# IBEC Transportation Impact Analysis: <br> Pedestrians, Bicycles, Transit, Parking, and VMT Descriptions 

Note: existing conditions for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit have already been reviewed and are therefore not presented here.

## I. Pedestrians

The pedestrian system evaluation focuses on the adequacy of existing and planned facilities to accommodate surges in pedestrians associated with events at the Proposed Project. Chapter 16 of the Highway Capacity Manual, $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition (Transportation Research Board, 2017) presents a detailed methodology for calculating the pedestrian LOS for a given street segment. In determining the overall LOS, this methodology considers a variety of factors such as block length, pedestrian wait times at intersections, route directness, sidewalk width, presence of lateral obstructions, midblock crossing opportunities, curb presence, width of outside through lane or bike lane, proportion of on-street parking that is occupied, buffer width to the street, etc. These factors play a role in how a pedestrian perceives the quality of the pedestrian system. However, these factors are not as important when considering surges in pedestrian flows associated with large events. In such instances, the evaluation typically focuses on whether crosswalks and sidewalks are of sufficient width to accommodate projected pedestrian flows during peak periods. If pedestrian flows become excessive, pedestrians may overflow onto streets, which can cause conflicts with moving vehicles and other forms of travel.

Crosswalks and sidewalks are analyzed using average pedestrian space as the threshold for determining facility adequacy. Average pedestrian space reflects the level of crowding on a crosswalk or sidewalk. It represents the average amount of sidewalk area available to each pedestrian walking along the segment. According to Page 4-31 of the HCM , average pedestrian space, which is represented in squarefeet per person (i.e., $\mathrm{ft}^{2} /$ ped) depends on the pedestrian flow rate, which is expressed as the number of pedestrians per minute per foot of effective sidewalk space. Additionally, the average walk speed (typically assumed to be 4 feet per second, or 2.7 miles per hour) influences average pedestrian space. Consistent with HCM guidance, a 0.85 peak hour factor (PHF) is applied to represent a moderate surge in pedestrian travel during the busiest 15 minutes of the peak hour.

For sidewalks, $13 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ /pedestrian of pedestrian space has been set as the lowest acceptable threshold. This value is near the LOS E/F threshold for facilities with cross-flows. For crosswalks, a value of $11 \mathrm{ft}^{2} /$ pedestrian is used, which represents an LOS E/F threshold under platooned (i.e., walking together in a group) flow conditions. For crosswalks, an additional step is required that considers the amount of walk time provided for the crosswalk (while also considering the intersection cycle length). According to the HCM, pedestrian flow rates remain relatively stable when the average space per pedestrian drops into the range of 5 to $9 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ / pedestrian. But when pedestrian space is reduced to below $5 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ / pedestrian, the flow rate declines precipitously. Accordingly, the thresholds applied in this study are more restrictive (and therefore more conservative) than the facility's absolute capacity.

Table 3.14-36 and 3.14-37 present an analysis of sidewalks and crosswalks, respectively, that would be used to the greatest degree under Baseline Plus Project post-event peak hour conditions for an 18,500person concert. Results are not shown for pre-event conditions because pedestrian volumes would be lower (i.e., flows are more concentrated after the event concludes than before it). Volumes would also be slightly lower for the post-event peak hour for an NBA basketball game due to slightly lower attendance. Figure 3.14-15 graphically displays the pedestrian flows and associated LOS on these facilities.

Table 3.14-36
Sidewalk Facility Analysis - Baseline Plus Project Post-Event Peak Hour $\left(18,500-\right.$ Person Concert) ${ }^{1}$

| Facility | Segment | Side | Width ${ }^{2}$ (ft.) | Pedestrians Per Hour | Average Pedestrian Space | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Century Boulevard | Prairie Ave to Doty Ave | North | 8 | 555 | 132 | A |
|  | East of Arena Plaza to Doty Ave ${ }^{3}$ | South | 8 | 5,360 | 14 | E |
|  | Doty Ave to Casino Access | North | 8 | 2,220 | 33 | C |
|  | Doty Ave to South Garage Access | South | 8 | 3,695 | 20 | D |
|  | Casino Access to Yukon Ave | North | 8 | 2,289 | 32 | C |
|  | South Garage Access to Yukon Ave | South | 8 | 371 | 198 | A |
| Prairie Avenue | Century Blvd. to Hardy Ave | East | 8 | 2,892 | 25 | C |
|  | an Bridge Over Prairie Avenue To We | Garage | 25 | 5,627 | 50 | B |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ Analysis performed for post-event peak hour condition associated with a sold out (18,500-person) concert because this activity would have a greater pedestrian flow demand than an NBA basketball game. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Average pedestrian space takes into consideration effective sidewalk width including obstructions and shy distances (e.g., areas near edge of sidewalk and building face where walking may feel uncomfortable). |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{3}$ Pedestrian analyses not conducted for portion of Century Boulevard along the Arena's public plaza frontage due to uncertainty of specific pedestrian egress routes, furniture zones, etc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOURCE: Fehr \& Peers, 2019. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3.14-37
Crosswalk Facility Analysis - Baseline Plus Project Post-Event Peak Hour (18,500-Person Concert) ${ }^{1}$

| Intersection | Leg | Crossing Width (ft.) | Pedestrians Per Hour | Average ${ }^{2}$ Pedestrian Space | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Century Boulevard/ Prairie Avenue | East | 12 | 3,447 | 12 | E |
| Century Boulevard/ Doty Avenue | West | 16 | 925 | 83 | C |
|  | East | 16 | 740 | 103 | B |
|  | North | 16 | 1,480 | 44 | C |
|  | South | 16 | 4,435 | 15 | E |
| Century Boulevard/ Casino Dwy/East Parking Garage | West | 16 | 740 | 85 | C |
|  | East | 16 | 370 | 169 | B |
|  | North | 12 | 1,919 | 24 | D |
|  | South | 12 | 741 | 63 | C |
| Prairie Avenue | West | 16 | 371 | 114 | B |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ Analysis performed for post-event peak hour condition associated with a sold-out (18,500-person) concert because this activity would have a greater pedestrian flow demand than an NBA basketball game, |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOURCE: Fehr \& Peers, 2019. |  |  |  |  |  |

The pedestrian flows shown in these tables and on Figure 3.14-15 are based on the following pedestrian behavior premises:

1. Pedestrian flows will tend to reach an equilibrium state in which alternate routes eventually achieve similar levels of perceived travel time.
2. Pedestrians tend to initially walk in the general direction of their destination (versus initially veering off-course even if that route has a comparable travel time).

Based on these premises, among pedestrians walking to the east lots within Hollywood Park (including the Hollywood Park Casino garage), 15 percent are assumed to use the east leg crosswalk at the Century Boulevard/Prairie Avenue intersection, with the remaining 85 percent walking east along the south side of Century Boulevard toward Doty Avenue. From there, they would cross at one of four crosswalk to reach the north side of the street. The 15 percent / 85 percent split results in both this east leg crosswalk and south side of Century Boulevard operating at LOS E. Thus, this assignment reflects the above-mentioned pedestrian behavior premises.

If the east leg crosswalk at the Century Boulevard/Prairie Avenue intersection were to instead be used by 33 percent of those attendees destined for parking on the east side of Hollywood Park, the total pedestrian volume would increase from approximately 3,450 to 4,100 pedestrians. This would cause
the average pedestrian space to decrease from 12 to 10 square-feet per pedestrian, dropping its performance below the 11 square-feet per pedestrian threshold for crosswalks. Conversely, if none of these pedestrians used the east leg crosswalk, this would cause the average pedestrian space on the south side of Century Boulevard west of Doty Avenue to decrease from 14 to 12 square-feet per pedestrian, dropping its performance below the 13 square-feet per pedestrian threshold for sidewalks. It is worth noting that the north side of Century Boulevard between Prairie Avenue and Doty Avenue would carry 550 pedestrians and operate at LOS A.

## Impact Statement:

The Proposed Project is considered to have a significant impact if it would adversely affect existing or planned pedestrian facilities; or fail to adequately provide for access by pedestrians.

Impact statement will identify significant impact to east leg crosswalk at Prairie/Century and recommend that it be widened to 20 feet. Mitigation will also relate to plaza design that provides highcapacity pedestrian path to reach east leg crosswalk (as a means to avoid excessive pedestrian flows on the south side of Century east of the site).

## II. Bicycles

## Impact Statement:

The Proposed Project is considered to have a significant impact if it would adversely affect existing or planned bicycle facilities; or fail to adequately provide for access by bicycle.

There are no existing bicycle facilities in the immediate vicinity of the Proposed Project. The City of Inglewood Circulation Element indicates that there are Class I bike paths along Century Boulevard on the south side of the Hollywood Park site and along Prairie Avenue on the west side of the Hollywood Park site. However, those facilities are no longer present. The Circulation Element also indicates that there are Class III facilities on Yukon Avenue south of Century Boulevard and on $104^{\text {th }}$ Street east of Yukon Avenue and a potential route on $104^{\text {th }}$ Street between Prairie Avenue and Yukon Avenue. However, there are no signs or pavement markings designating these facilities.

No bike facilities are planned on streets adjacent to the project site. However, the Metro Active Transportation Strategic Plan (ATSP) and the 2012 LA County Master Bicycle Plan show proposed bike facilities on the following roadways near to the Proposed Project:

- $104^{\text {th }}$ Street from Bufford Avenue to South Prairie Avenue (Class III)
- Lennox Boulevard from Felton Avenue to South Prairie Avenue (Class II)
- West $111^{\text {th }}$ Street from Buford Avenue to South Prairie Avenue (Class III)
- South Freeman Avenue from West $104^{\text {th }}$ St to West $111^{\text {th }}$ St (Class III)

The Proposed Project includes 23 spectator and 60 employee on-site bike parking spaces, which exceeds the City's bicycle parking code ${ }^{1}$. The spectator bike parking spaces would be located within the west parking structure, and would be accessed via Century Boulevard or Prairie Avenue. Employee bike parking would be located on the project site to the east of the arena and would be accessed via the driveway on $102^{\text {nd }}$ Street west of Doty Avenue.

As there are no existing or planned bicycle facilities adjacent to the Proposed Project, no bicycle facilities would be adversely affected. The Proposed Project would provide amenities and facilities to accommodate bicyclists and would not adversely affect any existing or planned bicycle facilities. Therefore, project impacts on the bicycle facilities are considered less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

## III. Transit

The Proposed Project's ancillary land uses are expected to generate a modest number of new bus riders. According to Table 3.14-12, 22 AM peak hour and 29 PM peak hour external trips would be made by walking, bicycling, or riding the bus. Those that choose to ride the bus would be dispersed over three different lines that operate in all directions with headways every 15 to 30 minutes during peak periods. Given that there is reserve capacity on these lines, the Proposed Project's ancillary land uses would not cause ridership on any of these bus lines to exceed their load capacity.

Based on the data presented in Table 3.14-17, a 2,000-person weekday Daytime Event at the Proposed Project would generate 18 bus riders during the AM peak hour. Based on the data presented in Table 3.14-18, a 7,500-person weekday Daytime Event would generate 104 bus riders during the PM peak hour. According to Technical Memorandum \#2 - Supplemental Information Regarding Existing Conditions (in Appendix K.2), Metro Lines 117, 211, and 212 experience existing peak hour ridership levels that represent less than 50 percent of each line's directional capacity. Therefore, these routes have reserve capacity (to accommodate up to 700 additional riders). Thus, a weekday Daytime Event at the Proposed Project would not cause ridership on any of these bus lines to exceed its load capacity.

Light rail ridership under Adjusted Baseline conditions is expected to increase over current conditions due to the opening of the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Line. To analyze ridership and reserve capacity, 2025 ridership forecasts were obtained from Metro, and specifically the forecasts associated with the Metro board recommended Alternative $\mathrm{C}-3^{2}$. This alternative consists of an interline train between existing Norwalk Station (Green Line) and Expo/Crenshaw, and a short line train between Willowbrook/Rosa

[^0]Parks Station and Redondo Beach Station (Green Line). To convert to a peak hour estimate on the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Line, the analysis used the ratio of AM peak hour riders (which was provided by Metro) to peak period riders from the 2025 ridership data provided by Metro at the Hawthorne/Lennox and Downtown Inglewood Stations. This ratio, 17 percent, was used as it represents conditions at the stations closest to the project site, to convert from peak period ridership to PM peak hour. Weekend forecasts were not available for the Crenshaw/LAX line. To estimate weekend ridership, the analysis was based on the ratio of existing weekday peak hour load and weekend peak hour load, which is 21 percent on the Green Line. To estimate hourly load, the boardings and alightings were added and subtracted at each station, to calculate the remaining hourly on-vehicle load.

The transit mode share model (see Technical Memorandum \#3 - Project Travel Demands for IBEC in Appendix K.1) was used to estimate the directionality of Proposed Project light rail riders and their relative use of the Downtown Inglewood station along the Expo/Crenshaw Line or the Hawthorne/Lennox Station along the Green Line. Table 3.14-33 displays the expected usage of various light rail lines and stations for each of the peak hours being studied. As shown, the majority of riders are expected to board/alight to/from the north (toward the Expo Line) at the Downtown Inglewood Station, or board/alight to/from the east (on the Green Line) at the Hawthorne / Lennox Station.

| TABLE 3.14-33 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directionality of Light Rail Riders - Adjusted Baseline Plus Project (Major Event) Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Weekday |  | Weekend |
| Line | Station | Direction | Pre-Event Peak <br> Hour | Post-Event <br> Peak Hour | Pre-Event Peak Hour |
| Crenshaw/LAX Green Line | Downtown Inglewood | North | 0\% | 51\% | 0\% |
|  |  | South | 51\% | 0\% | 51\% |
|  | Hawthorne / Lennox Station | East | 6\% | 43\% | 6\% |
|  |  | West | 43\% | 6\% | 43\% |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ See Technical Memorandum \#3 - Project Travel Demands for IBEC in Appendix K. 1 for methodologies used to develop these estimates. |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOURCE: Fehr \& Peers, 2019. |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3.14-34 presents the Adjusted Baseline pre-event peak hour (for both weekdays and weekends) passenger load and capacity approaching the Downtown Inglewood and Hawthorne/Lennox Stations. These particular light rail stations are selected because each station is the closest and most convenient to the Proposed Project on the Expo/Crenshaw and Green Lines, respectively. This table shows that there would be sufficient rail transit capacity to accommodate the Proposed Project demands during the weekday and weekend pre-event peak hours.

Table 3.14-35 shows this same information for Adjusted Baseline weekday post-event conditions. This table indicates that a major event at the Proposed Project could cause ridership in light rail trains traveling in the eastbound direction on the Green Line (i.e., leaving the Hawthorne/Lennox Station) to exceed their capacity.

Bus riders are expected to use various Metro bus routes (including 117, 211, and 212) that stop in the project vicinity. As noted previously, these lines would have ample reserve capacity to accommodate pre-event riders. Under post-event conditions, Route 117 operates one bus in each direction during the post-event hour, with a load capacity of 44 riders per direction per hour. Route 211 ends operations before the post-event hour. Route 212 operates two buses in each direction during the post-event hour, with a load capacity of 96 riders per direction per hour. With 162 post-event peak hour bus riders, bus capacity (for routes that stop in the immediate vicinity of the Arena site) could be exceeded during a major event at the Proposed Project.

Table 3.14-34
Adjusted Baseline Plus Project (Major Event) Light Rail Transit Load - Pre-Event Peak Hour CONDITIONS

|  |  |  | Weekday |  |  |  | Weekend |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Line | Station | Directi on | Peak Hour <br> Capacity ${ }^{1}$ | No Project Peak Hour Load | Project Load ${ }^{2}$ | Plus Project <br> Load (\% <br> Capacity) | Peak Hour Capacity ${ }^{3}$ | No Project Peak Hour Load | Project <br> Load ${ }^{4}$ | Plus Project <br> Load (\% <br> Capacity) |
| Crenshaw/ LAX - Green Line | Downtown Inglewood | North | 2,380 | 569 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 569 \\ (24 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 850 | 120 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 120 \\ (14 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | South | 2,380 | 1,098 | 317 | $\begin{aligned} & 1,415 \\ & (59 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 850 | 267 | 379 | $\begin{gathered} 646 \\ (76 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hawthorne / <br> Lennox | East | 2,380 | 1,385 | 34 | $\begin{aligned} & 1,419 \\ & (60 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 680 | 255 | 44 | $\begin{gathered} 299 \\ (44 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | West | 2,380 | 167 | 265 | $\begin{gathered} 432 \\ (18 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 680 | 106 | 319 | $\begin{gathered} 425 \\ (63 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

Notes:
${ }^{1}$ Based on ten two-car trains each having a capacity of 238 passengers (inclusive of seated and standing passengers) during peak hours.
${ }^{2}$ Project peak hour light rail riders calculated from Table 3.14-25 as follows: 1,080 pre-event attendees use transit with $68 \%$ arriving during pre-event peak hour of which five-sixths arrive via light rail $(1,080 \times 68 \% \times 83 \%=611)$ riders. Similarly, 66 employees arrive via transit with 10 percent occurring during pre-event peak hour and fourfifths using light rail $(66 \times 10 \% \times 80 \%=5$ riders $)$. Total ridership is thus 616 .
${ }^{3}$ Based on five two-car trains each having a capacity of 170 passengers (inclusive of seated and standing passengers) during off-peak peak hours.
${ }^{4}$ Project peak hour light rail riders calculated from Table 3.14-27 as follows: 1,260 pre-event attendees use transit with $68 \%$ arriving during pre-event peak hour of which six-sevenths arrive via light rail $(1,260 \times 68 \% \times 86 \%=737)$ riders. Similarly, 66 employees arrive via transit with 10 percent occurring during pre-event peak hour and four-fifths using light rail ( $66 \times 10 \% \times 80 \%=5$ riders). Total ridership is thus 742 .

SOURCE: Fehr \& Peers, 2019.

TAble 3.14-35
Adjusted Baseline Plus Project (Major Event) Light Rall Transit Load - Weekday Post-Event Peak hour Conditions

| Line | Station | Directi on | Peak Hour Capacity ${ }^{1}$ | No Project Peak Hour Load ${ }^{2}$ | Project Load ${ }^{3}$ | Plus Project Load (\% Capacity) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crenshaw/L AX - Green Line | Downtown Inglewood | North | 850 | 256 | 376 | $\begin{gathered} 632 \\ (74 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | South | 850 | 488 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 488 \\ (57 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hawthorne / <br> Lennox | East | 850 | 622 | 317 | $\begin{gathered} 939 \\ (110 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | West | 850 | 70 | 44 | $\begin{gathered} 114 \\ (13 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

Notes:
${ }^{1}$ Post-event train capacity is much lower than pre-event due to fewer trains per hour and lower 'standing room only' thresholds adopted by Metro.
${ }^{2}$ Applied the ratio of existing PM peak hour two-way train load versus 9 to 10 PM two-way train load (i.e., calculated as 45 percent on the Green Line at Hawthorne/Lennox Station) to the Adjusted Baseline PM peak hour train load to obtain post-event peak hour riders.
${ }^{3}$ Project peak hour light rail riders calculated from Table 3.14-26 as follows: 925 post-event attendees use transit with $83 \%$ departing during postevent peak hour of which four-fifths depart via light rail ( $925 \times 83 \% \times 80 \%=614$ ) riders. Similarly, 56 employees depart via transit with 79 percent occurring during post-event peak hour and four-fifths using light rail ( $56 \times 79 \% \times 80 \%=35$ riders). Total ridership is thus 737 .

SOURCE: Fehr \& Peers, 2019.

## Impact Statement:

The Proposed Project is considered to have a significant impact if it would adversely affect public transit operations.

Impacts are not expected to be considered significant under the relevant threshold.

## IV. Parking

## On-Street Parking (Existing):

This section describes current signage and programs in effect to regulate on-street parking in the project vicinity. The following describes on-street parking restrictions on key roadways in the project vicinity based on field reviews of current signage:

- On-street parking is prohibited on Century Boulevard.
- On-street parking is prohibited on Prairie Avenue.
- On-street parking is permitted on the west sides of Yukon Avenue and Doty Avenue with no time restrictions, with the exception of on Thursdays (Doty Avenue) and Fridays (Yukon Avenue) from 8 AM to 3 PM presumably for street sweeping. Parking is prohibited on the east side of each street.
- On-street parking on $101^{\text {st }}$ Street west of Prairie Avenue (along portions with fronting residences) is prohibited every day from noon to 6 PM unless the vehicle has an appropriate permit. Parking is also prohibited on Thursdays (south side) and Fridays (north side) from 8 AM to 3 PM presumably for street sweeping.
- On-street parking is permitted on $102^{\text {nd }}$ Street between Prairie Avenue and Freeman Avenue with no time restrictions, with the exception of on Thursdays (north side) and Fridays (south side) from 8 AM to 3 PM presumably for street sweeping. Between Prairie Avenue and Yukon Avenue, parking is permitted on the south side of the street with the exception of Thursdays from 8 AM to 3 PM . The north side of the street prohibits on-street parking at all times with the exception of when parking on the south side of prohibited.
- On-street parking is permitted on $103^{\text {rd }}$ Street west of Prairie Avenue with no time restrictions, with the exception of on Thursdays (north side) and Fridays (south side) from 8 AM to 3 PM presumably for street sweeping.
In summary, on-street parking is permitted on the majority of the residential and collector streets in the project vicinity. Depending on the size and timing of events at the Proposed Project, it is conceivable that some patrons may choose to park along these streets. The demand for this parking would be greatest prior to a major event, which would typically begin at 7 PM. By that time, much of the onstreet parking in the area, which is utilized by residents, would be occupied. Therefore, a limited supply of available on-street parking spaces would be available on these streets to accommodate major events at the Proposed Project.


## Major Event Parking Demand:

According to Table 3.14-25, a weekday basketball game would generate a parking demand by attendees and employees of approximately 7,700 spaces. A concert would result in a parking demand of approximately 8,100 spaces. These totals exclude additional parking required for players, officials, and charter buses, service/delivery vehicles, etc. For events held at the Proposed Project when there is no overlapping event at the NFL Stadium, vehicles would be expected to be parked at the following offstreet locations in the following quantities (based on their proposed supply):

- 3,110 vehicles would be parked in the project's West Parking Garage.
- 365 vehicles would be parked in the project's East Parking Garage.
- 650 vehicles would be parked in the project's South Parking Garage (with 100 of those spaces being reserved for players and key team employees).
- Between 3,700 and 4,100 vehicles would be parked in parking lots or structures within the Hollywood Park Specific Plan including the Hollywood Park Casino garage (located north of Century Boulevard and east of Prairie Avenue).

A modest amount of on-street parking would occur on residential and collector streets in the project vicinity. The City of Inglewood is planning to expand residential parking districts within the City near the Proposed Project and NFL Stadium, in order to prevent attendees from parking on residential streets near these new venues. However, such a program is not assumed under adjusted baseline conditions because it is unknown whether the City will expand such districts or, if they are expanded, what the geographic scope of those districts might be. Residents who wish to sell their driveway space to attendees looking to park will be required to file a business license with the City, which may discourage some residents from selling parking on their property.

Hollywood Park and the Hollywood Park Casino are the most convenient off-site locations to accommodate the parking needs of attendees and employees to the Proposed Project. Hollywood Park will have a large supply of parking that would otherwise typically be unused, and the Hollywood Park Casino parking structure typically has available unused spaces in it. Hollywood Park and the Hollywood Park Casino would therefore likely price their parking attractively compared to other off-site parking options in order to generate extra revenue. Hollywood Park and the Hollywood Park Casino will offer the easiest pedestrian connections to the Proposed Project, given their close proximity. Further, the large supply of parking at these locations will ensure that parking is available, as compared to smaller lots which may fill up. Based on information from the Hollywood Park Casino owners and City of Inglewood staff, 575 spaces would be available for use by Proposed Project attendees for a typical major event. About 9,000 spaces at the NFL Stadium within Hollywood Park would be available for use by Proposed Project attendees on typical days when there is not an overlapping event in the stadium.

Most on-site parking would be pre-paid. For this reason, vehicles would travel to specific-preassigned parking facilities and, as a result, would arrive consistently to all available parking locations (i.e. versus filling all on-site spaces first and then directing drivers to off-site spaces).

The supply of parking in the three proposed parking garages and at Hollywood Park and the Hollywood Park Casino is more than adequate to accommodate attendee and employee parking demands during major events at the Proposed Project (so long as an overlapping event at the NFL Stadium is not occurring). Parking on adjacent neighborhood streets would primarily be due to attendees searching for free and/or closer parking, and not the result of inadequate overall off-street supply. The overlapping
events subsection presented later describes how the Proposed Project's parking demands would geographically change when a major event is held concurrently at the NFL Stadium.

## Impact Statement:

There is no significance criterion for parking; therefore, no impact statement will be prepared.

## V. VMT

This section describes the methodologies used to estimate the vehicle miles of travel (VMT) associated with various project activities and scenarios. VMT is often expressed on a 'per capita' or 'per employee' basis to understand the relative efficiency of one project versus another. By definition, one VMT occurs when a vehicle is driven one mile. A given daily VMT value represents vehicular miles of travel for entire weekday or weekend day. Lastly, VMT values in this chapter represent the full length of a given trip, and are not truncated at city, county, or region boundaries.

Table 3.14-58 displays the weekday daily VMT associated with the ancillary land uses (refer to Appendix K. 3 for technical calculations). These estimates were developed using trip length data from the SCAG travel demand model. These values represent the VMT generated by these uses, and not necessarily the effect on VMT caused by them. The three office-related components would have a combined 379 employees, which translate to 15.1 daily work VMT per employee.

Table 3.14-58
Weekday VMT Generated by Ancillary Land Uses

| Land Use | VMT ${ }^{\text { }}$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Office ${ }^{2}$ | 5,708 | VMT shown only for primary work trip. ${ }^{3}$ |
| Retail | 9,276 | Includes all vehicle travel. |
| Full-Service Restaurant | 9,228 | Includes all vehicle travel. |
| Quick Service Restaurant | 5,854 | Includes all vehicle travel. |
| Coffee Shop | 2,607 | Includes all vehicle travel. |
| Community Space | 2,819 | Includes all vehicle travel. |
| Business Hotel | 5,144 | Includes all vehicle travel. |
| Notes: |  |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ Applies on a day in which an event is not occurring at Arena site. |  |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Includes 71,000 square-foot office space, 25,000 square-foot sports medicine clinic, and 54 employees associated with practice facility. |  |  |
| ${ }^{3}$ VMT associated with mid-day employee trips (e.g., to lunch) not included. Calculation per significance criterion for office use. |  |  |
| SOURCE: Fehr \& Peers, 20 |  |  |

Table 3.14-59 displays the VMT associated with the two Daytime events being studied (refer to Appendix K. 3 for technical calculations). These estimates were developed starting with each event's disaggregated daily trip generation. The number of attendee vehicle trips was then multiplied by the average trip length obtained from The Forum attendee origin-destination data. Average trip lengths for employees were derived from the SCAG travel demand model.

Table 3.14-59
VMT Generated by Daytime Events

| Event Type | Day | VMT per Event | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2,00-Person Corporate/Community <br> Event | Weekday | 68,645 |  |
| 7,500-Person Other Sporting Event or <br> Gathering | Weekend | 68,645 | Represents all vehicle travel and does not subtract VMT from |

SOURCE: Fehr \& Peers, 2019.

Table 3.14-60 displays the VMT associated with the two Major Events being studied (refer to Appendix K. 3 for technical calculations). These estimates were developed starting with each event's disaggregated daily trip generation. For the NBA game, the number of attendee vehicle trips was then multiplied by the average trip length obtained from the Staples Center attendee origin-destination data. For the concert, the number of attendee vehicle trips was then multiplied by the average trip length obtained from The Forum attendee origin-destination data. Average trip lengths for employees were derived from the SCAG travel demand model.

Table 3.14-60
VMT Generated by Major Events

| Event Type | Day | VMT per Event | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18,000-Person NBA <br> Basketball Game | Weekday | 398,447 | Represents all vehicle travel and does not subtract VMT from a potentially relocated event. |
|  | Weekend | 394,985 |  |
| 18,500-Person Concert | Weekday | 389,598 |  |
|  | Weekend | 386,237 |  |

SOURCE: Fehr \& Peers, 2019.

Table 3.14-61 illustrates how the two Major Events would affect regional VMT if they were replacing events otherwise being held at venues elsewhere in the region (refer to Appendix K. 3 for technical calculations). As shown, the Proposed Project would result in approximately 79,000 to 89,000 added

VMT for a Major Event consisting of an NBA Basketball game replacing an NBA Basketball game at Staples Center, with the net increase stemming from Staples Center having a higher non-auto mode split and shorter trip lengths when compared to the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would result in up to approximately 98,000 added VMT for a Major Event consisting of a concert replacing a concert at a venue elsewhere in the region; this increase in VMT is due to the larger sell-out capacity of the Proposed Project when compared to other venues in the region.

Table 3.14-61
Net Change in VmT Caused by Proposed Project Major Events

| Event Type | Day | Added VMT per Event | Subtracted VMT per Event | Net Change in VMT per Event |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18,000-Person NBA <br> Basketball Game Replacing <br> Sold-Out NBA Game at <br> Staples Center | Weekday | 398,447 | $-309,600{ }^{1}$ | +88,847 |
|  | Weekend | 394,985 | $-315,882^{1}$ | +79,103 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 18,500-Person Concert Replacing Sold-Out Concert Elsewhere in the Region | Weekday | 389,598 | $-291,277^{2}$ | +98,321 |
|  | Weekend | 386,237 | $-297,229^{2}$ | +89,008 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ Subtracted VMT is based on a sold-out 19,079-person NBA Basketball Game that would otherwise occur at Staples Center in Downtown Los Angeles (see Appendix K. 3 for calculations). |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Subtracted VMT is based on a sold-out 17,500-person Concert that would otherwise occur at concert venue elsewhere in the region (see Appendix K. 3 for calculations). |  |  |  |  |

SOURCE: Fehr \& Peers, 2019.

## Impact Statement:

The Proposed Project is considered to have a significant impact if the office components of the project generate work VMT exceeding (i.e., higher than) a level of 15 percent below existing regional daily work VMT per employee; or the retail components of the project that are not local serving cause a net increase in daily VMT; or the event component of the project causes a net increase in total daily VMT.

Has yet to be created, but will likely be straightforward by comparing the above results to the significance criteria. The event impacts will be significant since the events generate a net increase in VMT, the retail impact will be significant since the retail is considered regional serving and it generates a net increase in VMT, and the office and restaurant uses will be less than significant.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Inglewood Municipal Code Section 12-42.1(C)(3) states: "Bicycle racks, bicycle lockers or other secure bicycle parking shall be provided to accommodate four bicycles per the first fifty thousand square feet of nonresidential building area and one additional bicycle per each additional fifty thousand square feet of nonresidential building area. Calculations which result in a fraction of 0.5 or higher shall be rounded to the next higher whole number." Based on a project size of approximately $1,179,000 \mathrm{sf}$, as described in the project description, the project would require 27 bicycle spaces.
    

