open spaces.
- Goal LU-5** **City Sustained and Renewed.** Development and land use practices that sustain natural environmental resources, the economy, and societal well-being for use by future generations, which, in turn, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and impacts on climate change.
- Policy LU-5.1** **Sustainable Building Practices.** Promote sustainable building practices that utilize materials, architectural design features, and interior fixtures and finishings to reduce energy and water

consumption, toxic and chemical pollution, and waste in the design and construction of buildings.

Policy LU-5.2 Existing Structure Reuse. Encourage the retention of existing structures and promote their adaptive reuse with “green” building technologies in accordance with a green building standard, such as Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEEDTM), or other equivalent.

Policy LU-5.3 Heat Island Effect. Seek innovative ways to reduce the “heat island effect” by promoting such features as white roofs, light-colored hardscape paving, and shade structures and trees, and by reducing the extent of unshaded parking lots.

Policy LU-5.4 Sustainable Land Development Practices. Promote land development practices that reduce energy and water consumption, pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, and waste, incorporating such techniques as:

- Concentration of uses and design of development to promote walking and use of public transit in lieu of the automobile
- Capture and re-use of stormwater on-site for irrigation
- Orientation of buildings to maximize opportunities for solar energy use, daylighting, and ventilation
- Use of landscapes that protect native soil, conserve water, provide for wildlife, and reduce green waste
- Use of permeable paving materials
- Shading of surface parking, walkways, and plazas
- Management of wastewater and use of recycled water

Goal LU-7 Livable and Quality Neighborhoods. Neighborhoods that provide a variety of housing types, densities, and design, and a mix of uses and services that support the needs of their residents.

Policy LU-7.5 Walkable Neighborhoods. Maintain sidewalks, parkways, street tree canopies, and landscaping throughout the residential neighborhoods to promote walking as an enjoyable and healthy activity, and alternative to automobile use.

Goal LU-13 Well-Designed and Attractive Districts. Retail centers and corridors that are well-designed and attractive, providing a positive experience for visitors and community residents, and fostering business activity.

Policy LU-13.6 Bicycle Facilities. Encourage developers of commercial retail centers to incorporate facilities that promote customer and employee access by bicycles, such as secured storage, showers, and lockers.

- Goal LU-15** **Quality Business Parks.** A diversity of business parks accommodating office and light industrial uses that provides a variety of job opportunities for Agoura Hills’ residents.
- Policy LU-15.5** **Bicycle Facilities.** Encourage major business park and industrial business park projects to incorporate facilities that promote employee access by bicycles, such as secured storage, showers, and lockers.
- Goal M-3** **Intelligent Transportation Systems.** A transportation system that utilizes advanced ITS technologies to maximize the efficiency and safety of the City’s transportation system.
- Policy M-3.1** **Intelligent Transportation Systems.** Utilize ITS for Agoura Hills to improve the efficiency and safety of the transportation network through advanced technologies.
- Policy M-3.2** **Signal Timing Optimization.** Optimize traffic signal timing and coordination to reduce travel time and delay and increase safety.
- Goal M-4** **Ensuring Quality of Life.** A transportation system that meets existing and future demands by balancing the need to move traffic with the needs of residents.
- Policy M-4.3** **Traffic Control Devices.** Encourage the use of innovative methods for traffic control (such as roundabouts and traffic circles), which can add character and create opportunity for improved aesthetics while effectively managing entry, speed, and points of conflict, in addition to traditional traffic control methods (such as stop signs and traffic signals), where appropriate. Consider the use of these innovative traffic control devices based upon the physical context and street hierarchy.
- Policy M-4.4** **Truck Routes.** Maintain the designation of truck routes for commercial and industrial use to minimize impacts on residential neighborhoods. The City’s designated truck routes are shown in Figure M-6 (Truck Routes).
- Policy M-4.5** **Trucking Impacts.** Minimize noise and other impacts of truck traffic, deliveries, and staging on residential neighborhoods and mixed-use areas of the City.
- Policy M-4.6** **Energy Reduction.** Promote the use of alternative energy sources for transportation related programs and measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions within the City, including the use of low-emission vehicles in the City’s fleet system.
- Goal M-5** **Neighborhood Traffic Management.** Minimized through traffic in neighborhoods adjacent to major travel routes.
- Policy M-5.1** **Traffic Calming.** Consider the application of traffic calming techniques, where needed, to minimize neighborhood intrusion by through traffic and promote a safe and pleasant neighborhood environment.

- Goal M-6** **Alternative Transportation.** Reduced reliance on single-occupancy vehicle travel through the provision of alternative travel modes and enhanced system design.
- Policy M-6.1** **Efficient System.** Promote the most efficient use of the City's existing transportation network and encourage the integration of alternative modes into design standards and future improvements.
- Policy M-6.2** **Mode Choice.** Expand the choices of available travel modes to increase the freedom of movement for residents and reduce reliance on the automobile. Ensure that existing and future infrastructure will be adequate for future transportation modes.
- Policy M-6.3** **Design of Alternative Modes.** New roadways and future street-improvement projects shall be bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly in design.
- Policy M-6.4** **Design Enhancements.** Enhance bus stops with amenities such as street trees, benches, bus shelters and waste receptacles, public art or other measures.
- Policy M-6.5** **Education.** Promote non-motorized transportation through encouragement and education.
- Goal M-7** **Pedestrians.** Transportation improvements and development enhancements that promote and support walking within the community.
- Policy M-7.1** **Walkability.** Create a pedestrian environment accessible to all that is safe, attractive, and encourages walking. Maintain and promote the walkability within the City by identifying and completing deficient links within the sidewalk system.
- Policy M-7.2** **Pedestrian Connectivity.** Preserve and enhance pedestrian connectivity in existing neighborhoods and require a well-connected pedestrian network linking new and existing developments to adjacent land uses, including commercial uses, schools, and parks.
- Policy M-7.3** **Pedestrian Experience.** Promote walking and improve the pedestrian experience with streetscape enhancements and by orienting future development toward the street, where appropriate.
- Policy M-7.4** **Walkable Developments.** Encourage mixed-use development so that it is possible for a greater number of short trips to be made by walking.
- Goal M-8** **Bikeways.** Enhanced bicycle facilities throughout Agoura Hills for short trips and recreational uses.
- Policy M-8.1** **Bikeway Linkages.** Provide bikeway connectivity between residential areas and surrounding natural resource areas, parks, schools, employment centers, and other activity centers in the community.

- Policy M-8.2** **Continuous Bikeway Connectivity.** Provide a bicycle network that is continuous, closes gaps in the existing system, and permits easy bicycle travel throughout the community and the region.
- Policy M-8.3** **Recreational Biking.** Encourage recreational biking and promote the community’s mountain biking trail system to residents and visitors.
- Policy M-8.4** **Bicycling Safety.** Establish a Bicycle Safety Program that aims to educate the public about the safe use of bicycles on the City’s bikeways.
- Policy M-8.7** **Bicycle Parking.** Developments shall provide for bicycle parking facilities.

- Goal M-9** **Transit.** Transit options that are a viable component of the City’s multi-modal transportation system.
 - Policy M-9.1** **Transit Commuting.** Encourage the use of public transportation for commuting trips by collaborating with regional transit agencies to provide additional transit options for service to Agoura Hills.
 - Policy M-9.2** **Transit Planning.** Encourage transit planning as an integral component of the development review process, and identify recommended transit routes and stations as part of long-range planning efforts.
 - Policy M-9.3** **Citywide Shuttle Service.** Explore an intercity shuttle system to promote transit trips between residential, commercial, and community areas and enhance mobility for non-driving older adults, children, and persons with disabilities.
 - Policy M-9.4** **Local Transit.** Explore the feasibility of expanding the services of the existing transit programs and other appropriate transit programs.

- Goal M-10** **Transportation Demand Management.** The successful application of TDM measures to reduce reliance on single-occupancy vehicles for everyday travel.
 - Policy M-10.1** **Current Techniques.** Actively utilize current TDM techniques to aid in the reduction of single-occupancy vehicle trips.
 - Policy M-10.2** **Trip Reduction.** Encourage existing and new developments to participate in trip reducing activities.
 - Policy M-10.3** **Ride Share.** Actively promote the use of ride-sharing and ride-matching services, for both residents and non-residents.
 - Policy M-10.4** **City Employees.** Establish a TDM program for the City of Agoura Hills’ employees.
 - Policy M-10.5** **Preferential Parking.** Encourage the availability of preferential parking in selected areas for designated carpools.

- Goal M-11** **Parking.** Parking that is convenient and efficient for the use of residents, workers, and visitors.
- Policy M-11.1** **Parking Standards and Design.** Ensure that off-street parking and on-street parking requirements are adequate and that parking is designed to be sensitive to both context and environment. Include safety considerations (i.e., lighting and landscape design) in the parking standards and design.
- Policy M-11.2** **Shared Parking.** Maximize shared parking opportunities for uses with varied peak parking periods and for developments providing a TDM program.
- Policy M-11.3** **Efficient Parking Design.** Strive to provide an appropriate balance between providing adequate amounts of parking and reducing the amount of land devoted to parking through measures such as parking structures, underground parking, and shared parking.
- Goal M-12** **Regional Circulation System.** A comprehensive transportation system that is coordinated with adjacent jurisdictions and regional planning efforts.
- Policy M-12.2** **Regional Coordination.** Support regional efforts by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro or MTA) and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) to reduce single-occupancy vehicle travel, such as goals and measures identified in Metro’s Long Range Transportation Plan and SCAG’s Regional Transportation Improvement Program.
- Policy M-12.3** **Efficiency.** Support regional planning efforts that maximize the efficiency of existing transportation facilities.
- Policy M-12.4** **Regional Transit Planning.** Collaborate with regional transportation and transit agencies for the efficient allocation of transit and transportation resources.
- Policy M-12.5** **Freeway Enhancements.** Work with regional agencies and Caltrans to achieve timely implementation of programmed freeway and interchange improvements.
- Policy M-12.6** **Capital Improvements Program.** Identify and prioritize transportation improvement projects for inclusion in the City’s Capital Improvements Program (CIP) and to guide the City’s applications for regional, state or federal funds.
- Goal U-4** **Solid Waste Collection and Disposal Operations.** Control and reduction of solid waste generation and disposal.
- Policy U-4.2** **Diversion of Waste.** Require recycling, green recycling/composting, and waste separation to reduce the volume and toxicity of solid wastes sent to landfill facilities, with the objective of diverting nonhazardous waste to a certified

recycling processor, consistent with state mandates for landfill diversion.

Policy U-4.4 Community Education. Continue to publicize and educate the public about waste reduction techniques, programs, and facilities.

Policy U-4.5 Recycling for New Development. Require new development to incorporate recycling locations into the project.

Policy U-4.7 Recycling and Reuse of Construction Wastes. Continue the commercial solid waste/recycling program, consistent with state requirements for diversion, for waste collection from all commercial program providers, including recycling materials generated by the demolition and remodeling of buildings.

Policy U-4.8 Residential Waste Recycling. Continue to provide recycling as part of regular residential curbside service, including green and equestrian waste recycling.

Policy U-4.9 Non-Residential Waste Recycling. Continue to require non-residential uses and businesses to participate in the City's commercial recycling program.

Policy U-4.10 Community Clean-Up Events. Continue to sponsor and help coordinate annual clean-up events, in which volunteers and community organizers help pick up litter at parks and other public areas.

Goal U-5 Energy Provision and Conservation. Adequate, efficient, and environmentally sensitive energy service for all residents and businesses.

Policy U-5.1 New Development Requirements. Require that new development be approved contingent upon its ability to be served by adequate natural gas and electric facilities and infrastructure.

Policy U-5.2 Adequate Facilities. Coordinate with Southern California Edison (SCE) and Southern California Gas Company (SCGC) to ensure that adequate electric and natural gas facilities are available to meet the demands of existing and future development, and to encourage conservation techniques.

Policy U-5.3 Solar Access. Ensure that sites, landscaping, and buildings are configured and designed to maximize and protect solar access.

Policy U-5.4 Energy Efficient Incentives. Coordinate with relevant utilities and agencies to promote energy rebate and incentive programs offered by local energy providers to increase energy efficiency in older neighborhoods and developments.

Policy U-5.5 Undergrounding of Utilities. Require applicants to comply with the City's undergrounding of utilities ordinances and

policies and pursue a variety of funding opportunities to assist in supporting future efforts to underground existing utilities.

Policy U-5.6 Energy Conservation. Install energy-efficient appliances and alternative-energy infrastructure, such as solar energy panels (photovoltaic panels) within all new City facilities and within existing facilities, as feasible.

Policy U-5.7 Solar Panels in Projects. Provide incentives for use of solar energy in new development.

Goal CS-1 Park and Recreation Facilities. Balanced and comprehensive recreation facilities for the Agoura Hills community.

Policy CS-1.3 Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections. Connect recreational facilities with walking paths, trails, bikeways, and equestrian trails.

Policy CS-1.4 Bicycle Racks. Require the installation of bicycle racks at parks and community centers.

Goal NR-5 Water Conservation. Minimization of water consumption through conservation methods and other techniques.

Policy NR-5.1 Water Conservation and Education. Continue to support the efforts of the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District in water conservation in the City, both through minimizing the consumption of water and through public education.

Policy NR-5.2 Water Conservation Measures. Require water conservation measures/devices that limit water usage for all new construction projects, including public facilities, such as the use of water-efficient landscaping and irrigation, on-site stormwater capture as feasible, low-flow and efficient plumbing fixtures, and the use of recycled water for irrigation.

Policy NR-5.3 Water-Efficient Landscaping and Irrigation. Require that drought-tolerant landscaping, water-efficient irrigation systems be installed, and recycled water be used for landscaping, as feasible, for all private and City landscaping and parkways. Encourage such landscaping and irrigation, as appropriate, in private development.

Policy NR-5.4 Optimum Timing for Water Irrigation. Require that all irrigation systems irrigate at optimum times of the day, as recommended by the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, and consider the use of weather sensors, to facilitate optimum irrigation and other technology for monitoring and control. Encourage such irrigation timing for private development.

Policy NR-5.5 Recycled Water. Work with the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District in further creating opportunities for recycled water to irrigate the public landscape, provided that the heavy metal and

salt content of recycled water will not interfere with plant growth.

- Goal NR-9 Energy Conservation.** Provision of affordable, reliable, and sustainable energy resources to residents and businesses.
- Policy NR-9.1 Public Outreach.** Promote energy conservation measures and options to all residents, businesses, contractors, and consultants.
- Policy NR-9.2 Energy Conservation for City Facilities.** Implement energy-conserving measures for all existing City facilities, as feasible. For new City facilities, incorporate energy-conserving measures to the extent practical.
- Goal NR-10 Greenhouse Gas Reduction.** Reduce emissions from all activities within the City boundaries to help mitigate the impact of climate change.
- Policy NR-10.1 Climate Change.** Comply with all state requirements regarding climate change and greenhouse gas reduction and review the progress toward meeting the emission reductions targets.
- Policy NR-10.2 Regional Coordination.** Ensure that that any plans prepared by the City, including the General Plan, are aligned with, and support any regional plans to help achieve reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.
- Policy NR-10.3 Outreach and Education.** Partner with local agencies and organizations to coordinate outreach and education regarding the effects of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change.

4.15.5 References

- Agoura Hills, City of. 2008. *Agoura Hills Municipal Code*.
- . 2009. *Agoura Hills Draft General Plan*.
- California Air Resources Board (California ARB). 2004. *Fact Sheet: Climate Change Emission Control Regulations*.
- . 2007. *Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory Database (1990–2004)*.
http://www.arb.ca.gov/app/ghg/ghg_sector_data.php (accessed August 5, 2008).
- California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2008. *CEQA and Climate Change*, January.
- . 2009. *Model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans*, June.
- California Attorney General Office. *The California Environmental Quality Act Addressing Global Warming Impacts at the Local Agency Level*. http://ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/pdf/GW_mitigation_measures.pdf (accessed July 20, 2009).
- California Climate Action Team (CCAT). 2006. *Climate Action Team Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the California Legislature*, March.
- . 2007. *Climate Action Team Proposed Early Actions to Mitigate Climate Change in California*.

- California Department of Water Resources (California DWR). 2006. *Progress on Incorporating Climate Change into Management of California's Water Resources, Technical Memorandum Report*.
- California Energy Commission (CEC). 2005. *California Energy Demand 2006–2016 Staff Energy Demand Forecast*, p. 1-12, September.
- . 2006a. *California Commercial End-Use Survey*. 2006.
- . 2006b. *Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 to 2004. Staff Final Report*.
- . 2006c. *Our Changing Climate: Assessing the Risks to California, A Summary Report from the California Climate Action Center*, pp. 10–11, July.
- . 2006d. *U.S. Per Capita Electricity Use by State in 2003*. http://www.energy.ca.gov/electricity/us_percapita_electricity_2003.html (accessed November 28, 2007).
- . 2007a. *2007 Integrated Energy Policy Report*, December 5. http://www.energy.ca.gov/2007_energy_policy/index.html (accessed July 20, 2009)
- . 2007b. *California Energy Demand 2008–2018 Staff Revised Forecast. CEC-200-2007-015-SF2*, November.
- . n.d. Fuels and Transportation Division. <http://www.energy.ca.gov/transportation/index.html> (accessed July 20, 2009)
- California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA). 2004. *Technical Support Document for Staff Proposal Regarding Reduction of Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Motor Vehicles Climate Change Overview*.
- California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (California Governor's OPR). 2008. Technical Advisory: CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change through CEQA Review, June 19.
- . 2009. Preliminary Draft CEQA Guideline Amendments for Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Public Workshop Announcement. January 8, 2009.
- California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB). 2008. Statewide Diversion and Disposal Profile. <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles/Juris/JurProfile2.asp?RG=C&JURID=386&JUR=Pomona> (accessed February 16, 2009).
- Fehr & Peers. 2009. *Traffic Study for Agoura Hills General Plan Update*, July.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). 2004. *16 Years of Scientific Assessment in Support of the Climate Convention*, December. <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/10th-anniversary/anniversary-brochure.pdf> (accessed July 21, 2009).
- . 2006. *Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. Chapter 3 (Solid Waste Disposal).
- . 2007. Summary for Policymakers. In: *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, United Kingdom, and New York, NY, USA.
- National Association of Homebuilders (NAHB). 2003. *America's Housing 1900 to 2000, A Century of Progress*, April. http://www.nahb.org/fileUpload_details.aspx?contentID=7135 (accessed July 20, 2009).
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 1998. *State Workbook: Methodologies for Estimating Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, May.

———. 2008. *Fast Facts: Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks*, April.

VanRheenen, N.T., A.W. Wood, R.N. Palmer, and D.P. Lettenmaier. 2004. Potential Implications of PCM Climate Change Scenarios for Sacramento-San Joaquin River Basin Hydrology and Water Resources *Climatic Change*, 62:257–281.

CHAPTER 5 Other CEQA Considerations

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the evaluation of types of environmental impacts required by CEQA that are not covered within the other chapters of this EIR. In particular, Section 15126 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that all aspects of a project must be considered when evaluating its impact on the environment, including planning, acquisition, development, and operation. As part of this analysis, the EIR must also identify (1) significant environmental effects of the proposed project; (2) significant environmental effects which cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented; (3) significant irreversible environmental changes which would be involved in the proposed project should it be implemented; (4) growth-inducing impacts of the proposed project; (5) the mitigation measures proposed to minimize the significant effects; and (6) alternatives to the proposed project.

5.2 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

As required by the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must include a discussion of the ways in which the proposed project could directly or indirectly foster economic development or population growth, or the construction of additional housing and how that growth would, in turn, affect the surrounding environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d)). Growth can be induced in a number of ways, including the elimination of obstacles to growth, or through the stimulation of economic activity within the region. The discussion of removal of obstacles to growth relates directly to the removal of infrastructure limitations or regulatory constraints that could result in growth unforeseen at the time of project approval. Under CEQA, a determination whether induced growth is beneficial or detrimental is not necessarily made, but rather an analysis of the impacts of such growth must be analyzed. Induced growth is considered a significant impact only if it affects (directly or indirectly) the ability of agencies to provide needed public services, or if it can be demonstrated that the potential growth, in some other way, significantly affects the environment.

In general, a project may foster spatial, economic or population growth in a geographic area if it meets any one of the criteria identified below:

- The project removes an impediment to growth (e.g., the establishment of an essential public service, or the provision of new access to an area)
- The project results in the urbanization of land in a remote location (leapfrog development)
- Economic expansion or growth occurs in an area in response to the project (e.g., changes in revenue base, employment expansion, etc.)
- The project establishes a precedent-setting action (e.g., a change in zoning or general plan amendment approval)

If a project meets any one of these criteria, it may be considered growth inducing. Generally, growth-inducing projects are either located in isolated, undeveloped, or underdeveloped areas, necessitating the extension of major infrastructure, such as sewer and water facilities or roadways, or encourage premature or unplanned growth. The discussion of the removal of obstacles to growth relates directly to the removal of infrastructure limitations (typically through the provision of additional capacity or supply), or the reduction or elimination of regulatory constraints on growth that could result in growth unforeseen at the time of project approval. A physical obstacle to growth can involve the lack of public service infrastructure. The extension of public service infrastructure, including roadways, water mains, and sewer lines, into areas that are not currently provided with these services would be expected to support new development. Similarly, the elimination or change to a regulatory obstacle, including existing growth and development policies, could result in new growth.

5.2.1 Removal of Obstacles to Growth

The General Plan encourages the reuse and intensification of previously developed areas of the City rather than the extension of urban development into undeveloped areas of the City. Development under the General Plan Update is programmed for areas of the City that are developed and are served by an extensive network of electricity, water, sewer, storm drain, roadways, and other infrastructure sized to accommodate or allow for existing and planned growth. Only minor connections would be needed to accommodate new development. As no new major roads or highways have been proposed to provide new access to the City, the General Plan Update would not be removing an impediment to growth. The General Plan Update would not facilitate development in any undeveloped areas where development could not already occur under the current General Plan or existing Specific Plans. Instead, the General Plan Update focuses on infill development and increasing density on existing uses within identified Subareas. Therefore, the General Plan Update would not result in the removal of obstacles to growth that would result in growth-inducing development.

5.2.2 Population Growth

As discussed in Section 4.10 (Population and Housing), SCAG projections anticipate the City's population will increase by 165 residents by 2035 (from 2008 DOF estimates). Section 4.10 goes on to state that, under full buildout of the General Plan Update, the City's 2035 population is expected to increase by 1,650 persons. This would result in 1,892 more people living within the City of Agoura Hills by 2035 than under the governing SCAG plan. Upon buildout of the General Plan Update in 2035, the City's population is estimated to be 25,394 people, which is an increase of 8.8 percent over the numbers used for the 2009 DOF estimates. These projected increases in population would occur due to the focus on infill development within the General Plan Update and previously approved Specific Plans. While the General Plan Update proposes additional population beyond SCAG 2035 forecasts, SCAG updates its projections on a regular basis to account for actions such as a General Plan Update in its member jurisdictions. Therefore, the General Plan Update is accommodating for continued growth expected in the region, and is not necessarily inducing said growth.

Furthermore, the potential growth in the City under the proposed General Plan Update consists of infill development, development within existing Specific Plan areas, and intensification of existing uses within the City, and would not result in the urbanization of land in a remote location. Developed areas of the City are served by an extensive network of electricity, water, sewer, storm drain, roadways, and other infrastructure sized to accommodate or allow for existing and planned growth. As no new major roads or highways have been proposed to provide new access to the City, the General Plan Update would not be removing an impediment to growth. Instead, proposed development under the General Plan Update would serve to accommodate growth that will imminently occur in the Southern California region, as captured by SCAG projections in previous and future updates of their RTP. Therefore, the General Plan Update would not be growth inducing or set new precedent for growth, but rather would adequately plan for expected growth.

5.2.3 Employment Growth

Implementation of the General Plan Update would generate some short-term employment opportunities during construction activities of any future development under the proposed General Plan Update. Given the ample supply of construction workers in the regional work force of Southern California, the labor pool from which workers would be drawn, the proposed project would not be considered growth inducing from a short-term employment perspective.

Implementation of the General Plan Update would result in permanent employment opportunities at business developments created by development anticipated under the General Plan Update. These potential full-time and part-time positions are anticipated to be filled by the local labor force. The jobs associated with the new land use zones in the Subareas could be the types that attract new residents to the area. However, Agoura Hills is a primarily residential community, and has an existing employment base from which to pull employees. The economic expansion that would occur in association with these future developments is accounted for in the General Plan Update and anticipated by the City, and is not considered growth inducing.

5.2.4 Precedent Setting Actions

It is the specific purpose of the General Plan Update to preserve the community of Agoura Hills and accommodate for its orderly development. Therefore, by its nature, the General Plan Update is designed to reduce the potential for uncontrolled growth and associated environmental impacts.

The anticipated growth under the General Plan Update would consist of primarily infill development and intensification of existing uses within the City as well as implementation of previously approved Specific Plan areas, and would not result in the urbanization of land in a remote location. New development in the City would serve to accommodate the growth anticipated in the Southern California region, as captured by SCAG projections in previous and future updates of their RTPs. A General Plan is a regulatory document that plans for future growth and guides this identified development. As such, the General Plan Update would accommodate for future growth and would reduce the potential for uncontrolled growth. This process (and subsequent document) is in direct contrast to future,

unanticipated actions such as General Plan amendments or changes to the zoning of individual properties on a piece-meal basis. Therefore, by accommodating growth that is already projected by SCAG, the General Plan Update would not be growth inducing or to be precedent-setting.

5.3 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of any significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by a proposed project. Specifically, Section 15126.2(c) states:

Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts, and particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

The implementation of the General Plan Update would entail the commitment of energy and human resources for the associated changes. Resources will also be committed for the construction of future development that occurs under the General Plan Update.

Ongoing operation of developments under the General Plan Update would entail a further commitment of energy resources in the form of petroleum products (diesel fuel and gasoline), natural gas, electricity, and water. Long-term impacts would also result from an increase in vehicular traffic, and the associated air pollutant and noise emissions. This commitment of resources would be a long-term obligation in view of the fact that, practically speaking, it is impossible to return the land to its original condition once it has been developed. In summary, implementation of the General Plan Update would involve the following irreversible environmental changes to existing on-site natural resources:

- Commitment of energy and water resources as a result of the construction, operation and maintenance of development allowed under the General Plan Update
- Decrease in ambient air quality and increase in noise

5.4 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe any significant impacts that cannot be avoided, even with implementation of feasible mitigation measures. The following significant, unavoidable adverse impacts would result from project implementation.

- **Air Quality**
 - > **Project Specific**—Development under the General Plan Update could increase concentrations of criteria air pollutants in the project vicinity during construction and operational activities, which would exceed emissions allowed under the localized significance thresholds.
 - > **Cumulative**—The General Plan Update is not consistent with the 2007 AQMP. Therefore, the project is considered to have a significant cumulative impact.

- > **Mitigation Measures**—The following mitigation measures would be used to reduce construction emissions associated with implementation of the proposed General Plan Update, even though the impact would remain significant and unavoidable:

MM4.2-1

The City shall require future development within City limits to implement the following measures to the extent feasible:

Fugitive Dust Control Measures

- *Water trucks shall be used during construction to keep all areas of vehicle movements damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this will require twice daily applications (once in late morning and once at the end of the workday). Increased watering is required whenever wind speed exceeds 15 mph. Grading shall be suspended if wind gusts exceed 25 mph.*
- *The amount of disturbed area shall be minimized and onsite vehicle speeds shall be limited to 15 mph or less.*
- *If importation, exportation and stockpiling of fill material is involved, earth with 5% or greater silt content that is stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with earth binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting material shall be tarped from the point of origin or shall maintain at least two feet of freeboard.*
- *After clearing, grading, earth-moving or excavation is completed, the disturbed area shall be treated by watering, revegetation, or by spreading earth binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed.*
- *All material transported off-site shall be securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.*

NO_x Control Measures

- *When feasible, electricity from temporary power poles on site shall be utilized rather than temporary diesel or gasoline generators.*
- *When feasible, on site mobile equipment shall be fueled by methanol or natural gas (to replace diesel-fueled equipment), or, propane or butane (to replace gasoline-fueled equipment).*
- *Aqueous Diesel Fuel or biodiesel (B20 with retarded fuel injection timing), if available, shall be used in diesel fueled vehicles when methanol or natural gas alternatives are not available.*

VOC Control Measures

- *Low VOC architectural and asphalt coatings shall be used on site and shall comply with AQMD Rule 1113-Architectural Coatings.*

Other Ozone Precursor Control Measures

- *Equipment engines should be maintained in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturer's specifications.*
- *Schedule construction periods to occur over a longer time period (i.e., lengthen from 60 days to 90 days) during the smog season so as to minimize the number of vehicles and equipment operating simultaneously.*
- *Use new technologies to control ozone precursor emissions as they become readily available.*

- **Cultural Resources**

- > **Project Specific**—Development activities resulting from implementation of the General Plan Update could cause a substantial adverse change in a historical resource that could possibly be identified in the future as being historically significant under state or federal criteria.

- **Noise**

- > **Project Specific**—Due to the proximity of new development to existing sensitive receptors, the proposed project could increase noise and vibration during construction and operational activities, to levels that are considered unacceptable.

- **Population, Housing, and Employment**

- > **Cumulative**—Although the increase in population, housing, and employment anticipated from the General Plan Update is not considered significant in a regional context, because this information has not yet been considered by SCAG in its projections for 2035, the project is considered to have a significant cumulative impact.

- **Transportation/Traffic**

- > **Project Specific**—Development under the General Plan Update would result in an increased trip generation throughout the City that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system with respect to the number of vehicle trips or congestion along roadways, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.
 - > **Cumulative**—Due to the increase of traffic volumes on local roadways due to both the General Plan Update and growth in surrounding areas, cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

- **Utilities—Solid Waste**

- > **Cumulative**—The future of landfill capacity at landfills currently serving the City is somewhat uncertain. Additionally, the potential for increased waste diversion and recycling in the future is unknown. Although the project itself would have a less than significant contribution to this effect, impacts associated with cumulative development are considered significant and unavoidable.

5.5 EFFECTS NOT FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The following impacts were found not to be significant and were therefore not further analyzed in this EIR.

Agricultural Resources

Potential impacts to Agriculture Resources were determined not to be significant. As presented in Figure LU-3 (Land Use Diagram) of the General Plan Update, there is no land designated for agricultural purposes within the City and there are no agricultural uses within the City. As such, no farmland would be at risk for conversion and no conflicts would exist with any *Williamson Act* contracts due to implementation of the General Plan Update. Therefore, impacts to Agricultural Resources were not further analyzed in this EIR.

Mineral Resources

Potential impacts to Mineral Resources were determined not to be significant. As determined by the General Plan Update, there is no land designated for uses, such as collection of mineral resources within the City limits. No known valuable mineral resources or recovery sites exist within the City, and, therefore, none would be lost with implementation of the General Plan Update. The Liberty Canyon area is the only location within Agoura Hills where mining activities have been documented. For a brief period, sand was extracted from this area and was used for general filling purposes at local construction sites. Therefore, impacts to Mineral Resources were not further analyzed in this EIR.

5.6 REFERENCES

California Department of Finance (California DOF). 1980. *Report 84 E-4, Population Estimates for California Counties and Cities: January 1, 1976, through January 1, 1980.*

CHAPTER 6 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable Alternatives to the project or to the location of the project that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project while reducing significant project impacts. An EIR is not required to consider every conceivable Alternative to a project; rather, it must consider a range of potentially feasible Alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. In addition, an EIR should evaluate the comparative merits of the Alternatives. Therefore, this chapter sets forth potential Alternatives to the proposed project and evaluates them, as required by CEQA.

Key provisions of the CEQA Guidelines relating to the Alternatives analysis (Section 15126.6 et seq.) are summarized below:

- The discussion of Alternatives shall focus on Alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these Alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.
- The “no project” Alternative shall be evaluated along with its impact. The “no project” analysis shall discuss the existing conditions, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed project is not approved.
- The range of Alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason”; therefore, the EIR must evaluate only those Alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The Alternatives shall be limited to those that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts identified for the proposed project.
- With regard to alternative locations, only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR.
- An EIR need not consider an Alternative whose effects cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.

6.1.1 Rationale for Selecting Potentially Feasible Alternatives

Alternatives may include such changes to the proposed project as modification of the proposed project, altogether different uses, or suitable alternative project sites. However, the range of Alternatives discussed in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” which CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f) defines as:

... set[ting] forth only those Alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The Alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those Alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency

determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. The range of feasible Alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making.

Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of Alternatives (as described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1)) are environmental impacts, site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the project proponent could reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to an Alternative site. An EIR need not consider an Alternative whose effects could not be reasonably identified, and whose implementation is remote or speculative.

For purposes of this analysis, the project alternatives are evaluated to determine the extent to which they attain the basic project objectives, while seeking to lessen significant impacts identified for the proposed project. The process of updating the General Plan has involved extensive public participation and it represents the collective ideas of both residents and decision-makers. As such, all alternatives shall be evaluated against the Vision Statement adopted by the City during its public visioning process. The Vision Statement is as follows:

Agoura Hills is a special place surrounded by the Santa Monica Mountains where oak trees and rolling hills abound. Here we seek to preserve our city's best qualities while striving to create a better community. The future Agoura Hills is an attractive city of growing sophistication that chooses to retain its small town look and feel. The city remains a safe place, where people live, work, play, and move about in an economically viable and environmentally sustainable community. Sensitive growth and economic development are means of perpetuating our quality of life. These are balanced with resource conservation, as the city's semi-rural ranching past, rich history and unique neighborhoods are respected, and open spaces and surrounding hillsides are preserved. Agoura Hills is a place where its citizens have opportunities to engage in their community through recreation, social and civic activities, schools, and neighborhood organizations.

6.2 ALTERNATIVES REJECTED AS INFEASIBLE

6.2.1 Alternatives Considered to Reduce Environmental Impacts

■ Air Quality

The significant air quality impacts that are identified in Section 4.2 (Air Quality) of the EIR (both project-specific and cumulative) are primarily the result of the nature of estimating individual projects and associated emissions that could occur through 2035. As discussed in Impact 4.2-2, "In the case of the General Plan Update, which is considered a project under CEQA, it is expected that a number of construction projects could occur every year simultaneously. Without adequate construction schedules or information regarding project locations and demolition requirements, future economic conditions or market demand, construction emissions for individual projects cannot be quantified; therefore, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to quantify the emissions related to construction activities under the General Plan Update as the amount and timing of each construction event is not known at this time. Because the thresholds are established for individual development projects and as certain development projects implemented under the General Plan Update could individually exceed the SCAQMD

thresholds, the total amount of construction within the City under the General Plan Update could also exceed the SCAQMD’s recommended thresholds of significance.” Any variation of a long-term planning document, regardless of land use changes, would result in similar significant impacts due to the speculative nature of individual development projects. The only way to reduce these impacts would be on an individual project basis, as each of the listed factors above would be known and emissions could then be estimated accurately to determine whether they would exceed SCAQMD thresholds. One individual development project is not considered a feasible Alternative for future land use changes in the City through 2035. Consequently, a specific Alternative to reduce significant air quality impacts identified for the proposed project was rejected as infeasible.

■ Noise

As discussed in Impact 4.9-6 and Impact 4.9-7, impacts related to noise and vibration will be significant and unavoidable with respect to operation and construction activities, respectively. Analysis performed in Section 4.9 (Noise) determined that these findings of significance would occur with or without the implementation of the General Plan from ambient growth occurring without the General Plan Update and from growth outside of the City. Additionally, many locations throughout the City currently experience noise levels that exceed the acceptable levels set forth by the City’s Noise Ordinance. Therefore, noise impacts would occur with implementation of any alternative project. Thus, a specific alternative to reduce significant noise impacts identified for the proposed project was rejected as infeasible.

■ Traffic

As discussed in Section 4.13 (Transportation/Traffic), the General Plan Update is anticipated to result in a significant impact to traffic. A significant and unavoidable cumulative impact was also identified due to the potential contribution of trips by the proposed project to a cumulative total in the region that is currently somewhat unknown. This contribution and significant cumulative impact would occur with implementation of any alternative project. Thus, a specific alternative to reduce significant cumulative traffic impacts identified was rejected as infeasible.

■ Solid Waste

As discussed in Section 4.14 (Utilities), the General Plan Update is not anticipated to result in a significant impact to solid waste. However, a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact was identified due to the potential for landfill closure prior to the planning horizon of the proposed General Plan Update. Additionally, the potential for growth in nearby communities that is currently unplanned could contribute to a significant cumulative solid waste impact. Neither the proposed project, nor any other individual project in Agoura Hills or adjacent communities, has the ability to control the future closure date of landfills that currently serve the region. Therefore, this significant cumulative impact would occur with implementation of any alternative project. Thus, a specific alternative to reduce significant cumulative solid waste impacts identified was rejected as infeasible.

6.2.2 Alternative Site

As the General Plan Update is designed to guide the development within the City of Agoura Hills, an alternative site would not be an appropriate alternative to the proposed project.

6.2.3 All Residential or All Commercial

An alternative that considers a completely different mix of land uses was considered. Land use scenarios such as all residential for all new development or redevelopment would not achieve the objectives of the City, and could potentially cause greater impacts such as traffic and green house gases since residents would be forced to drive farther for shopping or employment. Further, this could increase other impacts that were previously identified as less than significant under the General Plan Update. Therefore, an alternative of this type was rejected from further analysis in the EIR because it does not meet the basic objectives of the proposed project listed above in the Vision Statement.

As with the all residential alternative above, an all non-residential development and redevelopment scenario could generate other impacts previously identified as less than significant under the General Plan Update and would not achieve the City's objectives. Therefore, an alternative of this type was rejected from further analysis in the EIR.

In general, an all residential project or all an non-residential project would present the same impacts as the proposed project, as these projects would still present new development to the community. However, neither scenario would include mixed-use development which has been identified to address one of the City's most important goals—to create a sustainable and economically viable community where people can live, work, and play. As such, alternatives of this type were rejected from further analysis.

6.3 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

Three scenarios, representing a range of reasonable Alternatives to the proposed General Plan Update were selected for detailed analysis. The goal for evaluating any of these Alternatives is to identify ways to avoid or lessen the significant environmental effects resulting from implementation of the proposed General Plan Update, while attaining most of the project objectives.

Alternatives selected for further analysis include the following:

- **Alternative 1—No Build (Zero Growth under Existing General Plan)**—Under this Alternative, no future development would occur through 2035 under the existing General Plan (1993) and the General Plan Update would not take place. Therefore, all potential environmental impacts would be the same as existing conditions. This Alternative allows decision-makers to assess the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project based on existing conditions and not approving any subsequent development proposals.
- **Alternative 2—No Project/Existing General Plan (1993) Buildout**—Under this Alternative, all future development would occur according to the existing General Plan (1993). This is the “No

Project” alternative, since no legislative changes would be required, and the 1993 General Plan would continue to be in effect. It is assumed that the buildout would occur by 2035. This Alternative would allow decision-makers to assess the impacts of not taking additional action with respect to land use and future development.

- Alternative 3—Reduced Density**—As discussed in DEIR Section 4.13 (Traffic/Transportation), project-related traffic impacts along 16 roadway segments cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. It was considered that a less intensive development plan may help to reduce these impacts. Project-related traffic impacts were categorized in two primary scenarios: (1) roadway segments that currently operate at sub-standard levels that would continue to operate at substandard levels in the future; and (2) roadway segments that currently operate at acceptable levels that would operate at substandard levels in the future with implementation of the General Plan Update. Alternative 3 seeks to reduce the impacts as categorized under Scenario 2 above where a nexus is evident between growth under the General Plan Update and identified traffic impacts. As such, four TAZs were selected within which development would be reduced. Under Alternative 3, development within TAZs 6, 8, 10, and 12 would be reduced by 25 percent except the following, which was not reduced: (1) residential areas outside of Subarea 5; and (2) the Agoura Village Specific Plan. These TAZs were selected as targeted reduction areas due to the amount of existing and projected traffic that occurs or would occur within the TAZ. In addition, reduced traffic tends to generate less air and noise pollution.

Table 6-1 (Comparison of Alternatives) identifies the level of development proposed under each of the identified alternatives.

Table 6-1 Comparison of Alternatives					
<i>Alternative</i>	<i>Single Family Residential (Units)</i>	<i>Multi Family Residential (Units)</i>	<i>Retail/Service (sq. ft.)</i>	<i>Office/ BP (sq. ft.)</i>	<i>BP/ Manufacturing (sq. ft.)</i>
Alternative 1	0	0	0	0	0
Alternative 2	116	293	1,458,799	2,947,606	1,414,292
Alternative 3	116	394	451,342	1,000,480	216,614
General Plan Update (Project)	116	413	625,794	1,098,291	273,445

6.3.1 Alternative 1: No Build (Zero Growth under Existing General Plan)

■ Description

Implementation of the No Build Alternative would represent zero growth through 2035, or effectively represent existing conditions. The existing General Plan (1993) would continue to be the guiding document for development within the City but no growth would actually occur. Existing land use designations would remain the same. For Alternative 1, conditions that existed at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was circulated would be used to assess the environmental impacts of Alternative 1.

■ Potential Impacts

Aesthetics

Under Alternative 1, no new development would occur through 2035. As a result, theoretically, the conditions that currently exist would be the same conditions in 2035. Currently, there are no officially designated scenic highways within the City of Agoura Hills. However, a portion of the US 101 Highway, which includes the length of the City, is identified as eligible for state scenic highway designation. A state scenic highway changes from “eligible” to “officially designated” when the local jurisdiction adopts a scenic corridor protection program, applies to Caltrans for scenic highway approval, receives notification from Caltrans for scenic highway approval, and must also adopt ordinances to preserve the scenic quality of the corridor or document that such regulation already exists in local codes. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, no impacts would occur.

Under the existing General Plan (1993), the following roadways are considered valuable scenic resources in the community and are recognized as scenic roadways by the City:

- Reyes Adobe Road
- Kanan Road
- US 101/Ventura Freeway
- Canwood Street
- Roadside Drive
- Driver Avenue
- Thousand Oaks Boulevard.

However, since no new growth would occur, each of the roadways with valuable scenic resources would remain unchanged. Aesthetic impacts related to Alternative 1 would be less than the less-than-significant (Class II) impact identified for the proposed project.

Impacts related to a substantial change in the visual character of the City were found to be less than significant for the General Plan Update, as new development would be subject to new policies that would improve the overall aesthetics within the City. Since Alternative 1 assumes no new development, it is reasonable to assume that impacts would therefore be greater than the proposed project. However, as Alternative 1 would not allow for any new development, the impact would be less than significant (Class II). Additionally, while these impacts would be less than significant, they would be slightly greater than the proposed project because the goals and policies of the proposed General Plan Update that seek to improve the design and character of the City would not apply. Existing development would experience a natural deterioration but would not be rebuilt or renovated under Alternative 1.

Similar to impacts of the proposed project, impacts related to light and glare and the impact thereof on nighttime views would be less than significant. Existing urban land uses affect nighttime views but since no new development would occur, impacts would be considered less than significant (Class II).

Overall, aesthetics impacts resulting from Alternative 1 would be slightly greater than the proposed General Plan Update; however, because the existing General Plan (1993) would not provide the same level of benefits as the proposed project, Alternative 1 is considered to have a greater aesthetic impact.

Air Quality

Implementation of the proposed project was found to be inconsistent with the AQMP for the South Coast Basin. Because Alternative 1 assumes no future development, and the AQMP is based on the general plans (including buildout) of all of the cities in the Basin, Alternative 1 is expected to have a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. Furthermore, because no development would occur under Alternative 1, the risk for potential construction and operational air quality impacts is further reduced. It should be noted however, that existing development within the City would continue to contribute to air quality emissions in the Basin. The air quality impact of Alternative 1 would be less than that identified for the proposed project.

Biological Resources

Alternative 1 would not involve any new development. Therefore, impacts to biological resources would be less than significant (Class II). These impacts are similar (although slightly lesser) to impacts identified for the proposed project which would also result in less-than-significant (Class II) impacts to biological resources. However, the proposed project includes goals and policies to support the restoration of creeks and maintaining a ‘green’ infrastructure, as well as sustainable landscaping techniques. These beneficial policies would not be implemented under Alternative 1.

Cultural Resources

While considered unlikely for development allowed under the General Plan Update, the potential for unknown historic resources does exist and they may be encountered during development. As such, the General Plan Update would result in a significant and unavoidable (Class I) impact. Alternative 1 would also result in a significant unavoidable impact, as resources may still be demolished, although not due to new development. less severe impact than the proposed project because no development would occur. It should be noted that the proposed goals and policies included in the General Plan Update to benefit cultural and historical resources would not be implemented under Alternative 1.

Geology and Soils

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 1 would expose people and/or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects resulting from strong seismic groundshaking or seismic-related ground failure due to the City’s location within the seismically active Southern California region. All risks and impacts associated with geological and soil impacts identified for the General Plan Update would also apply to Alternative 1. However, as Alternative 1 does not include new development, Alternative 1 would result in the potential for less severe impacts. Existing development has been constructed in adherence with applicable laws and regulations current at the time of development. As no future development would occur and all existing development was constructed in accordance with regulations current at the time of development, impacts associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic groundshaking, seismic-related ground failure, and landslides would continue to be less than significant (Class II). Impacts of Alternative 1 would be similar to, but less than, the proposed project and would be considered less than significant.

Future development under the General Plan Update would result in ground-disrupting activities, such as excavation and trenching for foundations and utilities; soil compaction and site grading; and the erection of new structures, all of which would temporarily disturb soils. This could result in soil erosion. However, all project-level plans would be required to submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and comply with all applicable requirements such as preparation of a SWPPP, NPDES Regulations, and best management practices (BMPs). Such compliance, in addition to implementation of existing code requirements, would ensure that erosion and other soil instability impacts resulting from future construction would be less than significant (Class II) for the proposed project. Since Alternative 1 would not allow for new construction, no impact (Class III) would result. This impact would be less than that identified for the General Plan Update.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Both Alternative 1 and the proposed project would involve the use of hazardous materials in the form of basic cleaning materials, landscaping chemicals, and hazardous substances used by existing businesses within the City on an ongoing basis. Future development under the General Plan Update would also involve the use of hazardous materials during construction activities, and with more development allowed, may increase the amount of hazardous materials used in the City on an ongoing basis. However, development under the General Plan Update would be required to comply with applicable laws and regulations that would reduce the risk of hazardous materials use, transportation, and disposal through the implementation of established safety practices, procedures, and reporting requirements. Since Alternative 1 allows no new development, existing conditions are expected to remain. Section 4.6 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials) of this EIR determined that operation of existing land uses within the City does not pose a significant hazard. Continued compliance with existing regulations would minimize the risks associated with the exposure of sensitive receptors, including schools, to hazardous materials. Therefore, as no new development would be allowed under Alternative 1, potential impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials would be similar to, but less than, the proposed project and would remain less than significant (Class II).

Hydrology and Water Quality

Implementation of Alternative 1 does not involve the construction of any new development projects. Therefore, no construction impacts (Class III) related to hydrology and water quality would occur. This represents a lesser impact than the less-than-significant impact anticipated under the proposed project.

The proposed project was found to have less-than-significant (Class II) impacts related to a potential violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements for construction and operational activities. Compliance with NPDES permit requirements, the 2005 UWMP, and General Plan Update policies would reduce the risk of water degradation within the City from the operation of new developments to the maximum extent practicable. Under Alternative 1, existing development and ongoing operations would be subject to the same regulations as the General Plan Update but would not have the benefit of the General Plan Update's protective water quality and hydrology policies. Nonetheless, as Alternative 1 would not allow for new development, impacts would be less than significant (Class II) and less than but similar to those anticipated under the General Plan Update.

Under the proposed project, impacts related to depletion of groundwater supplies or interference with groundwater recharge, such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level, were found to be less than significant (Class II). All existing land uses and future development contemplated in the General Plan Update would utilize water from LVMWD, which receives its potable water from MWD. As Alternative 1 would not allow for additional growth, existing conditions would remain. Existing uses are not known to be substantially depleting groundwater sources or interfering with recharge. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in somewhat lesser impacts than the General Plan Update, and result in less-than-significant (Class II) impacts to groundwater, similar to the proposed project.

With respect to drainage, the proposed General Plan Update would result in changes in ground surface permeability via paving as well as changes in topography via grading and excavation. However, policies proposed in the General Plan Update would require implementation of BMPs, incorporation of stormwater detention facilities as necessary, adequate design of drainage facilities, and minimization of increases in impervious areas to reduce impacts to less-than-significant (Class II) levels. Under Alternative 1 existing conditions would remain, without the benefit of the General Plan Update policies to ensure protection of resources. Nonetheless, since Alternative 1 would not allow for future development, it would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact similar to the proposed project.

Impacts related to the alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a waterway or the substantial increase in surface runoff resulting in flooding were found to be less than significant (Class II) with respect to the General Plan Update. In addition, impacts related to the exceedance of stormwater drainage systems were determined to be less than significant (Class II) for the proposed project. All development under the proposed project would comply with the proposed General Plan Update policies, NPDES regulations, CDFG regulations, as well as the preparation of, and compliance with, a SUSMP, which would reduce the risk of flooding from drainage alterations to less-than-significant (Class II) levels. Alternative 1 would not allow for additional development and existing development does not currently appear to result in significant hydrologic impacts. Therefore, Alternative 1 would have fewer impacts than the General Plan Update and would result in less-than-significant (Class II) impacts to hydrology, similar to the proposed project.

As discussed in Impact 4.7-5, the capacity of the existing storm drain infrastructure throughout the City is sufficient to handle existing stormwater flows. As Alternative 1 would not result in additional development that would generate a substantial amount of stormwater for the system, impacts resulting from Alternative 1 are considered less than significant (Class II). This would be similar to the proposed project.

The 100-year flood zone is primarily contained within Lindero Canyon, Liberty Canyon, Palo Comado Canyon, and Medea Creek and adjacent to Lindero Lake. However, some existing residential uses are located within the 100-year flood zone. Alternative 1 does not include new development, and thus would not place new structures, including housing, within the 100-year flood zone. Impacts are considered less than significant (Class II), similar to the proposed project.

The probability of dam failure in the area is low. The potential for this risk is the same for the proposed as Alternative 1. Development under the proposed General Plan Update would not increase the risk of dam failure, although it would increase the number of persons and amount of development exposed to this hazard. However, implementation of the flood protection policies contained in the proposed General Plan Update, and compliance with the existing Floodplain Ordinance, as described in Impact 4.7-8, would ensure that the proposed project would result in less-than-significant (Class II) impacts due to dam failure. As Alternative 1 would not allow for additional development and would not increase the number of people exposed to a potential hazard, Alternative 1 would result in a lesser impact than the proposed project.

The potential risk associated with inundation by tsunami is nil due to the City's elevation and distance from the Pacific Ocean. This impact is the same for Alternative 1 and the General Plan Update. In addition, there are no water bodies of significance size or elevation that could cause loss due to seiche. Potential risks from mudflow (i.e., mudslide, debris flow) would be considered prevalent, as slopes of 10% or more exist throughout the City. Prolonged rainfall during certain storm events would saturate and could eventually loosen soil, resulting in slope failure. However, this impact would be less than significant, the same for Alternative 1 and the proposed project.

Overall, impacts to hydrology under Alternative 1 would be less than the proposed General Plan Update.

Land Use

Alternative 1 would not allow for additional growth within the City. The existing General Plan (1993) would remain the underlying land use regulatory document, however, no growth would take place. Implementation of Alternative 1 would not result in impacts related to land use nor would it conflict with existing land use policies currently in place. Additionally, Alternative 1 would not divide an established community, nor would it conflict with a habitat conservation plan. Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact, similar to that of the General Plan Update.

Noise

Implementation of Alternative 1 would not involve the use of construction equipment, as no new development would occur. Therefore, no impacts (Class III) related to construction noise would occur, which would be less than the less-than-significant (Class II) impacts anticipated under the proposed project.

Less-than-significant impacts related to an increase in ambient noise would occur as a result of Alternative 1. Although zero growth would occur, it is anticipated that ambient noise levels will still increase due to increased traffic from development outside of the City that would travel through Agoura Hills. With respect to a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise, implementation of the General Plan Update was found to have a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. This impact was determined based on a comparison of the General Plan Update buildout with the existing ambient noise levels. Implementation of Alternative 1 would also have a less-than-significant (Class II) impact, although lesser than that anticipated under the General Plan Update due to no new development.

Based on noise measurements and on existing and future noise modeling, noise levels in excess of City standards currently occur and would continue to occur in many residential areas and other noise-sensitive uses throughout the City. Traffic noise would be higher or louder in the future than it is now along all freeways and highways, and along most major arterial and collector roads in Agoura Hills due to development outside of the City, regardless of whether the General Plan Update is adopted or not. Therefore, impacts related to Alternative 1 would be significant and unavoidable as the condition currently exists and is expected to deteriorate as a result of development outside the City, similar to the proposed project. Implementation of Alternative 1 would have no impacts related to groundborne noise or vibration. Impacts related to vibration from construction activities associated with the General Plan Update were determined to be significant and unavoidable (Class I). Operational impacts resulting from vibration were found to be less than significant for the General Plan Update. No impact (Class III) would be expected, as no new development would occur under Alternative 1, which is less substantial than impacts under the proposed project.

Population and Housing

Alternative 1 would not allow for additional growth, and so no measurable increase in population, housing, or employment is expected within the City, resulting in no impact (Class III), although by no growth this alternative would be less than SCAG's forecasts. Alternatively, the General Plan Update would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact related to future increases in population, housing, and employment and consistency with SCAG's forecasts. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in lesser impacts to population and housing than the proposed project.

Public Services

Implementation of Alternative 1 would not result in impacts to public services beyond the less-than-significant (Class II) levels identified for the proposed General Plan Update since no development is proposed. Current conditions indicate that the response times for police and fire services are at acceptable levels and impacts were determined to be less than significant (Class II).

According to Section 4.11 (Public Services) of this EIR, all of the public schools in Agoura Hills are operating below maximum capacity. Impacts of the General Plan Update were found to be less than significant (Class II) due to the implementation of Goal CS-8 (Education System) and Policy CS-8.2 (Expand and Improve Facilities). As Alternative 1 would not generate additional school-aged children, Alternative 1 would not put additional strain on the school system and would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. However, although both Alternative 1 and the proposed project are considered to result in a less-than-significant level of impact to schools, Alternative 1 would result in a slightly lesser impact than the proposed project.

Impacts to libraries as a result of Alternative 1 would be similar to that of the General Plan Update: less than significant. Circulation levels have remained consistent over the past few years. Based on an anticipated population increase under the General Plan Update, the proposed project could increase demand on library services. However, this would be a less-than-significant impact. As Alternative 1

would not result in an increase in population which could generate additional demand on library services, Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact, similar to the proposed project.

Recreation

Alternative 1 would not result in new development. Full build out of the proposed General Plan Update would increase population in the City and therefore demand on recreation facilities. The existing General Plan (1993) recommends a standard of eight acres of park and open space land per 1,000 residents. Based on the existing City population of 23,337 residents, the current park inventory of 73.5 acres provides approximately 3.15 acres of parkland per 1,000 persons. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact to recreation. The existing General Plan (1993) has park and recreation standards and Alternative 1 would be required to continue to follow the Parks Master Plan, even though no new development is proposed. However, under the proposed General Plan Update, Policy CS-1.1 (Service Level Goals), Policy CS-1.2 (Cooperation with External Agencies), Policy CS-1.8 (Facilities in Residential Development), Policy CS-3.1 (Use Agreements with Other Agencies), and Policy CS-3.2 (Work with Surrounding Communities) would require the development of park and recreation facilities, commensurate with new development. Impacts to recreation facilities would be less than significant (Class II). Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in similar impacts to recreation as the proposed project, less than significant.

Transportation

In order to assess future impacts related to Alternative 1, it would be reasonable to assume that existing conditions would persist. Growth in other areas outside of the City may continue and would affect transportation in the City, but is not accounted for in this analysis. Currently, ten street segments in the City operate at deficient conditions (LOS D or worse) and one segment (Palo Comado Canyon Road east of Chesebro Road) currently operates at LOS F. Significant traffic impacts would continue to occur as a result of Alternative 1. Additionally, the beneficial roadway improvements that would take place under the General Plan Update would not take place under Alternative 1. With the addition of area-wide growth occurring outside of the City, these impacts would likely worsen. Under the proposed project, 16 segments were determined to operate below LOS C, even after improvements occur to the roadways. Similarly, the measures related to alternative modes of travel in the proposed General Plan would not be implemented as part of Alternative 1. Both Alternative 1 and the proposed project would result in significant unavoidable traffic impacts for traffic trips and congestion, although somewhat less for Alternative 1 because there would be no additional development that could generate further traffic.

As Alternative 1 would not include future development and related construction activities, construction impacts to traffic would not occur (Class III). Alternative 1 would result in a less substantial impact to construction traffic than the less-than-significant impact (Class II) anticipated under the proposed project.

As no new development would occur under Alternative 1, impacts related to parking would be less than significant (Class II), similar to the proposed project.

Overall, impacts related to traffic and parking would be less under Alternative 1.

Utilities

According to the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the total existing water demand for the City is approximately 29,270 AFY, which is the sum of the demands of all land types within the City. LVMWD currently has a supply of 36,590 available to the City, representing a surplus of 7,320 AFY.

Under Alternative 1, it is assumed that no future development would take place. As such, additional water demand is not anticipated, resulting in less-than-significant (Class II) impacts. The proposed project would result in the use of an additional 321,380 gallons per day over Alternative 1. Alternative 1 would therefore result in less water usage than the proposed project by not allowing for new development.

Section 4.14 (Utilities and Service Systems) of this EIR examined the potential impacts related to water demand and availability. It was determined that the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts regarding the need for construction of new water treatment facilities. Given that no development would occur under Alternative 1, there would likely not be a need to construct new treatment facilities to accommodate an increase in demand in the City. Therefore, impacts from Alternative 1 would be the same as that of the proposed project.

Buildout of the General Plan Update is expected to generate 3,839,552 gallons of wastewater per day. The Tapia Water Reclamation Facility, which treats wastewater from the City, has a current capacity of 16 million gallons per day. Currently, the facility accepts approximately 9.5 million gallons per day. Increased wastewater generation due to implementation of the General Plan Update could be accommodated within the existing treatment infrastructure; therefore expansion of existing facilities would not be required under the General Plan Update and impacts would be less than significant. Under Alternative 1, the daily generation of wastewater would be approximately 484,154 gallons per day less than the proposed project and would result in a less-than-significant impact. Impacts related to Alternative 1 would be less than significant (Class II) and would be less than those associated with implementation of the proposed project.

Section 4.7 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of this EIR examined the potential for significant impacts to existing storm drains in the City. The City's existing storm drain system and flood control facilities generally have sufficient capacity to provide developed areas with adequate protection from flooding. However, some localized areas of the City may currently require drainage improvements, regardless of the level of development.

As Alternative 1 does not include future development or corresponding infrastructure improvements, existing conditions in some areas may remain somewhat deficient. Under the proposed project, development would take place that could allow for necessary infrastructure improvements. Additionally, goals and policies of the General Plan Update would require new development to ensure adequate stormwater capacity and to address existing deficiencies, resulting in a less-than-significant impact. Therefore, impacts on stormwater facilities related to Alternative 1 would be greater than those of the General Plan Update, but still are less than significant.

Currently, the City generates less than one percent of the total countywide solid waste stream. The increase of 16 tons of solid waste per day anticipated to be generated by full buildout of the General Plan Update would comprise approximately 0.2 percent of the 6,740-ton daily permitted capacity of the three landfills serving the City of Agoura Hills. Therefore, waste generated by growth proposed under the General Plan Update would be accommodated by existing landfill capacities, and would result in a less-than-significant impact. Under Alternative 1, approximately 32,099 fewer pounds of solid waste per day would be generated than under the proposed project, and Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact. However, impacts related to Alternative 1 would be less than those anticipated under the General Plan Update, due to less development in the City.

The proposed project is anticipated to result in a demand for electricity of approximately 137,608,690 kWh/year. Existing conditions would continue under Alternative 1 which would result in a demand of approximately 109,711,395 kWh/year, approximately 28,549,968 kWh/year less than the proposed project. Goal U-5 (Energy Provision and Conservation) of the General Plan Update contains policies that would foster coordination with SCE to ensure that adequate electricity services would be available to the City, thereby resulting in a less-than-significant impact. Although impacts related to electricity use for the proposed project were found to be less than significant, Alternative 1 would be expected to have even fewer impacts to electricity consumption. Under Alternative 1, additional development would not take place within the City and SCE would continue to serve existing uses. Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact. However, Alternative 1 would have a less impact on electricity than the proposed project.

The proposed project is anticipated to result in a demand for natural gas of approximately 74,712,619 cf/month. Existing conditions would continue under Alternative 1 which would result in a demand of approximately 66,273,081 cf/month, approximately 8,439,538 cf/month less than the proposed project. Goal U-5 (Energy Provision and Conservation) of the General Plan contains policies that would foster coordination with SCGC to ensure that adequate natural gas services would be available to the City, thereby resulting in a less-than-significant impact. Buildout of the General Plan Update was found to have less-than-significant impacts related to the use of natural gas. Under Alternative 1, additional development would not take place within the City and SCGC would continue to serve existing uses. Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact, and would have a less impact on natural gas than the proposed project.

Climate Change

An analysis of the potential significant emission of GHG under the proposed project resulted in a determination that it would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. During buildout and operation of the proposed project, GHGs would be emitted as the result of construction activities and deliveries; new direct operational sources, such as operation of emergency generators, natural gas usage, and operation of fleet vehicles; and indirect operational sources, such as production of electricity, steam and chilled water, transport of water, and decomposition of project-related wastes. GHGs would also be emitted by visitors and employees travelling to, from, and within the City. As the proposed project includes goals and policies to comply with all state requirements, impacts associated with GHG emissions during construction and operational activities are considered less than significant. Alternative 1

proposes no new development, making the potential impacts associated with GHG less than significant and less than those of the General Plan Update. However, Alternative 1 would not realize the beneficial effects of compliance with the goals and policies, as well as land use patterns and alternative modes of travel put forth in the General Plan Update that aim to reduce the existing and future GHG Emissions proactively.

■ Attainment of Project Objectives

Under Alternative 1, no new development would occur. The purpose of the General Plan Update is to achieve the Vision established with input from the City’s residents and decision makers. In California, the general plan acts as the constitution for development and functions as a tool for the City to exercise the power of regulating land use given to it by the state. The Vision states that “The City remains a safe place, where people live, work, play, and move about in an economically viable and environmentally sustainable community. Sensitive growth and economic development are a means of perpetuating our quality of life [and that] these are balanced with resource conservation, as the city’s semi-rural ranching past, rich history and unique neighborhoods are respected, and open spaces and surrounding hillsides are preserved”. Under Alternative 1, the portion of the vision regarding resource conservation and preservation would be achieved, but would not include the variety of goals and policies of the General Plan Update to address environmental issues in light of GHGs, and in more sustainable ways. In order for the City to achieve economic development, which would allow the City to further provide a good quality of life to its residents (through increased tax base), new development must occur. Allowing only existing development would likely not allow for an economically viable City, since there would be no new development and no additions to existing development, including businesses and shopping centers, to address market changes and allow the City to be economically competitive. The General Plan Update would set forth a means for this sustainable, and comprehensive growth, whereas Alternative 1 would not. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not fulfill the identified project objectives.

6.3.2 Alternative 2: No Project/Existing General Plan (1993) Buildout

Under Alternative 2, the types and densities of land uses would be those of the existing General Plan (1993). Alternative 2 would serve as a means of comparison between what is allowed under the existing General Plan (1993) and the proposed General Plan Update. The existing General Plan (1993) allows for more than twice the amount of retail uses, more than twice the amount of Office/Business Park uses, and more than four times the amount of Business Park/Manufacturing uses, although the amount of multi-family residential units expected would be less (by approximately 100 units).

■ Potential Impacts

Aesthetics

Under Alternative 2, new development would occur as allowed under the existing General Plan (1993). The existing General Plan (1993) does not officially designate scenic highways within the City of Agoura

Hills. However, a portion of the US 101 Highway, which includes the length of the City, is identified as eligible for the state scenic highway designation. A state scenic highway changes from “eligible” to “officially designated” when the local jurisdiction adopts a scenic corridor protection program, applies to Caltrans for scenic highway approval, receives notification from Caltrans for scenic highway approval, and must also adopt ordinances to preserve the scenic quality of the corridor or document that such regulation already exists in local codes. There are no scenic highways designated by the proposed General Plan Update and no impact (Class III) would occur. Alternative 2 would result in no impact (Class III) to a scenic corridor and impacts would therefore be similar to the proposed project.

Under the existing General Plan (1993), the following roadways are considered valuable scenic resources in the community and are recognized as scenic roadways by the City:

- Reyes Adobe Road
- Kanan Road
- US 101/Ventura Freeway
- Canwood Street
- Roadside Drive
- Driver Avenue
- Thousand Oaks Boulevard

The existing General Plan (1993) Scenic Highways Element sets forth policies (Policy 1.1 through Policy 1.11) to protect locally recognized roadways from aesthetic degradation. However, each of the roadways with valuable scenic resources would remain unchanged as a result of new development under the existing General Plan (1993). Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact, similar to the proposed project.

Impacts related to a substantial change in the visual character of the City under the proposed project were found to be less than significant (Class II), as new development would be required to comply with goals and policies set forth and would improve the overall aesthetic of the City. Alternative 2 assumes new development would occur, as allowed under the existing General Plan (1993), and the Land Use Element sets forth policies to ensure quality urban design but does not include the additional policies related to design of the General Plan Update. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that impacts of Alternative 2 would be less than significant (Class II), and roughly similar to, but slightly greater than, those of the proposed project.

Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant (Class II) impacts to light and glare and nighttime views would be less than significant. Existing urban land uses affect nighttime views but since the existing General Plan (1993) sets forth guidelines relative to the reduction of nighttime glare, impacts would be less than significant (Class II). This would be similar to impacts anticipated under the proposed project.

Overall, aesthetics impacts resulting from Alternative 2 would be slightly greater than the proposed General Plan Update; however, because the existing General Plan (1993) would not provide the same level of benefits as the proposed project, Alternative 2 is considered to have a greater aesthetic impact.

Air Quality

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update was found to be inconsistent with the AQMP for the South Coast Basin. The AQMP is based upon information set forth in the general plans of all cities within the Basin. As such, the existing General Plan (1993) was accounted for in the current AQMP and Alternative 2 would be consistent with this plan, resulting in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. The proposed project would result in a greater impact than Alternative 2 with respect to consistency with the AQMP. However, this is only because the AQMP was based on the existing General Plan (1993). With respect to development, the General Plan Update would result in less severe impacts to air quality than the development assumed under the existing General Plan (1993) and incorporated into the AQMP, due primarily to the lesser amount of development with the General Plan Update. Impacts to air quality caused by the proposed project were analyzed in Section 4.2 of this EIR for both construction and operation. With respect to construction, Alternative 2 would allow new development consistent with the existing General Plan (1993). Similar to the proposed project, precise development plans are unknown at this time for Alternative 2 and exact construction emissions cannot be calculated. Without adequate construction schedules or information regarding project locations and demolition requirements, future economic conditions or market demand, construction emissions for individual projects cannot be quantified; therefore, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to quantify the emissions related to construction activities under Alternative 2, as the amount and timing of each construction event is not known at this time. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in significant and unavoidable (Class I) construction-related air quality impacts. This would be similar to impacts anticipated under the proposed project, but Alternative 2 would likely have greater impacts, since more development overall is allowed.

Implementation of the proposed project could contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation for criteria air pollutants during both construction and operation. Construction impacts result from demolition, excavation, building/utility construction, painting, and paving. Similar to the proposed project, development under Alternative 2 would consist of a series of individual construction projects throughout the buildout of the existing General Plan (1993). It is not possible to accurately analyze those potential future impacts because emissions from construction vary by project. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts even with the incorporation of mitigation measure MM4.2-1. As buildout of Alternative 2 would result in development of more than twice the square footage of the proposed project, it is reasonable to expect that air quality impacts of Alternative 2 would be similar to and likely greater than the construction of the proposed project. Operation of the proposed project was found to have significant air quality impacts as well. The proposed land uses were modeled using the URBEMIS 2007 air modeling software. Operation of the proposed project would generate emissions that exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD for VOC, NO_x, CO, and PM₁₀. Because the existing General Plan (1993) would have more vehicle trips generated compared to the proposed project, it is reasonable to expect that Alternative 2 would also result in significant and unavoidable (Class I) impacts, greater than those of the proposed project.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the region is in nonattainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards. As discussed above, operation of the proposed project would generate emissions that exceed thresholds of significance for VOC, NO_x, CO, and PM₁₀. Because the Basin is in nonattainment

for PM₁₀, VOC, and NO_x, the proposed project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to these criteria pollutants. Based on the amount of development anticipated under full buildout, it would be reasonable to expect, given the above discussion, that Alternative 2 would be cumulatively considerable and result in a significant impact. However, the existing General Plan (1993) would have a greater number of vehicle trips, resulting in greater emissions compared to the proposed project, and would therefore result in a more severe cumulative impact.

Operation of the proposed General Plan Update would increase local traffic volumes above existing conditions, but would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial localized carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations. As discussed in Section 4.2 of this EIR, CO₂ modeled for the proposed project was determined to be well below the relevant standards. Although the traffic generated by the existing General Plan (1993) would be greater than the proposed project, it would be reasonable to expect similar less-than-significant (Class II) impacts resulting from Alternative 2 because CO concentrations for the proposed project were identified to be well below the thresholds.

Similar to the proposed project, construction and operation of development under Alternative 2 would not create objectionable odors. Standard construction requirements would be imposed upon each applicant to minimize odors from construction, and future developments would be required to adhere to the City's solid waste requirements. Therefore, any project-generated refuse would be stored in covered containers and trash removed at regular intervals. This impact would remain less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

Overall, air quality impacts anticipated under Alternative 2 would be similar to the proposed project and many would remain significant and unavoidable (Class I). However, because the existing General Plan (1993) would generate significantly more vehicle trips, it is likely that air quality impacts would be greater than those of the proposed project as mobile emissions would be higher.

Biological Resources

Impacts related to biological resources would be similar to the potential impacts related to the General Plan Update. Biological impacts are determined on a site-by-site, case-by-case basis and would be identified as site-specific development plans are submitted to the City in the future. Although Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts to the General Plan Update, Alternative 2 would not include the many goals and policies of the General Plan Update that enhance and preserve existing biological resources, so impacts would be slightly greater. The proposed General Plan Update was determined to result in less-than-significant (Class II) impacts for each of the thresholds relating to biological resources. Alternative 2 would result in similar less-than-significant (Class II) impacts, although somewhat greater than the General Plan Update.

Cultural Resources

Alternative 2 would allow for development within the City which could result in the potential for demolition of unknown historic and cultural resources. While this was considered unlikely for development allowed under the General Plan Update, the potential for unknown resources does exist and development under the General Plan Update could result in significant (Class I) impacts to historical

resources. The existing General Plan (1993) EIR analyzed the anticipated growth (as would be allowed under Alternative 2) and determined that with incorporation of identified mitigation measures, impacts to cultural resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant (Class II) level. However, because the existing General Plan (1993) does not prevent demolition of potentially historical resources, it is possible that development under Alternative 2 could result in similar construction-related significant impacts. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in a similar impact to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 exposes people and/or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects resulting from strong seismic groundshaking or seismic-related ground failure due to the City's location within the seismically active Southern California region. All impacts associated with geological and soil impacts that were identified for the proposed General Plan Update would also apply to Alternative 2. The risks to people and structures would not be increased regardless of the size or type of development, as adherence to existing regulations would ensure seismic safety to the greatest extent possible. Existing development has been constructed in adherence with applicable laws and regulations. All future development in the City would be required to adhere to the *California Building Code* (CBC) current at the time of application, which includes strict building specifications to ensure structural and foundational stability, similar to the proposed project. In addition, the City would continue to require all future development to prepare and submit a detailed soils and geotechnical analysis for site-specific projects. Therefore, as all future development projects would be required to adhere to applicable regulations, impacts associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic groundshaking, seismic-related ground failure, and landslides would continue to be less than significant (Class II), similar to the proposed project.

Future development under the General Plan Update, as well as Alternative 2, would result in ground-disrupting activities, such as excavation and trenching for foundations and utilities; soil compaction and site grading; and the erection of new structures, all of which would temporarily disturb soils. This could result in soil erosion; however, applicants for future specific development projects would be required to submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) for coverage under the Statewide General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit and must comply with all applicable requirements, including the preparation of a SWPPP, applicable NPDES Regulations, and best management practices (BMP). Such compliance, in addition to implementation of existing code requirements, would ensure that erosion and other soil instability impacts resulting from future construction would be less than significant (Class II). Impacts of Alternative 2 would be similar to those identified for the proposed project because all development would be held to the same regulations.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The City is located within an urban, developed area. Both Alternative 2 and the proposed project would involve the use of hazardous materials in the form of basic cleaning materials and landscaping chemicals as well as hazardous substances used by businesses in the City on an ongoing basis. Future development under the General Plan Update would also involve the use of hazardous materials during construction activities, and with more development allowed, may increase the amount of hazardous materials used in

the City on an ongoing basis. However, development under the General Plan Update would be required to comply with applicable laws and regulations that would reduce the risk of hazardous materials use, transportation, and disposal through the implementation of established safety practices, procedures, and reporting requirements. Alternative 2 would allow for development under the existing General Plan (1993), which would increase the use of hazardous materials, such as those noted above. Development allowed under Alternative 2 would be required to comply with all applicable and current regulations regarding the use, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials and so would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. Compliance with existing regulations as well as policies within the existing General Plan (1993) would minimize the risks associated with the exposure of sensitive receptors, including schools, to hazardous materials. However, because Alternative 2 allows for substantially more industrial/manufacturing land uses than does the General Plan Update, impacts could be greater than the proposed project but would still remain less than significant (Class II).

Hydrology and Water Quality

The proposed project was found to have less-than-significant (Class II) impacts related to a potential violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements for construction and operational activities. Compliance with NPDES permit requirements, the 2005 UWMP, and General Plan Update policies under Goal S-1 (Protection from Flood Hazards), Goal NR-6 (Water Quality), and Goal U-3 (Storm Drain System) would reduce the risk of water degradation within the City from the operation of new developments to the maximum extent practicable. Alternative 2 would allow for new development consistent with the existing General Plan (1993). Based on the allowable uses, and the requirements to comply with NPDES permit requirements, the 2005 UWMP, and the existing General Plan (1993) policies, Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact, similar to the proposed project. However, the existing General Plan (1993) allows for substantially more square footage than the proposed project and does not include the variety of General Plan Update policies to further encourage favorable water quality and so could therefore result in greater impacts than those anticipated under the General Plan Update.

Under the proposed project, impacts related to depletion of groundwater supplies or interference with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level were found to be less than significant (Class II). All existing land uses and future development contemplated in the General Plan Update would utilize water from LVMWD, which receives its potable water from MWD. As Alternative 2 would also utilize water from the LVMWD and would not deplete groundwater sources or interfere with recharge, Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact, similar to the General Plan Update.

Development under the proposed General Plan Update would result in alterations to drainage, such as changes in ground surface permeability via paving, changes in topography via grading and excavation. However, policies in the General Plan Update would require implementation of BMPs, incorporation of stormwater detention facilities as necessary, adequate design of drainage facilities to minimize adverse effects on water quality, and minimization of increases in impervious areas. Impacts would be less than significant (Class II) for the General Plan Update.

Alternative 2 would allow for development consistent with the existing General Plan (1993). This development would be required to comply with BMPs and other stormwater regulations at the time of application, reducing potential impacts to a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. This impact would be similar to that anticipated under the proposed project.

Impacts related to the alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a waterway or the substantial increase in surface runoff resulting in flooding were found to be less than significant (Class II) with respect to the General Plan Update. In addition, impacts related to the exceedance of stormwater drainage systems was determined to be less than significant (Class II) for the proposed project. All development under the proposed project would comply with the proposed General Plan Update policies, NPDES regulations, CDFG regulations, as well as the preparation of and compliance with a SUSMP which would reduce the risk of flooding from drainage alterations to less-than-significant (Class II) levels. Alternative 2 would allow for types and quantities of development consistent with the existing General Plan (1993). This development would comply with any hydrology-related policies in the existing General Plan (1993), NPDES regulations, CDFG regulations, as well as the preparation of and compliance with a SUSMP which would reduce the risk of flooding from drainage alterations to less-than-significant (Class II) levels. This impact would be similar to that anticipated under the proposed project.

As discussed in Impact 4.7-5, the capacity of the existing storm drain infrastructure throughout the City is generally sufficient to handle existing stormwater flows. Under the proposed project, most new development would occur as infill development and redevelopment in areas that are currently developed or approved for development as part of a specific plan. Additionally, compliance with Policy U-3.3 (Drainage Plans and Studies) in the General Plan Update requires developers to submit a watershed drainage plan and study which would reduce impacts to less-than-significant (Class II) levels. Alternative 2 would allow for development consistent with the existing General Plan (1993) for which the existing infrastructure is generally adequate. This impact would be considered less than significant (Class II). However, there are existing conditions. Additionally, Alternative 2 would result in substantially more development than the proposed project and could result in more substantial impacts, although impacts would still be considered less than significant.

The 100-year flood zone is primarily contained within Lindero Canyon, Liberty Canyon, Palo Comado Canyon, and Medea Creek and adjacent to Lindero Lake. However, some existing residential uses are located within the 100-year flood zone. Alternative 2 includes development under the existing General Plan (1993) and could result in locating structures within the 100-year flood zone. However, compliance with the existing General Plan (1993) policies and requirements would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant (Class II) impact, similar to the proposed project.

The probability of dam failure in the area is low. Development under the proposed General Plan Update would not increase the risk of dam failure, although it would increase the number of persons and amount of development exposed to this hazard. However, implementation of the flood protection policies contained in the proposed General Plan Update, and compliance with the City's existing Floodplain Ordinance, as described in Impact 4.7-8, would ensure that the proposed project would result in less-than-significant (Class II) impacts due to dam failure. Alternative 2 would allow for development under

the existing General Plan (1993) which would increase the amount of development and the number of people exposed to a potential hazard beyond that of the General Plan Update. However, implementation of flood protection policies in the existing General Plan (1993), as well as compliance with the City's Floodplain Ordinance would reduce the impacts of Alternative 2 to less than significant (Class II). Although the impact of Alternative 2 would be less than significant (Class II), impacts could be greater than those identified under the proposed project.

The potential risk associated with inundation by tsunami would be less than significant due to the City's elevation and distance from the Pacific Ocean. This impact is the same for Alternative 2 and the General Plan Update. In addition, there are no water bodies of significance size or elevation that could cause loss due to seiche. Potential risks from mudflow (i.e., mudslide, debris flow) would be considered prevalent, as slopes of 10 percent or more exist throughout the City. Prolonged rainfall during certain storm events would saturate and could eventually loosen soil, resulting in slope failure. However, this impact would be the same for Alternative 2 and the proposed project, less than significant (Class II).

Overall, impacts to hydrology under Alternative 2 would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update.

Land Use

Alternative 2 consists of development as allowed by the existing General Plan (1993). The existing General Plan (1993) will remain the underlying land use regulatory document. Implementation of Alternative 2 would not result in impacts related to land use nor would it conflict with existing land use policies or plans. Rather, Alternative 2 would not change existing land use designations and would allow future growth to occur. Alternative 2 would not divide an established community, nor would it conflict with a habitat conservation plan, as there are none in the City. Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant (Class II) impacts to land use, similar to the General Plan Update.

Noise

Implementation of Alternative 2 would involve the use of construction equipment similar to that of the General Plan Update, which was determined to result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. Even though more development and therefore more construction noise would result from Alternative 2, impacts are still anticipated to be less than significant (Class II).

The General Plan Update was found to have less-than-significant impacts related to causing a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise. Implementation of Alternative 2 could potentially have greater noise impacts since buildout of the existing General Plan (1993) is expected to generate nearly twice the number of daily trips than those of the General Plan Update. This could be a significant and unavoidable (Class I) impact due to the increase in vehicle trips and ambient noise levels, which is greater than the impact anticipated from the proposed project.

Based on noise measurements and on existing and future noise modeling, noise levels in excess of City standards currently occur and would continue to occur in many residential areas and other noise-sensitive uses throughout the City. Traffic noise would be higher or louder in the future than it is now along all

freeways and highways, and along most major arterial and collector roads in Agoura Hills due to development both inside and outside of the City. Therefore, impacts due to Alternative 2 would be significant and unavoidable. As Alternative 2 would result in a greater number of vehicle trips than the General Plan Update, Alternative 2 would result in a more severe noise impact than the proposed project, even though both would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Impacts related to vibration from construction activities associated with the General Plan Update were determined to be significant and unavoidable (Class I). Operational impacts resulting from vibration were found to be less than significant for the General Plan Update. Both construction and operational activities of Alternative 2 would be similar to the proposed project, although somewhat greater, and impacts would be similar. That is, there would be significant and unavoidable (Class I) impacts for construction and less-than-significant (Class II) impacts for operations. Impacts related to groundborne noise would be similar to, although slightly less than, the General Plan Update. That is, both would result in less-than-significant impacts.

Population and Housing

The General Plan Update was found to result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact related to inducing substantial growth even though development would slightly exceed estimates provided by SCAG for the year 2035. Alternative 2 includes development previously approved in the existing General Plan (1993). This plan, as well as the projections for development within, was incorporated into the current SCAG plans and projections. As such, Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact with respect to population and housing. However, because the General Plan Update would technically exceed the SCAG projections, although it would result in a less-than-significant impact, this impact would be slightly greater than the less-than-significant impact for Alternative 2.

Public Services

Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in slightly greater impacts to public services than the proposed General Plan Update, resulting from more development, but the impacts would be similar to that of the General Plan Update, less than significant (Class II).

Current conditions indicate that the response times for police and fire services are at acceptable levels and impacts were determined to be less than significant (Class II) for the General Plan Update. Development under Alternative 2 would occur consistent with the existing General Plan (1993). Policy 1.1-6 (and its associated Implementation Measures) in the existing General Plan (1993) would ensure that adequate emergency and police and fire services are provided to the City commensurate with new development, resulting in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact, similar to the proposed project.

According to Section 4.11 of this EIR, all of the public schools in Agoura Hills are operating below maximum capacity. Impacts of the General Plan Update were found to be less than significant (Class II). Pursuant to Policy 3.1 of the existing General Plan (1993) (and associated Implementation Measures), quality school services would be available to the residents of the City and potential impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant (Class II) level. Alternative 2 would result in a similar less-than-

significant (Class II) impact, even though there would be more students generated by the additional development than in the General Plan Update.

Impacts to libraries as a result of Alternative 2 would be similar to that of the General Plan Update: less than significant (Class II). Circulation levels have remained consistent over the past few years. Based on an anticipated population increase under the General Plan Update, the proposed project could increase demand on library services, but this would still result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. Alternative 2 would allow for development consistent with the existing General Plan (1993) which could increase population within the library service area. However, it would also result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact.

Recreation

The existing General Plan (1993) recommends a standard of eight acres of park and open space land per 1,000 residents. Based on the existing City population of 23,337 residents, the current park inventory of 73.5 acres provides approximately 3.15 acres of parkland per 1,000 persons.

Full build out of the proposed General Plan Update would increase population in the City and therefore demand on recreation facilities. However, under the General Plan Update, Policy CS-1.1 (Service Level Goals), Policy CS-1.2 (Cooperation with External Agencies), Policy CS-1.8 (Facilities in Residential Developments), Policy CS-3.1 (Use Agreements with Other Agencies), and Policy CS-3.2 (Work with Surrounding Communities) would require the development of park and recreation facilities, commensurate with new development, and impacts to recreation facilities would be reduced to less-than-significant (Class II) levels.

Alternative 2 would also result in an increase in population in the City, although perhaps to a lesser extent than the General Plan Update given that the General Plan Update identifies more multi-family residential units. However, the Parks and Recreation Element of the existing General Plan (1993) puts forth Policy 1.1, Policy 1.3, Policy 2.1, Policy 2.2, Policy 2.3, Policy 3.1, Policy 3.4, and Policy 4.1 (and associated Implementation Measures) that would require the development of park and recreation facilities, commensurate with new development. Impacts of Alternative 2 would be reduced to less-than-significant (Class II) levels. Therefore, impacts of Alternative 2 would be similar to those anticipated under the proposed project, less than significant.

Transportation

The General Plan Update would generate a smaller increase in AM peak hour trips (3,026 trips versus 7,548 trips) and a significantly smaller increase in PM peak hour trips (4,775 trips versus 10,364 trips) and daily trips (45,302 trips versus 100,686 trips) than Alternative 2, as shown in the traffic study prepared for the General Plan Update (Appendix B). Thus, it would be reasonable to assume that Alternative 2 would result in greater impacts than those of the General Plan Update. The General Plan Update would result in significant unavoidable impacts due to substantial increases in congestion on roadways. Alternative 2 was determined to operate below LOS C along 16 roadway segments, thereby resulting in a significant and unavoidable (Class I) impact. Additionally, without the beneficial roadway improvements that would

take place under the General Plan Update, impacts under Alternative 2 would not be improved. Therefore, Alternative 2 would have greater impacts than the proposed project.

Impacts to the County's CMP in the region were found to be less than significant for the proposed project and would be similar for Alternative 2. Impacts related to increasing roadway hazards were found to be less than significant for the proposed project. Similar less than significant design hazard impacts would be expected of Alternative 2.

Impacts related to emergency access were found to be less than significant for the General Plan Update as standard development procedures require that future development plans be submitted to the City for review and approval. This process would ensure that all new development has adequate emergency access and is in compliance with acceptable regulations at the time of application. This same level of compliance would be required for development under Alternative 2, resulting in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact, similar to the proposed project.

The General Plan Update would result in no impact to alternative modes of transportation. The existing General Plan (1993) does not include extensive policies regarding alternative modes of transportation. Additionally, Alternative 2 would not benefit from the proactive policies provided in the General Plan Update. Therefore, while Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact to alternative modes of transportation, impacts would be greater than the proposed project.

Impacts related to parking were found to be less than significant for the proposed project. Alternative 2 would be subject to all parking requirements set forth in the City's Zoning Code, which would ensure that parking impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant (Class II) level. This impact would be similar to the proposed project.

Overall, impacts related to transportation and traffic would be greater than those identified for the proposed project.

Utilities

Water and sewer service is provided to the City by the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD). According to the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the total existing water demand for the City is approximately 29,270 AFY, which is the sum of the demands of all land types within the City. However, LVMWD currently has a supply of 36,590 available to the City, representing a surplus of 7,320 AFY. Development under Alternative 2 involves the ultimate buildout of the existing General Plan (1993) and would demand approximately 4,627,694 gallons per day, or approximately 5,184 AFY. This is an increase of approximately 12,623 gallons per day or 14.1 AFY over the proposed project and an increase of approximately 374 AFY over existing conditions. This increase would likely be adequately handled by the existing surplus in water provision. When the existing General Plan (1993) was analyzed pursuant to CEQA, impacts related to future water supply were determined to be less than significant because Policy 5.1 and Implementation Measure 5.1-6 of the Public Facilities, Utilities, and Services Element, set forth a strategy to ensure adequate water supply for the proposed buildout. Due to a greater level of future development under Alternative 2 than the proposed project, impacts under Alternative 2

would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, although still less than significant (Class II), as is the case for the General Plan Update.

Impacts to the wastewater system resulting from the General Plan Update were found to be less than significant (Class II). Buildout of the General Plan Update would be expected to generate approximately 3,839,552 gallons of wastewater per day. The Tapia Water Reclamation Facility, which treats wastewater from the City, has a current capacity of 16 million gallons per day. Currently, the facility accepts approximately 9.5 million gallons per day. Alternative 2 would generate approximately 4,367,199 gallons per day of wastewater, an increase of approximately 527,648 gallons per day over the General Plan Update and approximately 1,011,800 gallons per day over existing conditions. Increased wastewater generation due to implementation of the existing General Plan (1993) could be accommodated within the existing treatment infrastructure; therefore expansion of existing facilities would not be required. Policy 6.1 and Implementation Measure 6.1-4 of the existing General Plan (1993) would ensure that adequate sewer services are provided commensurate with new development. Since the existing General Plan (1993) allows significantly more overall square footage, impacts as a result of Alternative 2 would be greater than the proposed project, although still less than significant (Class II).

The City's Solid Waste Management Program staff coordinates the collection of waste for the City of Agoura Hills, contracting with independent haulers to pick-up and dispose of waste throughout the City. The General Plan Update is anticipated to generate approximately 186,041 pounds of solid waste per day and was determined to result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact to solid waste. Due to the increase in development, Alternative 2 would generate approximately 271,405 pounds of solid waste per day, an increase of approximately 85,364 pounds per day over the General Plan Update and an increase of approximately 117,463 pounds per day above existing conditions. Based on a greater level of future development under Alternative 2 than the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have greater impacts. However, Policy 8.1-4 of the existing General Plan (1993) would ensure that impacts remain less than significant (Class II) as buildout of the existing General Plan (1993) occurs, similar to the conclusion for the proposed project.

The proposed project is anticipated to demand approximately 137,608,689 kWh/year of electricity. Alternative 2 would result in a demand of 184,148,249 kWh/year, representing an increase in electricity demand of approximately 46,539,561 kWh/year over the proposed project. Policy 9.1 and Policy 9.2 of the existing General Plan (1993) require coordination with SCE to ensure adequate electricity services would be available to the City and impacts would be less than significant (Class II). Although impacts related to electricity use would be less than significant under Alternative 2, the electricity use under the existing General Plan (1993) would be substantially higher and result in a greater impact than the proposed project.

The proposed project is anticipated to demand approximately 74,712,619 cf/month of natural gas. Alternative 2 would result in a demand of approximately 83,018,819 cf/month of natural gas, representing an increase in natural gas demand of approximately 8,306,200 cf/month over the proposed project. This would equate to a 13 percent increase in natural gas demand for the City, and would be considered to be a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. Policy 9.1 and Policy 9.2 of the existing General Plan (1993) require coordination with SCGC to ensure adequate natural gas services would be available

to the City, resulting in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. Therefore, although still less than significant, Alternative 2 would have a greater natural gas impact because of the greater level of development and demand for natural gas.

For both gas and electricity, Alternative 2 would not realize the conservation benefits of implementation of the several policies of the General Plan Update related to reducing energy use.

Climate Change

An analysis of the potential significant emission of GHG under the proposed project resulted in a determination that it would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. During buildout and operation of the proposed project, GHGs would be emitted as the result of construction activities and deliveries; new direct operational sources, such as operation of emergency generators, natural gas usage, and operation of fleet vehicles; and indirect operational sources, such as production of electricity, steam and chilled water, transport of water, and decomposition of project-related wastes. GHGs would also be emitted by visitors and employees travelling to, from, and within the City. As the proposed project includes implementation measures, as well as goals and policies to comply with all state GHG requirements, impacts associated with GHG emissions during construction and operational activities are considered less than significant. Alternative 2 includes new development as allowed under the existing General Plan (1993), which would result in a greater amount of development than the proposed project. The existing General Plan (1993) does not have policies aimed at reducing GHG. However, all development moving forward would be required to comply with all Climate Change Action Team (CCAT) and similar policies, and would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. It is worth noting that without implementation of the proposed General Plan Update, proactive goals and policies related to reducing GHG through programs, land use patterns and alternative modes of transportation, which would help the City to comply with AB32 would likely not be implemented. As a result, Alternative 2 is expected to have greater impacts than the proposed project.

■ Attainment of Project Objectives

Under Alternative 2, all development would occur according to the existing General Plan (1993). However, the existing General Plan (1993) was adopted over 17 years ago and the needs and desires of the community have changed since then. The purpose of the General Plan Update is to achieve the Vision established with input from the City's residents and decision makers. In California, the general plan acts as the constitution for development and functions as a tool for the City to exercise the power of regulating land use given to it by the state. The Vision states that "The City remains a safe place, where people live, work, play, and move about in an economically viable and environmentally sustainable community. Sensitive growth and economic development are a means of perpetuating our quality of life [and that] these are balanced with resource conservation, as the city's semi-rural ranching past, rich history and unique neighborhoods are respected, and open spaces and surrounding hillsides are preserved."

The existing General Plan (1993) would realize some of same objectives of the Vision as the General Plan Update. However, Alternative 2 would effectively be "business as usual" and would not fully meet

the intent or the letter of the Vision. Examples of how Alternative 2 would not meet the Vision objectives include (1) The existing General Plan (1993) would not necessarily be environmentally sustainable, as the proactive and sustainable goals and policies of the General Plan Update would not be implemented; (2) While the existing General Plan (1993) would support more development than the General Plan Update, the General Plan Update goals and policies that promote revitalization and renovation of existing centers and businesses to make them more viable would not be realized; and (3) growth under Alternative 2 would be less sensitive than the General Plan Update because it lacks goals and policies to promote sensitivity in development.

6.3.3 Alternative 3: Decreased Density

As discussed in DEIR Section 4.13 (Transportation/Traffic), project-related traffic would worsen traffic along 16 roadway segments. It was determined that a less intensive development plan may help to reduce these impacts. Project-related traffic impacts were categorized in two primary scenarios: (1) roadway segments that currently operate at sub-standard levels that would continue to operate at substandard levels in the future and (2) Roadway segments that currently operate at acceptable levels that would operate at substandard levels in the future with implementation of the General Plan Update. Alternative 3 seeks to reduce the impacts as categorized under Scenario 2 above, where a nexus is evident between growth under the General Plan Update and identified traffic impacts. As such, 4 TAZs were selected within which development would be reduced. Under Alternative 3, development within TAZs 6, 8, 10, and 12 would be reduced by 25 percent except the following, which was not reduced: (1) residential areas outside of Subarea 5; and (2) the Agoura Village Specific Plan. These TAZs were selected as targeted reduction areas due to the amount of existing and projected traffic that occurs or would occur within the TAZ in which they are located. In addition, reduced traffic tends to generate less air and noise pollution. Development levels proposed under Alternative 3 are shown in Table 6-1 (Comparison of Alternatives) and would result in 19 fewer multi-family units, 174,452 fewer square feet of retail, 97,811 fewer square feet of office space, and 56,831 fewer square feet of manufacturing/business park uses than the proposed project. The reduction of traffic impacts would also reduce impacts to air quality and noise.

■ Potential Impacts

Aesthetics

Under Alternative 3, impacts would be the same as the General Plan Update. All of the goals and policies to preserve aesthetics, such as Goal NR-1 (Open Space System) through Goal NR-4 (Natural Areas) to reduce light and glare would apply. Land uses would occur in the same manner as under the General Plan Update with similar use types and locations, but with reduced density in Subareas 6, 8, 10, and 12. Therefore, impacts of Alternative 3 would be less than significant (Class II), similar to the proposed project.

Air Quality

Implementation of the proposed project was found to be inconsistent with the AQMP for the South Coast Basin due to the projected number of people, homes, and jobs occurring under the General Plan Update. Alternative 3 includes a land use pattern similar to the proposed project but with a reduced development intensity in TAZs 6, 8, 10, and 12. Development in these areas is primarily office and industrial, and therefore only reduces the amount of housing units by 19 multi family dwelling units. This reduction does not bring Alternative 3 in line with the SCAG projections for 2035. Therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable (Class I) and similar to the proposed project. However, it is important to note that this relates to the fact that the AQMP was based on the development program of the existing General Plan (1993). With respect to development, the General Plan Update would result in less severe impacts to air quality than the development assumed under the existing General Plan (1993) and incorporated into the AQMP.

Implementation of the proposed project could contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation for criteria air pollutants during both construction and operation. Construction impacts result from demolition, excavation, building/utility construction, painting, and paving. Similar to the proposed project, development under Alternative 3 would consist of a series of individual construction projects. It is not possible to accurately analyze those potential future impacts because emissions from construction vary by project. Policy LU-5.1 (Sustainable Building Practices) promotes sustainable building practices to reduce energy and water consumption, reduce toxic and chemical pollution, and the generation of waste. Policy LU-5.2 (Existing Structure Reuse) encourages the retention of existing structures and promotes their adaptive reuse and renovation of existing buildings with “green” building technologies in accordance with a green building standard such as Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED™). Policy LU-5.4 (Sustainable Land Development Practices) promotes land development practices that reduce energy and water consumption, pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, and wastes. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts even with the incorporation of the aforementioned policies and mitigation measure MM4.2-1 identified in DEIR Section 4.2 (Air Quality). Alternative 3 allows for development of a similar type and location as the General Plan Update. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that air quality impacts would be similar for construction of the proposed General Plan Update. The proposed land uses were modeled using the URBEMIS 2007 air modeling software. Operation of the proposed project would generate emissions that exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD for VOC, NO_x, CO, and PM₁₀, resulting in a significant and unavoidable (Class I) impact. While Alternative 3 would result in slightly fewer vehicle trips than the General Plan Update, it would still result in significant and unavoidable (Class I) impacts.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. As discussed above, operation of the proposed project would generate emissions that exceed thresholds of significance for VOC, NO_x, CO, and PM₁₀. Because the Basin is in nonattainment for PM₁₀, VOC, and NO_x, the proposed project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to these criteria pollutants. Based on the amount of development anticipated under full buildout, it would be reasonable to expect, given the above discussion, that Alternative 3 would be cumulatively

considerable and result in a significant impact (Class I). However, since densities under Alternative 3 are less than the proposed project, impacts would be to a lesser degree.

Operation of the proposed General Plan Update would increase local traffic volumes above existing conditions, but would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial localized carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations. As discussed in DEIR Section 4.2 (Air Quality), CO₂ modeled for the proposed project was determined to be well below the relevant standards. Traffic generated by Alternative 3 would be less than the proposed project, and so it would be reasonable to expect similar less-than-significant (Class II) impacts resulting from Alternative 3.

Similar to the proposed project, construction and operation of development under Alternative 3 would not create objectionable odors. Standard construction requirements would be imposed upon each applicant to minimize odors from construction, and future developments would be required to adhere to the City's solid waste regulations. Therefore, any project-generated refuse would be stored in covered containers and trash removed at regular intervals. This impact would remain less than significant (Class II), similar to the proposed General Plan Update.

Overall, air quality impacts anticipated from Alternative 3 would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update and would remain significant and unavoidable (Class I). However, as Alternative 3 would generate fewer vehicle trips, it is likely that impacts would be lesser than those anticipated under the proposed General Plan Update.

Biological Resources

Potential impacts related to biological resources would be similar to those of the General Plan Update even though Alternative 3 would result in slightly less development, because potential impacts have little relation to the land use types or density. The proposed General Plan Update was determined to result in less-than-significant (Class II) impacts for each of the thresholds relating to biological resources. Alternative 3 would result in similar less-than-significant (Class II) impacts.

Cultural Resources

Alternative 3 would allow for development within the City that could result in the potential for demolition of unknown historic resources even with implementation of Goal HR-1 (City that Values its Historic Resources) and Policy HR-1.1 (Appreciation and Protection of Historic Resources), Policy HR-1.2 (Maintenance of Historic Resources) and Implementation Measure HR-7. While this was considered unlikely for development allowed under the General Plan Update, the potential for unknown historic resources does exist. This potential historic impact is significant and unavoidable (Class I) for the General Plan Update. Because the same potential exists for Alternative 3, this impact would also be significant and unavoidable (Class I) for Alternative 3. Goal HR-3 (City that Recognizes its Prehistoric Resources) and Policy HR-3.1 (Recognition of Resources) through Policy HR-3.3 (Human Remains) would address potential impacts to prehistoric resources from the General Plan Update and result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. While Alternative 3 would reduce the density of development in certain locations, it would not eliminate particular areas of the City from potential development. Therefore, impacts would be similar to the General Plan Update and less than significant (Class II).

Geology and Soils

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 exposes people and/or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects resulting from strong seismic groundshaking or seismic-related ground failure due to the City's location within the seismically active Southern California region. All impacts associated with geological and soil impacts that were identified for the proposed General Plan Update would also apply to Alternative 3. The risks to people and structures would not be increased regardless of the size or type of development, as adherence to existing regulations would ensure seismic safety to the greatest extent possible. Alternative 3 includes a reduction of the development intensity proposed in the General Plan Update but development would still be required to comply with General Plan Update policies. Applicable goals and policies regarding geology and soils include Goal NR-8 (Mineral Resources), Goal S-2 (Protection from Geologic Hazards), and Goal LU-3 (City of Open Space), and would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant (Class II) level. All future development in the project area would be required to adhere to the most recent *California Building Code* (CBC) current at the time of application, which includes strict building specifications to ensure structural and foundational stability, similar to the proposed project. The City would also continue to require all future development to prepare and submit a detailed soils and geotechnical analysis for site-specific projects. Therefore, because future development projects would be required to adhere to applicable goals, policies, and regulations, impacts associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic groundshaking, seismic-related ground failure, and landslides would continue to be less than significant (Class II), similar to the proposed project.

Future development under the General Plan Update, as well as Alternative 3, would result in ground-disrupting activities, such as excavation and trenching for foundations and utilities; soil compaction and site grading; and the erection of new structures, all of which would temporarily disturb soils. This could result in soil erosion; however, applicants for future specific development projects would be required to submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) for coverage under the Statewide General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit and must comply with all applicable requirements, including the preparation of a SWPPP, applicable NPDES regulations, and best management practices (BMP). Such compliance, in addition to implementation of existing code requirements, would ensure that erosion and other soil instability impacts resulting from future construction would be less than significant (Class II). Impacts of Alternative 3 would be similar to those identified for the proposed project because they would both be subject to the same regulations.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The City is located within an urban developed area. Thus, the proposed project would involve the use of hazardous materials in the form of basic cleaning materials and landscaping chemicals as well as hazardous substances used by businesses in the City on an ongoing basis. Future development under the General Plan Update would be required to comply with applicable laws and regulations that would reduce the risk of hazardous materials use, transportation, and disposal through the implementation of established safety practices, procedures, and reporting requirements. Continued compliance with existing regulations would minimize the risks associated with the exposure of sensitive receptors, including schools, to hazardous materials. Development allowed under Alternative 3 would be required to comply with all applicable and current regulations regarding the use, transportation, and disposal of hazardous

materials. Although Alternative 3 would allow less development than the proposed project, it would also result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact, similar to that identified for the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The proposed project was found to have less-than-significant (Class II) impacts related to a potential violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements for construction and operational activities. Compliance with NPDES permits requirements, the 2005 UWMP, and proposed General Plan policies under Goal S-1 (Protection from Flood Hazards), Goal NR-6 (Water Quality), and Goal U-3 (Stormdrain System) would reduce the risk of water degradation within the City from the operation of new developments to the maximum extent practicable. Alternative 3 would allow for development of similar types and locations as the General Plan Update but with a reduced density in some locations. Therefore, impacts would be expected to be similar to those of the General Plan Update. Violation of waste discharge requirements or water quality standards would be minimized and would be less than significant (Class II).

Impacts related to substantially depleting groundwater supplies or interfering substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level were found to be less than significant (Class II) for the General Plan Update. All existing land uses and future development contemplated in the General Plan Update would utilize water from the LVMWD, which receives its potable water from MWD. As Alternative 3 would allow for development of similar types and in similar locations to the General Plan Update but with reduced densities in TAZs 6, 8, 10, and 12, impacts of Alternative 3 would be less than significant (Class II). Therefore, Alternative 3 would have similar but lesser impacts than the proposed project.

Development under the proposed General Plan Update would result in alterations to drainage, such as changes in ground surface permeability via paving, changes in topography via grading and excavation. However, polices in the General Plan Update would require implementation of BMPs, incorporation of stormwater detention facilities as necessary, adequate design of drainage facilities to minimize adverse effects on water quality, and minimization of increases in impervious areas. Impacts would be less than significant (Class II). Alternative 3 allows for future development similar to the General Plan Update but at a reduced density in TAZs 6, 8, 10 and 12. Compliance with the General Plan policies and implementation of BMPs similar to the proposed project would ensure that Alternative 3 also results in less-than-significant (Class II) impacts.

Impacts related to the alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or the substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site was found to be less than significant (Class II) for the General Plan Update. In addition, impacts related to the exceedance of stormwater drainage systems were determined to be less than significant (Class II) for the proposed project. All development under the proposed project would comply with the proposed General Plan Update policies, NPDES regulations, CDFG regulations, as well as the preparation of and compliance with a SUSMP which would reduce the risk of flooding from drainage alterations to less-than-significant (Class II) levels. Alternative 3 includes development of similar types and in similar locations to the proposed project but

with reduced densities in some locations. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than significant (Class II), similar to the proposed project.

Under the proposed project, most new development would occur as infill development and redevelopment in areas that are currently developed or approved for development as part of a specific plan. Compliance with Policy U-3.3 (Drainage Plans and Studies) in the General Plan Update requires developers to submit a watershed drainage plan and study which would reduce impacts to less-than-significant (Class II) levels. Alternative 3 includes development of similar types and in similar locations to the proposed project but with reduced densities in some locations. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than significant (Class II), similar to the proposed project.

The 100-year flood zone is primarily contained within Lindero Canyon, Liberty Canyon, Palo Comado Canyon, and Medea Creek and adjacent to Lindero Lake. However, some existing residential uses are located within the 100-year flood zone. Alternative 3 includes development similar to the proposed General Plan Update and could result in locating structures (including residential uses) within the 100-year flood zone. However, compliance with General Plan Update policies such as Policy S-1.4 (SEMS Plan), Policy S-1.5 (Preservation of Flood Plains), Policy S-1.6 (Floodplain Requirements), and Policy S-1.7 (Flood Mitigation Design), as well as FEMA regulations, would ensure that flows are not substantially impeded or redirected. Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact, similar to the proposed project.

The probability of dam failure in the area is low. Development under the proposed General Plan Update would not increase the risk of dam failure, although it would increase the number of persons and amount of development exposed to this hazard. However, implementation of the flood protection policies contained in the proposed General Plan Update, and compliance with the City's existing Floodplain Ordinance, would ensure that the proposed project would result in less-than-significant (Class II) impacts due to dam failure. Alternative 3 would allow for development of similar types of land uses and in similar locations as the General Plan Update but at reduced densities in some areas. Alternative 3 would allow for fewer residential units, thereby reducing the number of people exposed to potential hazards. While this is a small number of people, it still represents a lesser impact than the General Plan Update. Thus, risks associated with flooding, including dam failure inundation, would be considered somewhat less than that of the General Plan Update but both would result in less-than-significant (Class II) impacts, given compliance with local, state, and federal regulations, as well as General Plan Update policies.

The potential risk associated with inundation by tsunami is less than significant due to the City's elevation and distance from the Pacific Ocean. This impact is the same for both Alternative 3 and the General Plan Update. In addition, there are no water bodies of significant size or elevation that could cause loss due to seiche. Potential risks from mudflow (i.e., mudslide, debris flow) would be considered prevalent, as slopes of 10 percent or more exist throughout the City. Prolonged rainfall during certain storm events would saturate and could eventually loosen soil, resulting in slope failure. However, this impact would be the same for Alternative 3 and the proposed project, and would be less than significant (Class II).

Overall, impacts to hydrology under Alternative 3 would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update.

Land Use

Implementation of Alternative 3 would not result in impacts related to land use nor would it conflict with land use plans in place in the City. Alternative 3 would allow for land uses of similar type and in similar patterns to that proposed under the General Plan Update. However, densities would be reduced in TAZs 6, 8, 10 and 12. Alternative 3 would not divide an established community, nor would it conflict with a habitat conservation plan, as there are none in the City. The proposed project was determined to result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact due to conflict with an established land use plan or policies. Therefore, Alternative 3, which is similar in type and land use patterns, would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact, similar to the proposed project.

Noise

Implementation of Alternative 3 would involve the use of construction equipment similar to that of the General Plan Update, although perhaps to a lesser extent, given the reduced development densities. The General Plan Update was determined to result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in a similar impact related to construction noise. Similarly, less-than-significant (Class II) impacts related to an increase in ambient noise would occur as a result of Alternative 3. Therefore, impacts would be similar to that of the General Plan Update.

The General Plan Update was found to have less-than-significant (Class II) impacts related to causing a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise. Land uses in Alternative 3 would be the same as those proposed under the General Plan Update but with lower densities in select areas (TAZs 6,8,10, and 12). Therefore, impacts resulting from Alternative 3 would be expected to be less than those resulting from the General Plan Update, and would be considered less than significant (Class II).

Based on noise measurements and on existing and future noise modeling, noise levels in excess of City standards currently occur and would continue to occur in many residential areas and other noise-sensitive uses throughout the City. Traffic noise would be higher or louder in the future than it is now along all freeways and highways, and along most major arterial and collector roads in Agoura Hills due to development both inside and outside of the City. Therefore, while Alternative 3 would result in slightly less development densities in select areas, impacts due to Alternative 3 would still be significant and unavoidable (Class I) because the condition currently exists. This impact would be similar to that anticipated under the proposed project. Implementation of the General Plan Update policies would, in most cases, reduce to a less-than-significant level the exterior noise levels and/or increments on future noise-sensitive land uses that could be developed under the proposed General Plan Update (Goal N-1 [Land Use Conflicts], Goal N-2 [Motor Vehicles], and Goal N-3 [Non Transportation Related Noise]). However, the proposed policies would do little to remediate or reduce the magnitude of noise effects on many existing noise-sensitive land uses in areas with current high noise exposures or where substantial noise increases are expected. Therefore, the continuing exposure of existing noise-sensitive land uses to noise levels in excess of City standards or to substantial noise increases as a result of the future growth

under both the General Plan Update and Alternative 3 are considered a significant unavoidable impact (Class I).

Impacts related to vibration from construction activities associated with the General Plan Update were determined to be significant and unavoidable (Class I). Operational impacts resulting from vibration were found to be less than significant (Class II) for the General Plan Update. Both construction and operational activities of Alternative 3 would be slightly less than but similar to the proposed project, and impacts would be similar, significant and unavoidable (Class I) impacts for construction and less-than-significant (Class II) impact for operations.

Impacts related to groundborne noise would be similar to, although slightly less than, the General Plan Update. That is, both would result in less-than-significant (Class II) impacts.

Population and Housing

Implementation of Alternative 3 will have similar less-than-significant (Class II) impacts related to population and housing. Alternative 3 includes development of similar land use types and locations, but with reduced densities within TAZs 6, 8, 10, and 12. However, development within these TAZs is mostly commercial and industrial and Alternative 3 would not substantially reduce the number of housing units constructed within the City. However, due to the slight reduction in housing units and the considerable reduction in commercial/industrial space which will reduce jobs in the area, Alternative 3 would result in slightly lesser impacts than the proposed project, although still less than significant.

Public Services

Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in impacts to public services similar to those identified for the proposed General Plan Update. Current conditions indicate that the response times for police and fire services are at acceptable levels and impacts were determined to be less than significant (Class II). Additionally, the proposed project was found to result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact to fire protection and police services. Alternative 3 would result in similar development types and locations as the proposed project but with reduced densities in some locations. It is therefore reasonable to assume that Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. Compliance with Policy S-3.1 (Fire Services) and Goal S-4 (Protection from Crime) and Policy S-4.1 (Police Services) would further ensure less-than-significant impacts.

According to DEIR Section 4.11 (Public Services), all of the public schools in Agoura Hills are operating below maximum capacity. Impacts of the General Plan Update were found to be less than significant (Class II) due to the implementation of Goal CS-8 (Educational System) and Policy CS-8.2 (Expand and Improve Facilities). Alternative 3 would result in development consistent with the proposed General Plan Update but with reduced densities in TAZs 6, 8, 10, and 12. Development in these areas is primarily commercial and industrial, therefore residential development under Alternative 3 would only be reduced by 19 multi family dwelling units compared to the proposed project. Alternative 3 would comply with Goal CS-8 (Educational System) and Policy CS-8.2 (Expand and Improve Facilities). Compliance with the General Plan goals and policies as well as the reduced number of dwelling units would ensure that

Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. This would be similar, but slightly less, than the proposed project.

Impacts to libraries as a result of Alternative 3 would be similar to that of the General Plan Update, less than significant (Class II). Circulation levels have remained consistent over the past few years. Based on an anticipated population increase under the General Plan Update, the proposed project could increase demand on library services. However, impacts would be less than significant (Class II). Alternative 3 would allow for development similar to the proposed project but with reduced densities in TAZs 6, 8, 10 and 12. This would increase population within the library service area, but slightly less than the proposed project. Compliance with Policy CS-9.1 (Support Library Services) would ensure that quality library services would be available to residents of Agoura Hills under Alternative 3 and potential impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant (Class II) impact, similar to the proposed project.

Recreation

The existing General Plan (1993) recommends a standard of eight acres of park and open space land per 1,000 residents. Based on the existing City population of 23,337 residents, the current park inventory of 73.5 acres provides approximately 3.15 acres of parkland per 1,000 persons.

Full build out of the proposed General Plan Update would increase population in the City and therefore demand on recreation facilities. However, under the General Plan Update, compliance with Policy CS-1.1 (Service Level Goals), Policy CS-1.2 (Cooperation with External Agencies), Policy CS-1.8 (Facilities in Residential Development), Policy CS-3.1 (Use Agreements with Other Agencies), and Policy CS-3.2 (Work with Surrounding Communities) would require the development of park and recreation facilities, commensurate with new development, and impacts to recreation facilities would be reduced to less-than-significant (Class II) levels. Alternative 3 would allow for development of land uses similar to the proposed project, but with reduced densities in some locations. This would result in the generation of fewer new residents to the area that could put strain on the existing recreational amenities. Compliance with General Plan Update Policy CS-1.1 (Service Level Goals), Policy CS-1.2 (Cooperation with External Agencies), Policy CS-1.8 (Facilities in Residential Development), Policy CS-3.1 (Use Agreements with Other Agencies), and Policy CS-3.2 (Work with Surrounding Communities) would ensure that Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact to recreational facilities. Due to the smaller population generation, Alternative 3 would result in a slightly less impacts than the proposed project and impacts would be less than significant (Class II).

Transportation

Alternative 3 would generate fewer AM peak hour trips (2,749 trips versus 3,026 trips), fewer PM peak hour trips (4,398 trips versus 4,775 trips), and fewer daily trips (41,697 trips versus 45,302 trips) than the proposed General Plan Update, as shown in the traffic study prepared for the General Plan Update (Appendix B). The reduction in trips is a result of an approximately 25 percent reduction in development within TAZs 6, 8, 10 and 12, with the exception of the following, which was not reduced: (1) residential areas outside of Subarea 5 and (2) the Agoura Village Specific Plan area.

Under the proposed General Plan Update, after incorporation of the proposed roadway improvements, 16 locations could operate below LOS C as described below. Therefore, impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable (Class I).

1. Lake Lindero Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard
8. Kanan Road south of Fountainwood Avenue
9. Kanan Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard
12. Kanan Road south of Thousand Oaks Boulevard
13. Driver Avenue east of Argos Street
16. Canwood Street west of Reyes Adobe Road
21. Kanan Road south of Canwood Street East
23. Canwood Street east of Kanan Road
24. Kanan Road north of Agoura Road
26. Agoura Road east of Kanan Road
27. Kanan Road south of Agoura Road
29. Agoura Road east of Cornell Road
31. Driver Avenue west of Chesebro Road
34. Dorothy Drive between Lewis Road & US-101 SB ramps/Chesebro Road
35. Chesebro Road south of Dorothy Drive
36. Agoura Road west of Chesebro Road

Alternative 3 would result in 12 segments that would operate below LOS C, as opposed to the General Plan Update. The segments that would operate below LOS include the following:

1. Lake Lindero Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard
8. Kanan Road south of Fountainwood Avenue
9. Kanan Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard
12. Kanan Road south of Thousand Oaks Boulevard
13. Driver Avenue east of Argos Street
16. Canwood Street west of Reyes Adobe Road
21. Kanan Road south of Canwood Street East
23. Canwood Street east of Kanan Road
24. Kanan Road north of Agoura Road
27. Kanan Road south of Agoura Road
31. Driver Avenue west of Chesebro Road
35. Chesebro Road south of Dorothy Drive

While a significant and unavoidable (Class I) impact would still occur with Alternative 3, the significant and unavoidable impacts would be somewhat reduced under Alternative 3 as compared to the proposed project.

Impacts to the County's CMP in the region were found to be less than significant for the proposed project and would be similar for Alternative 3. Impacts related to increasing roadway hazards were found

to be less than significant for the proposed project. Therefore, design hazard impacts of Alternative 3 are expected to be similar to the proposed project, less than significant (Class II).

Impacts related to emergency access were found to be less than significant for the General Plan Update, as standard development procedures require that future development plans be submitted to the City for review and approval. This process would ensure that all new development has adequate emergency access and is in compliance with acceptable regulations at the time of application. This same level of compliance would be required for development under Alternative 3, resulting in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact, similar to the proposed project.

The General Plan Update would result in no impact to alternative modes of transportation. Alternative 3 would be subject to similar goals and policies as the General Plan Update that encourage, promote, and to some extent, require the use and provision of alternative modes of transportation. These include (Goal M-6 [Alternative Transportation], Goal M-9 [Transit], Policy M-6.1 [Efficient System] through Policy M-6.6 [Alternative Mode Funding], Policy M-9.1 [Transit Commuting] through Policy M-9.5 [Funding]). In addition to promoting a balanced transportation system, future provision of amenities, such as bicycle racks (Policy M-8.6 [Bicycle Facility Design] and Policy M-8.7 [Bicycle Parking]), additional bicycle lanes (Goal M-8 [Bikeways], Policy M-8.1 [Bikeway Linkages] through Policy M-8.5 [Bikeway design]), and pedestrian connections (Goal M-7 [Pedestrians]. Policy M-7.1 [Walkability] through Policy M-7.7 [Design Standards]) will help to improve the quality of life of City residents. The General Plan Update goals and policies strive to support and expand upon the existing TDM Program (Goal M-10 [Transportation Demand Management], Policy M-10.1 [Current Technologies] through Policy M-10.5 [Preferential Parking]). As such, Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts as the General Plan Update, and would result in no impact to the provision of alternative modes of transportation.

Impacts related to parking were found to be less than significant for the proposed project. Alternative 3 would be subject to all parking requirements set forth in the City's Zoning Code, which would ensure that parking impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant (Class II) level. This impact would be similar to the proposed project.

Overall, impacts related to transportation and traffic would be less than those identified for the proposed project.

Utilities

Water and sewer service is provided to the City by the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD). According to the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the total existing water demand for the proposed project area is approximately 29,270 AFY, which is the sum of the demands of all land types within the City. However, the LVMWD currently has a supply of 36,590 available to the City, representing a surplus of 7,320 AFY. Alternative 3 would result in a demand of approximately 16,690 gallons less per day than the General Plan Update. DEIR Section 4.14 (Utilities) examined the potential impacts related to water demand and availability of the proposed project and determined that impacts would be less than significant (Class II). Further, the General Plan Update would not require the

construction of new water treatment facilities and would create a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. As Alternative 3 would result in less development, and therefore less water demand, than the proposed project, it is reasonable to assume that Alternative 3 would also result in less-than-significant (Class II) impacts, although slightly lesser impacts than the proposed project.

Impacts to the wastewater system resulting from implementation of the General Plan Update were found to be less than significant (Class II). Buildout of the General Plan Update would be expected to generate 3,839,552 gallons of wastewater per day. The Tapia Water Reclamation Facility, which treats wastewater from the City, has a current capacity of 16 million gallons per day. Currently, the facility accepts approximately 9.5 million gallons per day. Increased wastewater generation due to implementation of the General Plan Update could be accommodated within the existing treatment infrastructure; therefore expansion of existing facilities would not be required. In addition, Policy U-2.1 (Sufficient Service) and Policy U-2.5 (Service Inadequacies) under Goal U-2 (Wastewater System) of the General Plan Update require that service inadequacies be identified and addressed and that sufficient sewer service be maintained, resulting in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. Under Alternative 3, the daily generation of wastewater would be approximately 3,790,591 gallons per day, less than that anticipated for the proposed project. This amounts to 48,961 gallons of water per day less than the proposed project. Additionally, Alternative 3 would comply with Policy U-2.1 (Sufficient Service) and Policy U-2.5 (Service Inadequacies) under Goal U-2 (Wastewater System) of the General Plan Update. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in slightly less impacts than the General Plan Update, and would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact.

The City's Solid Waste Management Program staff coordinates the collection of waste for the City of Agoura Hills, contracting with independent haulers to pick-up and dispose of waste throughout the City. Waste generated by growth proposed under the General Plan Update would be accommodated by existing landfill capacities and would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. Alternative 3 includes development in similar patterns to the proposed project but with reduced densities in some locations that would reduce the level of development. Alternative 3 would result in approximately 5,201 fewer pounds of solid waste per day than development under the General Plan Update. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact to solid waste, similar to but less than the proposed project.

The proposed project is anticipated to result in an electricity demand of approximately 137,608,689 kWh/year. Alternative 3 would result in an electricity demand of approximately 133,274,583 kWh/year, a decrease in electricity demand of approximately 4,334,106 kWh/year over the proposed project. Goal U-5 (Energy Provision and Conservation) of the General Plan Update includes policies that would foster coordination with SCE to ensure adequate electricity services would be available to the City. The General Plan Update was determined to result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact to electricity. Based on the reduced level of development and electricity demand, it is reasonable to assume that Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. This impact would be similar to, but less than, the proposed project.

The proposed project is anticipated to result in a natural gas demand of approximately 74,712,619 cf/month. Alternative 3 would result in a natural gas demand of approximately 73,696,909 cf/month, a

decrease in natural gas demand of approximately 1,015,710 cf/month over the proposed project. Goal U-5 (Energy Provision and Conservation) of the General Plan Update contains policies that would foster coordination with SCGC to ensure adequate natural gas services would be available to the City, resulting in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. Therefore, although still less than significant, Alternative 3 would result in a smaller natural gas impact than the proposed project.

Climate Change

An analysis of the potential significant emission of GHG completed for the proposed project determined it would result in a less-than-significant (Class II) impact. During buildout and operation of the proposed project, GHGs would be emitted as the result of construction activities and deliveries; new direct operational sources, such as operation of emergency generators, natural gas usage, and operation of fleet vehicles; and indirect operational sources, such as production of electricity, steam and chilled water, transport of water, and decomposition of project-related wastes. GHGs would also be emitted by visitors and employees travelling to, from, and within the City. As the proposed project includes goals and policies as well as implementation measures to comply with all state GHG requirements, impacts associated with GHG emissions during construction and operational activities are considered less than significant (Class II). Alternative 3 includes development of similar type and location as the proposed project but with reduced densities in some locations. Alternative 3 is expected to reduce vehicle miles traveled; reduce electricity, natural gas, and water demand; and generate less solid waste and wastewater than the proposed project, to a limited extent. As Alternative 3 would result in less development and somewhat lessened impacts than the proposed project and it would comply with the implementation measures, goals and policies, it is reasonable to assume that impacts would be less than significant (Class II).

■ Attainment of Project Objectives

Under Alternative 3, development similar in type and location to that of the General Plan Update would occur but with reduced densities in TAZs 6, 8, 10 and 12. The purpose of the General Plan Update is to achieve the Vision established with input from the City's residents and decision makers. In California, the general plan acts as the constitution for development and functions as a tool for the City to exercise the power of regulating land use given to it by the state. The Vision states that "The City remains a safe place, where people live, work, play, and move about in an economically viable and environmentally sustainable community. Sensitive growth and economic development are a means of perpetuating our quality of life [and that] these are balanced with resource conservation, as the city's semi-rural ranching past, rich history and unique neighborhoods are respected, and open spaces and surrounding hillsides are preserved". Alternative 3 would only partially satisfy the City's objectives.

The General Plan Update substantially lowers the amount of residential and non-residential development at buildout, when compared to the existing General Plan (1993). The General Plan Update buildout scenario was created to be a more realistic development scenario for 2035, allowing some future development and flexibility for additions to existing buildings. Alternative 3 would further reduce the amount of development that would be ultimately allowed, thereby reducing potential flexibility for new

development, and additions to existing development, thereby reducing potential economic vitality and viability of the City for the future.

The General Plan Update proposes no changes to existing residential areas, but would allow vacant lots to be developed as currently allowed for by the Zoning Code. Alternative 3 would decrease the number of multi-family housing units that could be built in the City. Multi-family units in mixed use areas, separate from the Agoura Village Specific Plan area, would not be able to be fully developed. Mixed use, with a balance of residential and non-residential uses in close proximity, is an important tool in creating an environmentally sustainable City, as it encourages alternative transportation modes. Reducing the number of multifamily residential units allowed would jeopardize the overall viability of such development as mixed-use planned developments. Therefore, Alternative 3 does not fully meet the objectives of the City as defined by the City Vision.

6.4 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

Table 6-2 (Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Project) provides a summary of the comparison of alternatives to the proposed project.

Table 6-2 Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Project			
Environmental Issue Area	No Development	No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development (Continuation of Existing General Plan)	Decreased Density
Aesthetics	+	+	=
Air Quality	-	+	-
Biological Resources	-	+	=
Cultural Resources	-	=	=
Geology and Soils	-	=	=
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	-	+	=
Hydrology and Water Quality	-	+	=
Land Use	=	=	=
Noise	-	+	-
Population and Housing	-/=	-/=	=
Public Services	-	=	=
Recreation	+	=	=
Transportation	-	+	-
Utilities	-	+	-
Climate Change	=	+	-

(-) = Impacts considered to be less when compared with the proposed project.

(+) = Impacts considered to be greater when compared with the proposed project.

(=) = Impacts considered to be equal or similar to the proposed project.

All impacts identified above are a conclusion for the overall impact within each issue area. This is to say that individual thresholds within each issue area may differ, but the conclusions represent an overall impact.

6.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA Guidelines require that an environmentally superior Alternative is identified. Alternative 3 (Reduced Density Alternative) would be considered the environmentally superior alternative in terms of reducing the impacts to issues areas identified as significant and unavoidable within this EIR, as summarized in Table 6-2 (Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Project), although it does not sufficiently meet the project objectives.

6.6 REFERENCES

This section includes, but is not limited to, those sources relied upon for each environmental topic area analyzed in this document (Sections 4.1 through 4.15), as well as other sections of the EIR.

7.1 REPORT PREPARERS

■ PBS&J

Carrie Garlett, Project Manager

Chris Mundhenk, Project Manager

Ruta Thomas, Project Manager

TJ Nathan, Associate Project Manager

Steve Smith, Associate Project Manager

Karl Osmundson, Senior Scientist

Jennifer Lee, Planner II

Allison Wax, Planner II

Karl Fielding, Planner I

Joel Miller, Senior Administrator

James Songco, Graphic Designer

Maggie Visser, Senior GIS Analyst

7.2 ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONSULTED

■ Fehr and Peers/Transportation Consultants

Tom Gaul

Sarah Brandenburg

Caitlin Boon

CHAPTER 8 Introduction to the Final EIR

8.1 CEQA REQUIREMENTS

Before approving a project, the *California Environmental Quality Act* (CEQA) requires the Lead Agency to prepare and certify a Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR). The contents of a Final EIR are specified in Section 15132 of the CEQA Guidelines, which states that:

The Final EIR shall consist of:

- (a) The Draft EIR or a revision of the Draft EIR.
- (b) Comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary.
- (c) A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR.
- (d) The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process.
- (e) Any other information added by the Lead Agency.

The Lead Agency (the City of Agoura Hills) must also provide each public agency that commented on the Draft EIR (DEIR) with a copy of the City's response to those comments at least ten days before certifying the Final EIR. In addition, the City may also provide an opportunity for members of the public to review the Final EIR prior to certification, though this is not a requirement of CEQA.

8.2 PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS

The DEIR for the General Plan Update was circulated for review and comment by the public, agencies, and organizations for a 45-day public review period that began on December 10, 2009, and concluded on January 25, 2010. A public information meeting was held on January 21, 2010, to receive comments on the adequacy of the DEIR. In addition to the verbal comments that were received at the public meeting, ten written letters were also received during the review period.

8.3 CONTENTS AND ORGANIZATION OF THE FINAL EIR

This Final EIR is composed of two volumes. They are as follows:

Volume I **Final EIR**—This volume describes the existing environmental conditions in the project area and in the vicinity of the project, and analyzes potential impacts on those conditions due to the proposed project; identifies mitigation measures that could avoid or reduce the magnitude of significant impacts; evaluates cumulative impacts that would be caused by the project in combination with other future projects or growth that could occur in the region; analyzes growth-inducing impacts; and provides a full evaluation of the alternatives to the proposed project that could eliminate, reduce, or avoid project-related impacts.

This volume also contains an explanation of the format and content of the Final EIR (Chapter 8); all text changes to the DEIR resulting from corrections of minor errors and/or clarification of items, which have been incorporated into the EIR (Chapter 9); a complete list of all persons, organizations, and public agencies that commented on the DEIR, copies of the comment letters received by the City of Agoura Hills on the proposed project, and the Lead Agency’s responses to these comments (Chapter 10); and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Chapter 11).

Volume II Final EIR Appendices—This volume includes supporting technical data used in the preparation of the Draft EIR. No text changes were made to the Technical Appendices in preparation of the Final EIR.

8.4 USE OF THE FINAL EIR

Pursuant to Sections 15088(a) and 15088(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, the lead agency must evaluate comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the DEIR and must prepare written responses. The Final EIR allows the public and the City of Agoura Hills an opportunity to review the response to comments, revisions to the DEIR, and other components of the EIR, such as the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), prior to the City’s decision on the project. The Final EIR serves as the environmental document to support approval of the proposed project, either in whole or in part.

After completing the Final EIR, and before approving the project, the Lead Agency must make the following three certifications as required by Section 15090 of the CEQA Guidelines:

- That the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA
- That the Final EIR was presented to the decision-making body of the Lead Agency, and that the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information in the Final EIR prior to approving the project
- That the Final EIR reflects the Lead Agency’s independent judgment and analysis

Pursuant to Section 15091(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, if an EIR that has been certified for a project identifies one or more significant environmental effects, the lead agency must adopt “Findings of Fact.” For each significant impact, the lead agency must make one of the following findings:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.
2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

Each finding must be accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for the finding. In addition, pursuant to Section 15091(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, the agency must adopt, in conjunction with the findings, a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes that it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures. This program is referred to as the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Additionally, pursuant to Section 15093(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, when a Lead Agency approves a project that would result in significant, unavoidable impacts that are disclosed in the Final EIR, the agency must state in writing its reasons for supporting the approved action. This Statement of Overriding Considerations is supported by substantial information in the record, which includes this Final EIR. Since the project could result in thirteen significant and unavoidable impacts (eight project-specific and six cumulative) in the issue areas of transportation/traffic, noise, cultural resources, and air quality, the City of Agoura Hills would be required to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if it approves the proposed project.

The certifications, Findings of Fact, and the Statement of Overriding Considerations are included in the staff report and resolutions that accompany this document. The Final EIR will be considered, and, in conjunction with making Findings, the City of Agoura Hills may decide whether or how to approve the proposed project.

CHAPTER 9 Changes to the Draft EIR

9.1 FORMAT OF TEXT CHANGES

Text changes are intended to clarify or correct information in the DEIR in response to comments received on the document, or as initiated by Lead Agency staff, including changes to the proposed General Plan. Revisions are shown in Section 9.2 (Text Changes) below as excerpts from the DEIR text, with a ~~line through~~ deleted text and an underline beneath inserted text. In order to indicate the location in the DEIR where text has been changed, the reader is referred to the page number of the DEIR.

9.2 TEXT CHANGES

This section includes revisions to text, by DEIR Section, that were initiated either by Lead Agency staff or in response to public comments. The changes appear in order of their location in the DEIR.

Pages 4.1-3 through 4.1-5, Section 4.1 (Aesthetics)

Scenic Corridors/Roads

Scenic corridors provide an opportunity for the public to take advantage of the aesthetic value of the natural environment. Scenic corridors can help carry the feeling of rural character throughout the City, both by providing views of open and rural areas from a variety of locations, and by carrying rural design themes along the roadway and parkway landscaping of the scenic highway itself. Caltrans has officially designated US Highway 101 an Eligible State Scenic Highway from Topanga Canyon Boulevard to State Route 33 in Ventura.

The following roadways are valuable scenic resources in the community and are recognized as scenic roadways by the City:

- Reyes Adobe Road (from Thousand Oaks Boulevard to Agoura Road)
- Thousand Oaks Boulevard. (from westerly City limits to its eastern terminus just beyond Carell Avenue)
- Agoura Road (from westerly City limits to easterly City limits)
- [Kanan Road \(from Agoura Road south to the City limits\)](#)

Reyes Adobe Road provides scenic vistas to the north and south along the roadway, including prominent views of Ladyface Mountain. Single-family residential uses predominate along Reyes Adobe Road, with commercial nodes at Agoura Road and Canwood Street. The landscape theme is varied as the areas between the residential walls and the sidewalk along most of this corridor are owned by private individuals.

Kanan Road is a north/south roadway and overall provides scenic vistas to the north and south along the roadway, including prominent views of Ladyface Mountain to the south and views of the Santa Monica Mountains to the north. The roadway contains a landscaped median north of the Ventura Freeway. South of Agoura Road, it is currently a two-lane road through undeveloped areas with no landscaping. This southerly segment serves as a scenic entry at the southerly City limits.

Thousand Oaks Boulevard runs in an east/west direction through the northern residential sections of the community providing vistas from key high locations near Strawberry Hill and Reyes Adobe Road. From these high points, one looks out over the developed area of the City to the backdrop of mountains and foothills. Thousand Oaks Boulevard has a landscaping of suburban character and a City landscaped median. Adjacent uses along Thousand Oaks Boulevard are predominantly residential with commercial nodes at Lake Lindero Drive and Kanan Road.

Agoura Road runs in an east/west direction along the southern section of the community, along the base of the Santa Monica Mountain foothills. The view along Agoura Road is characterized by close-in foothill views to the south, with occasional vistas beyond the City to the north with the backdrop of rolling hills and the higher, more distant Simi Hills. Through the old commercial district of the City near Chesebro Road, Agoura Road is lined with large mature oak trees. An open rectangular concrete drainage channel carries the Chesebro Canyon Wash along the north side of Agoura Road from Medea Creek beyond Waring Place. Generally, Agoura Road east of Kanan Road is a two-lane arterial developed to rural standards without curb and gutter.

Curb, gutters and sidewalk requirements have been established by the Agoura Village Specific Plan for portions of Agoura Road in that Plan area (from just east of Cornell Road to just west of Kanan Road). As part of this plan, Agoura Road will remain two lanes through the Plan area, generally from Cornell Road to Kanan Road. Portions of Agoura Road west of Kanan Road are four lanes. From Kanan Road westerly to the City limits, the roadway in its entirety will eventually become a four-lane arterial.

In general, land to the south of Agoura Road is undeveloped or developed with scattered hillside residential units. Between Agoura Road and the Ventura Freeway (US-101) are older commercial uses and more recently developed research and development parks and office buildings with surface parking. Between Cornell Road and Kanan Road, Agoura Road runs through the Agoura Village Specific Plan area, forming the primary backbone of the proposed mixed-use development village.

West of Reyes Adobe Road, the south side of Agoura Road is primarily vacant until just before the westerly City limits. However, these parcels are expected to be developed in the future pursuant to the Ladyface Mountain Specific Plan.

Landscaped medians are located along portions of Agoura Road, west of Kanan Road. The Agoura Village Specific Plan establishes guidelines for median landscaping along the segment between Cornell Road and portions of Kanan Road, while the Ladyface Mountain Specific Plan provides standards for the portion west of Kanan Road to the westerly City limits.

The following roadways offer some scenic elements, although not to the extent of the four highlighted above:

US-101/Ventura Freeway is listed as an Eligible State Scenic Highway by the California Department of Transportation. This eligible portion of US-101 traverses rugged, undeveloped hillsides in northwestern Los Angeles County and southern Ventura County into fertile farmland near Camarillo.

Canwood Street parallels US-101 to the north and offers views of the Santa Monica Mountains and Simi Hills. In addition, the street is not as densely developed in the eastern half of the City.

Roadside Drive parallels US-101 to the south and is located north of Agoura Road. Roadside Drive offers views of the Santa Monica Mountains and the Simi Hills.

Driver Avenue is an east/west roadway that runs through predominantly residential areas and adjacent to Agoura High School.

~~**Thousand Oaks Boulevard** runs in an east/west direction through the northern residential sections of the community providing vistas from key high locations near Strawberry Hill and Reyes Adobe Road. From these high points, one looks out over the developed area of the City to the backdrop of mountains and foothills.~~

~~Thousand Oaks Boulevard has a landscaping of suburban character and a City landscaped median. Adjacent uses along Thousand Oaks Boulevard are predominantly residential with commercial nodes at Lake Lindero Drive and Kanan Road.~~

~~**Agoura Road** runs in an east/west direction along the southern section of the community, along the base of the Santa Monica Mountain foothills. The view along Agoura Road is characterized by close-in foothill views to the south, with occasional vistas beyond the City to the north with the backdrop of rolling hills and the higher, more distant Simi Hills. Through the old commercial district of the City near Chesebro Road, Agoura Road is lined with large mature oak trees. An open rectangular concrete drainage channel carries the Chesebro Canyon Wash along the north side of Agoura Road from Medea Creek beyond Waring Place. Generally, Agoura Road east of Kanan Road is a two-lane arterial developed to rural standards without curb and gutter.~~

~~Curb, gutters and sidewalk requirements have been established by the Agoura Village Specific Plan for portions of Agoura Road in that Plan area (from just east of Cornell Road to just west of Kanan Road). As part of this plan, Agoura Road will remain two lanes through the Plan area, generally from Cornell Road to Kanan Road. Portions of Agoura Road west of Kanan Road are four lanes. From Kanan Road westerly to the City limits, the roadway in its entirety will eventually become a four-lane arterial.~~

~~In general, land to the south of Agoura Road is undeveloped or developed with scattered hillside residential units. Between Agoura Road and the Ventura Freeway (US-101) are older commercial uses and more recently developed research and development parks and office buildings with surface parking. Between Cornell Road and Kanan Road, Agoura Road runs through the Agoura Village Specific Plan area, forming the primary backbone of the proposed mixed-use development village.~~

~~West of Reyes Adobe Road, the south side of Agoura Road is primarily vacant until just before the westerly City limits. However, these parcels are expected to be developed in the future pursuant to the Ladyface Mountain Specific Plan.~~

~~Landscaped medians are located along portions of Agoura Road, west of Kanan Road. The Agoura Village Specific Plan establishes guidelines for median landscaping along the segment between Cornell Road and portions of Kanan Road, while the Ladyface Mountain Specific Plan provides standards for the portion west of Kanan Road to the westerly City limits.~~

Pages 4.1-8 and 4.1-9, Section 4.1 (Aesthetics)

Implementation of the General Plan Update would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Therefore, *no impact* would occur (Class III).

The topographic and natural resources in the City provide local viewsheds for residents within their neighborhoods, as well as persons traveling through the City along U.S. Highway 101 and other road segments. As discussed previously, the highly visible Ladyface Mountain within the Santa Monica Mountains provides a backdrop to the City as viewed from along the freeway corridor and other arterials. Other important scenic resources include Strawberry Hill, the Morrison Ranch Hills, Palo Comado Hills, and the higher more distant Simi Hills to the north. The following local road segments are valuable scenic resources in the community that provide scenic views of these hillsides and ridgelines:

- Reyes Adobe Road from Thousand Oaks Boulevard to Agoura Road
- Thousand Oaks Boulevard. (from westerly City limits to its eastern terminus just beyond Carell Avenue)
- Agoura Road from westerly City limits to easterly City limits
- [Kanan Road from Agoura Road south to the City limits](#)

Thousand Oaks Boulevard and Agoura Road generally provide the most scenic views of the mountains located in the northern and southern boundaries of the City limits. In addition, Reyes Adobe Road provides similar views while traveling north or south, rather than parallel to the mountains. More specifically, Reyes Adobe Road provides scenic vistas to the north and south along the roadway axis, including prominent views of Ladyface Mountain. Thousand Oaks Boulevard runs through the northern residential sections of the community. It provides vistas from key high locations near Strawberry Hill and Reyes Adobe Road. From these high points, one looks out over the developed area of the City to the backdrop of mountains and foothills. Agoura Road runs along the southern section of the community, along the base of the Santa Monica Mountain foothills. The view along Agoura Road is characterized by close-in foothill views to the south, with occasional vistas beyond the City to the north with the backdrop of the rolling hills and the higher, more distant Simi Hills. [The segment of Kanan Road south of Agoura Road to the City limits provides excellent views of Ladyface Mountain. South of Agoura Road, it is currently a two-lane road through undeveloped areas with no landscaping. This segment serves as a scenic entry at the southerly City limits.](#)

Pages 4.2-26, Section 4.2 (Air Quality)

■ Final Level of Significance

With the implementation of the General Plan Update policies and application of all local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to air quality and incorporation of mitigation measure MM4.2-1, impacts, from a programmatic perspective, would still be *significant and unavoidable* (Class I). Cumulative impacts would also be considered *significant and unavoidable* (Class I).

Pages 4.13-6 and 4.13-7, Section 4.13 (Transportation/Traffic)

- **Chesebro Road**—Chesebro Road is an east/west collector street between Canwood Street and Palo Comado Canyon Road north of the US-101 freeway and a north/south collector street between Agoura Road and the US-101 freeway eastbound on-ramp. One travel lane is provided in each direction. Sidewalk and street parking is provided on the north side of the road between Canwood Street and Palo Comado Canyon Road. Sidewalks and street parking are provided along both sides of the road south of Dorothy Drive and along the south side of the facility between Palo Comado Canyon Road south of the US-101 freeway and Agoura Road. The posted speed limit is [4535 miles per hour in some places, and 25 miles per hour in others, particularly for the segment that runs through Old Agoura.](#)

Pages 4.13-16 and 4.13-17, Section 4.13 (Transportation/Traffic), Table 4.13-3

The following corrections to the roadway classification of Driver Avenue in Table 4.13-3 (Existing Peak Hour & Daily Levels of Service) have been made.

	<i>Street Segment</i>	<i>Classification</i>	<i># of Lanes</i>	<i>Peak Hour</i>	<i>Volume</i>	<i>LOS</i>
12	Kanan Rd (s/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	Arterial	4D	AM	2,660	D
			4D	PM	2,360	D
			—	Daily	31,200	—
13	Driver Ave (e/o Argos St)	Arterial <u>Collector</u>	2U	AM	1,005	D
			2U	PM	625	C or better
			—	Daily	6,800	—
14	Agoura Rd (e/o Flintlock Ln)	Arterial	4D	AM	680	C or better
			4D	PM	880	C or better
			—	Daily	8,600	—
15	Reyes Adobe Rd (n/o Canwood St)	Arterial	4U	AM	1,280	C or better
			4U	PM	1,110	C or better
			—	Daily	13,400	—
16	Canwood St (w/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Collector	2U	AM	420	C or better
			2U	PM	485	D
			—	Daily	5,500	—

Street Segment		Classification	# of Lanes	Peak Hour	Volume	LOS
17	Canwood St (e/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	245	C or better
			2U	PM	265	C or better
			—	Daily	3,100	—
18	Reyes Adobe Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	4D	AM	1,350	C or better
			4D	PM	1,165	C or better
			—	Daily	13,300	—
19	Agoura Rd (w/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	4D	AM	775	C or better
			4D	PM	800	C or better
			—	Daily	9,150	—
20	Agoura Rd (e/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	4D	AM	1,090	C or better
			4D	PM	1,095	C or better
			—	Daily	11,700	—
21	Kanan Rd (s/o Canwood St E)	Arterial	5D	AM	3,190	D
			5D	PM	3,065	D
			—	Daily	39,700	—
22	Canwood St (w/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	325	C or better
			2U	PM	380	C or better
			—	Daily	4,150	—
23	Canwood St (e/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	790	C or better
			2U	PM	855	C or better
			—	Daily	9,750	—
24	Kanan Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	4D	AM	1,705	C or better
			4D	PM	1,785	C or better
			—	Daily	21,800	—
25	Agoura Rd (w/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	765	C or better
			2U	PM	795	C or better
			—	Daily	9,050	—
26	Agoura Rd (e/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	390	C or better
			2U	PM	525	C or better
			—	Daily	6,250	—
27	Kanan Rd (s/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	1,310	D
			2U	PM	1,345	D
			—	Daily	15,500	—
28	Roadside Dr (w/o Lewis Rd)	Collector	2U	AM	225	C or better
			2U	PM	250	C or better
			—	Daily	2,800	—

Street Segment		Classification	# of Lanes	Peak Hour	Volume	LOS
29	Agoura Rd (e/o Cornell Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	385	C or better
			2U	PM	455	C or better
			—	Daily	5,300	—
30	Chesebro Rd (n/o Driver Ave)	Collector	2U	AM	255	C or better
			2U	PM	325	C or better
			—	Daily	3,450	—
31	Driver Ave (w/o Chesebro Rd)	Arterial Collector	2U	AM	1,100	D
			2U	PM	690	C or better
			—	Daily	8,200	—
32	Palo Comado Canyon (e/o Chesebro Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	1,490	F
			2U	PM	1,080	D
			—	Daily	12,550	—

Page 4.13-18, Section 4.13 (Transportation/Traffic)

Analysis of existing conditions determined that thirty-two of the forty-three street segments studied currently operate at LOS C or better during both AM and PM peak hours. Ten of the street segments studied currently operate at LOS D during at least one of the peak hours and one location currently operates at LOS F.¹⁷ Thus, in comparing these locations to the minimum acceptable level of service criteria established in the General Plan (LOS C), the following eleven locations currently operate below LOS C and are considered deficient in the existing conditions during at least one peak period:

1. Lake Lindero ~~Road~~ Drive north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard (AM peak hour)
9. Kanan Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard (AM and PM peak hours)
12. Kanan Road south of ~~Agoura Road~~ Thousand Oaks Boulevard (AM and PM peak hours)
13. Driver Avenue east of Argos Street (AM peak hour)
16. Canwood Street ~~east-west~~ of Reyes Adobe Road (PM peak hour)
21. Kanan Road south of Canwood Street East (AM and PM peak hour)

Page 4.13-40, Section 4.13 (Transportation/Traffic), Table 4.13-6

The following correction to Table 4.13-6 (Year 2035 Base Peak Hour & Traffic Volumes) has been made.

Street Segment		Peak Hour	Volume
31	Driver Ave (w/o Chesebro Rd)	AM	1,185
		PM	700
		Daily	8,550

Pages 4.13-52 through 4.13-54, Section 4.13 (Transportation/Traffic), Table 4.13-9

The following corrections to the roadway classification of Driver Avenue in Table 4.13-9 (Future Peak Hour Levels of Service) have been made.

Street Segment	Classification	Peak Hour	Year 2035 with Proposed General Plan Land use									Less than LOS
			Year 2035 Base			Without Improvements		With Proposed Circulation Element				
			Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	# of Lanes	LOS		
11 Thousand Oaks Blvd (e/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,615	4D	C or better	1,665	4D	C or better	4D	C or better		
		PM	925	4D	C or better	1,000	4D	C or better	4D	C or better		
12 Kanan Rd (s/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	Arterial	AM	2,895	4D	D	3,130	4D	F	4D	F	**	
		PM	2,555	4D	D	2,895	4D	D	4D	D	**	
13 Driver Ave (e/o Argos St)	Arterial Collector	AM	1,090	2U	D	1,130	2U	D	2U	D	**	
		PM	635	2U	C or better	700	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
14 Agoura Rd (e/o Flintock Ln)	Arterial	AM	710	4D	C or better	830	4D	C or better	4D	C or better		
		PM	885	4D	C or better	1,045	4D	C or better	4D	C or better		
15 Reyes Adobe Rd (n/o Canwood St)	Arterial	AM	1,280	4U	C or better	1,470	4U	C or better	4U	C or better		
		PM	1,110	4U	C or better	1,380	4U	C or better	4U	C or better		
16 Canwood St (w/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Collector	AM	445	2U	C or better	445	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
		PM	490	2U	D	490	2U	D	2U	D	**	
17 Canwood St (e/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	AM	245	2U	C or better	285	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
		PM	265	2U	C or better	315	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
18 Reyes Adobe Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,355	4D	C or better	1,935	4D	C or better	5D	C or better		
		PM	1,165	4D	C or better	1,965	4D	C or better	5D	C or better		
19 Agoura Rd (w/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	AM	810	4D	C or better	1,110	4D	C or better	4D	C or better		
		PM	805	4D	C or better	1,230	4D	C or better	4D	C or better		
20 Agoura Rd (e/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,120	4D	C or better	1,505	4D	C or better	4D	C or better		
		PM	1,100	4D	C or better	1,630	4D	C or better	4D	C or better		

Street Segment	Classification	Peak Hour	Year 2035 with Proposed General Plan Land use									Less than LOS
			Year 2035 Base		Without Improvements			With Proposed Circulation Element				
			Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	
21 Kanan Rd (s/o Canwood St E)	Arterial	AM	3,470	5D	D	3,970	5D	F	5D	F	**	
		PM	3,315	5D	D	4,180	5D	F	5D	F	**	
22 Canwood St (w/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	AM	345	2U	C or better	630	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
		PM	385	2U	C or better	730	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
23 Canwood St (e/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	AM	790	2U	C or better	1,110	2U	D	2.5U*	C or better		
		PM	855	2U	C or better	1,560	2U	F	2.5U*	D	**	
24 Kanan Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,990	4D	C or better	2,800	4D	D	4D	D	**	
		PM	2,095	4D	D	3,300	4D	F	4D	F	**	
25 Agoura Rd (w/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	AM	795	2U	C or better	1,325	2U	D	4D	C or better		
		PM	805	2U	C or better	1,535	2U	F	4D	C or better		
26 Agoura Rd (e/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	AM	425	2U	C or better	695	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
		PM	530	2U	C or better	930	2U	D	2U	D	**	
27 Kanan Rd (s/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,545	2U	F	1,880	2U	F	4U	C or better		
		PM	1,595	2U	F	2,115	2U	F	4U	D	**	
28 Roadside Dr (w/o Lewis Rd)	Collector	AM	225	2U	C or better	300	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
		PM	250	2U	C or better	350	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
29 Agoura Rd (e/o Cornell Rd)	Arterial	AM	430	2U	C or better	700	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
		PM	470	2U	C or better	875	2U	D	2U	D	**	
30 Chesebro Rd (n/o Driver Ave)	Collector	AM	360	2U	C or better	360	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
		PM	335	2U	C or better	335	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
31 Driver Ave (w/o Chesebro Rd)	Arterial Collector	AM	1,185	2U	D	1,225	2U	D	2U	D	**	
		PM	700	2U	C or better	755	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
32 Palo Comado Canyon (e/o Chesebro Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,495	2U	F	1,725	2U	F	4U	C or better		
		PM	1,080	2U	D	1,520	2U	F	4U	C or better		

Page 4.13-62, Section 4.13 (Transportation/Traffic)

The effectiveness of the proposed roadway improvements was tested against the future traffic volume projections. As shown in Table 4.13-9 (Future Peak Hour Levels of Service), the proposed roadway improvements would result in the improvement of five of the twenty-one locations that are below LOS C identified in the “Future Conditions Without Improvements” to a condition of LOS C or better. The five locations at which conditions would improve are:

25. Agoura Road west of Kanan Road (AM and PM peak hours)
32. Palo Comado Canyon Road east of Chesebro Road (AM and PM peak hours)
33. Chesebro Road south of Driver Avenue (PM peak hour)
37. Palo Comado Canyon Road south of US-101 (AM and PM peak hours)
38. Chesebro Road north of Agoura Road (AM peak hour)

Pages 4.15-15 through 4.15-17, Section 4.15 (Climate Change)

Draft CEQA Guideline Amendments for Greenhouse Gas Emissions

[As of December 31, 2009, the California Natural Resources Agency has adopted revisions to the CEQA Guidelines addressing “the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions and the effects of greenhouse gas emissions, including, but not limited to, effects associated with transportation or energy sources.” \(See Pub. Resources Code, § 21083.05.\) These regulations are expected to become effective, perhaps with modest changes, by early February 2010, after a 30-day review period by the Office of Administrative Law \(OAL\). Under CEQA Guidelines section 15007\(b\), public agencies need only comply with new CEQA Guidelines that “apply to steps in the CEQA process not yet undertaken by the date when agencies must comply with the amendments. That date, according to section 15007\(d\), is 120 days after the amendments are final. For these amendments, that date would be in late May or early June, depending on the date on which OAL takes its final action. Here, then, the Draft EIR was not required to comply with the new amendments. Even so, the City has done its best, based on the Guidelines as adopted by the Natural Resources Agency, to comply with provisions apparently applicable to draft EIRs.](#)

The ~~Draft~~ CEQA Guideline Amendments, ~~if adopted, would~~ amend or add new text pertaining to GHG emissions to fourteen sections of the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Chapter 3 of the *California Code of Regulations*). A brief summary of the ~~proposed~~ text revisions is provided below.

Section 15064.4. Determining the Significance of Impacts from Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This section ~~would be added to~~ clarifies that a lead agency’s responsibility in assessing GHG impacts. The text ~~proposes~~ identifies general considerations that should be weighed when determining the significance of an effect:

- The extent to which the project may increase or reduce greenhouse gas emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting
- The extent to which the project emissions exceed any threshold of significance that applies to the project

- The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions. Such regulations must be adopted by the relevant public agency through a public review process and must include specific requirements that reduce or mitigate the project's incremental contribution of greenhouse gas emissions. If there is substantial evidence that the possible effects of a particular project are still cumulatively considerable notwithstanding compliance with the adopted regulations or requirements, an EIR must be prepared for the project.

~~Although the Draft CEQA Guideline Amendments have not yet been adopted, these considerations are weighed in the discussion of the proposed projects' impacts, below.~~ The Draft CEQA Guideline Amendments require that lead agencies “describe, calculate or estimate the amount of greenhouse emissions associated with a project” but leave the choice of a preferred methodology to the lead agency's discretion. Qualitative or other performance-based standards may also be weighed.

Section 15126.4 Consideration and Discussion of Mitigation Measures Proposed to Minimize Significant Effects. The ~~proposed~~ text in this section states that lead agencies shall consider feasible means of mitigating GHG emissions that may include but not be limited to the following:

- Measures in an existing plan or mitigation program for the reduction of emissions that are required as part of the lead agency's decision
- Reductions in emissions resulting from a project through implementation of project features, project design, or other measures, such as those described in [CEQA Guidelines] Appendix F
- Off-site measures, including offsets, to mitigation a project's emissions
- Measures that sequester greenhouse gases
- In the case of adoption of a plan, such as a general plan, long range development plan, or greenhouse gas reduction plan, mitigation may include the identification of specific measures that may be implemented on a project-by-project basis. Mitigation may also include the incorporation of specific measures or policies found in an adopted ordinance or regulation that reduces the cumulative effect of emissions.

Section 15130. Discussion of Cumulative Impacts. The ~~proposed~~ text in this section simply states that the project should be considered in the context of past, current and foreseeable development to determine if a cumulatively considerable impact would result.

Section 15183.5. Tiering and Streamlining the Analysis of Greenhouse Gas Emissions. ~~As a proposed addition to the CEQA Guidelines,~~ This section identifies the method by which a programmatic GHG analysis (i.e., General Plan, Long Range Development Plan, or other plan) may be used for tiering purposes for project-level analyses. This section also identifies the manner in which GHG reduction plans or climate action plans may be applied to project-level analyses.

Proposed CEQA Checklist Questions. Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines contains a sample checklist that may be used by lead agencies when considering environmental impacts. Two new checklist questions have been ~~proposed~~ added for GHG emissions:

- Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

However, the ~~Draft~~ CEQA Guidelines Amendment also proposes new cautionary text to clarify that the checklist must be used with discretion and may not cover all environmental impacts. The checklist questions are not necessarily intended to serve as significance criteria. Development of significance criteria is left to the discretion of local lead agencies.

Throughout Document—Policy Changes

The following changes have been made to policies in the General Plan Update, and so changes are also made to the DEIR where the text of these policies is listed. These changes apply to all instances where the text is shown in the DEIR. No new impacts or changes in impacts have been identified as a result of these policy changes.

Policy NR-4.12	Wildlife Corridors. Protect and maintain wildlife corridors, particularly the Liberty Canyon wildlife corridor, <u>and adjacent areas as appropriate</u> , to help the continued survival of wildlife.
Policy LU-8.4	Property Setbacks. Discourage uniform <u>Encourage variable</u> setbacks to enhance streetscape character and increase building separation.
Policy S-3.9	Fuel Modification. Ensure that new development complies with fuel modification requirements of the Los Angeles County Fire Department while protecting natural resources and habitat to the extent feasible, <u>and encourage design that minimizes the need for fuel modification on public parklands, to the extent feasible.</u>

9.3 FIGURE CHANGES

Figure 3-2 (Land Use Diagram)

Changed the legend acronym for Residential High Density from “(HDR)” to “(RHD).” Removed the legend reference to “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, and removed the corresponding shading on map. However, kept a general reference to the “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area” in the northeastern corner, and added the same general reference along the southern edge of the map.

Figure 3-3 (Community Subareas)

Changed the legend acronym for Residential High Density from “(HDR)” to “(RHD).” Removed the legend reference to “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, and removed the corresponding shading on map. However, kept a general reference to the “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation

Area” in the northeastern corner, and added the same general reference along the southern edge of the map.

Figure 4.3-1 (Habitats and Sensitive Species)

Removed the legend reference to “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, and removed the corresponding shading on map. However, kept a general reference to the “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area” in the northeastern corner, and added the same general reference along the southern edge of the map.

Figure 4.6-1 (Hazards)

Changed “Special Flood Hazard Area Inundated by 100 Year Flood (Zone A – No base flood elevations determined)” to “Special Flood Hazard area 1% Annual Chance Flood (Zone A – No base flood elevations determined).” Also, added a general reference along the southern edge of the map to the “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area,” as shown in the northeastern corner of the map.

Figure 4.8-1 (Existing Land Use)

Removed the legend reference to “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, and removed the corresponding shading on map. However, kept a general reference to the “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area” in the northeastern corner, and added the same general reference along the southern edge of the map.

Figure 4.8-2 (Existing General Plan [1993])

Removed legend reference to “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, and removed corresponding shading on map. However, kept a general reference to the “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area” in the northeastern corner, and added the same general reference along the southern edge of the map.

Figure 4.8-3 (Proposed General Plan [2009])

Removed legend reference to “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, and removed corresponding shading on map. However, kept a general reference to the “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area” in the northeastern corner, and added the same general reference along the southern edge of the map.

Figure 4.8-4 (Community Subareas)

Changed legend acronym for Residential High Density from “(HDR)” to “(RHD).” Removed the legend reference to “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, and removed the corresponding shading on map. However, kept a general reference to the “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation

Area” in the northeastern corner, and added the same general reference along the southern edge of the map.

Figure 4.9-1 (Noise Monitoring Locations)

Removed the legend reference to “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, and removed the corresponding pattern on map. However, kept a general reference to the “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area” in the northeastern corner, and added the same general reference along the southern edge of the map.

Figure 4.9-2 (Noise Contours—Existing)

Removed the legend reference to “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, and removed the corresponding shading on map. However, kept a general reference to the “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area” in the northeastern corner, and added the same general reference along the southern edge of the map.

Figure 4.9-3 (Noise Contours—Future)

Removed the legend reference to “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, and removed the corresponding shading on map. However, kept a general reference to the “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area” in the northeastern corner, and added the same general reference along the southern edge of the map.

Figure 4.11-1 (Community Facilities)

Added a general reference to the “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area” along the southern edge of the map, as shown in the northeastern corner.

Figure 4.12-1 (Recreational Facilities)

Removed the legend reference to “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area,” and removed the corresponding shading on map. However, kept a general reference to the “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area” in the northeastern corner, and added the same general reference along the southern edge of the map.

Figure 4.12-2 (Trail Network)

Removed the legend reference to “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area,” and removed the corresponding shading on map. However, kept a general reference to the “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area” in the northeastern corner, and added the same general reference along the southern edge of the map. Also, changes were made to the trail designations outside of the City to provide more accuracy and clarity.

9.4 APPENDIX CHANGES

There were no appendix changes to the DEIR.

CHAPTER 10 Responses to Comments

10.1 ORGANIZATION OF THE RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

The letters in this section of the EIR include public comments on the DEIR for the proposed City of Agoura Hills General Plan 2035. The DEIR was circulated for public review from December 10, 2009, to January 25, 2010, a 45-day review period.

The comment letters included herein were submitted by public agencies, citizen groups, and private citizens. Each written comment that the City received is included in this section. Responses to these comments have been prepared to address the environmental concerns raised by the commenter and to indicate where and how the EIR addresses pertinent environmental issues.

The comment letters have been numbered sequentially in order of their receipt by the City. Each issue within a comment letter, if more than one, has a letter assigned to it. Responses to the comment letter immediately follow each letter. References to the responses to comments identify first the letter number, and second, the comment letter (6A, for example). Where comments have been duplicated within a single letter, the reader is referred to the appropriate responses number rather than having a comment repeated and providing a duplicate answer.

The commenters, along with the page number on which their comment letters appear, are listed below.

Table 10-1 Comment Letters Received during the Draft EIR Comment Period		
Letter No.	Commenter/Organization	Page No.
1	Christina Chiang, Letter dated 12-24-09	10-3
2	Dave Singleton, Program Analyst, Native American Heritage Commission, Letter dated 1-6-10	10-6
3	David R. Lippman, Director of Facilities and Operations, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, Letter dated 1-13-10	10-11
4	Daniel S. Blankenship, Staff Environmental Scientist, California Department of Fish and Game, Letter dated 1-20-10	10-13
5	Jacob Lieb, Manager, Assessment, Housing & EIR, Southern California Association of Governments, Letter dated 1-25-10	10-15
6	Tricia Maier, Manager, Program Administration Section, County of Ventura Resource Management Agency, Letter dated 1-25-10	10-22
7	Ben Emami, Engineering Manager II, Ventura County Public Works Agency, Transportation Department, Memorandum dated 1-30-10	10-24
8	Robin Jester, Acting Permit Manager, Planning and Regulatory, Ventura County Public Works Agency, Watershed Protection District, Memorandum dated 1-22-10	10-27
9	Joan Rupert, Section Head, Environmental & Regulatory Permitting Section, Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation, Letter dated 1-25-10	10-29
10	Jess Thomas, President, Old Agoura Homeowners' Association, Letter dated 1-25-10	10-31
	Responses to Comments Received at the January 21, 2010 Planning Commission Hearing	10-41

10.2 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

This section contains the original comment letters, which have been bracketed to isolate the individual comments, with each letter followed by a section with the responses to the comments within the letter. As noted above, and stated in Sections 15088(a) and 15088(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, comments that raise significant environmental issues are provided with responses. Comments that are outside of the scope of CEQA review will be forwarded for consideration to the decision-makers as part of the project approval process. In some cases, a response may refer the reader to a previous response, if that previous response substantively addressed the same issues.

Allison Cook

From: Christina Chiang [cchiarch@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 24, 2009 1:00 PM
To: Allison Cook
Subject: comment on Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Allison Cook,

I am writing in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Report. I respond as a long-time Agoura Hills resident and an architectural historian. I grew up in Agoura Hills, going to Yerba Buena Elementary, Lindero Canyon Middle, and Agoura High Schools. So I consider Agoura Hills home and am concerned about its future growth. My specific area of concern is cultural resources. Growing up in a house near the Reyes Adobe, I realized how important and rare such cultural resources were in Agoura Hills. Also, additionally, I currently work in the environmental consulting field, specializing in cultural resources.

The cumulative impact section of the Cultural Resources Section of the EIR said that it is entirely possible "that present and future development activities will continue to result in impacts on significant cultural resources." For mitigation, the EIR proposes separate environmental review for significant historical resources. However, how would the city know what historic-period buildings or structures are significant under state or federal regulations? It would be possible for a historic-period building to not be identified and miss the separate environmental review. For another mitigation measure, a citywide survey of historic resources would be helpful to know what historic resources should be appreciated and protected. Identifying resources would be a proactive way to help contribute to the unique identity and character of Agoura Hills. The neighboring cities of Calabasas and Los Angeles have been doing citywide surveys for such reasons and for planning purposes to avoid impacts to historic resources. This measure was mentioned in Impact 4.4-3 but not mentioned as a policy. Why doesn't the City of Agoura Hills have a citywide historic resources survey conducted by qualified professionals?

Secondly, I am concerned that there is no planning to explicitly prohibit or at least identify and discourage demolition or inappropriate alteration of historic-period buildings or structures. This was also mentioned in Impact 4.4-3 as why there would be a significant impact. Without local regulations, it will be difficult to maintain the physical quality of significant historic resources in the city. Resources will be knowingly or inadvertently altered, losing their historic character and will not be able to qualify as historic resources anymore. This situation happened with the Reyes Adobe, as the extent of alterations disqualified it from becoming a California Historic Landmark or Point of Historical Interest. Under Policy HR-1.1 and 1.2, why are there not any requirements to deny such demolition and alteration of historic resources?

Without some additional and stronger planning measures, the city could lose many historic or potential historic resources, and thus, pieces of our history that could foster stewardship and civic pride in this area. Though there are lots of new, "old-looking" structures, such as the Craftsman-style commercial buildings off of the I01, those structures cannot replace authentic historic resources that have been lived in and are witnesses of our area's history. Local historic resources help make communities unique and engaging to residents; thus, the ones in Agoura Hills deserve more protection and mitigation against significant adverse impacts.

Sincerely,
Christina Chiang

■ Response to Letter 1

COMMENTER: Christina Chiang

DATE: December 24, 2009

Response 1

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b) states that “a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.” The General Plan Update (GPU) provides for the development of residential, retail/service, office/business park, and manufacturing uses. There are no known historic structures that would qualify for state or federal listing in the City. The Reyes Adobe is not considered eligible for state or federal listing, due to modifications to the structure and foundation. Nonetheless, Goal HR-1 of the GPU calls for “the protection and maintenance of historic resources to foster stewardship and civic pride, which contributes to the unique identity and character of Agoura Hills.” To further that goal, the GPU includes the following policies: “Enhance the community appreciation of the importance of the City’s historic sites and buildings, and protect and preserve significant historical resources, to the extent feasible” (HR-1.1); and “Ensure the maintenance of the physical quality of significant historic resources, particularly those elements contributing to its identity and role in the community” (HR-1.2). The policies apply to the Reyes Adobe and any other structure that in the future is determined to have historic significance, either per state or federal guidance, or otherwise. GPU Implementation Measures HR-2 and HR-3 further protect the Reyes Adobe. HR-2 states, “The City shall continue to maintain and enhance the Reyes Adobe Historical site,” and HR-3 states, “The City shall continue to utilize the Reyes Adobe site as an important historic and cultural resource focal point and gathering space for the community, and shall consider utilizing other locally significant resources to further engage residents in cultural and civic activities.”

Section 4.4 (Cultural Resources) of the DEIR states that development activities provided for in the GPU have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a potential historical resource through demolition or alternation of a potential historical resource’s physical characteristics that convey its historical significance. The City has not conducted a Citywide survey or inventory of potential historic resources. It is important to keep in mind that the Reyes Adobe, the most prominent structure representing the City’s past, is not considered “historical” per state and federal criteria. Implementation Measure HR-1 (which implements Policy HR-1), states “The City shall consider creating a program to identify historic resources of local significance, including recommendations to promote and protect such resources to the extent feasible.” Under this measure, a Citywide historic survey would occur comprehensively. Absent the comprehensive study, or until that is completed, Implementation Measure HR-7 provides that:

For any project involving the demolition, relocation, or alteration of a structure, or a change to the structure’s immediate setting, in which the structure is over 45 years old, and which potentially exhibits characteristics of an historic resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, during the project review and entitlement process, the City shall require an assessment of the potential historical significance of the structure by a professional historic resource consultant as

part of the application. If the resource is considered historical per CEQA, the assessment shall make recommendations for mitigating potential impacts to the structure, or identify requirements for the proper documentation per state or federal guidelines of any significant historic structure proposed for demolition, which shall be made conditions of project approval, as approved by the Director of Planning and Community Development.

Therefore, during the project application review stage for development, alteration or demolition, City staff would request an historic significance assessment for any structure over 45 years old and that potentially exhibits characteristics of an historic resource per the criteria outlined in CEQA Section 10564.5, and considering state and federal criteria. City staff's initial review of this CEQA section and federal and state criteria would form the criteria for determining whether a professional assessment should be prepared for the resource. A determination regarding whether a resource should be preserved, or can be altered or demolished providing there is proper documentation of the resource, is something that is more appropriately done on a case by case basis once the historic assessment is prepared for an individual building or structure. The GPU does not recommend a broad policy that would prevent all future demolition or alteration, rather advocates considering the particular circumstances of a project as it moves through the project review and entitlement phase.

In summary, because a Citywide historic resources survey has not yet been conducted and it cannot be determined with certainty that no such historic resources exist, and because City policies do not explicitly prohibit demolition or alteration of all historic period buildings or structures, should they exist, it is possible that development could cause a substantial adverse change in a resource that could possibly be identified in the future as being historically significant under state or federal criteria.

As such, impacts to historical resources were determined to be significant and unavoidable in the DEIR.

No changes to the DEIR are necessary.

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

915 CAPITOL MALL, ROOM 364
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
(916) 653-6251
Fax (916) 657-5390
Web Site www.nahc.ca.gov
e-mail: ds_nahc@pacbell.net



January 6, 2010

RECORDED
JAN 08 2010
BY: *ac*

Ms. Allison Cook, Principal Planner
CITY OF AGOURA HILLS
3001 Ladyface Court
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Re: SCH#2009051013 CEQA Notice of Completion: draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the City of Agoura Hills General Plan Update EIR; located in the City of Agoura Hills; Los Angeles County, California

Dear Ms. Cook:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) is the state 'trustee agency' pursuant to Public Resources Code §21070 for the protection and preservation of California's Native American Cultural Resources.. (Also see *Environmental Protection Information Center v. Johnson* (1985) 170 Cal App. 3rd 604) The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA - CA Public Resources Code §21000-21177, amended in 2009) requires that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, that includes archaeological resources, is a 'significant effect' requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) per the California Code of Regulations §15064.5(b)(c)(f) CEQA guidelines). Section 15382 of the CEQA Guidelines defines a significant impact on the environment as "a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of physical conditions within an area affected by the proposed project, including ... objects of historic or aesthetic significance." In order to comply with this provision, the lead agency is required to assess whether the project will have an adverse impact on these resources within the 'area of potential effect (APE)', and if so, to mitigate that effect. To adequately assess the project-related impacts on historical resources, the Commission recommends the following.

2a

The Native American Heritage Commission did perform a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search in the NAHC SLF Inventory, established by the Legislature pursuant to Public Resources Code §5097.94(a) and Native American Cultural resources were not identified within one-half mile of the APE - City Boundaries. However, there are Native American cultural resources in close proximity.

2b

Early consultation with Native American tribes in your area is the best way to avoid unanticipated discoveries once a project is underway. Enclosed are the names of the nearest tribes and interested Native American individuals that the NAHC recommends as 'consulting parties,' for this purpose, that may have knowledge of the religious and cultural significance of the historic properties in the project area (e.g. APE). We recommend that you contact persons on the attached list of Native American contacts. A Native American Tribe or Tribal Elder may be the only source of information about a cultural resource.. Also, the NAHC recommends that a Native American Monitor or Native American culturally knowledgeable person be employed whenever a professional archaeologist is employed during the 'Initial Study' and in other phases of the environmental planning processes.. Furthermore we suggest that you contact the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) at the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) Coordinator's office (at (916) 653-7278, for referral to the nearest OHP Information Center of which there are 11..

2c

Consultation with tribes and interested Native American tribes and individuals, as consulting parties, on the NAHC list ,should be conducted in compliance with the requirements of federal NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321-43351) and Section 106 and 4(f) of federal NHPA (16 U.S.C. 470 [f] *et se*), 36 CFR Part 800.3, the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CSQ; 42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq*) and NAGPRA (25 U.S.C. 3001-3013), as appropriate. .

2d

Lead agencies should consider avoidance, as defined in Section 15370 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) when significant cultural resources could be affected by a project. Also, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 provide for provisions for accidentally discovered archeological resources during construction and mandate the processes to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a project location other than a 'dedicated cemetery. Discussion of these should be included in your environmental documents, as appropriate.

The authority for the SLF record search of the NAHC Sacred Lands Inventory, established by the California Legislature, is California Public Resources Code §5097.94(a) and is exempt from the CA Public Records Act (c.f. California Government Code §6254.10). The results of the SLF search are confidential. However, Native Americans on the attached contact list are not prohibited from and may wish to reveal the nature of identified cultural resources/historic properties. Confidentiality of "historic properties of religious and cultural significance" may also be protected the under Section 304 of the NHPA or at the Secretary of the Interior' discretion if not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Secretary may also be advised by the federal Indian Religious Freedom Act (cf. 42 U.S.C, 1996) in issuing a decision on whether or not to disclose items of religious and/or cultural significance identified in or near the APE and possibly threatened by proposed project activity.


CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(d) requires the lead agency to work with the Native Americans identified by this Commission if the initial Study identifies the presence or likely presence of Native American human remains within the APE. CEQA Guidelines provide for agreements with Native American, identified by the NAHC, to assure the appropriate and dignified treatment of Native American human remains and any associated grave liens.

Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources Code §5097.98 and Sec. §15064.5 (d) of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines) mandate procedures to be followed, including that construction or excavation be stopped in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery until the county coroner or medical examiner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. . Note that §7052 of the Health & Safety Code states that disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony.

Again, Lead agencies should consider avoidance, as defined in §15370 of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines), when significant cultural resources are discovered during the course of project planning and implementation

Please feel free to contact me at (916) 653-6251 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Dave Singleton
Program Analyst

Attachment: List of Native American Contacts

Cc: State Clearinghouse

2e

2f

2g

2h

Native American Contacts
Los Angeles County
January 6, 2010

Charles Cooke
32835 Santiago Road
Acton , CA 93510

(661) 733-1812 - cell
suscol@intox.net

Chumash
Fernandeno
Tataviam
Kitanemuk

Beverly Salazar Folkes
1931 Shadybrook Drive
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362
805 492-7255
(805) 558-1154 - cell
folkes9@msn.com

Chumash
Tataviam
Fernandeño

San Fernando Band of Mission Indians
John Valenzuela, Chairperson

P.O. Box 221838
Newhall , CA 91322
tsen2u@live.com

(661) 753-9833 Office
(760) 885-0955 Cell
(760) 949-1604 Fax

Fernandeño
Tataviam
Serrano
Vanyume
Kitanemuk

Randy Guzman - Folkes
655 Los Angeles Avenue, Unit E
Moorpark , CA 93021
ndnRandy@gmail.com
(805) 905-1675 - cell

Chumash
Fernandeño
Tataviam
Shoshone Paiute
Yaqui

Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians
William Gonzales, Cultural/Environ Depart
601 South Brand Boulevard, Suite 102
San Fernando CA 91340
rortega@tataviam-nsn.us

(818) 837-0794 Office
(818) 581-9293 Cell
(818) 837-0796 Fax

LA City/County Native American Indian Comm
Ron Andrade, Director
3175 West 6th Street, Rm.
Los Angeles , CA 90020
(213) 351-5324
(213) 386-3995 FAX

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. Also, federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106, and federal NAGPRA.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#2009051013; CEQA Notice of Completion; draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the City of Agoura Hills General Plan Update EIR; Los Angeles County, California.

■ Responses to Letter 2

COMMENTER: Dave Singleton, Program Analyst, Native American Heritage Commission

DATE: January 6, 2010

Response 2A

Section 4.4.3 (Project Impacts and Mitigation) of the DEIR assesses potential impacts to historic and archaeological resources, and identifies mitigation, consistent with CEQA requirements.

Response 2B

This comment is noted. To gather information, the City requested a records search by the South Central Coastal Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System at the California State University, Fullerton. Also, the California Points of Historical Interest, California Historical Landmarks, California Register of Historical Resources, and the National Register of Historic Places were reviewed, and a search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) sacred lands database was requested by the City. The NAHC response letter indicated that no Native American cultural resources have been recorded in the areas of concern.

Response 2C

The City initiated consultation with Native American Tribes in the area beginning in September 2006 and continuing through 2009 in accordance with federal and state law. Such correspondence is included in Appendix E of the DEIR.

Response 2D

Policies of the General Plan Update (GPU) encourage avoidance of significant cultural resources. Policy HR-3.1 requires that the potential for the presence of significant archaeological resources be considered prior to the development of a property, and Policy HR-3.2 requires that significant archaeological resources be preserved in-situ, as feasible, and when avoidance of impacts is not possible, data recovery mitigation is required for all significant resources. Policy HR-3.3 requires that if human remains or funerary objects are discovered and unearthed during soil disturbing activities, the discoveries shall be treated in compliance with applicable state and federal laws, including notifying the appropriate government entities. In part due to these policies, the DEIR finds that impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

Response 2E

This comment is noted. No further response is necessary.

Response 2F

Based on correspondence as noted in Response 2C, the area is not expected to contain Native American human remains. However, Policy HR-3.3, noted above in Response 2D, would address any potential discovery of human remains and ensures the proper actions take place to handle such discoveries.

Response 2G

Please refer to Responses 2D and 2F above.

Response 2H

Please refer to Response 2D.

No changes to the EIR are necessary.



Dedicated to Providing Quality Water & Wastewater Service

OFFICERS

President
Charles Caspary
Director, Division 1

Vice President
Lee Renger
Director, Division 3

Secretary
Glen Peterson
Director, Division 2
MWD Representative

Treasurer
Jeffery A. Smith
Director, Division 5

Joseph M. Bowman
Director, Division 4

John R. Mundy
General Manager

Wayne K. Lemieux
Counsel

HEADQUARTERS
4232 Las Virgenes Road
Calabasas, CA 91302
(818) 251-2100
Fax (818) 251-2109

WESTLAKE
FILTRATION PLANT
(818) 251-2370
Fax (818) 251-2379

TAPIA WATER
RECLAMATION FACILITY
(818) 251-2300
Fax (818) 251-2309


RANCHO LAS VIRGENES
COMPOSTING FACILITY
(818) 251-2340
Fax (818) 251-2349

www.lvmwd.com

MEMBER AGENCY OF THE
METROPOLITAN WATER
DISTRICT
OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

January 13, 2010

Allison Cook, Principal Planner
Planning Department
City of Agoura Hills
30001 Ladyface Court
Agoura Hills, CA 91301



RE: City of Agoura Hills General Plan Update EIR

Dear Ms Cook:

Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD) is in receipt of your request for agency comment concerning the City of Agoura Hills General Plan EIR. The EIR was prepared to evaluate potential impacts of the proposed land use changes associated with future development resulting from implementation of the proposed General Plan Update, and also addresses appropriate and feasible mitigation measures or project alternatives that would minimize or eliminate these impacts.

The General Plan Update would result in only a small increase in the demand for water, and would not exceed LVMWD 2007 Master Plan projections. Buildout of the General Plan may require expansion and/or upgrade of LVMWD's water conveyance system; however, the upgrades to the conveyance system would be on a project-by-project basis.

It is anticipated that cumulative development would not exceed the capacity of the wastewater treatment system, and the City would continue to implement water conservation measures that would result in a decrease in wastewater generation.

LVMWD understands that land use designations are under the jurisdiction of the City. Potable water services to these areas by LVMWD are met with the District's purchased potable water from Metropolitan Water District (MWD). The reliability of LVMWD water supply is dependent on the reliability of its imported water supplies, which are managed and delivered by MWD. LVMWD 2007 Potable Water, Recycled Water and Sanitation Master Plans examined the capacities of the existing facilities, calculated the increased water demand and wastewater flows from the City using approved land use designations and recommended capital projects to adequately meet these changes.

If you have any questions, please contact Lindsay Cao at 818.251.2163.

Very truly yours,

David R. Lippman
David R. Lippman, P.E.
Director of Facilities and Operations

cc: Lindsay Cao



■ Response to Letter 3

COMMENTER: David R. Lippman, Director of Facilities and Operations, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District

DATE: January 13, 2010

Response 3

The commenter notes that the General Plan Update would result in only a small increase in the demand for water, and would not exceed District projections. The commenter also notes that cumulative development is not expected to exceed the capacity of the wastewater treatment system. The DEIR is consistent with these comments. No further response is necessary.

Allison Cook

From: Daniel Blankenship [DSBlankenship@dfg.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2010 3:11 PM
To: Allison Cook
Subject: General Plan Update SCH 2009051013

Dear Ms. Cook,

The Department has reviewed the above referenced DEIR. The DEIR has a solid environmental conservation framework. The Department concurs with the natural resource goals and policies listed on 4.3-39-41.

The California Wildlife Action Plan, a recent Department guidance document, identified the following stressors affecting wildlife and habitats within the project area: 1) growth and development; 2) water management conflicts and degradation of aquatic ecosystems; 3) invasive species; 4) altered fire regimes; and 5) recreational pressures. The Department looks forward to working with the City of Agoura Hills to minimize impacts to fish and wildlife resources with a focus on these stressors.

Please let me know if you would like a copy of the California Wildlife Action Plan.

I look forward to working with you and your staff during review and implementation of biological mitigation measures that will be part of specific project CEQA documents. Please let me know if you have any specific biological resource questions. I currently review CEQA documents for portions of LA and Ventura counties.

Sincerely, Dan

Daniel S. Blankenship
Staff Environmental Scientist
CA Department of Fish and Game
P.O. Box 221480
Newhall, CA 91322-1480
phone/fax (661) 259-3750
cell (661)644-8469
dsblankenship@dfg.ca.gov

Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Orders S-16-08 and S-13-09, I will not be available on the first, second, and third Fridays of the month

■ Response to Letter 4


COMMENTER: Daniel S. Blankenship, Staff Environmental Scientist, California Department of Fish and Game

DATE: January 20, 2010

Response 4


The commenter notes that the DEIR has a solid environmental conservation framework, and concurs with the natural resource goals and policies. No further response is necessary.

5



January 25, 2010

Ms. Allison Cook
Principal Planner
City of Agoura Hills
Planning and Community Development Department
30001 Ladyface Court
Agoura Hills, CA 91301
acook@ci.agoura-hills.ca.us



Main Office

818 West Seventh Street
12th Floor
Los Angeles, California
90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800
f (213) 236-1825

www.scag.ca.gov

Officers

President
Jon Edney, El Centro

First Vice President
Larry McCallon, Highland

Second Vice President
Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica

Immediate Past President
Richard Dixon, Lake Forest

**Executive/Administration
Committee Chair**

Jon Edney, El Centro

Policy Committee Chairs

Community, Economic and
Human Development
Cari Morehouse, Ventura

Energy & Environment
Keith Hanks, Azusa

Transportation
Mike Ten, South Pasadena

RE: SCAG Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the City of Agoura Hills General Plan Update [SCAG No. I20090665]

Dear Ms. Cook,

Thank you for submitting the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the City of Agoura Hills General Plan Update [SCAG No. I20090665] to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for review and comment. SCAG is the authorized regional agency for Inter-Governmental Review of Programs proposed for federal financial assistance and direct development activities, pursuant to Presidential Executive Order 12372 (replacing A-95 Review). Additionally, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083(d) SCAG reviews Environmental Impacts Reports of projects of regional significance for consistency with regional plans per the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, Sections 15125(d) and 15206(a)(1). SCAG is also the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency and as such is responsible for both preparation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) under California Government Code Section 65080 and 65082. As the clearinghouse for regionally significant projects per Executive Order 12372, SCAG reviews the consistency of local plans, projects, and programs with regional plans. This activity is based on SCAG's responsibilities as a regional planning organization pursuant to state and federal laws and regulations. Guidance provided by these reviews is intended to assist local agencies and project sponsors to take actions that contribute to the attainment of regional goals and policies.

SCAG staff has reviewed this project and determined that the proposed project is regionally significant per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Sections 15125 and/or 15206. The proposed project entails a General Plan Update for the City of Agoura Hills, which would guide physical development of the City through 2035.

We have evaluated this project based on the policies of SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Compass Growth Vision (CGV) that may be applicable to your project. The RTP and CGV can be found on the SCAG web site at: <http://scag.ca.gov/igr>. The attached detailed comments are meant to provide guidance for considering the proposed project within the context of our regional goals and policies. We also encourage the use of the SCAG List of Mitigation Measures extracted from the RTP to aid with demonstrating consistency with regional plans and policies. Please send a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) ONLY to SCAG's main office in Los Angeles for our review. If you have any questions regarding the attached comments, please contact Bernard Lee at (213) 236-1895. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jacob Lieb, Manager
Assessment, Housing & EIR

DOCS# 155210

**COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
FOR THE CITY OF AGOURA HILLS GENERAL PLAN UPDATE
[SCAG NO. I20090665]**

PROJECT LOCATION

The project is located Citywide in the City of Agoura Hills. Located in the foothills of the Santa Monica Mountains on the western edge of Los Angeles County in the Conejo Valley, the City of Agoura Hills is characterized by rolling hills and a blend of semi-rural and suburban development. The City, which encompasses nearly 7 square miles (approximately 4,366 acres), straddles the Ventura Freeway and is situated approximately 36 miles west of downtown Los Angeles. Generally, Agoura Hills is bordered by Westlake Village to the west, Thousand Oaks to the northwest, Ventura County to the north, Calabasas and unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County to the east, and unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County to the south.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The City of Agoura Hills is regulated by objectives and policies put forth in the General Plan. The General Plan is a state-required legal document (Government Code Section 65300) that provides guidance to decision makers regarding the conservation of resources and the future physical form and character of development for the city. It is the official statement of the jurisdiction regarding the extent and types of development of land and infrastructure that will achieve the community's physical, economic, social, and environmental goals. The General Plan expresses the City's goals and articulates the City's intentions with respect to the rights and expectations of the general public, property owners, community interest groups, prospective investors, and business interests. Although the General Plan consists of individual sections, or elements, that address a specific area of concern, it also embodies a comprehensive and integrated planning approach for the jurisdiction.

Under state law, each General Plan must contain seven elements:

- Land Use
- Circulation
- Housing
- Conservation
- Open Space
- Noise
- Safety

The existing General Plan in the City of Agoura Hills was adopted in 1993. The proposed General Plan Update includes a focused update of the Land Use, Circulation, and Noise Elements. Refinement of the remaining Elements and consolidation into four new "super elements" will take place with the focused update.

The proposed General Plan Update provides for the development of approximately 116 single-family residential dwelling units, 413 multifamily residential, 625,794 square feet of retail/service, 1,098,291 square feet of office/business park, and 273,445 square feet of business park/manufacturing uses through the year 2035. The actual development patterns may occur differently than anticipated in this document due to market forces. For example, the pace of development may be faster or slower than anticipated by the analysis, or it could not occur at all.

CONSISTENCY WITH REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Regional Growth Forecasts

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) should reflect the most current SCAG forecasts, which are the 2008 RTP (May 2008) Population, Household and Employment forecasts. The forecasts for your region, subregion, and city are as follows:

Adopted SCAG Regionwide Forecasts¹

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2030</u>	<u>2035</u>
Population	19,418,344	20,465,830	21,468,948	22,395,121	23,255,377	24,057,286
Households	6,086,986	6,474,074	6,840,328	7,156,645	7,449,484	7,710,722
Employment	8,349,453	8,811,406	9,183,029	9,546,773	9,913,376	10,287,125

Adopted LV-MCOG Subregion Forecasts¹

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2030</u>	<u>2035</u>
Population	94,525	97,304	101,622	105,898	110,027	113,960
Households	32,571	33,610	35,259	36,584	37,841	38,874
Employment	316,766	326,071	339,071	351,525	363,635	374,847

Adopted City of Agoura Hills Forecasts¹

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2030</u>	<u>2035</u>
Population	23,348	23,357	23,401	23,439	23,472	23,501
Households	7,486	7,544	7,605	7,652	7,698	7,736
Employment	11,942	12,277	12,491	12,743	13,011	13,269

1. The 2008 RTP growth forecast at the regional, subregional, and city level was adopted by the Regional Council in May 2008.

SCAG Staff Comments:

Based on a review of Chapter 4.10 (Population, Housing, and Employment), SCAG staff has confirmed that the DEIR accounts for SCAG's 2008 RTP growth forecasts. However, as indicated on page 4.2-19, the City's employment and population projections for the year 2035, based on General Plan buildout, exceed SCAG's projections.

The 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) also has goals and policies that are pertinent to this proposed project. This RTP links the goal of sustaining mobility with the goals of fostering economic development, enhancing the environment, reducing energy consumption, promoting transportation-friendly development patterns, and encouraging fair and equitable access to residents affected by socio-economic, geographic and commercial limitations. The RTP continues to support all applicable federal and state laws in implementing the proposed project. Among the relevant goals and policies of the RTP are the following:

Regional Transportation Plan Goals:

- RTP G1 *Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region.*
- RTP G2 *Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region.*
- RTP G3 *Preserve and ensure a sustainable regional transportation system.*
- RTP G4 *Maximize the productivity of our transportation system.*
- RTP G5 *Protect the environment, improve air quality and promote energy efficiency.*
- RTP G6 *Encourage land use and growth patterns that complement our transportation investments.*
- RTP G7 *Maximize the security of our transportation system through improved system monitoring.*

rapid recovery planning, and coordination with other security agencies.

SCAG Staff Comments:

SCAG staff finds that the proposed project generally meets consistency with RTP G6, and meets partial consistency with RTP G1, G4, and G5. RTP G2, G3, and G7 are not applicable to this project since it is not a transportation project.

The proposed project partially meets consistency with RTP G1. Mobility pertains to the speed at which one may travel and the delay, or difference between the actual travel time and travel time that would be experienced if a person traveled at the legal speed limit. Per page 4.13-69, in year 2035 "the proposed General Plan Update would result in future operating conditions at LOS D and below at sixteen locations, even after incorporation of the proposed roadway improvements." Accessibility measures how well the transportation system provides people access to opportunities, such as jobs, education, shopping, recreation, and medical care. The proposed project offers regional auto access via US Highway 101 and local access via Kanan Road and Reyes Adobe Road in the north/south direction, and Agoura Road and Thousand Oaks Boulevard in the east/west direction. In addition, the addition of new commercial uses in the City would improve accessibility for its residents.

With regard to RTP G4, the proposed project partially meets consistency. Productivity is a system efficiency measure that reflects the degree to which the transportation system performs during peak demand conditions. As indicated previously, the proposed project would impact sixteen locations in the transportation network.

The proposed project is partially consistent with RTP G5. As mentioned on page 4.2-22, "Construction and operation of the proposed project could generate emissions that exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD for ROG, NO_x, CO, and PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}."

The proposed project generally meets consistency with RTP G6. US Highway 101 runs through the City. Also, the City is served by three bus lines, in addition to dial-a-ride and seasonal shuttle services.

GROWTH VISIONING

The fundamental goal of the **Compass Growth Visioning** effort is to make the SCAG region a better place to live, work and play for all residents regardless of race, ethnicity or income class. Thus, decisions regarding growth, transportation, land use, and economic development should be made to promote and sustain for future generations the region's mobility, livability and prosperity. The following "Regional Growth Principles" are proposed to provide a framework for local and regional decision making that improves the quality of life for all SCAG residents. Each principle is followed by a specific set of strategies intended to achieve this goal.

Principle 1: Improve mobility for all residents.

- GV P1.1** *Encourage transportation investments and land use decisions that are mutually supportive.*
- GV P1.2** *Locate new housing near existing jobs and new jobs near existing housing.*
- GV P1.3** *Encourage transit-oriented development.*
- GV P1.4** *Promote a variety of travel choices*

SCAG Staff Comments:

The proposed project generally meets consistency with Principle 1. GV P1.3 is not applicable as the City does not readily lend itself to transit accessibility.

The proposed project generally meets consistency with GV P1.1. As mentioned previously, US Highway 101 runs through the city, providing regional access while several roadways provide local access. And public transit service is provided by regular and seasonal bus, and dial-a-ride services.

With regard to GV P1.2, the proposed project generally meets consistency. The project makes provision for new housing and employment generating space. Of note is the City's projection for jobs/housing ratio in 2035 is 2.0, which is higher than SCAG's projection of 1.72 for the City and considerably higher than 1.26 projected for the region.

With regard to GV P1.4, the proposed project generally meets consistency. In addition to auto and public transit, the project provides provisions for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Principle 2: Foster livability in all communities.

- GV P2.1 *Promote infill development and redevelopment to revitalize existing communities.*
- GV P2.2 *Promote developments, which provide a mix of uses.*
- GV P2.3 *Promote "people scaled," walkable communities.*
- GV P2.4 *Support the preservation of stable, single-family neighborhoods.*

SCAG Staff Comments:

The proposed project meets consistency with Principle 2.

The proposed project meets consistency with GV P2.1. The project calls for new growth in areas of the City that are generally infill in nature.

With regard to GV P2.2, the proposed project meets consistency as several of the subareas in the General Plan suggest a mixture of uses.

The proposed project meets consistency with GV P2.3. Several subareas call for the creation of pedestrian-oriented developments.

With regard to GV P2.4, the proposed project meets consistency as it does not intend to generate new development in single-family neighborhoods.

Principle 3: Enable prosperity for all people.

- GV P3.1 *Provide, in each community, a variety of housing types to meet the housing needs of all income levels.*
- GV P3.2 *Support educational opportunities that promote balanced growth.*
- GV P3.3 *Ensure environmental justice regardless of race, ethnicity or income class.*
- GV P3.4 *Support local and state fiscal policies that encourage balanced growth*
- GV P3.5 *Encourage civic engagement.*

SCAG Staff Comments:

Principle 3 cannot be assessed based on the information provided in the General Plan Update DEIR.

Principle 4: Promote sustainability for future generations.

- GV P4.1** *Preserve rural, agricultural, recreational, and environmentally sensitive areas*
- GV P4.2** *Focus development in urban centers and existing cities.*
- GV P4.3** *Develop strategies to accommodate growth that uses resources efficiently, eliminate pollution and significantly reduce waste.*
- GV P4.4** *Utilize "green" development techniques*

SCAG Staff Comments:

SCAG staff finds that the project is consistent with Principle 4.

The proposed project generally meets consistency with GV P4.1, since it intends to promote growth in developed areas, in most cases.

With regard to GV P4.2, the proposed project meets consistency. The project largely intends to focus new growth in areas that are already developed within the City.

With regard to GV P4.3 and P4.4, the proposed project meets consistency. Several goals describe policies that are intended to be more energy efficient (Goal U-5), reduce pollution (Goal NR-10), reduce waste (Goal U-4), and utilize "green" development techniques (Goal LU-5).

CONCLUSION

Where applicable, the proposed project partially meets consistency with SCAG Regional Transportation Plan Goals and generally meets consistency with Compass Growth Visioning Principles.

All feasible measures needed to mitigate any potentially negative regional impacts associated with the proposed project should be implemented and monitored, as required by CEQA. We recommend that you review the SCAG List of Mitigation Measures for additional guidance, and encourage you to follow them, where applicable to your project. The SCAG List of Mitigation Measures may be found here:
http://www.scag.ca.gov/igr/documents/SCAG_IGRMMRP_2008.pdf

When a project is of statewide, regional, or areawide significance, transportation information generated by a required monitoring or reporting program shall be submitted to SCAG as such information becomes reasonably available, in accordance with CEQA, Public Resource Code Section 21018.7, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097 (g).

■ Response to Letter 5

COMMENTER: Jacob Lieb, Manager, Assessment, Housing & EIR, Southern California Association of Governments

DATE: January 25, 2010

Response 5

This letter indicates that the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has reviewed the General Plan Update based on the policies of SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Compass Growth Vision (CGV). A list of recommended SCAG mitigation measures from the RTP is included in the letter to aid in demonstrating project consistency with regional plans and policies. The commenter concludes that the General Plan Update policies are consistent, generally consistent or partially consistent with the RTP and GCV. The General Plan Update sought to meet all requirements of the RTP and GCV, to the best ability. In some cases, the RTP and GCV policies and provisions do not apply to the General Plan Update, or apply only in part. Many of the mitigation measures identified in the RTP, and recommended by SCAG in this letter, have already been incorporated into the General Plan Update, where feasible. The City will continue consider the recommended list of SCAG mitigation measures for use in CEQA documents that are required as individual development projects are proposed in the future. No changes to the DEIR and no further comments are necessary.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY


county of ventura

Planning Division

Kimberly L. Rodriguez
Director

January 25, 2010

City of Agoura Hills
Planning & Community Development
30001 Ladyface Court
Agoura Hills, CA 91301
Attn.: Allison Cook

E-mail: acook@ci.agoura-hills.ca.us

Subject: Comments on DEIR for the Proposed 2006-2014 General Plan Housing
Element Update

Dear Ms. Cook:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the subject document. Attached are the comments that we have received resulting from intra-county review of the subject document. Additional comments may have been sent directly to you by other County agencies.

Your proposed responses to these comments should be sent directly to the commenter, with a copy to Laura Hocking, Ventura County Planning Division, L#1740, 800 S. Victoria Avenue, Ventura, CA 93009.

If you have any questions regarding any of the comments, please contact the appropriate respondent. Overall questions may be directed to Laura Hocking at (805) 654-2443.

Sincerely,

Tricia Maier, Manager
Program Administration Section

Attachment

County RMA Reference Number 09-019-2



■ Response to Letter 6

COMMENTER: Tricia Maier, Manager, Program Administration Section, County of Ventura Resource Management Agency

DATE: January 25, 2010

Response 6

The commenter thanks the City for the opportunity to review and comment on the DEIR, and notes the inclusion of comment letters from various County departments. The specific comments are Letters 7 and 8, the responses to which follow. No further response to this letter is necessary.

7

JAN 25 2010

ac



**PUBLIC WORKS AGENCY
TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT
Traffic, Advance Planning & Permits Division**

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 30, 2009
TO: RMA – Planning Division
Attention: Laura Hocking
FROM: Ben Emami, Engineering Manager II
SUBJECT: **REVIEW OF DOCUMENT 09-019** Notice of Availability (NOA) and Notice of Intent (NOI) to Adopt and Public Hearing for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)
City of Agoura Hills General Plan Update (GPU). (city)
Lead Agency: **City of Agoura Hills**

Pursuant to your request, the Public Works Agency -- Transportation Department has completed the review of the NOA and NOI to Adopt and Public Hearing for the Draft EIR for the City of Agoura Hills GPU. The Draft EIR was prepared to evaluate the environmental effects of the adoption of the GPU. The Draft EIR analyzes the following issue areas: aesthetics; air quality; biological resources; cultural resources; geology and soils; hazard and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use and planning; noise; population, housing, employment; public services; recreation; transportation/traffic; utilities and service systems; and climate change. The Draft EIR identifies less than significant, as well as potentially significant, but mitigatable, environmental effects of the project in the areas of: air quality; biological resources; cultural resources; geology and soils; hazard and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use and planning; noise; population, housing, employment; recreation; transportation/traffic; utilities and service systems; and climate change. The Draft EIR identifies significant and unavoidable impacts for which there is no feasible mitigation in the following areas: air quality; cultural resources; noise; population, housing, employment; and transportation/traffic. The GPU is a comprehensive long-range plan for the physical development of the City through 2035.

We offer these comments:

1. The Draft EIR indicates that this project would generate additional traffic to the Regional Road Network. Table 4.13-8, page 4.13-50, of the Draft EIR provides that the Proposed General Plan (GP) Trip Generation would be 45,302 daily trips.

2. When future developments are proposed, the projects may have site specific and/or cumulative impact on County roadways. The subsequent environmental document for these projects should include any site-specific or cumulative impact to the County Road Network and local roads. The project proponent will then be required to mitigate any adverse impacts this project may have on County Road Network. To address the cumulative adverse impacts of traffic on the Regional Road Network, Traffic Impact Mitigation Fees (TIMF) should be assessed on development projects in accordance with the terms of the Agreement between the City of Agoura Hills and the County dated February 12, 1992 (see attached). With payment of the TIMF, the level of service and safety of the existing roads with regards to cumulative impact would remain consistent with the County's GP.

3. Please provide us a copy of the Final EIR for our review and comments, when it becomes available.

Our review is limited to the impacts this project may have on the County's Regional Road Network.

Please contact me at 654-2087 if you have questions.

■ Response to Letter 7

COMMENTER: Ben Emami, Engineering Manager II, Ventura County Public Works Agency, Transportation Department


DATE: December 30, 2009

Response 7

The commenter reiterates the level of traffic that would result from implementation of the General Plan Update, as noted in the DEIR. Section 4.13 (Transportation/Traffic) adequately addresses potential impacts of the proposed General Plan implementation on the surrounding roadway system. Additionally, the commenter refers to an agreement between the City of Agoura Hills and the County of Ventura dated February 2, 1992, which requires the City to condition projects to mitigate traffic and circulation impacts along County roadways. These comments are noted. Individual development projects proposed in the City in the future would be required to assess specific potential traffic impacts to City and County roadways, and would be required to comply with all applicable City and County traffic mitigation programs. No further response is necessary.

JAN 25 2010

ac



COUNTY OF VENTURA
PUBLIC WORKS AGENCY
WATERSHED PROTECTION DISTRICT

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 22, 2010

TO: Laura Hocking,
RMA Planning Technician

FROM: Robin Jester, P.E., Acting Permit Manager
Planning and Regulatory

SUBJECT: RMA 09-019-2 – City of Agoura Hills Draft General Plan Update
Los Angeles County

Project Description:

Notice the City of Agoura Hills Draft General Plan Update is available for review.

Comments:

The Planning and Regulatory Division has provided comments on May 29, 2009 and December 4, 2009 and the District has no further comments.

End of Text

■ Response to Letter 8

COMMENTER: Robin Jester, Acting Permit Manager, Planning and Regulatory, Ventura County Public Works Agency, Watershed Protection District

DATE: January 22, 2010

Response 8

The commenter states that the County of Ventura Planning and Regulatory Division has previously provided comments on May 29, 2009, and December 4, 2009, and has no further comments. This comment is noted. No further response is necessary.




COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
"Creating Community Through People, Parks and Programs"

Russ Guiney, Director

January 25, 2010

Sent via email: acook@ci.agoura-hills.ca.us

Ms. Allison Cook
Principal Planner
Planning Department
City of Agoura Hills
30001 Ladyface Court
Agoura Hills, CA 93010



Dear Ms. Cook:

**CITY OF AGOURA HILLS
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR)
FOR THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE**

The Department of Parks and Recreation has reviewed the above project for potential impact on the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Department. As mentioned in the previous comment letter for the Notice of Preparation for the Draft EIR, the proposed joint County/ National Park Service (NPS) Zuma Ridge Trail is part of the General Plan Update. Please collaborate with this Department and NPS for any future plans for the trail.

Thank you for including this Department in the review process. If you have any trail related inquiries, please contact Andrew Lopez at (213) 639-6058 or anlopez@parks.lacounty.gov.

Sincerely,

Joan Rupert
Section Head
Environmental & Regulatory Permitting Section

JR:JY:tis/response Agoura Hills General Plan update DEIR

c: National Park Service (I. Nicholson)
Parks and Recreation (N. E. Garcia, L. Hensley, F. Moreno, A. Lopez, J. Yom)

■ Responses to Letter 9

COMMENTS: Joan Rupert, Section Head, Environmental & Regulatory Permitting Section, Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation

DATE: January 25, 2010

Response 9

The commenter notes that the proposed County of Los Angeles/National Park Service (NPS) Zuma Ridge Trail is part of the General Plan Update, and asks for collaboration with the County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation for any future plans for the trail. The proposed Zuma Ridge (Simi-to-Sea) Trail is partially within the City of Agoura Hills. Figure 4.12-2 of the EIR shows existing and proposed trails in and adjacent to the City. Currently in the City, the southernmost portion of the Zuma Ridge Trail follows Agoura Road westerly from Dorothy Drive to Cornell Road, where it terminates. The Agoura Village Specific Plan (AVSP), adopted by the City Council in 2008, shows a conceptual continuation of this alignment along Cornell Road to south of the City, as does the Citywide Trails and Pathways Master Plan, adopted by the City Council in 2009. The General Plan Update, and the EIR, reference and follow the Citywide Trails and Pathways Master Plan. The specific additional alignment needed within the City in order to connect with the Zuma Ridge Trail south of the City would be coordinated with both of these agencies, and in consideration of the feasibility of being able to acquire permission of property owners and the practicality of trail construction given physical constraints. Goals and policies that address trails in the City are found in Chapter 3, Section C., of the General Plan Update. In particular, Policy CS-5.3 specifically calls for coordination of the City's trail system with regional jurisdictions and other public agencies. Policy CS-5.1 calls for linking the local trail and pathway system to existing and proposed regional trails. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR as an environmental document. Therefore, no further response is necessary and no changes are proposed to the DEIR.

OLD AGOURA HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
6064 CHESEBRO ROAD
AGOURA HILLS, CALIFORNIA 91301
818-889-9965

COMMENT ON DEIR GENERAL PLAN UPDATE 2010

Allison Cook – Principal Planner
City of Agoura Hills
30001 Ladyface Court
Agoura Hills, CA 91301
acook@ci.agoura-hills.ca.us

JAN 26 2010

ac

25 JAN 2010

Dear Ms. Cook,

There are several inconsistencies in the DEIR that we would request to be resolved. Additionally, we have found that some longstanding problems lack inclusion for possible remedy and that some listed traffic circulation improvements should be reconsidered for alternative decisions. For these reasons, we find that the DEIR is deficient in stating and examining possible solutions to historic environmental problems in Old Agoura.

10a

DRIVER AVENUE

The designation of Driver is inconsistent at several places in the DEIR and those designations are inconsistent with the specifications given for the street's use. On page 4.13-6, Driver is listed as a "collector", and in Table 4.13-3 on page 4.13-17 it is called an "arterial". In the Fehr & Peers traffic study, in appendix B on page 10, Driver is termed a "collector street". In the Draft General Plan document, Figure M-2 shows the design width and cross section specifications for the different street designations. Driver barely qualifies for the specs of a "local street", which are depicted as 32-40 feet of paving width, 2-lane undivided. Now, according to the peak load counts Driver is being used as a secondary arterial, which is supposed to be 60-80 feet wide and either divided or undivided. Since Driver's width and capacity are substandard for its use, the DEIR must explore alternative routes and other ways to reduce the traffic load.

10b

10c

10d

The main problem for Old Agoura residents concerning Driver is not being able to exit from Colodny, Fairview, Lewis, or Foothill onto Driver during Agoura High rush hours. Placing stop signs on Driver at each of these locations would create enough gaps in traffic flow for residents to exit these feeder streets, as well as allow exit from the many private driveways on Driver.

10e

FLOOD CONTROL

Section 4.7 mentions the reliance on Palo Comado and Chesebro creeks to carry storm water runoff from Old Agoura to the lined channel South of Old Agoura Park. These creeks are not maintained to allow adequate flood control in major storms. Two jurisdictional interfaces combine to add to this problem. A three-fourths mile section of Chesebro Creek is in unincorporated Los Angeles County, and is on land owned by the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area. Additionally, the California Department of Fish and Game regulates any activity within these seasonal creeks. Since the City contracts with the County Department of Public Works for maintenance of flood control, the DEIR should stress the need for developing a protocol between these entities for adequate flood control. Many residences along the Palo Comado section that feeds into the Chesebro creek are susceptible to flooding when major storms occur.

10f

PRIVATE SEWAGE SYSTEMS

Reference is made to section 4.14.8, Draft General plan Goals and Policies of the 4.14 Utilities and Service Systems section. Specifically, Policy U-2.2 advocates the potential for extending public sewer systems throughout Old Agoura. The DEIR should delve into the enormous complexity and expense of such an undertaking. Private septic system failures are relatively rare in Old Agoura. As incredibly expensive as modern private systems are, they are still much less than a share of the cost of an entire public system. All of the newer homes and significant re-models have installed the newer systems. Any study of the possibility of a blanket installation of public sewers should include the growth inducing and reduction in ground water recharging aspects of deleting private sewage systems. It is worth mentioning that the Old Topanga neighborhood of Calabasas has initiated a movement to secede from that city because of a heavy-handed, and technically uninformed, effort to impose a complete public system in their community. Old Agoura is aware of the present and pending State legislation regarding private sewage systems, and we appreciate the City's record of cooperation in tracking that intent and movement.

10g

CONCLUSION

This concludes our comment on the DEIR for the General Plan update, and we eagerly anticipate contributing to the development of the overall update.

Jess Thomas, President
Old Agoura Homeowners Association

■ Responses to Letter 10

COMMENTER: Jess Thomas, President, Old Agoura Homeowners' Association

DATE: January 25, 2010

Response 10A

The commenter notes that there are several inconsistencies in the DEIR to be resolved. He goes on to list these specifically further in the letter. Therefore, responses to each of the issues are included below.

Response 10B

The commenter notes that the DEIR and the General Plan Update contain inconsistencies in terms of the roadway classification given to Driver Avenue. The correct classification is “collector.” For the most part, the General Plan Update and DEIR correctly identify the classification. There are two places where the reference has been corrected. Table 4.13-3 on page 4.13-17 and Table 4.13-9 on page 4.13-52 of the DEIR incorrectly refer to an “arterial classification,” which has been changed in the tables as follows, and in the text of the FEIR:

Table 4.13-3 Existing Peak Hour & Daily Levels of Service

	<i>Street Segment</i>	<i>Classification</i>	<i># of Lanes</i>	<i>Peak Hour</i>	<i>Volume</i>	<i>LOS</i>
12	Kanan Rd (s/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	Arterial	4D	AM	2,660	D
			4D	PM	2,360	D
			—	Daily	31,200	—
13	Driver Ave (e/o Argos St)	Collector	2U	AM	1,005	D
			2U	PM	625	C or better
			—	Daily	6,800	—
14	Agoura Rd (e/o Flintlock Ln)	Arterial	4D	AM	680	C or better
			4D	PM	880	C or better
			—	Daily	8,600	—
15	Reyes Adobe Rd (n/o Canwood St)	Arterial	4U	AM	1,280	C or better
			4U	PM	1,110	C or better
			—	Daily	13,400	—
16	Canwood St (w/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Collector	2U	AM	420	C or better
			2U	PM	485	D
			—	Daily	5,500	—
17	Canwood St (e/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	245	C or better
			2U	PM	265	C or better
			—	Daily	3,100	—

Chapter 10 Responses to Comments

<i>Street Segment</i>		<i>Classification</i>	<i># of Lanes</i>	<i>Peak Hour</i>	<i>Volume</i>	<i>LOS</i>
18	Reyes Adobe Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	4D	AM	1,350	C or better
			4D	PM	1,165	C or better
			—	Daily	13,300	—
19	Agoura Rd (w/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	4D	AM	775	C or better
			4D	PM	800	C or better
			—	Daily	9,150	—
20	Agoura Rd (e/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	4D	AM	1,090	C or better
			4D	PM	1,095	C or better
			—	Daily	11,700	—
21	Kanan Rd (s/o Canwood St E)	Arterial	5D	AM	3,190	D
			5D	PM	3,065	D
			—	Daily	39,700	—
22	Canwood St (w/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	325	C or better
			2U	PM	380	C or better
			—	Daily	4,150	—
23	Canwood St (e/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	790	C or better
			2U	PM	855	C or better
			—	Daily	9,750	—
24	Kanan Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	4D	AM	1,705	C or better
			4D	PM	1,785	C or better
			—	Daily	21,800	—
25	Agoura Rd (w/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	765	C or better
			2U	PM	795	C or better
			—	Daily	9,050	—
26	Agoura Rd (e/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	390	C or better
			2U	PM	525	C or better
			—	Daily	6,250	—
27	Kanan Rd (s/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	1,310	D
			2U	PM	1,345	D
			—	Daily	15,500	—
28	Roadside Dr (w/o Lewis Rd)	Collector	2U	AM	225	C or better
			2U	PM	250	C or better
			—	Daily	2,800	—
29	Agoura Rd (e/o Cornell Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	385	C or better
			2U	PM	455	C or better
			—	Daily	5,300	—
30	Chesebro Rd (n/o Driver Ave)	Collector	2U	AM	255	C or better
			2U	PM	325	C or better

Street Segment		Classification	# of Lanes	Peak Hour	Volume	LOS
			—	Daily	3,450	—
31	Driver Ave (w/o Chesebro Rd)	Collector	2U	AM	1,100	D
			2U	PM	690	C or better
			—	Daily	8,200	—
32	Palo Comado Canyon (e/o Chesebro Rd)	Arterial	2U	AM	1,490	F
			2U	PM	1,080	D
			—	Daily	12,550	—

Table 4.13-9 Future Peak Hour Levels of Service

Street Segment	Classification	Peak Hour	Year 2035 with Proposed General Plan Land use									
			Year 2035 Base			Without Improvements		With Proposed Circulation Element				Less than LOS
			Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	# of Lanes	LOS		
11	Thousand Oaks Blvd (e/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,615	4D	C or better	1,665	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
			PM	925	4D	C or better	1,000	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
12	Kanan Rd (s/o Thousand Oaks Blvd)	Arterial	AM	2,895	4D	D	3,130	4D	F	4D	F	**
			PM	2,555	4D	D	2,895	4D	D	4D	D	**
13	Driver Ave (e/o Argos St)	Collector	AM	1,090	2U	D	1,130	2U	D	2U	D	**
			PM	635	2U	C or better	700	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
14	Agoura Rd (e/o Flintock Ln)	Arterial	AM	710	4D	C or better	830	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
			PM	885	4D	C or better	1,045	4D	C or better	4D	C or better	
15	Reyes Adobe Rd (n/o Canwood St)	Arterial	AM	1,280	4U	C or better	1,470	4U	C or better	4U	C or better	
			PM	1,110	4U	C or better	1,380	4U	C or better	4U	C or better	
16	Canwood St (w/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Collector	AM	445	2U	C or better	445	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
			PM	490	2U	D	490	2U	D	2U	D	**
17	Canwood St (e/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	AM	245	2U	C or better	285	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
			PM	265	2U	C or better	315	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
18	Reyes Adobe Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,355	4D	C or better	1,935	4D	C or better	5D	C or better	
			PM	1,165	4D	C or better	1,965	4D	C or better	5D	C or better	

Chapter 10 Responses to Comments

Street Segment	Classification	Peak Hour	Year 2035 with Proposed General Plan Land use									Less than LOS
			Year 2035 Base		Without Improvements		With Proposed Circulation Element					
			Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	# of Lanes	LOS		
19 Agoura Rd (w/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	AM	810	4D	C or better	1,110	4D	C or better	4D	C or better		
		PM	805	4D	C or better	1,230	4D	C or better	4D	C or better		
20 Agoura Rd (e/o Reyes Adobe Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,120	4D	C or better	1,505	4D	C or better	4D	C or better		
		PM	1,100	4D	C or better	1,630	4D	C or better	4D	C or better		
21 Kanan Rd (s/o Canwood St E)	Arterial	AM	3,470	5D	D	3,970	5D	F	5D	F	**	
		PM	3,315	5D	D	4,180	5D	F	5D	F	**	
22 Canwood St (w/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	AM	345	2U	C or better	630	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
		PM	385	2U	C or better	730	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
23 Canwood St (e/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	AM	790	2U	C or better	1,110	2U	D	2.5U*	C or better		
		PM	855	2U	C or better	1,560	2U	F	2.5U*	D	**	
24 Kanan Rd (n/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,990	4D	C or better	2,800	4D	D	4D	D	**	
		PM	2,095	4D	D	3,300	4D	F	4D	F	**	
25 Agoura Rd (w/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	AM	795	2U	C or better	1,325	2U	D	4D	C or better		
		PM	805	2U	C or better	1,535	2U	F	4D	C or better		
26 Agoura Rd (e/o Kanan Rd)	Arterial	AM	425	2U	C or better	695	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
		PM	530	2U	C or better	930	2U	D	2U	D	**	
27 Kanan Rd (s/o Agoura Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,545	2U	F	1,880	2U	F	4U	C or better		
		PM	1,595	2U	F	2,115	2U	F	4U	D	**	
28 Roadside Dr (w/o Lewis Rd)	Collector	AM	225	2U	C or better	300	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
		PM	250	2U	C or better	350	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
29 Agoura Rd (e/o Cornell Rd)	Arterial	AM	430	2U	C or better	700	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		
		PM	470	2U	C or better	875	2U	D	2U	D	**	
30 Chesebro Rd (n/o Driver Ave)	Collector	AM	360	2U	C or better	360	2U	C or better	2U	C or better		

Street Segment	Classification	Peak Hour	Year 2035 with Proposed General Plan Land use								
			Year 2035 Base		Without Improvements			With Proposed Circulation Element			Less than LOS
			Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	Volume	# of Lanes	LOS	# of Lanes	LOS	
31 Driver Ave (w/o Chesebro Rd)	Collector	PM	335	2U	C or better	335	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
		AM	1,185	2U	D	1,225	2U	D	2U	D	**
		PM	700	2U	C or better	755	2U	C or better	2U	C or better	
32 Palo Comado Canyon (e/o Chesebro Rd)	Arterial	AM	1,495	2U	F	1,725	2U	F	4U	C or better	
		PM	1,080	2U	D	1,520	2U	F	4U	C or better	

In addition, Figure M-1 of the General Plan Update also incorrectly shows Driver Avenue as an arterial. Figure M-1 of the General Plan Update has been corrected to show Driver Avenue as a collector.

Response 10C

The commenter notes that Driver Avenue qualifies for the specifications of a local street, as defined in Figure M-2 of the General Plan Update, but that it is being used as a secondary arterial given peak load counts. It is not certain to which peak load counts the commenter is referring. Driver Avenue experiences heavy traffic flow primarily during the starting and ending times at the high school, but traffic flow eases outside of these hours.

In any case, the classification of a roadway is determined by how it is used, not by its width. The information in Figure M-2 of the General Plan Update is provided as general guidance for how roadways are commonly designed in terms of width. Local streets provide access directly from residences. Secondary arterials are similar to primary arterials, which are designed to move relatively high volumes of traffic between the freeway and local circulation system, but they tend to serve a more localized function. Driver Avenue is classified as a collector, since it serves as a connector between local residential streets and arterials. By its function, it would neither serve as a local street nor a secondary arterial. This comment does not pertain to the DEIR adequacy, therefore no changes are proposed to the document.

Response 10D

The commenter notes that the width and capacity of Driver Avenue are substandard for its use, and so the DEIR must explore alternative routes and other ways to reduce traffic. As noted above, the classification of Driver Avenue is as a collector street, and reflects the function of the roadway. There is no need to change this classification.

Section 4.13 (Transportation/Traffic) of the DEIR analyzes potential impacts to the roadways throughout the City. The General Plan Update proposes a series of roadway improvements, as feasible, which are reflected in the DEIR, to alleviate congestion throughout the City.

Driver Avenue is forecast to operate at Level of Service (LOS) D in the AM peak hour period. Both Driver Avenue east of Argos Street and Driver Avenue west of Chesebro Road are shown on page 4-13.62 of the DEIR, under “Future Conditions with Proposed General Plan Improvements” with these LOS, which primarily result from the traffic patterns currently created by the high school. Specifically for Driver Avenue, the DEIR notes on page 4.13-67 that traffic volumes along Driver Avenue are not expected to increase significantly under future conditions.

Page 4.13-62 under “Year 2035 (Future) with Project Locations Below LOS C,” notes that some roadway segments in the City remain below LOS C with the General Plan Update implementation. The text lists several factors preventing the implementation of physical improvements on such roadways to alleviate congestion, including physical constraints, adverse impacts to neighborhood character/quality of life, and general policy. For Driver Avenue in particular, it goes on to state that the surrounding neighborhood of Old Agoura is low-density and the introduction of additional traffic lanes would detract from the overall neighborhood character. Therefore, no improvements to widen capacity are proposed along Driver Avenue. Therefore, per CEQA, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur along Driver Avenue, as well as select other City roadways. The impact is considered unavoidable, as there is no feasible mitigation measures to address this impact, in consideration of the quality of life issues noted above. Therefore, in order to adopt the proposed General Plan, the City Council must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations per CEQA regarding all significant and unavoidable environmental impacts, including those related to transportation/circulation.

Related to this, Policy M-1.3 of the General Plan Update identifies establishing flexible minimum acceptable LOS criteria for a series of roadways in the City, including Driver Avenue, by allowing an LOS less than C. It lists roadway segments adjacent to schools (Driver Avenue and Lake Lindero Road) due to heavy usage before and after school hours.

The General Plan Update and DEIR have adequately explored feasible methods to reduce the traffic load on Driver Avenue, as described above. No further changes to the DEIR are necessary.

Response 10E

The commenter notes that the problem for Old Agoura residents concerning Driver Avenue is not being able to exit from Colodny Drive, Fairview Avenue, Lewis Road or Foothill Road onto Driver Avenue during the high school “rush hours.” The commenter suggests placing stop signs on Driver Avenue at each of the street intersections to allow exiting from these roads, as well as allowing exiting directly from residential driveways onto Driver Avenue.

Stop signs are recommended where there is a balanced traffic flow in all directions at the intersection so that there will not be delay on the side streets. This is not the case at any of the intersections noted in the letter. In addition, the placement of stop signs would likely negatively affect traffic by increasing delay due to more cars stopping along Driver Avenue.

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR. Response 10D above addresses traffic congestion and flow along Driver Avenue. No changes are necessary to the DEIR.

Response 10F

The commenter notes that Palo Comado Creek and Chesebro Creek are not maintained to allow adequate flood control in major storms, and that many residences are susceptible to flooding when major storms occur. The commenter further notes that portions of Chesebro Creek are within Los Angeles County and Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area jurisdiction (in addition to portions within the City), which add to the problem.

The portions of Palo Comado Creek and Chesebro Creek mentioned in the letter are natural drainages. In some portions along these creeks, the existing residences are located within flood zones (Special Flood Hazard Areas Subject to Inundation by a 1% Annual Chance of Flood – Zone AE) per the FEMA Federal Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM).

Section 4.7 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of the DEIR addresses potential flooding impacts due to implementation of the proposed General Plan. Impact 4.7-4 states that development under the proposed General Plan could alter the existing drainage patterns in the City and potentially result in increased downstream flooding through the addition of impervious surfaces. It goes on to state that this could exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. The text notes, however, that adherence to proposed General Plan policies and local, state and federal regulations would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The DEIR section describes the applicable regulations pertaining to flooding and drainage, and lists the applicable General Plan Update goals and policies, particularly in the Community Safety, Infrastructure and Community Services, and Natural Resources elements. The policies address the City’s desire to adequately maintain its storm drain system, including creeks, minimize further impacts to the storm drain system, and coordinate with relevant agencies to ensure flood protection.

The DEIR adequately addresses flood and storm water issues resulting from implementation of the General Plan, and no further changes to the document are necessary.

Response 10G

This comment pertains to General Plan Update Policy U-2.2, which the commenter states advocates the potential for extending public sewer systems throughout Old Agoura. The commenter believes that the DEIR should address the “enormous complexity and expense of such an undertaking.” The commenter further notes that any study of the possibility of installing public sewers should include growth inducing issues, as well as any potential reduction in groundwater recharge.

This comment pertains primarily to the General Plan Update, Chapter 3: Infrastructure and Community Services. There, Policy U-2.2 states the following: “Explore the potential for extending sewer lines into the Old Agoura area with the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD), Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, and Old Agoura Homeowners Association (HOA).” The policy does not necessarily advocate for extending the sewer line, rather it supports studying the issue further, in coordination with the Old Agoura HOA, as well as the regulatory agencies. One of the reasons for considering extending the sewer system in Old Agoura is because of water quality issues often associated with individual private septic systems.

The DEIR analyzes wastewater, hydrology and water quality issues in Sections 4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality, and 4.14 Utilities and Service Systems. The extent of analysis of these issues is adequate in the DEIR. The extension of sewer lines in Old Agoura is not currently proposed as part of the General Plan Update. If exploration of Policy U-2.2 results in the recommendation to extend the sewer lines, then the City would undertake a sewer feasibility study at that time. If a sewer system is proposed in Old Agoura as a result of the study, separate CEQA review would be required for the proposed extension of lines. This would include addressing growth inducing impacts and groundwater recharge impacts of the project, as well as other environmental areas in compliance with CEQA. No changes to the DEIR are necessary.

10.2.11 Responses to Comments Received at the January 21, 2010, Planning Commission Hearing on the General Plan Update Draft EIR

The City of Agoura Hills Planning Commission held a public hearing to accept comments on the Draft EIR on January 21, 2010. The comments received at that hearing and responses thereto are included below.

■ Jess Thomas, Speaking on Behalf of the Old Agoura HOA

The following comments pertain to the General Plan Update, not the DEIR.

Comment

Mr. Thomas explains that he will have a detailed letter submitted by the Monday deadline. His main issues are traffic/circulation, Old Agoura, and flood control maintenance in the creeks in Old Agoura. He notes that the DEIR isn't specific enough to cover some historical problems in Old Agoura of circulation, flood control, etc.

Response

The commenter summarizes his general comments on the General Plan. The comments are noted. The commenter says that the DEIR isn't specific enough. However, the commenter provides no further information regarding the particular portions of the DEIR that are not sufficiently specific to which to respond to. The DEIR was prepared with an adequate level of specificity, given that the document was a Program DEIR, and was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and its Guidelines.

Comment

The commenter states that it was agreed upon to eventually return Driver Avenue to a local collector, but Figure M-1 in the General Plan shows it as the same designation as Thousand Oaks Boulevard, a four-lane divided road. He requests that the General Plan state the intention to use Canwood Street as the main east-west carrier of through traffic, not Driver Avenue.

Response

In the DEIR, information about transportation/traffic is found in Section 4.13. Figure M-1 of the General Plan corresponds to Figure 4.13-7 of the DEIR. The depiction of Driver Avenue as an arterial is a typographical error, and should be "collector." This correction has been made to Figure M-1 in the General Plan and Figure 4.13-7 of the DEIR. The statement about the General Plan stating the intention to use Canwood Street as the main east-west carrier of through traffic is not a comment that pertains to the DEIR. Nonetheless, it is not the purpose of the General Plan to instruct drivers on which roads to

use, rather it is to identify existing roads, their classifications and types of facilities, and any proposed improvements to the roadways.

Comment

Mr. Thomas notes that the description of Chesebro Road on page 3-8 of the General Plan is limited and inaccurate. It only describes a one-block portion of a 2-mile-long road. The General Plan says that the speed limit is 45 miles per hour, but it is actually 25 miles per hour on all but the short section noted in the General Plan.

Response

With regard to the speed limit on Chesebro Road, this correction has been made to p. 3-8 of the General Plan, and to p. 4.13-6 of the DEIR, last paragraph, which now reads:

- **Chesebro Road**—Chesebro Road is an east/west collector street between Canwood Street and Palo Comado Canyon Road north of the US-101 freeway and a north/south collector street between Agoura Road and the US-101 freeway eastbound on-ramp. One travel lane is provided in each direction. Sidewalk and street parking is provided on the north side of the road between Canwood Street and Palo Comado Canyon Road. Sidewalks and street parking are provided along both sides of the road south of Dorothy Drive and along the south side of the facility between Palo Comado Canyon Road south of the US-101 freeway and Agoura Road. The posted speed limit is [4535 miles per hour in some places, and 25 miles per hour in others, particularly for the segment that runs through Old Agoura.](#)

Comment

The speaker notes that he will have extensive comments on the blanket proposal for the extension of public sewers into all of Old Agoura, as depicted in Goal U-2 of the General Plan.

Response

The comment is noted. No further response is necessary.

Comment

Mr. Thomas notes that Goal U-3 of the General Plan needs to be more specific about the County agency being able to clear debris in Chesebro Creek.

Response

This comment pertains to the General Plan, not the adequacy of the DEIR. Therefore, the comment is noted, and no further response is necessary. It should be noted that the General Plan is a broad document that guides policy in the City. Policy U-3.1 pertains to coordinating flood control planning with the County. It is not the purpose of the General Plan to specifically identify how debris should be cleared in specific drainages in the City.

Comment

The speaker notes that the comments he spoke of addressed the General Plan, but that they are the same concerns he has for the DEIR.

Response

As noted by the speaker, the comments pertain to the General Plan, not the adequacy of the DEIR that was the subject of the hearing on January 21, 2010. Where possible, the responses above attempt to address similar issues in the DEIR.

CHAPTER 11 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

11.1 INTRODUCTION

This section reflects the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) requirements of Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21081.6. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15097 states:

... In order to ensure that the mitigation measures and project revisions identified in the EIR or negative declaration are implemented, the public agency shall adopt a program for monitoring or reporting on the revisions which it has required in the project and the measures it has imposed to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. A public agency may delegate reporting or monitoring responsibilities to another public agency or to a private entity which accepts the delegation; however, until mitigation measures have been completed the lead agency remains responsible for ensuring that implementation of the mitigation measures occurs in accordance with the program.

11.2 ENFORCEMENT

In accordance with CEQA, the primary responsibility for making determinations with respect to potential environmental effects rests with the lead agency rather than the monitor or preparer. As such, the City of Agoura Hills is identified as the enforcement agency for this Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

11.3 PROGRAM MODIFICATION

After review and approval by the lead agency, minor changes to the MMRP are permitted but can only be made by the City of Agoura Hills. No deviations from this MMRP shall be permitted unless it continues to satisfy the requirements of PRC Section 21081.6, as determined by the lead agency.

11.4 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The organization of the MMRP follows the subsection formatting style as presented within the General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Only those subsections of the environmental issues presented in the EIR that have mitigation measures are provided below in Table 11-1 (Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix). All other subsections in the EIR do not contain mitigation measures.

Table 11-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Monitoring Phase	Responsible Agency/Party	Compliance Verification		
				Initial	Date	Comments
Air Quality						
<p>MM4.2-1 The City shall require future development within City limits to implement the following measures to the extent feasible:</p> <p><u>Fugitive Dust Control Measures</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Water trucks shall be used during construction to keep all areas of vehicle movements damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this will require twice-daily applications (once in late morning and once at the end of the workday). Increased watering is required whenever wind speed exceeds 15 mph. Grading shall be suspended if wind gusts exceed 25 mph. ■ The amount of disturbed area shall be minimized and onsite vehicle speeds shall be limited to 15 mph or less. ■ If importation, exportation and stockpiling of fill material is involved, earth with 5% or greater silt content that is stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with earth binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting material shall be tarped from the point of origin or shall maintain at least two feet of freeboard. ■ After clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation is completed, the disturbed area shall be treated by watering, revegetation, or by spreading earth binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed. ■ All material transported off-site shall be securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. <p><u>NO_x Control Measures</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ When feasible, electricity from temporary power poles on site shall be utilized rather than temporary diesel or gasoline generators. ■ When feasible, on site mobile equipment shall be fueled by methanol or natural gas (to replace diesel-fueled equipment), or, propane or butane (to replace gasoline-fueled equipment). ■ Aqueous Diesel Fuel or biodiesel (B20 with retarded fuel injection timing), if available, shall be used in diesel fueled vehicles when methanol or natural gas alternatives are not available. <p><u>VOC Control Measures</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Low VOC architectural and asphalt coatings shall be used on site and shall comply with AQMD Rule 1113-Architectural Coatings. <p><u>Other Ozone Precursor Control Measures</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Equipment engines should be maintained in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturer's specifications. ■ Schedule construction periods to occur over a longer time period (i.e., lengthen from 60 days to 90 days) during the smog season so as to minimize the number of vehicles and equipment operating simultaneously. <p>Use new technologies to control ozone precursor emissions as they become readily available.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Require the following for future development projects, as specified: fugitive dust control; NO_x control measures; ozone precursor control measures; and low VOC coatings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Prior to approval of future projects ■ At site inspection 	City of Agoura Hills Planning and Community Development Department			