
VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT
B.2 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE - REASONABLY FORESEEABLE
FUTURE DEVELOPMENT (FOOTBALL STADIUM/CASINO)
ALTERNATIVE

This Alternative evaluates a theoretical scenario in which the Proposed Project does not go forward, but an alternative project consistent with the underlying zoning regulations is developed. The development of an athletic stadium is considered a reasonably foreseeable development because (1) it is consistent with the current zoning designation, and (2) it represents a development proposal that was previously proposed and analyzed in an EIR in 1995. For purposes of this analysis, the following project defining features and environmental impact analysis (though modified to reflect current conditions), are generally adapted from the Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium EIR (SCH#95-051042), dated September 6, 1995.

The Athletic Stadium Alternative would add a state-of-the-art venue for professional football to the City of Inglewood. This Alternative would include the construction and operation of an athletic Stadium for professional and collegiate football, professional soccer, and other special events. Under the Stadium Alternative, the Racetrack would be demolished, but the Casino would be retained on the Project Site.

Stadium Operations

The operating hours of the Stadium would vary depending on the schedules of the different teams using the facility and the time of year. Typically, events at the Stadium would take place during a portion of the day, such as the afternoon or evening. It is estimated that the facility would be in use for events approximately 55 days per year. Major events that would take place at the Stadium include professional and collegiate football. These events would take place on Saturdays for college games and primarily on Sundays for professional games (See Table VI.B.2-1: Stadium Event Profile).

To provide for television broadcast to the east coast, weekend games would ordinarily begin at 1:00 p.m. Additionally, the Stadium could host a limited number of Monday Night Football games or Saturday/Thursday night games during a given year. Such games would ordinarily begin at 6:00 p.m. Other events that could take place at the Stadium include professional soccer matches, concerts, motocross events, and trade shows.

The Stadium is estimated to require approximately 2,600 employees during typical major events (i.e. 65,000 spectators), with fewer employees required for smaller events (average attendance 25,000), depending upon the event. During the balance of the year, the number of employees would be a limited staff of approximately 20 maintenance personnel.

**Table VI.B.2-1
Stadium Event Profile**

Event	Events per Year	Sold Out Events ¹	Attendance
NFL Football Regular Season ²	16 Total (14 Sunday games, 2 Monday/Thursday games)	5	50,000 - 60,000
NFL Football Preseason	4	0	40,000 - 50,000
College Football ³	6 Saturday games	1	50,000 - 60,000
Major League Soccer (MLS)	14 regular season games. 1 playoff game. Most games on Sundays, some on weekdays	6	18,000 - 25,000
Soccer Exhibitions	9	3	40,000 - 60,000
Other events (motocross, concerts, etc.)	5 events per year (weekday or weekend)	2	25,000
Totals			
Events per Year	55 events		
Total Annual Attendance	2,580,500 spectators		
Average Daily Attendance	46,900 spectators		
Employees	20 permanent maintenance personnel. 2,600 temporary employees for major events includes concessions, parking, crowd control, retail, safety and security. Fewer employees would be required for other events, depending on the characteristics of the event.		
¹ Sold out event assumes 65,000 for NFL games, CFA games, and other events; and 25,000 for MLS games. ² Interest has been expressed in locating two professional teams at Hollywood Park. Accordingly, this EIR assumes use of the Stadium by two professional teams. Additionally the potential exists for Super Bowls to be played at this stadium. Super Bowls have not been included in the typical attendance calculations as they would be an infrequent, specialized event. ³ Potentially (depending on the teams playing at the proposed Stadium), every other year one of the collegiate games could be a 82,000 spectator event. This potential event has been included in the calculations for annual attendance and average daily attendance in order to provide a maximum number. Source: Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium EIR, 1995.			

Façade, Lighting, and Site Design

The Stadium would be constructed of reinforced concrete, and steel with a glass and metal finish. The height of the proposed stadium as contemplated in the 1995 EIR was 125 feet above grade. Playing field lighting would consist of 600-700 metal halide fixtures mounted on four lighting racks. These racks would be mounted on the interior edge of the masts of the Stadium. Security lighting would illuminate the façade, parking areas, and any on-site roadways. Parking lot and exterior building lights would be directed downward and toward the interior of the site to reduce the impacts of glare on adjacent uses. A consistent signage style and format would be developed for the Stadium. Visually offensive equipment (HVAC units, dumpsters, etc.) would be screened from view from public streets per the City of Inglewood design controls.

Aesthetics

Views and Urban Design

Impacts on views and urban design under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. Under this Alternative, the Project Site would be redeveloped in the area currently containing the Racetrack. The Racetrack would be demolished and the stadium would be constructed in approximately the same location. The stadium structure would be approximately 125 feet above grade and thus would be visually prominent to the surrounding neighborhood. The stadium structure would however be compatible with the existing environment, as it would be located within proximity to and within sight of the Forum and the Casino, and it would not be a substantial increase in building height as compared to the existing Hollywood Park Racetrack grandstands. Although this Alternative would alter the views of and from the Project Site, the resulting views and urban design would provide several visual improvements. Under this Alternative, the overall visual character of this site would be improved as compared to the property's current condition. Impacts to views and urban design under this Alternative would be less than significant.

Light and Glare

Impacts on light and glare under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. This Alternative would generate new sources of light and glare in the form of street lighting, signage illumination and structural light illumination within and on top of the stadium. Stadium lighting would consist of 600-700 metal halide fixtures mounted on four lighting racks. These racks would be mounted on the interior edge of the masts of the Stadium. In comparison to the Proposed Project, which would reduce the extent of evening lighting and illumination from pole mounted lights in the parking areas and event lighting (created by evening events at the racetrack), this Alternative would have increased light and glare impacts during evening stadium events, resulting in a potentially significant and unavoidable impact.

Shade and Shadow

The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact with respect to shade/shadow. This Alternative would be developed with a stadium structure at a height of 125 feet above grade. Due to the proposed location of the stadium footprint in central area of the Project Site, the stadium's shadow would potentially impact the areas to the west across Prairie and to the north, on the existing Project Site, and to the east. During the summer solstice, the longest shadows would be cast at a distance of approximately 171 feet between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., with the longest shadows occurring during the early morning hours to the west and during the late afternoon to the east. Shadows during midday would be significantly shorter and oriented to the north. During the summer solstice, morning shadows would not be cast upon the residential and commercial properties along the west side of Prairie Avenue, and would not shade these uses for more than 4 consecutive hours during the summer months. During the winter solstice, the maximum shadow length from a 125 foot structure would be approximately 402 feet between

9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., with the longest shadows occurring during the morning hours to the west and during the afternoon hours to the east. Shadows during midday would be significantly shorter and oriented to the north (approximately 196 feet north at 12:00 p.m.). Winter shadows would not impact the residential properties west of the commercial properties along Prairie Avenue for more than 3 consecutive hours. Afternoon shadows would be cast upon the Hollywood Park property and thus would not affect any sensitive receptors. Therefore, like the Proposed Project, this Alternative would result in less than significant shade and shadow impacts.

Air Quality

Construction

The Proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable construction impacts with respect to air quality. The daily construction intensity (e.g., construction equipment hours) for the Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Alternative would be similar to the daily construction intensity assumed for the Proposed Project since the racetrack would also be demolished under this Alternative and a new structure built. Accordingly, the Hollywood Park Stadium Alternative daily regional construction emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ would be similar to the emissions presented for the proposed project and would result in a significant and unavoidable air quality impact.

Operational

The Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Alternative would generate more mobile and area source emissions than the Proposed Project. Weekday emissions would be approximately 170 ppd for VOC, 267 ppd for NO_x, 1,979 ppd for CO, three ppd for SO_x, 88 ppd for PM_{2.5}, and 452 ppd for PM₁₀. Weekend emissions would be approximately 206 ppd for VOC, 323 ppd for NO_x, 2,397 ppd for CO, three ppd for SO_x, 107 ppd for PM_{2.5}, and 548 ppd for PM₁₀. Regional operational emissions would exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀. As such, the Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Alternative regional operational emissions would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

Mobile source emissions associated with the Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Alternative would potentially increase localized CO emissions. Project-related one- and eight-hour CO concentrations were 3.2 and 2.2 ppm, respectively. These concentrations are well below the State one- and eight-hour standards of 9.0 and 20 ppm, respectively. Increased traffic associated with the Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Alternative would not substantially change the CO concentrations estimated for the Proposed Project. As such, the Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Alternative would result in a less than significant localized CO impact.

The Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Alternative would be consistent with the current General Plan land use designation utilized to calculate the emissions budget in the most recent AQMP. As such, the Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Alternative would be compatible with the AQMP. The Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Alternative would generate more GHG emissions than estimated for the Proposed Project

on a daily basis. However, the Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Alternative would generate less annual GHG emissions than the Proposed Project as the athletic stadium would not be used on a daily basis. Overall, like the Proposed Project, the Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Alternative would result in a less than significant global warming impact.

Overall, Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Alternative emissions would be greater than Proposed Project emissions, but would result in similar significant and unavoidable air quality impact conclusions for operations. However, unlike the Proposed Project, the Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Alternative would be consistent with the SCAQMD AQMP.

Geology and Soils

Impacts on geology and soils under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. This Alternative would involve the development of a stadium located in the central area of the Project Site. With regard to geological and associated seismic risks, this Alternative would propose a structure to be located outside of the delineated Restricted Use Zone (RUZ) of the Potrero fault zone. As delineated on the 1984 Alquist Priolo Special Studies Zone Map, there are no active faults beneath the area that would be developed with the stadium. The geotechnical recommendations associated with site preparation, earthwork and foundations that are identified in the 1995 Hollywood Park Stadium EIR and the EIR for the Proposed Project would carry over to this Alternative, with site specific geotechnical engineering considerations for the construction of a stadium structure. Therefore, the geology and soils impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant after mitigation.

Hazardous Materials and Risk of Upset

Construction

Construction impacts on hazardous materials and risk of upset under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. Similar to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would result in the demolition of existing uses except for the Casino, and would generate potentially significant impacts associated with potential exposure to asbestos containing materials (ACMs) and lead based paint (LBP) during construction. Construction of this Alternative would also involve site clearing and construction activities within the parking lot areas on the Project Site. Therefore, this Alternative would have a less than significant impact with respect to hazardous materials during construction.

Operation

Operational impacts with respect to hazardous materials and risk of upset under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. Under this Alternative, the stadium uses would not require or generate substantial hazardous materials. Operations would involve the use and storage of pesticides, fertilizer, cleaning solvents, and similar potentially hazardous materials used during the maintenance and operation of a stadium facility, but such use would be similar to the existing uses associated with the

racetrack operations. Therefore, this Alternative would have a less than significant impact after with mitigation with respect to hazardous materials during operation.

Cultural Resources

Archeological Resources

A cultural resources records search was conducted for the Hollywood Park Redevelopment Project Property by the South Central Coastal Information Center, California Historical Resources Information System in July 2007. Based on a review of all recorded archaeological sites within a ½-mile radius of the Project Site and cultural resource reports on file, database records for all California Points of Historical Interest, California Historical Landmarks, the California Register of Historical Resources, the National Register of Historic Places, and the California Historical Resources Inventory listings, no significant cultural resources are known to be located on the Project Site. Therefore, neither the Project nor the Stadium Alternative would result in any impacts to known cultural resources. Nevertheless, mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the impacts to less than significant levels for unknown cultural resources in the unlikely event that such resources are accidentally discovered during the earthwork activities.

Historic Resources

The Proposed Project would not result in any impacts to significant historic resources. Similar to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would involve the demolition of existing structures on the Project Site except for the Casino. Through a comprehensive historic resource analysis which included a field investigation of the Project Site and surrounding area, review of building permit records, maps, books and photographs, it was determined, by an evaluation of criteria used by the California Register of Historical Resources and the National Register of Historic Places, that none of the existing buildings located on the Project Site are considered significant cultural resources pursuant to CEQA. As such, this Alternative would result in a less than significant impact to historic resources.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Construction

Construction-related impacts on water quality under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. Under the Stadium Alternative, water quality impacts would be slightly reduced, but similar to the Proposed Project. This Alternative would result in the demolition of existing uses except for the Casino and it would involve the redevelopment of the remainder of the Project Site to accommodate a stadium and parking for the site. Therefore, this Alternative would result in similar amounts of disturbed site area as compared to the Proposed Project. Accordingly, the construction activities would generate a similar potential to impair the surface water flows during storm events as compared to the Proposed Project. However, the implementation of prescribed best management practices and compliance with the RWQCB regulations would reduce potentially significant water quality

impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts after mitigation.

Operational

Operational impacts to water quality under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. Under the Stadium Alternative, the amount of impervious surface area would be slightly decreased as compared to the existing site conditions, as the area to be developed is entirely paved with a surface parking lot. The existing parking areas would be redeveloped with a stadium and the surrounding areas, which are currently impervious, would be landscaped to improve visual aspects and the site's stormwater flows. Therefore, the Stadium Alternative would result in reduced flows as compared to existing conditions, but operational flows would be roughly the same as compared to the Proposed Project. Similar to the Proposed Project, it is anticipated that development of the site would be designed in a manner that retains and controls storm water flows in a manner that would not significantly impact the existing storm water infrastructure. Accordingly, this Alternative would result less than significant water quality impacts after mitigation.

Noise

Construction

Construction activity associated with the Stadium Alternative would result in similar noise levels as discussed for the Proposed Project. Construction-related noise exposure would also be expected to be similar in duration due to a similar amount of required construction activity. Construction noise levels would be generally the same for the residential land uses closest to the stadium site (i.e., the residential uses west of Prairie Avenue, the Renaissance development, Darby Park, and the residential neighborhoods east of the training track). Therefore, even with implementation of comparable mitigation measures prescribed for the Proposed Project, mitigated construction noise levels for this Alternative would also likely exceed the five dBA significance threshold at the sensitive receptors near the Project Site. As such, construction activity would result in a significant and unavoidable short-term construction noise impact. It is anticipated however that construction activity associated with the alternative would comply with the standards established in the Noise Ordinance. Nevertheless, like the Proposed Project, construction noise impacts associated with the Stadium Alternative would be considered significant and unavoidable after mitigation.

Operational

On event days, the Stadium Alternative would result in more daily vehicle trips than the Proposed Project and, as such, would result in higher mobile noise levels. On non-event days, operational noise impacts would be reduced as compared to the Proposed Project. Mobile noise associated with the Stadium Alternative may result in noise level increases greater than three decibels within the "normally unacceptable" or "clearly unacceptable" category (see Section IV.G. Noise). However, such noise impacts would only occur immediately prior to and after events, which would occur on 55 days per year. Likewise,

stationary noise sources associated with the Stadium Alternative would be louder than the Proposed Project, but would be limited to 55 days per year. Stationary noise under this Alternative would be expected to be substantially similar to the existing noise levels associated with live race events currently existing at Hollywood Park. Overall, noise associated with this Alternative would be similar to noise levels that are currently occurring under the existing operations, but would be increased as compared to the Proposed Project. Because the Stadium Alternative may result in noise level increases greater than three decibels within the “normally unacceptable” or “clearly unacceptable”, impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable, which would result in a significant impact not created by the Proposed Project.

Population, Housing, and Employment

Impacts on population, housing and employment under the Proposed Project would be significant and unavoidable due to a technical inconsistency with regional housing and population growth forecasts.

Construction Impacts

The Proposed Project would generate approximately 17,105 construction-related jobs over the 10-year buildout and stabilization horizon of the Proposed Project. As this Alternative would require a similar amount of demolition and construction work as the Proposed Project, it is estimated that employment opportunities associated with construction of this Alternative would be similar as compared to the Proposed Project. The number of temporary construction jobs would be considered a beneficial impact under this Alternative, and similar to the Proposed Project, indirect impacts upon regional population, housing and employment conditions would be less than significant under this Alternative.

Operational Impacts of the Alternative

Employment Displacement Impacts

Similar to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would eliminate horse racing at the Hollywood Park Racetrack and would generate employment displacement with respect to the horse racing industry. However, as discussed below in more detail, this Alternative would generate new types of job opportunities required to operate an athletic stadium. Therefore, operational employment displacement impacts for this Alternative would be less than significant.

Employment Generation Impacts

Indirect Employment Growth

Employment opportunities typically associated with stadium venues would not likely result in substantial permanent population growth or associated housing demands. Indirect impacts to population and housing demographics generated by this Alternative would be considered less than significant, and would be essentially equivalent to the less than significant impact generated by the Proposed Project.

Direct Employment Growth

The Stadium Alternative would generate approximately 20 permanent full-time new jobs, 2,600 temporary event related new jobs, and no housing units.¹ This Alternative would result in a decrease of permanent full-time jobs. As compared to the Proposed Project, which would generate approximately 517 net new jobs, the level of full-time employment generated by this Alternative would be significantly reduced. Nevertheless, as this Alternative would still generate substantial temporary and event-related jobs, employment impacts would be considered less than significant.

Population/Housing Impacts

This Alternative would involve the construction of no new dwelling units and, as such, would not generate any population growth. As compared to the Proposed Project, which would create approximately 2,995 new residential dwelling units, resulting in approximately 8,985 new permanent residents, this Alternative would not generate housing and population growth.

Although this Alternative avoids the Proposed Project's significant and unavoidable impact due to a technical inconsistency with regional housing and population growth forecasts, the Alternative is less beneficial with respect to population and housing because it does not further the SCAG's goals outlined in the Compass Growth Vision Strategy to encourage better relationships between housing, transportation and employment. Likewise, this Alternative does not support the SBCCOG's South Bay Strategy of supporting incentives for well-planned mixed-use development and affordable housing, nor does it aid in creating new market rate and affordable dwelling units needed in Inglewood as determined by the RHNA. Since no dwelling units are created under this Alternative, unlike the Proposed Project, it does not help to bring balance to the job-to-housing ratio in the surrounding job-rich South Bay and Westside job markets. Additionally, this Alternative does not support the Housing Element's goal of providing a significant amount of additional home ownership opportunities within the City so as to promote a balanced ratio of renter-occupied versus owner occupied housing opportunities within the City. Since the Stadium Alternative is inconsistent with the SCAG, SBCCOG and City policies, plans and goals of creating housing closer to jobs and providing additional home ownership opportunities within Inglewood, the Alternative's impacts to population and housing would be significant and unavoidable.

Land Use and Planning

A Stadium Alternative would be consistent with the existing Commercial-Recreation designations of the current Zoning district, General Plan designations, and Redevelopment Plan Land Use designations. Unlike the Proposed Project, this Alternative would not require any discretionary requests involving a zone change, a General Plan Amendment and adoption of a Specific Plan. Therefore, impacts from consistency with land use plans would be less than significant. However, constructing a football stadium

¹ *Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium EIR, SCH#95-051042, City of Inglewood, September 6, 1995.*

on the Project Site would create potential use conflicts with the existing land uses in the surrounding areas. The surrounding area is comprised of a mix of low-to medium-density residential, commercial, motel, and office uses. The placement of a stadium directly adjacent to these land uses could create conflicts caused by the concentration of traffic and noise when events are being hosted at the stadium. This would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

Public Utilities

With the exception of operational solid waste, impacts on public utilities under the Proposed Project would be considered less than significant.

Water

The Stadium Alternative is estimated to utilize approximately 3,000 gallons per minute (gpm) of water during peak demand, or approximately 469,180 gallons per event. With an estimated 55 events per year, this Alternative would increase water demands by 79 acre feet per year for the stadium. With the continued operation of the casino, it is estimated this Alternative would utilize 661,780 gpd on event days. As shown in Table VI.B.2-2, below, this Alternative would consume 65 AF/yr less than current demands.

**Table VI.B.2-2
Estimated Water Consumption by the Stadium Alternative**

Land Use	Unit/Quantity	Water Use (gal/day/unit)	Total (gal/day)	Total (AF/year)
Existing				
Existing Uses ^a	--	--	--	360
Stadium Alternative				
Stadium	55 events per year 46,918 persons per event	10 gal/person/event	469,180	79
Casino	321,000 sf	0.6 gal/sf/day ^b	192,600	216
Total Alternative Water Demand			661,780	295
Total Net Water Demand			340,641	(65)
<i>Notes:</i>				
<i>du: Dwelling units</i>				
<i>sf: Square feet</i>				
<i>AFY: Acre feet per year.</i>				
^a <i>Hall and Foreman, EIR Technical Appendix - Public Utilities Report, May 2008.</i>				
^b <i>Hollywood Park Project, Utilities and Infrastructure Technical Report, Hall & Foreman, August 29, 2008.</i>				
<i>Source: Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium EIR, SCH#95-051042, City of Inglewood, September 6, 1995; and, Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.</i>				

As discussed in Section IV.J.1. Water, the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan accounted for some level of redevelopment on the Hollywood Park project site. Since the Stadium Alternative's water demand is less than existing conditions, all of the water demanded by the Stadium Alternative has already been accounted for in the 2005 UWMP.

Similar to the Proposed Project, Ordinance No. 170,978 would apply to this Alternative, resulting in increased water conservation measures although no mitigation measures are proposed for this Alternative. Impacts under this Alternative associated with water availability would be less than significant.

Wastewater

Wastewater generation for the stadium under this Alternative is estimated to be 469,180 gallons per event, assuming an average attendance of 46,918 spectators per event and using a rate of 10 gallons per spectator per event. Additionally, the casino would be expected to generate approximately 112,350 gpd of wastewater. As shown in Table VI.B.2-3 below, this Alternative would generate a net increase of approximately 57,530 gpd of wastewater on event days. This Alternative would generate increased wastewater flows on event days, which would be limited to 55 days per year. As compared to the Proposed Project, peak daily flows including event days, and annual flows would be decreased under this Alternative. Similar to the Proposed Project, it is expected that the existing wastewater infrastructure would be sufficient to handle the demands from this Alternative. Therefore, impacts under this Alternative with regard to wastewater would be considered less than significant.

**Table VI.B.2-3
Estimated Wastewater Generation by the Stadium Alternative**

Land Use	Unit/Quantity	Generation Rate (gpd/unit)	Total (gallons/day)
<i>Existing</i>			
Existing Uses^a	--	--	524,000
<i>Subtotal Existing:</i>			
<i>Stadium Alternative</i>			
Stadium	55 events per year 46,918 persons per event	10 gal/person/event ^b	469,180
Casino	321,000 sf	0.35 gal/sf/day ^c	112,350
Total Alternative Wastewater Generation			581,530
Total Net Wastewater Generation			57,530
<i>Notes:</i>			
^a Hollywood Park Project, Utilities and Infrastructure Technical Report, Hall & Foreman, August 29, 2008.			
^b Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium EIR, SCH#95-051042, City of Inglewood, September 6, 1995.			
^c Based on County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County wastewater generation rates.			
Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.			

Energy

Electricity

As shown in Table VI.B.2-4, below, this Alternative would generate a peak demand for approximately 10,000 kilowatts per hour per event during periods of the most intense use of the stadium, and this Alternative would require 8,763,300 KW-hr for the operation of the casino. The additional electrical demand posed by the Stadium Alternative would require the existing distribution system at Hollywood

Park to be reconfigured and expanded. New electrical facilities required to serve the stadium consist of two elements: a new customer substation and a 66 Kilovolt transmission line tap to serve the new substation. In 1995 Southern California Edison determined that electrical loads resulting from the proposed stadium project were within the parameters of the overall projected load growth that Edison had planned for in the Inglewood area. That determination, however, would need to be confirmed by Edison for this Alternative in consideration of current conditions. This Alternative would result in an electricity demand of approximately 9,313,300 KW-Hr of electricity per year, which when compared to the existing conditions, this Alternative would result in a decrease in demand electricity by approximately 16,696,704 KW/hr/year. As compared to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would require less electricity by approximately 23,533,548 KW/hr/year. With further evaluation from Edison and the completion of the required infrastructure upgrades, it is expected that electrical facilities would be sufficient to handle the peak loads for the stadium under this Alternative. Therefore, this Alternative would result in less than significant electricity impacts after mitigation.

**Table VI.B.2-4
Estimated Electricity Demands – Stadium Alternative**

Land Use	Size (SF)	Demand (Kilowatt hours/unit/year)	Total (kilowatt hours/year)
Existing Uses ^a	--		26,010,004
<i>Subtotal Existing</i>	-	-	
Stadium Alternative			
Stadium	55 events per year 46,918 persons per event	10,000 KW-Hr/event ^b	550,000
Casino	321,000 sf	27.3 KW-Hr/sf/yr ^c	8,763,300
Total Alternative Electricity Demand			9,313,300
Total Net Electricity Demand			-16,696,704
<p><i>Notes:</i> <i>du: dwelling unit</i> <i>sf: square feet</i> ^a Hollywood Park Land Company, June 8, 2007. ^b Generation Rates based on the Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium EIR, SCH#95-051042, City of Inglewood, September 6, 1995. ^c The electricity generation rate was based on existing electricity demands for the casino as provided by the Hollywood Park Land Company. Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.</p>			

Natural Gas

Under this Alternative, the development of a new stadium would require a maximum of 50,000 cubic feet of natural gas per event for operations, or approximately 2,750,000 cubic feet per year for the stadium.²

² *Ibid.*

Additionally, this Alternative would require approximately 1,557,960 cubic feet of natural gas per month for the continued operation of the casino. As shown in Table VI.B.2-5, below, this Alternative would generate a net decrease in demand of approximately 2,107,773 cubic feet of natural gas per month as compared to the existing conditions. In comparison to the Proposed Project, which would generate a net total demand for 19,909,975 cf of natural gas per month, demands for natural gas under this Alternative would be reduced by approximately 22,017,748 cf of natural gas per month. Similar to the Proposed Project, it is expected that existing natural gas infrastructure would be sufficient to serve the needs of this Alternative. Therefore, impacts with regard to natural gas demand would be considered less than significant for this Alternative.

**Table VI.B.2-5
Estimated Natural Gas Consumption – Stadium Alternative**

Land Use	Unit/Quantity	Demand Rate	Total (cf/month)
Existing Uses ^a	--	--	3,894,900
Stadium Alternative			
Stadium	50,000 cf/event	2,750,000 cf/year ^b	229,167
Casino	321,000 sf	-- ^c	1,557,960
Total Alternative Natural Gas Demand			1,787,127
Total Net Natural Gas Demand			-2,107,773
<i>Notes:</i>			
^a Hollywood Park Land Company, June 8, 2007.			
^b Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium EIR, SCH#95-051042, City of Inglewood, September 6, 1995.			
^c Per Hollywood Park Land Company usage totals, the casino represents approximately 40% of the existing natural gas demand.			
Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.			

Solid Waste

Demolition activities under this Alternative would generate demolition debris associated with the removal of the racetrack, grandstand and asphalt. The amount of construction waste generated under this Alternative would be substantially similar to the construction waste required for the demolition and building generated under the Proposed Project and it is anticipated that existing landfills would have adequate capacity for the debris during the timeline of the Alternative's construction process. Therefore, construction-related solid waste impacts would be less than significant under this Alternative.

As shown in Table VI.B.2-7, below, net operational solid waste generation for this Alternative would be approximately 2,463 pounds of solid waste per day (annualized over the year). This Alternative would result in an increased generation of solid waste on event days by approximately 40,000 pounds per day. On an annual basis however, solid waste disposal needs under this Alternative would be reduced by approximately 9,793 lbs/day. However, operational-related solid waste impacts would be significant and unavoidable as regional landfill capacity for the life of the Alternative beyond 2015 has not been

accommodated. Because solutions to meet future disposal needs have not yet been developed at the regional level (i.e., developing new landfills within the County and transporting waste outside the region) operational solid waste impacts would be significant and unavoidable on a project-specific and cumulative level. Therefore, impacts with regard to operational solid waste would be considered significant and unavoidable for the Stadium Alternative.

**Table VI.B.2-6
Estimated Construction and Demolition Debris – Stadium Alternative**

Construction Activity	Size (sf)	Rate (lbs./sf) ^a	Generated Waste (tons)
Demolition-Existing Uses			
Main Building/Grandstand	594,000	155	46,035
		<i>Subtotal</i>	46,035
Construction-Alternative			
Stadium	400,000 sf	3.89	778
		<i>Subtotal</i>	1,663
		Total	47,698

^a Generation rates for demolition, construction and renovation are derived from the *Characterization of Building-Related Construction and Demolition Debris in the United States*, U.S.E.P.A., Report No. EPA530-R-98-101, June 1998. Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.

**Table VI.B.2-7
Estimated Operational Solid Waste Generation – Stadium Alternative**

Land Use	Unit/Quantity	Generation Rate ^a (lbs/unit/day)	Total (Pounds/Day)
Existing Uses			
Main Building/Grandstand	594,000 sf	.006	3,564
Casino ^b	321,000 sf	.005	1,605
		<i>Subtotal</i>	5,169
Stadium Alternative			
Stadium	55	40,000/event ^c	6,027
Casino	321,000 sf	.005	1,605
Total Alternative Solid Waste Generation			7,632
Total Net Solid Waste Generation			2,463

^a Generation Rates based on City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation Solid Waste Generation, 1981. Uses not listed are estimated by the closest type of use available in the table.
^b Does not include the Pavilion area which has been abandoned and is not in use.
^c Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium EIR, SCH#95-051042, City of Inglewood, September 6, 1995.
 Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.

Public Services

Impacts on public services under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation.

Police Protection

The development of a Stadium Alternative would place an increased demand on the IPD for police protection services. Similar to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would generate tax revenue that the City could use to hire new officers that would help off-set the increased police services demanded on event days. This Alternative would also incorporate mitigation measures to reduce the potential for increasing demands upon police services in the area, such as strategically positioned lighting, building security systems, and implementation of an on-site security plan. This Alternative would not include a police substation on the Project Site, however, it is anticipated with the mitigation measures presented above, impacts on police protection services under this Alternative would be less than significant.

Fire Protection

The projected demand for fire protection services is typically based on the amount and size of new structures on a site. The Stadium Alternative would result in the development of a 65,000 seat stadium that would hold approximately 55 events per day, and the continued operation of the existing casino. As such, this Alternative would place an increased demand on the LACoFD for fire protection services on event days held at the stadium, although fire protection and emergency services needs would likely be decreased as compared to the Proposed Project on non-event days. As discussed in Section IV.K.2, Fire Protection, fire flow requirements would be determined by the LACoFD for the stadium. It is anticipated that the required fire flow would be accommodated for this development as such flows are already able to serve the emergency needs of the existing racetrack facility. Overall, the impact on fire protection services under this Alternative would be less than significant.

Schools

This Alternative would result in the development of a 65,000 seat athletic stadium and the continued operation of the existing casino and would not include the development of any housing units. Therefore, this Alternative would not generate any new students to the area. The Proposed Project would result in the generation of 575 students including 279 elementary students, 137 middle school students, and 159 high school students. To mitigate the impact on schools the Proposed Project is responsible for mandatory payment of school fees in conformance with SB 50, or in the alternative, the Project Applicant may enter into a school finance agreement with respect to a joint use of the 4-acre civic site with the appropriate school district to address mitigation to school impacts in lieu of payment of developer fees. Therefore, the Proposed Project may be an improvement over the Stadium Alternative in that the Proposed Project makes available a 4-acre site that could be a joint use school for students in the City and a library. Nevertheless, impacts to schools under the Proposed Project and the Stadium Alternative would be less than significant.

Recreation and Parks

This Alternative would include the development of a stadium and would not generate any new housing within the City. As such, this Alternative would increase recreational services, but would not generate any additional demands for recreation facilities. The Proposed Project would result in approximately 25 acres for parks and recreation and open space, which would be an over supply as compared to the demand generated by the project characteristics. Impacts to recreation and parks would be considered less than significant for the Stadium Alternative; however, the Proposed Project could be considered more beneficial since it would provide a substantial public benefit by increasing the amount of common open space that is available within the City.

Libraries

This Alternative would not generate any new impacts to the Inglewood Library system because no new residents are generated. The Proposed Project would introduce approximately 8,985 new residents to the Project Site and require additional library services, specifically increasing demand for public-use computers. However, through the potential allocation of the four-acre civic site to a joint use school, including a library, and contribution to the City's tax revenue, these demands would be met. Therefore, the Proposed Project may be an improvement over the Stadium Alternative in that the Proposed Project makes available a 4-acre site that could be a joint use school for students in the City and a library. Accordingly, impacts with regard to library services would be considered less than significant for this Alternative.

Traffic and Transportation

Under the Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Alternative, the existing Hollywood Park Racetrack would be removed, but the existing Casino would continue to operate. A 65,000 seat athletic stadium to accommodate professional and collegiate football, professional soccer, and/or other special events would be developed. It is anticipated that the athletic stadium would be in use for events approximately 55 days per year. During weekdays, events at the athletic stadium would ordinarily begin at 6:00 p.m., with peak traffic generation coinciding with the weekday p.m. peak hour conditions. During weekends, events at the athletic stadium would ordinarily begin at 1:00 p.m., with peak traffic generation coinciding with the weekend mid-day peak hour conditions.

Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Weekday Trip Generation Summary

The weekday trip generation forecast for the Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Alternative is summarized in Table VI.B.2-8. As presented in Table VI.B.2-8, the Athletic Stadium Alternative is expected to generate 74 fewer vehicle trips (60 fewer inbound trips and 14 fewer outbound trips) during the weekday AM peak hour as the athletic stadium is not anticipated to be utilized during this time period. During the weekday PM peak hour, the Athletic Stadium Alternative is expected to generate an additional 9,769 vehicle trips (12,450 more inbound trips and 2,681 fewer outbound trips). Over a 24-hour period, the

Athletic Stadium Alternative project is forecast to generate an additional 29,170 daily trip ends during a typical weekday (14,585 inbound trips and 14,585 outbound trips).

**Table VI.B.2-8
Athletic Stadium Alternative Weekday Project Trip Generation**

Patron Mode	Size	Daily Trip Ends Volumes	AM Peak Hour Volumes			PM Peak Hour Volumes		
			In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Passenger Vehicles	19,260 vehicles	38,250	Nom.	Nom.	Nom.	12,519	Nom.	12,519
Charter Buses	200 Buses	400	Nom.	Nom.	Nom.	200	Nom.	200
Event Personnel/Others	2,500 vehicles	5,000	Nom.	Nom.	Nom.	Nom.	Nom.	Nom.
<i>Existing Racetrack To Be Removed</i>	<i>(10,000) Attend.</i>	<i>(14,750)</i>	<i>(60)</i>	<i>(14)</i>	<i>(74)</i>	<i>(269)</i>	<i>(2,681)</i>	<i>(2,950)</i>
Alternative Net Total		29,170	(60)	(14)	(74)	12,450	(2,681)	9,769
<i>Note: Assumptions regarding patron mode and trip characteristics are available in Appendix G-1 to this Draft EIR which contains the Revised Traffic Impact Study.</i>								

Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Weekend Trip Generation Summary

The weekend trip generation forecast for the Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium Alternative is summarized in Table VI.B.2-9. As presented in Table VI.B.2-9, the Athletic Stadium Alternative is expected to generate an additional 11,003 vehicle trips (11,190 more inbound trips and 187 fewer outbound trips) during the weekend mid-day peak hour. Over a 24-hour period, the Athletic Stadium Alternative project is forecast to generate an additional 35,340 daily trip ends during a typical weekend day (17,670 inbound trips and 17,670 outbound trips).

Traffic Impact Comparison

Weekday Conditions

A qualitative review was conducted to determine if the Athletic Stadium Alternative project would likely result in an increase in project impacts when compared to the Proposed Project. During the weekday conditions, the Athletic Stadium Alternative project is expected to generate 1,678 fewer vehicle trips than the Proposed Project during the AM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, the Athletic Stadium Alternative project is expected to generate 9,808 more vehicle trips than the Proposed Project. Over a 24-hour period, the Athletic Stadium Alternative project is forecast to generate an additional 11,948 daily trip ends during a typical weekday. Based on this comparison, it is determined that the Athletic Stadium Alternative project would likely result in no project impacts when compared to the Proposed Project during the weekday AM peak hour (as the athletic stadium is not anticipated to be utilized during the AM

peak hour time period). However, during the weekday PM peak hour, the Athletic Stadium Alternative project would likely result in an overall increase in traffic impacts when compared to the Proposed Project.

**Table VI.B.2-9
Athletic Stadium Alternative Weekend Project Trip Generation**

Patron Mode	Size	Daily Trip Ends Volumes	Mid Day Peak Hour Volumes		
			In	Out	Total
Passenger Vehicles	19,260 vehicles	38,250	12,519	Nom.	12,519
Charter Buses	200 Buses	400	200	Nom.	200
Event Personnel/Others	2,500 vehicles	5,000	Nom.	Nom.	Nom.
<i>Existing Racetrack To Be Removed</i>	<i>(15,000) Attend.</i>	<i>(8,580)</i>	<i>(1,529)</i>	<i>(187)</i>	<i>(1,716)</i>
Alternative Net Total		35,340	11,190	(187)	11,003
<i>Note: Assumptions regarding patron mode and trip characteristics are available in Appendix G-1 to this Draft EIR which contains the Revised Traffic Impact Study.</i>					

Weekend Conditions

A qualitative review was conducted to determine if the Athletic Stadium Alternative project would likely result in an increase in project impacts when compared to the Proposed Project. During the weekend conditions, the Athletic Stadium Alternative project is expected to generate 9,629 more vehicle trips than the Proposed Project during the mid-day peak hour and 9,832 more trips over a 24-hour typical weekend period. Based on this comparison, it is determined that the Athletic Stadium Alternative project would likely result in an overall increase in traffic impacts when compared to the Proposed Project during the weekend mid-day peak hour.

Parking

As shown in Table VI.B.2-10, below, the Stadium Alternative would be required by the City of Inglewood Municipal Code to provide 17,280 parking spaces. Under this Alternative, it is assumed the applicant would provide the code-required parking associated with the stadium and casino use. Therefore, impacts with respect to parking under this Alternative would be less than significant.

**Table VI.B.2-10
City of Inglewood Commercial Parking Requirements – Stadium Alternative**

Land Use	Size (sq. ft./units)	Parking Requirements	Minimum Requirement
Stadium	65,000 seats	1/5 seats	13,000
Casino	321,000 sf	1/75 SF GFA	4,280
Total Parking Required			17,280
<i>Source: City of Inglewood Municipal Code, WMS, 2007, Walker Parking, 2007; and, Hollywood Park Athletic Stadium EIR, SCH#95-051042, City of Inglewood, September 6, 1995.</i>			

Conclusion

The Athletic Stadium Alternative would not reduce the following significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the Proposed Project: construction and operational air quality, construction-related noise, population and housing, and operational solid waste. In addition, the Stadium Alternative creates additional significant and unavoidable impacts that are not created by the Proposed Project with respect to: Land Use (Compatibility with existing area) and Noise (Operation).

As described in Table VI.B.2-11, below, the Stadium Alternative would not achieve many of the Project Objectives as it represents a scenario in which the project does not go forward and no residential units are constructed. It should also be noted that although this Alternative is considered a reasonably foreseeable alternative because it is permitted under existing zoning, there is no indication that a stadium would be feasible. Moreover, this alternative is a sub-set of the “No Project” alternative and is not an alternative chosen as being capable of reducing project impacts.

**Table VI.B.2-11
Assessment of Stadium Alternative to Meet the Project Objectives**

Project Objectives	Assessment of the Alternative to Meet Objectives
1. To contribute to the revitalization of the City of Inglewood by providing an example of “smart-growth” infill development consisting of mixed-use retail, office, hotel, residential development, and integrated open space;	The Stadium Alternative would not satisfy this objective.
2. To provide an economically viable project that promotes the City’s economic well-being by significantly increasing property and sales tax revenues and providing high-quality retail uses and the opportunity for transient occupancy tax;	The Stadium Alternative would not satisfy this project objective because the economic viability of a stadium is unlikely.
3. To preserve the Casino/Gambling Facility on the Hollywood Park Site.	The Stadium Alternative would be consistent with this project objective, as the Casino and Gambling facility would continue to operate.
4. To provide land for a civic/public use.	The Stadium Alternative would satisfy this objective.

Project Objectives	Assessment of the Alternative to Meet Objectives
5. To create exciting community park and open space areas, that exceed the City’s existing General Plan goals of one acre per 1,000 residents, in a manner that meets the needs of the proposed development and is beneficial to the overall community;	The Stadium Alternative would not satisfy this objective.
6. To add a variety of ownership-housing opportunities, of different product types and prices, in an area of the greater Los Angeles region that is job-rich, thus creating a better balance of housing and employment opportunities;	The Stadium Alternative would not satisfy this objective.
7. To provide opportunities for viable retail and creative office space in a manner that is complimentary to the existing character of the adjoining residential neighborhood;	The Stadium Alternative would not satisfy this objective.
8. To eliminate and prevent the spread of blight and deterioration by providing housing ownership opportunities, retail and restaurant uses, and public open space within portions of the Merged Redevelopment Project Area;	The Stadium Alternative would assist in eliminating and preventing the spread of blight through the development of a new stadium, but would do so in a different manner as the Proposed Project since no new housing opportunities would be created.
9. To create safe, secure and defensible spaces through project design, while also allowing public spaces, such as parks and retail, to be open to the public;	The Stadium Alternative would satisfy this objective, but to a different degree than the Proposed Project.
10. To provide a state-of-the-art sustainability program to be incorporated into the buildout and operation of the Proposed Project;	The Stadium Alternative would incorporate sustainability features to the maximum extent feasible for such a use and would satisfy this objective, but to a different degree than the Proposed Project.
11. To promote walking and bicycle use through enhanced pedestrian connections and bicycle pathways in a mixed-use project which integrates housing with employment opportunities;	The Stadium Alternative would not satisfy this objective because the stadium would not create a new walkable neighborhood.
12. To promote a safe pedestrian-oriented environment by providing extensive streetscape amenities; and	The Stadium Alternative not would satisfy this objective.
13. To enhance the visual appearance and appeal of the neighborhood by providing perimeter and interior landscaping.	The Stadium Alternative would satisfy this objective.