

Message

**From:** Peter Puglese [ppuglese@cityofinglewood.org]  
**Sent:** 9/10/2018 10:57:54 AM  
**To:** Mike Samuelson [M.Samuelson@fehrandpeers.com]  
**CC:** Christina Erwin [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=4dddbff2e8414460abdcaefc2d500dd-Christina E]; Brian Boxer [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=a4f8c4ab743d4d5194aa8b3d8c519c29-Brian Boxer]; Tom Gaul [T.Gaul@fehrandpeers.com]; Netai Basu [N.Basu@fehrandpeers.com]; 'Lisa Trifiletti' [lisa@trifiletticonsulting.com]; Mindala Wilcox [mwilcox@cityofinglewood.org]  
**Subject:** RE: Murphy's Bowl: Future Network Changes  
**Attachments:** F&P - Future Network Changes Comments 09-10-2018.pdf

Mike,

Attached is my comments to your PDF. I added my own text boxes.

For the 4 intersections below => I agree with the changes for your simulation.

Let me know if you have any questions or comments.

I will try to get back to you this week on the La Cienega @ Manchester NB Config.

We don't have signal Plans from the Stadium for intersections along Pincay. Not sure what the timeline is.

-Peter

---

**From:** Mike Samuelson <M.Samuelson@fehrandpeers.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 24, 2018 5:03 PM  
**To:** Peter Puglese <ppuglese@cityofinglewood.org>  
**Cc:** Christina Erwin <CErwin@esassoc.com>; 'Brian Boxer' <bboxer@esassoc.com>; Tom Gaul <T.Gaul@fehrandpeers.com>; Netai Basu <N.Basu@fehrandpeers.com>; 'Lisa Trifiletti' <lisa@trifiletticonsulting.com>; Mindala Wilcox <mwilcox@cityofinglewood.org>  
**Subject:** Murphy's Bowl: Future Network Changes

Hi Peter,

Attached please find a brief memorandum detailing the future network changes (for year 2024) for the IBEC study. Please confirm if the changes we have noted for City of Inglewood intersections are correct, and if there are any changes at other study intersections that we should include. I'll also be sending the memorandum to Pat Tomcheck from LAWA to review the City of Los Angeles intersections.

In addition, I wanted to detail the four intersections where our simulation signal timing differ from the signal timing plans, based on field observations we made the following adjustments:

- Prairie/Manchester: The timing sheet indicates that the through phases (phases 2, 4, 6, and 8) were the lagging phases. Field observations revealed that the southbound left turn phase (phase 7) was the lagging phase and the simulation was changed accordingly.
- Prairie/Century: Max split times for the southbound move were extended in the simulation to reflect timing observed in the field rather than the timing shown in the signal timing sheet.
- Prairie/Arbor Vitae: The signal heads and signal timing sheets are set up such that there could be more than one approach with a protected left turn phase, but in the field only the northbound left turn phase is currently operating as protected. The simulation therefore reflects only a northbound protected left turn phase.

- Prairie/Hardy: This intersection is set up very similarly to intersection 25 and the same changes to the simulation, diverging from what was shown in the signal timing sheet.

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments on the future network changes or signal timing.

Thanks,  
Mike

**Mike Samuelson**  
Senior Transportation Planner

**FEHR & PEERS**

**Los Angeles**

600 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 1050  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
(213) 261-3050

[M.Samuelson@fehrandpeers.com](mailto:M.Samuelson@fehrandpeers.com)

[www.fehrandpeers.com](http://www.fehrandpeers.com)