

DRAFT MEMORANDUM

Date: June 22, 2018

To: Brian Boxer and Christina Erwin, ESA

From: Tom Gaul, Netai Basu, and Mike Samuelson

Subject: Update on Potential Thresholds of Significance for Use in the Ref.: 3002

Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center (IBEC) Transportation Analysis

On May 18, 2018 Fehr & Peers submitted a memorandum summarizing the results of research into thresholds of significance for 14 categories of transportation impacts that have been used by the City of Inglewood and other local jurisdictions in published environmental documents. This was used to facilitate discussions with City staff and the EIR team on May 21 and June 11, 2018. The purpose of this memorandum is to document decisions that were made on June 11 regarding the selection of thresholds of significance to be used in the EIR for the proposed IBEC project. Thresholds of significance were selected for 9 of the 14 categories, noted below and marked with an asterisk (*) in the attached table. The decision was made not to analyze 3 of the categories as transportation impacts in this EIR, also noted below and marked with "xx" in the attached table. Thresholds of significance for 2 of the categories remain undecided.

- 1. Signalized Intersections (V/C-Based Thresholds) selected
- 2. Signalized Intersections (Delay-Based Thresholds) not yet determined
- 3. Unsignalized Intersections selected
- 4. Residential Street Segments this topic will be analyzed in the General Plan consistency analysis rather than as an independent category of transportation impacts.
- 5. Arterial Corridors (Delay-Based Thresholds) data will be reported but this data will not be used as an independent category of transportation impacts.
- 6. CMP Facilities (Freeway and Arterial) selected
- 7. Freeway Facilities selected
- 8. Transit Facilities selected
- 9. Bicycle Facilities selected
- 10. Pedestrian Facilities selected
- 11. Site Access this topic will not be assessed for significance in the EIR but will be addressed in the design review/entitlement phase of project approval
- 12. Emergency Access selected
- 13. Construction-Period Impacts selected, with minor refinements
- 14. VMT Impacts not yet determined

The purpose of this memo is to document discussions between City staff and its consultant team as the City selects thresholds of significance to be used in the EIR for the proposed Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center project. We can be reached at (213) 261-3050 to discuss these matters. Thank you.

1. Signalized Intersections (V/C-Based Thresholds)

* City of Inglewood (Hilton Tru Hotel (2017) and Downtown & Fairview Heights TOD (2016))
Same as County of Los Angeles and City of Hawthorne (below)

* County of Los Angeles and City of Hawthorne

A proposed project would normally have a significant impact on intersection capacity on at an intersection operating at LOS C, D, or E/F prior to the addition of project traffic if the project traffic causes an increase in the V/C ratio as follows:

- V/C ratio increase >= 0.040 if LOS is C
- V/C ratio increase >= 0.020 if LOS is D
- V/C ratio increase >= 0.010 if LOS is E or F

* City of Los Angeles

- The LOS is C, its final post-project V/C ratio is 0.701 to 0.800, and the project-related increase in V/C is 0.040 or greater; or
- The LOS is D, its final post-project V/C ratio is 0.801 to 0.900, and the project-related increase in V/C is 0.020 or greater; or
- The LOS is E or F, its final post-project V/C ratio is 0.901 or greater, and the project-related increase in V/C is 0.010 or greater.

2. Signalized Intersections (HCM Delay-Based Thresholds)

City of Sacramento

The traffic generated by the project degrades LOS from acceptable (without the project) to unacceptable (with the project) or, if the LOS (without project) is already (or projected to be) unacceptable and project-generated traffic increases the average vehicle delay by 5 seconds or more.

City of Seattle

Decline from LOS D or better to LOS E or F; or an addition of at least 5 seconds of delay if already at LOS E or F

3. Unsignalized Intersections

A project would have a significant traffic impact at an unsignalized intersection if project-related traffic causes the level of service at the worst approach to deteriorate from LOS D or better to LOS E or LOS F and peak hour signal warrants would be met, or would cause peak hour signal warrants to be met when the worst approach is already operating at LOS E or LOS F.

4. Residential Street Segments

This issue will be not be addressed in the transportation impact analysis but rather in the General Plan consistency analysis.

5. Arterial Corridors (Delay-Based Thresholds)

Changes in travel time on arterial corridors during the pre-event and post-event hours will be reported but will not be used as an independent threshold for transportation impacts.

6. CMP Facilities (Freeway and Arterial Monitoring Locations)

A project would normally have a significant CMP impact if project traffic results in at least a 2% increase in the demand to capacity ratio, causing or worsening LOS F conditions (D/C >1.00). This threshold applies to both CMP Freeway Monitoring Stations and CMP Arterial Monitoring Intersections.

7. Freeway Facilities

- * (1) The traffic generated by the project causes off-ramp traffic to queue back to the freeway gore point or mainline, or worsens an existing/projected queuing problem.
- * (2) Threshold of significance for all freeway mainlne locations will be the threshold for CMP Facilities described above.

8. Transit Facilities

* Impacts to the transit system are considered significant if the Proposed Project would: (1) adversely affect public transit operations or (2) fail to adequately provide for access to public transit.

9. Bicycle Facilities

* Impacts to bicycle facilities are considered significant if the Proposed Project would: adversely affect existing or planned bicycle facilities; or fail to adequately provide for access by bicycle.

10. Pedestrian Facilities

* Impacts to pedestrian facilities are considered significant if the Proposed Project would: adversely affect existing or planned pedestrian facilities; or fail to adequately provide for access by pedestrians.

11. Site Access

This topic will not be assessed for significance in the EIR but will be addressed in the design review/entitlement phase of project approval.

12. Emergency Access

* Impacts to emergency access are considered significant if the Proposed Project would result in inadequate emergency access.

13. Construction-Period Impacts

- * Temporary Traffic Impacts:
 - The length of time of temporary street closures or closures of traffic lanes;
 - The classification of the street (major arterial, state highway) affected;
 - The existing traffic levels and level of service (LOS) on the affected street segments and intersections;
 - Whether the affected street directly leads to a freeway on- or off-ramp or other state highway;
 - Potential safety issues involved with street or lane closures; and
 - The presence of emergency services (fire, hospital, etc.) located nearby that regularly use the affected street.
- * Temporary Loss of Access:
 - The length of time of any loss of vehicular or pedestrian access to a parcel fronting the construction area;
 - The availability of alternative vehicular or pedestrian access; and
 - The type of land uses affected, and related safety, convenience, and/or economic issues.
- * Temporary Loss of Bus Stops or Rerouting of Bus Lines:
 - The length of time that an existing bus stop would be unavailable or that existing service would be interrupted;
 - The availability of a nearby location to which the bus stop or route can be temporarily relocated;
 - The existence of other bus stops or routes with similar routes/destinations; and
 - Whether the interruption would occur on a weekday, weekend or holiday, and whether the existing bus route typically provides service that/those day(s).
- * Temporary Loss of On-Street Parking:
 - The current utilization of existing on-street parking;
 - The availability of alternative parking locations or public transit options (e.g. bus, train); and
 - The length of time that existing parking spaces would be unavailable.

14. VMT Impacts

- no increase (similar to State guidance for regional retail centers)
- 15% below regional average (would need to identify comparable arenas and then create a database of VMT/capita. This has the advantage of skirting the issue of whether patrons/events are new or are moved from other arenas.)
- Report change in VMT but do not assess significance of that change, as it is not yet required.