# 5.14 TRANSPORTATION

This section of the draft environmental impact report (DEIR) evaluates the potential for implementation of the proposed La Puerta School Site Specific Plan (Specific Plan) to result in transportation impacts in the City of Claremont. The analysis in this section is based in part on the following technical report:

- *La Puerta School Site Residential Development Traffic Impact Analysis*, Environment Planning Solutions, July 15, 2022.

A complete copy of this study is provided as Appendix I to this DEIR.

## 5.14.1 Environmental Setting

### 5.14.1.1 REGULATORY BACKGROUND

State and local laws, regulations, plans, or guidelines related to transportation that are applicable to the Specific Plan are summarized below.

#### State

##### *Assembly Bill 1358: The California Complete Streets Act*

The California Complete Streets Act (AB 1358) of 2008 was signed into law on September 30, 2008. Beginning January 1, 2011, AB 1358 requires circulation elements to address the transportation system from a multimodal perspective. The bill states that streets, roads, and highways must "meet the needs of all users in a manner suitable to the rural, suburban, or urban context of the general plan." Essentially, this bill requires a circulation element to plan for all modes of transportation where appropriate, including walking, biking, car travel, and transit.

The Complete Streets Act also requires circulation elements to consider the multiple users of the transportation system, including children, adults, seniors, and people with disabilities. AB 1358 tasks the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to release guidelines for compliance, which are so far undeveloped.

##### *Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act*

The Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (SB 375) was signed into law on September 30, 2008. The SB 375 regulation provides incentives for cities and developers to bring housing and jobs closer together and to improve public transit. The goal behind SB 375 is to reduce automobile commuting trips and length of automobile trips, thus helping to meet the statewide targets for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions set by the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32). SB 375 requires each metropolitan planning organization to add a broader vision for growth, called a "sustainable communities strategy" (SCS), to its transportation plan. The SCS must lay out a plan to meet the region's transportation, housing, economic, and environmental needs in a way that enables the area to lower greenhouse gas emissions. The SCS should integrate transportation, land use, and housing policies to plan for achievement of the regional emissions target.

### *Senate Bill 743*

On September 27, 2013, Senate Bill 743 (SB 743) was signed into law, starting a process that fundamentally changed transportation impact analysis as part of CEQA compliance. The legislature found that with the adoption of SB 375, the State of California had signaled its commitment to encourage land use and transportation planning decisions and investments that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and thereby contribute to the reduction of GHG emissions, as required by the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill [AB] 32).

SB 743 eliminates auto delay, level of service (LOS), and other similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion as the sole basis for determining significant impacts under CEQA. Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, the new criteria "shall promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses" (Public Resources Code Section 21099(b)(1)).

Pursuant to SB 743, the Natural Resources Agency adopted revisions to the CEQA Guidelines to implement SB 743 on December 28, 2018. The revised CEQA Guidelines establish new criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts. Under the new guidelines, VMT-related metric(s) that evaluate the significance of transportation-related impacts under CEQA for development projects, land use plans, and transportation infrastructure projects are required beginning on July 1, 2020. The legislation does not preclude the application of local general plan policies, zoning codes, conditions of approval, or any other planning requirements that require evaluation of LOS, but these metrics may no longer constitute the sole basis for determining transportation impacts under CEQA.

## Regional

### *Southern California Association of Governments*

The Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) Connect SoCal provides a regional transportation plan for six counties in Southern California: Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Los Angeles, Ventura, and Imperial. The 2020-2045 RTP/SCS is a long-range visioning plan that builds upon and expands land use and transportation strategies established over several planning cycles to increase mobility options and achieve a more sustainable growth pattern. As described on SCAG's web site for the RTP/SCS, the plan, "… charts a path toward a more mobile, sustainable and prosperous region by making connections between transportation networks, between planning strategies and between the people whose collaboration can improve the quality of life for Southern Californians." (SCAG 2020).

## Local

### *City of Claremont General Plan Community Mobility Element*

The Claremont General Plan Community Mobility Element addresses circulation and mobility in the City. Circulation refers to all travel modes and routes people use to move within and beyond Claremont: the local street system, via biking, or walking, or using transit. Moving people and goods within the City efficiently and effectively allows the community to function well economically and socially. Mobility describes people's ability

to circulate from home to school, work, or shopping with ease and safety. Alternatives to the private car—transit. biking, and walking—can offer choice and convenience. The City's plans for circulation and mobility are centered on providing options and make sustainable the use and interaction of these options (City of Claremont 2009).

The Community Mobility Element includes goals and policies for the City's circulation system. Goals of the Community Mobility Element include efforts to enhance the regional transportation network, to reduce traffic congestion while retaining the historic patterns and functions of City streets, and to establish and maintain a comprehensive system of pedestrian ways and bicycle routes that provides viable options to travel by automobile. The following goals and policies of the Community Mobility Element are applicable to the Specific Plan:

**Goal 4-2:** Reduce traffic congestion while retaining the historic patterns and functions of City streets.

- **Policy 4-2.1.** Require new development to minimize traffic impacts created by the development and to incorporate mitigation measures which are acceptable to the City.
- **Policy 4-2.4.** Protect residential neighborhoods from cut- through traffic and other traffic-related problems by continuing to implement the traffic calming policies, as determined appropriate by the Traffic and Transportation Commission and the City Council.
- **Policy 4-2.12.** Continue to promote an efficient network of different travel options.

**Goal 4-3:** Establish and maintain a comprehensive system of pedestrian ways and bicycle routes that provides viable options to travel by automobile.

- **Policy 4-3.1.** Promote walking throughout the community. Install sidewalks where missing and make improvements to existing sidewalks for accessibility purposes. Particular attention should be given to needed sidewalk improvement near schools and activity centers.
- **Policy 4-3.3.** Continue to provide for compatible joint use of the Thompson Creek Trail and Wilderness Park Trail by bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians.
- **Policy 4-3.5.** Recognize and accommodate the pedestrian ADA access in Claremont's neighborhoods and continue to make improvements to increase pedestrian safety.
- **Policy 4-3.9.** Strive to provide pedestrian pathways that are well shaded and pleasantly landscaped to encourage use.

### *City of Claremont Complete Streets Policy*

In 2019 Claremont adopted a Complete Streets Policy to establish guiding principles and practices so transportation improvements are planned, designed, constructed, operated, maintained, and evaluated to encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use while promoting safe operations for all users.

### *City of Claremont VMT Screening Criteria Guidelines*

Claremont adopted screening criteria guidelines issued by the Technical Advisory produced by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR). OPR has identified guidelines for projects that may be screened and would therefore be exempt from a VMT analysis. The theory is that the development of these projects will be their nature reduce vehicle trips and therefore be in conformance with SB 743.

Per the City's adopted VMT screening criteria guidelines, which are provided in the City of Claremont Draft Transportation Study Guidelines for Vehicle Miles Traveled and Level of Service Assessment, projects exempt from VMT analysis include but are not limited to:

- Retail projects up to 50,000 SF in floor area.
- Projects generating less than 110 daily trips.
- Residential and office projects located in "low VMT" areas. "Low VMT" is defined as 10% below the subarea VMT metrics for that area.
- Projects within a Transit Priority Area (TPA). A TPA is defined as locations within ½ mile of a major transit stop or station (e.g., Gold Line or Metrolink), or within ½ mile of a high-quality transit corridor with a 15-minute or less headways during peak commute hours.
- Affordable housing developments or affordable housing units within mixed-used developments.
- Transportation projects that promote nonauto travel, improve safety, or improve traffic operations at current bottlenecks, such as transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, intersections traffic control or widening at intersections to provide new turn lanes (City of Claremont 2020).

## 5.14.1.2 EXISTING CONDITIONS

### Transportation System

### *Vehicular Access and Circulation*

The Project Area is in the northern region of the City and consists of an approximately 9.58 acre roughly square-shaped vacant parcel (APN8670-003-900). As shown in Figure 3-1, *Aerial Photograph of Project Area*, the Project Area is bounded by Thompson Creek Trail to the north, Navarro and Lamar Drives to the south, Forbes Avenue to the east, and La Puerta Sports Park to the west.

Regional access to the Project Area is provided by State Route 210 (SR-210) and Interstate 10 (I-10). Local roadways providing access to the Project Area include Base Line Road, Forbes Avenue, Bonnie Brae Avenue, and Miramar Avenue.

## *Alternative Modes of Travel*

### *Pedestrian Access and Circulation*

As shown in Figure 3-1, *Aerial Photograph of Project Area*, pedestrian access to the Project Area is provided by a curb-adjacent public sidewalk along both sides of Forbes Avenue and Miramar Avenue. The sidewalk along Forbes Avenue continues south of the Project Area and connects to the public sidewalk along Base Line Road. The sidewalk along Miramar Avenue continues east of the Project Area and connects to the public sidewalk on Bonnie Bae Avenue. Pedestrian access to the Project Area is also provided via the Thompson Creek Trail, which abuts the northern boundary of the Project Area (see Figure 3-1).

### *Bicycle Access and Circulation*

There are no dedicated bicycle lanes or facilities along Forbes Avenue or Miramar Avenue, which provide direct access to the Project Area. However, Thompson Creek Trail, which forms the northern boundary of the Project Area is a multi-use trail that permits bicycling as a form of travel. The next closest bicycle facilities are dedicated, striped on-street bicycle lanes along both sides of Base Line Road, approximately 0.35 mile south of the Project Area. Dedicated, striped on-street bicycle lanes are also provided Mills Avenue, approximately 0.5 mile east of the Project Area.

### *Public Transit*

As an alternative to automobile travel, several transit providers serve the City of Claremont. They include bus services provided by Foothill Transit, the Metrolink commuter rail line, and Claremont Dial-a-Ride.

Foothill Transit operates several bus routes throughout the City. The Foothill Transit routes connect Claremont to other jurisdictions in the San Gabriel Valley and Inland Empire, and all of the routes are accessible from the Claremont Transit Center. Two Foothill Transit routes operate near the Project Area, which include:

- Foothill Transit Line 188 (Azusa- Claremont- Montclair Transit Cent) – Line 188 serves Montclair, Claremont, La Verne, San Dimas, Glendora, and Azusa. Line 292 runs south of the Project Area via Foothill Boulevard. It starts at the Azusa Intermodal Transit Center and ends at the Montclair Transit Center. Days of operation are Monday through Sunday, including major holidays, from the early morning until the late evening hours.

- Foothill Transit Line 292 (Claremont Transit Center – Pomona Transit Center) – Line 292 serves Claremont, Pomona, and Montclair. Line 292 runs south of the project site via Foothill Boulevard. It starts at the Pomona Transit Center and ends at the Claremont Transit Center. Days of operation are Monday through Friday during the morning and afternoon peak commuter periods; no weekend service is provided for this route.

The nearest bus stop to the Project Area for Routes 188 and 292 is at the southwest corner of the Indian Hill Boulevard and Foothill Boulevard intersection, approximately 1.65 miles southwest of the Project Area.

Commuter rail service (Metrolink) is available at the Claremont Metrolink Station, which is approximately 3.6 miles south of the Project Area. The Metrolink San Bernardino Line operates seven days per week east–west

from San Bernardino to Los Angeles. The Metropolitan Transportation Authority is in the process of completing an extension of the Gold Line (L Line) light rail line eastward from its current terminus in Azusa to Montclair. As of June 2022, extension of Gold Line to Pomona was halfway complete. The Azusa to Pomona extension will add four new stations—Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, and Pomona. Upon completion of the current phase, the next extension will be from Pomona to Claremont, and then Claremont to Montclair; with the potential to connect to the Ontario Airport. The Claremont station is part of the currently unfunded portion of the Gold Line expansion from Glendora to Montclair. The future Gold Line station will be located approximately where the current Metrolink station is today (Metro 2022).

Claremont Dial-a-Ride, which operates within the boundaries of Claremont, provides curb-to-curb, shared ride cab service that offers reliable transportation at a reasonable price. Dial-a-ride is open to everyone (children, youth, adults, and seniors) traveling within the Dial-a-Ride service area. Service is also provided to the medical facilities in the Pomona Valley Medical Center area, the Courthouse and Social Security office in Pomona as well as the Montclair Place and Montclair TransCenter (PVTA 2022).

## 5.14.2 Thresholds of Significance

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would normally have a significant effect on the environment if the project would:

T-1 Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

T-2 Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b).

T-3 Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

T-4 Result in inadequate emergency access.

## 5.14.3 Environmental Impacts

The following impact analysis addresses thresholds of significance for which the Notice of Preparation disclosed potentially significant impacts. The applicable thresholds are identified in brackets after the impact statement.

**Impact 5.14-1: Implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in a conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. [Threshold T-1]**

*Impact Analysis:* Following is a discussion of the potential impacts on a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system as a result of development accommodated by the Specific Plan. Specifically, the following discussion demonstrates that implementation of the Specific Plan would not conflict with nor preclude the City from implementing adopted programs, plans, and policies addressing the circulation system.

The evaluation was conducted by reviewing City documents related to transportation: The Claremont General Plan Mobility Element and Zoning Ordinance.

## Claremont General Plan Mobility Element

The Claremont General Plan Mobility Element addresses circulation and mobility in the City. Circulation refers to all travel modes and routes people use to move within and beyond Claremont: the local street system, via biking, or walking, or using transit. Moving people and goods within the City efficiently and effectively allows the community to function well economically and socially. Mobility describes people's ability to circulate from home to school, work, or shopping with ease and safety. Alternatives to the private car—transit. biking, and walking—can offer choice and convenience. The City's plans for circulation and mobility are centered on providing options and make sustainable the use and interaction of these options (City of Claremont 2009).

### *Vehicular Access and Circulation*

As shown in Figures 3-2, *Conceptual Site Plan*, and 3-6, *Proposed Tentative Tract Map*, vehicular access to the Project Area would be provided via a stop-controlled entry drive along Forbes Avenue, which would feed into a looped low-speed private street. The entry drive would form a new T-intersection with Forbes Avenue, with stop controls (stop sign and striping) provided on the interior of the new private street to control vehicles exiting the new residential neighborhood onto Forbes Avenue.

The private street would provide direct access to the driveways of each single-family home, with the exception of any homes fronting onto and taking direct access off of Forbes Avenue, which is an existing public street. The private street would be maintained by the established homeowner's association. It should be noted that the existing La Puerta Sports Park, west of and abutting the Project Area, is accessed via Indian Hill Boulevard. No vehicle access to the Project Area via Indian Hill Boulevard is available or planned.

The street classification and standards for Forbes Avenue (forms the eastern Project Area boundary) and Miramar Avenue (abuts the northeastern Project Area boundary), which are the main roads that are in proximity of and provide direct access to the Project Area, were reviewed, and compared to existing and future conditions of these roadways as a result of implementation of the Specific Plan. Under existing conditions both streets are two-lane residential local streets with on-street parking permitted, and they both have a posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour. Per the Community Mobility Element, both streets are classified as Local Streets with a 36- to 40-foot right-of-way and one travel lane in each direction.

Development accommodated by the Specific Plan would not impact the functionality or use of Forbes Avenue or Miramar Avenue. As noted above, vehicular access to the Project Area would be provided via a stop-controlled entry drive along Forbes Avenue, which would connect to an internal looped private street system. Design and construction of the entry drive and private street system would be required to adhere to the City's Public Works Construction Standards and the standards outlined in the Claremont Municipal Code, which are imposed on development projects during the City's development review and building plan check process. For example, at the new entry drive and Forbes Avenue intersection, a substantially clear line of sight must be maintained between the driver of a vehicle waiting at the stop sign and the driver of an approaching vehicle. Sight distance is the continuous length of roadway visible to the driver. Based on a review of aerial photography,

there are no restrictions blocking the view from the proposed location of the proposed entry drive and north- and southbound traffic on Forbes Avenue, and sufficient sight distance would be provided. Compliance with the established design standards would ensure that hazards due to design features would not occur and that the placement of the vehicular access and circulation improvements would not create a conflict for motorists, pedestrians, or bicyclists traveling along Forbes Avenue.

The current number of travel lanes, roadway width and speed limit for Forbes Avenue and Miramar Avenue would remain as they currently exist. Implementation of the Specific Plan would not require any roadway improvements or modifications to either roadway, with the exception of right-of-way improvements along the western side of Forbes Avenue (i.e., new public sidewalk, landscaping, and drive aprons for the homes that would take direct access from Forbes Avenue), which forms the eastern Project Area boundary. However, the proposed improvements would not affect the functionality of Forbes Avenue. The introduction of drive aprons for the homes that would front onto and take direct access form Forbes Avenue (see Figure 3-2) would require vehicles pulling out of the driveways to proceed with caution as vehicles pull into Forbes Avenue; however, the introduction of driveways is not a new feature along Forbes Avenue as there are many homes along this roadway that already have driveways. Driveways and aprons would be designed and constructed in accordance with the City's Public Works Construction Standards.

Based on the preceding, impacts to vehicular access and circulation would be less than significant.

### *Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Circulation*

As shown in Figure 3-1, *Aerial Photograph of Project Area*, pedestrian access to the Project Area is provided by a curb-adjacent public sidewalk along both sides of Forbes Avenue and Miramar Avenue. The sidewalk along Forbes Avenue continues south of the Project Area and connects to the public sidewalk along Base Line Road. The sidewalk along Miramar Avenue continues east of the Project Area and connects to the public sidewalk on Bonnie Bae Avenue. Pedestrian access to the Project Area is also provided via the Thompson Creek Trail, which abuts the northern boundary of the Project Area (see Figure 3-1).

Under implementation of the Specific Plan, the existing public sidewalk along the Forbes Avenue project frontage, which forms the eastern Project Area boundary, would remain or be reconstructed. The public sidewalk would connect to sidewalks along the internal private street of the Project Area and to the existing Thompson Creek Trail. The sidewalk system would provide a means for safe travel for future residents and a means to get around the neighborhood and access to surrounding and nearby recreational uses/areas (including Thompson Creek Trail and the La Puerta Sports Park), as well as to other areas of the City. The new sidewalks would be designed and constructed in accordance with the City's Public Works Construction Standards, including compliance with ADA requirements.

Implementation of the Specific Plan supports and implements the following goal and policies of the Claremont Community Mobility Element:

- **Goal 4-3:** Establish and maintain a comprehensive system of pedestrian ways and bicycle routes that provides viable options to travel by automobile.

- **Policy 4-3.1** Promote walking throughout the community. Install sidewalks where missing and make improvements to existing sidewalks for accessibility purposes. Particular attention should be given to needed sidewalk improvement near schools and activity centers.

- **Policy 4-3.3** Continue to provide for compatible joint use of the Thompson Creek Trail and Wilderness Park Trail by bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians.

- **Policy 4-3.5** Recognize and accommodate the pedestrian ADA access in Claremont's neighborhoods and continue to make improvements to increase pedestrian safety.

- **Policy 4-3.9** Strive to provide pedestrian pathways that are well shaded and pleasantly landscaped to encourage use.

There are no dedicated bicycle lanes or facilities along Forbes Avenue or Miramar Avenue, which provide direct access to the Project Area. However, Thompson Creek Trail, which forms the northern boundary of the Project Area is a multi-use trail that permits bicycling as a form of travel. The next closest bicycle facilities are dedicated, striped on-street bicycle lanes along both sides of Base Line Road, approximately 0.35 mile south of the Project Area. Dedicated, striped on-street bicycle lanes are also provided Mills Avenue, approximately 0.5 mile east of the Project Area.

Finally, the following roadway segments were evaluated for vehicle traffic, pedestrian volumes and bike volumes given the proximity to Thompson Creek Trail:

- Forbes Avenue between Miramar Avenue and Base Line Road
- Miramar Avenue between Forbes Avenue and Mills Avenue
- Indian Hill Boulevard between Armstrong Drive and Mt Carmel Drive

Table 5.14-1 shows the existing Average Daily Traffic (ADT), AM peak hour volume and PM peak hour volume for vehicle, bike, and pedestrian traffic. The ADT for the roadway segment were collected on April 14, 2022, along with the intersection turn movements and are included in the Traffic Impact Study (Appendix I) for reference.

**Table 5.14-1 Study Segments Vehicle, Bike, and Pedestrian Traffic**

| Roadway Segment | ADT | | | Daily Bike Volume | | | Daily Pedestrian Volume | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | EB/NB | WB/SB | Total | EB/NB | WB/SB | Total | EB/NB | WB/SB | Total |
| Forbes Ave between Miramar Ave and Base Line Rd | 165 | 158 | 323 | 8 | 9 | 17 | 64 | 71 | 135 |
| Miramar Ave between Forbes Ave and Mills Ave | 158 | 149 | 307 | 13 | 10 | 23 | 94 | 116 | 210 |
| Indian Hill Blvd between Armstrong Dr and Mt Carmel Dr | 932 | 918 | 1850 | 9 | 4 | 13 | 93 | 108 | 201 |

**Table 5.14-1 Study Segments Vehicle, Bike, and Pedestrian Traffic**

| Roadway Segment | AM Peak Hour Traffic | | | AM Peak Hour Bike Volume | | | AM Peak Hour Pedestrian Volume | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | EB/NB | WB/SB | Total | EB/NB | WB/SB | Total | EB/NB | WB/SB | Total |
| Forbes Ave between Miramar Ave and Base Line Rd | 16 | 17 | 33 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 14 | 29 |
| Miramar Ave between Forbes Ave and Mills Ave | 16 | 16 | 32 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 17 | 21 | 38 |
| Indian Hill Blvd between Armstrong Dr and Mt Carmel Dr | 61 | 79 | 140 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 24 | 41 |
| **Roadway Segment** | **PM Peak Hour Traffic** | | | **PM Peak Hour Bike Volume** | | | **PM Peak Hour Pedestrian Volume** | | |
| | EB/NB | WB/SB | Total | EB/NB | WB/SB | Total | EB/NB | WB/SB | Total |
| Forbes Ave between Miramar Ave and Base Line Rd | 15 | 21 | 36 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 12 | 22 |
| Miramar Ave between Forbes Ave and Mills Ave | 15 | 20 | 35 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 14 | 16 | 30 |
| Indian Hill Blvd between Armstrong Dr and Mt Carmel Dr | 107 | 97 | 204 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 13 | 26 |

According to the Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS), which provides access to California crash data based on the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS), between January 1, 2015, and December 31, 2021, no pedestrian and vehicle crashes were reported at the knuckle of Forbes Avenue/Miramar Avenue as well as on the mid-block intersection at Indian Hill Boulevard/Thompson Creek Trail.

### *Conclusion*

Implementation of the Specific Plan would generate pedestrian and bike trips from the Project Area. Pedestrians and bicyclists would utilize Thompson Creek Trail to access either the westbound and southbound sidewalks along the knuckle of Forbes Avenue/Miramar Avenue (east of the Project Area) or the midblock crosswalk on Indian Hill Boulevard/Thompson Creek Trail (west of the Project Area). As demonstrated above, implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in any impacts to pedestrian or bicycle facilities or circulation. The pedestrian and bicycle improvements would be in conformance with the City's Complete Streets Policy, which establishes guiding principles and practices so that transportation improvements are planned, designed, constructed, operated, maintained, and evaluated to encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use while promoting safe operations for all users.

However, and at the request of the City's Engineering Division, various safety enhancements would be implemented by the project applicant to enhance pedestrian and bike safety in and around the Project Area. The safety enhancements, which are provided below for reference, are outlined in the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the Specific Plan (Appendix I) and will be included as conditions of approval. It should be noted that the safety enhancements are not needed to reduce any impacts as none were identified.

- The following warning and guiding signs shall be implemented by the project applicant at Forbes Avenue and Miramar Avenue intersection given the significant pedestrian and bicycle traffic experienced at the knuckle pursuant Figure 2C-2 of the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices:
    - W1-6L for westbound approach
    - W1-6R for northbound approach
    - W1-1aL (25 MPH) for westbound approach
    - W1-1aR (25 MPH) for northbound approach
    - W1-8L for westbound approach
    - W1-8R for northbound approach
    - W1-1L & W13-1P (25 MPH) advance warning signs for westbound approach
    - W1-1R & W13-1P (25 MPH) advance warning signs for northbound approach
- The following warning and guiding signs shall be implemented by the project applicant for the mid-block crossing at the Indian Hill Boulevard/Thompson Creek Trail pursuant to Figure 3B-17 (CA) of the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices:
    - W16-9P & W11-2 for northbound approach
    - W16-9P & W11-2 for southbound approach
    - R1-5 for northbound approach
    - R1-5 for southbound approach
    - W16-7P & W11-2 for northbound approach
    - W16-7P & W11-2 for southbound approach

### *Public Transit*

Foothill Transit operates several bus routes throughout the City. The Foothill Transit routes connect Claremont to other jurisdictions in the San Gabriel Valley and Inland Empire, and all of the routes are accessible from the Claremont Transit Center. Two Foothill Transit routes operate near the Project Area, which include Foothill Transit Line 188 (Azusa- Claremont- Montclair Transit Cent) and Foothill Transit Line 292 (Claremont Transit Center – Pomona Transit Center). The nearest bus stop to the Project Area for Routes 188 and 292 is at the southwest corner of the Indian Hill Boulevard and Foothill Boulevard intersection, approximately 1.65 miles southwest of the Project Area. These bus routes and stops, although over one mile away from the Project Area, are the closed stops and would be available to serve future project residents. Implementation of the Specific Plan would not impact these bus routes or stops, nor require the need for additional bus routes or stops to serve future residents of the Project Area.

Project residents would have access to commuter rail service at the Claremont Metrolink Station, which is approximately 3.6 miles south of the Project Area. Further, future residents would have Claremont Dial-a-Ride as an option for public transport, which provides curb-to-curb, shared ride cab service that offers reliable

transportation at a reasonable price. Dial-a-ride is open to all people travelling within the Dial-a-Ride service area.

Based on the preceding, impacts to public transit would be less than significant.

**Impact 5.14-2: Implementation of the Specific Plan would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b). [Threshold T-2]**

*Impact Analysis:* SB 743 was signed by Governor Brown in 2013 and required the Governor's Office of Planning and Research to amend the CEQA Guidelines to provide an alternative to level of service for evaluating transportation impacts. SB743 specified that the new criteria should promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks and a diversity of land uses. The bill also specified that delay-based level of service could no longer be considered an indicator of a significant impact on the environment. In response, Section 15064.3, Determining the Significance of Transportation Impacts, was added to the CEQA Guidelines on January 1, 2019. Section 15064.3 states that VMT is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts and provides lead agencies with the discretion to choose the most appropriate methodology and thresholds for evaluating VMT.

### VMT Analysis Methodology and Assessment

The City of Claremont Draft Transportation Study Guidelines for Vehicle Miles Traveled and Level of Service Assessment provides VMT screening criteria guidelines, as described above in Section 5.14.1.1, *Regulatory Background*. A VMT analysis was prepared for the Specific Plan using the City's guidelines for VMT analysis. The analysis was prepared using the SCAG Transportation Analysis Model, hereafter referred to as "Model."

The Project Area is located in the Model Tier 1 Traffic Analysis Zone 22450000 and Tier 2 Traffic Analysis Zone 22450200, referred to as "Zone" hereafter. The potential population generated by residential development accommodated by the Specific Plan was calculated using a population of 2.9 persons per household, which is consistent with the existing residential uses in the SCAG model. Based on this data, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in a population of 198 persons (68 dwelling units times 2.9 persons per household; the 68 dwelling units includes 58 single-family dwelling units and 10 accessory dwelling units). For the VMT analysis the project population and households were entered into the project Zone in both the base year (2012) and future year (2040) models.

The model includes validated scenarios for 2012 and 2040. Data for years between 2012 and 2040 was extrapolated using linear interpolation between the 2012 and 2040 model output. The model was run for the base year (2012) and future year (2040) without and with-project conditions. VMT was then evaluated using the Origin-Destination (OD) matrices as required by the City's VMT guidelines. The OD matrices do not include trip purpose, but are broken down by vehicle type (i.e., passenger vehicles, light heavy-duty trucks, heavy heavy-duty trucks).

Pursuant to the City's VMT guidelines, a project would result in a significant project generated VMT impact if either of the following conditions are satisfied:

- The baseline (2022) project generated VMT per service population exceeds 15 percent below the SGVCOG Northeast Subarea baseline VMT per service population, or
- The cumulative project generated VMT per service population exceeds 15 percent below the SGVCOG Northeast Subarea baseline VMT per service population.

The project's effect on VMT would be considered significant if it results in the following condition:

- The cumulative link-level Citywide VMT per service population increases under the plus project condition compared to the no project condition.

The VMT analysis conducted for the Specific Plan results are shown in Tables 5.14-2 and 5.14-3. As shown in Table 5.14-2, implementation of the Specific Plan would have a less than significant impact on VMT in the baseline and cumulative conditions. The year 2022 project VMT per service population would be 24.8, which is 14.79 percent below the City's threshold of 29.1. The cumulative project VMT per service population would be 25.6, which is 6.04 percent below the City's threshold of 27.2. Therefore, implementation of the Specific Plan would have a less than significant impact on VMT.

**Table 5.14-2 VMT Analysis of Project Impact**

| | 2012 | 2040 | 2022 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Project Zone VMT | 141,527 | 152,043 | 145,283 |
| TAZ 22450000 Population | 5,600 | 5,721 | 5,643 |
| TAZ 22450000 Employment | 219 | 228 | 222 |
| TAZ 22450000 Service Population | 5,819 | 5,949 | 5,865 |
| Project VMT/SP | 24.3 | 25.6 | 24.8 |
| SGVCOG Area VMT[1] | 199,855,237 | 205,552,552 | 201,889,992 |
| SGVCOG Service Population | 5,633,375 | 6,431,395 | 5,918,382 |
| City VMT/SP | 35.5 | 32.0 | 34.2 |
| **Baseline Threshold[1]** | **Baseline Proj VMT/SP** | **% Above/Below Threshold** | **Baseline VMT Impact?** |
| 29.1 | 24.8 | -14.79% | No |
| **Cumulative Threshold[1]** | **Cumulative Proj VMT/SP** | **% Above/Below Threshold** | **Cumulative VMT Impact?** |
| 27.2 | 25.6 | -6.04% | No |

1 SGVCOG VMT and Service Population obtained from the SCGCOG VMT Evaluation Tool dataset (hppt//555307c8-adff-4c43-a7f5-7d496a4ae77e.filesusr.com/ugd/f815d4_c5066beb93014a9795752ded3b4fb22d.xlsx?dn=SGVCOG%20VMT%20Screening%20Tool_Database_Update_07152021.xlsx)

**Table 5.14-3 2040 Project Effect on VMT**

| | Without Project | With Project | VMT Impact |
|---|---|---|---|
| Citywide Roadway VMT | 1,227,535 | 1,225,243 | |
| Citywide Service Population | 62,170 | 62,367 | |
| Citywide Roadway VMT/SP | 19.74 | 19.65 | No |

As shown in Table 5.14-3, the cumulative (2040) Citywide roadway VMT would be reduced from 1,227,535 without the project to 1,225,243 with the project. Citywide VMT per Service Population would be reduced from 19.74 to 19.65.

Based on the preceding, implementation of the Specific Plan would have a less than significant impact on VMT.

**Impact 5.14-3: Implementation of the Specific Plan would not increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment). [Threshold T-3]**

***Impact Analysis:*** As shown in Figures 3-2, *Conceptual Site Plan*, and 3-6, *Proposed Tentative Tract Map*, vehicular access (for both emergency and non-emergency vehicles) to the Project Area would be provided via a stop-controlled entry drive along Forbes Avenue, which would feed into a looped low-speed private street. The private street would provide direct access to the driveways of each single-family home, with the exception of any homes fronting onto and taking direct access off of Forbes Avenue, which is an existing public street. The private street would be maintained by the established homeowner's association.

The City and Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD) have adopted design standards that preclude the construction of any unsafe roadway, circulation, or access design features. Design and construction of the proposed access and circulation improvements would be required to adhere to the City's Standard Engineering Plans and LACoFD's design standards, which are imposed on development projects during the City's development review and building plan check process. For example, at intersections and project driveways, a substantially clear line of sight must be maintained between the driver of a vehicle waiting at the crossroad and the driver of an approaching vehicle. Sight distance is the continuous length of roadway visible to the driver. Based on a site visit and a review of aerial photography, there are no restrictions blocking the view from the proposed location of the entry drive and south- and northbound traffic on Forbes Avenue, and sufficient sight distance would be provided. Compliance with the established design standards would ensure that hazards due to design features would not occur and that the placement of the vehicular access and circulation improvements would not create a conflict for motorists, pedestrians, or bicyclists traveling within or around the Project Area. Additionally, various safety enhancements would be implemented by the project applicant to enhance pedestrian and bike safety, as detailed above under Impact 5.14-1.

The internal street would include sidewalks for pedestrians and bicyclists. T Bicyclists would also be able to safely ride along the internal street. Implementation of the Specific Plan would also not include incompatible

uses such as farm equipment or other unusually slow vehicles that would present a traffic hazard on area roadways.

Based on the preceding, impacts would be less than significant.

**Impact 5.14-4: Implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in inadequate emergency access. [Threshold T-4]**

*Impact Analysis:* Implementation of the Specific Plan would introduce new onsite vehicular access and circulation improvements, as discussed above. To address emergency and fire access needs, the improvements would be required to be designed and constructed in accordance with all applicable City and LACoFD design standards for emergency access (e.g., minimum street width and turning radius). For example, the proposed internal street would be designed to meet the minimum width requirements of LACoFD to allow for the adequate circulation of emergency vehicles.

Development accommodated by the Specific Plan would be required to incorporate all applicable design and safety requirements as set forth in the most current adopted fire codes, building codes, and nationally recognized fire and life safety standards of the City and LACoFD, such as those outlined in Chapter 15.20 (Fire Prevention) of the Claremont Municipal Code. Compliance with these standards is ensured through the City's and LACoFD's development review and building plan check process.

During the development review and building plan check process, the City would coordinate with LACoFD to ensure that the necessary fire prevention and emergency response features are incorporated into development accommodated by the Specific Plan and that adequate circulation and access (e.g., adequate turning radii for fire trucks) are provided within the traffic and circulation components of the Project Area. Emergency access to the Project Area would be via a new stop-controlled entry drive via Forbes Avenue, which connects to an internal looped private street. The private street would serve as a fire access lane and become part of the onsite fire access loop (see Figures 3-2, *Conceptual Site Plan*). All site and building improvements would be subject to review and approval by the City and LACoFD.

Finally, implementation of the Specific Plan would not require major road closures or otherwise impact the functionality of Forbes Avenue as a public safety access route. However, some improvements would be required within the right-of-way of Forbes Avenue abutting the eastern Project Area boundary (i.e., new curb and gutter, landscaping, and driveways for homes fronting onto street), which would require temporary closure of a portion of the south-bound lane of this public street. However, any minor road closure would be temporary and would only be necessary during the construction activities associated with these improvements. All proposed road closures would also be subject to review and approval by the City. Upon completion of the improvements along Forbes Avenue, all road conditions would be restored to normal.

Based on the preceding, impacts to emergency access would be less than significant.

## 5.14.4 Cumulative Impacts

As demonstrated above, implementation of the Specific Plan would be consistent with adopted policies, plans, and programs regarding circulation, including roadway and pedestrian facilities. Construction and operation of development accommodated by the Specific Plan would comply and/or be consistent with the Claremont General Plan Mobility Element, City's Public Works Construction Standards, the Claremont Municipal Code, and SCAG's RTP/SCS. In accordance with the City of Claremont's Transportation Study Guidelines for VMT and LOS Assessment, if a project is consistent with the SCAG RTP/SCS, then the cumulative impacts (project effect on VMT) shall be considered less than significant.

In respect to cumulative impacts of a project, pursuant to the City's VMT guidelines, a project would result in a significant project generated VMT impact if the following condition is satisfied:

- The cumulative project generated VMT per service population exceeds 15 percent below the SGVCOG Northeast Subarea baseline VMT per service population.

The project's effect on VMT would be considered significant if it results in the following condition:

- The cumulative link-level Citywide VMT per service population increases under the plus project condition compared to the no project condition.

The cumulative project VMT per service population would be 25.6, which is 6.04 percent below the City's threshold of 27.2. Therefore, implementation of the Specific Plan would have a less than significant impact on VMT. A summary of cumulative projects used in the traffic impact analysis is included in Table 5, Cumulative Projects Trip Generation, of the traffic impact analysis prepared for the Specific Plan (Appendix I).

All development projects in the City would be required to undergo discretionary review and would be subject to the transportation impact requirements and CEQA review. For example, as with the Specific Plan, other development projects would be required to analyze the potential transportation impacts that would result from the projects and would be required to demonstrate their consistency with applicable transportation goals and policies of the City of Claremont General Plan. As with the Specific Plan, other development projects would similarly be required to comply with all applicable existing regulations, procedures, and policies that are intended to transportation impacts.

Cumulatively, implementation of the Specific Plan would not alter the traffic patterns of the Project Area or its surroundings. Development accommodated by the Specific Plan would not increase VMT impacts that would be specific to the Project Area as demonstrated above and would therefore, not contribute to any cumulative VMT impacts in the City or region. Site access to the Project Area would be designed per City standards and would not combine with other area traffic impacts to result in a significant cumulative impact on circulation or create hazardous conditions. Therefore, development accommodated by the Specific Plan combined with cumulative development would not result in a cumulatively significant impact.

## 5.14.5 Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements, the following impacts would be less than significant: 5.14-1, 5.14-2, and 5.14-3.

## 5.14.6 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts related to transportation were identified and no mitigation measures are required.

## 5.14.7 Level of Significance After Mitigation

No significant adverse impacts related to transportation were identified.

## 5.14.8 References

Claremont, City of. 2020, August. City of Claremont Draft Transportation Study Guidelines for Vehicle Miles Traveled and Level of Service Assessment. https://www.ci.claremont.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/15846/637468392143100000.

Claremont, City of. 2009. Community Mobility Element. Chapter 4 of City of Claremont General Plan. https://www.ci.claremont.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/15330/637353406471730000.

Environment Planning Development Solutions. (EPD). 2022, July 15. La Puerta School Site Residential Development Traffic Impact Analysis.

Metro. 2022. Foothill Gold Line: Claremont Station (currently unfunded). https://foothillgoldline.org/cities_staclaremontremont/.

Pomona Valley Transit Authority (PVTA). 2022. Claremont Dial-A-Ride. https://www.pvtrans.org/programs/claremont-dial-a-ride/.

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2020, September 3. *Connect SoCal*: The 2020–2045 Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy of the Southern California Association of Governments. https://www.connectsocal.org/Pages/Connect-SoCal-Final-Plan.aspx.

*This page intentionally left blank.*