
VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT
C. ALTERNATIVE RU 800

This Alternative was selected as a possible scenario for future development to allow for a reduced development scenario that would potentially reduce the project’s environmental impact while achieving some, but not all of the project objectives. Specifically, Alternative RU 800 would result in the development of approximately 800 dwelling units on the Hollywood Park Racetrack site. This Alternative would retain the Racetrack and Grandstand, and would include the removal and discontinuation of the casino. The existing barns would be relocated to the infield area of the Main Track and the practice track would be removed. To accommodate residential development, the surface parking areas would be reduced.

Compared to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would result in a decrease of 2,195 dwelling units and elimination of land use otherwise proposed for retail, civic, hotel, office, casino, open space, and community space. A summary of the planned development under this Alternative is provided in Table VI.C-1, below.

Table VI.C-1
Development Summary of Alternative RU 800

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	UNITS/ FLOOR AREA (NET) ^a
Residential	800 du
Retail	N/A
Grandstand (Retention of Existing Facility)	Retention of Existing Facility
Casino	N/A
Civic Use	N/A
Hotel	N/A
Office	N/A
Open Space	N/A
Community Space (HOA Recreation Facility)	N/A
Notes	
^a The use of net floor area is calculated per the Inglewood Municipal Code for purposes of determining the developed floor area. All floor area values are expressed in square feet (sf). Source: Hollywood Park Land Company, July 2008.	

Aesthetics

Views and Urban Design

Impacts on views and urban design under the Proposed Project would be less than significant. Under Alternative RU 800, the Project Site would be redeveloped in a manner that retains the existing Racetrack and Grandstand, removes the existing Casino, and adds approximately 800 single family dwelling units. This Alternative would retain the visual character of the existing grandstand area and would redevelop the areas currently used as surface parking into single family dwelling units. As compared to the Proposed Project, open space would decrease by 25 acres and civic, hotel, office, open space, and community space would be eliminated. While the density, mix of land uses and overall community character would differ, the urban design of the infill development would be substantially similar. Although this Alternative would alter the views of and from the Project Site, the Alternative would be designed to yield resulting views and urban design characteristics that would be consistent with the Merged Redevelopment Plan and that would provide several visual improvements as compared to the existing conditions of the Project Site. Accordingly, 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. Similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative RU 800 would generate new sources of light and glare in the form of street lighting, and structural illumination from the 800 new dwelling units. In contrast to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would retain the existing grandstand which generates a substantial amount of light pollution. Compared to the Proposed Project, which would reduce the nighttime lighting impacts through the elimination of the racetrack, Alternative RU 800 would retain the racetrack and the associated light and glare impacts would remain. Therefore, as compared to the Proposed Project, light and glare impacts would be increased under this Alternative. However, since light and glare impacts under this Alternative would be no worse than the existing conditions, impacts would be considered less than significant.

Shade and Shadow

The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact with respect to shade/shadow. Alternative RU 800 would be developed with single family homes with most new structures substantially below the 75 foot height of the buildings associated with the Proposed Project. Unlike the Proposed Project, Alternative RU 800 does not include the hotel structure which could be up to 150 feet. Therefore, Alternative RU 800 would not generate any new significant shade or shadow impacts upon adjacent land uses. Therefore, impacts under this Alternative with respect to shade or shadow would be less than significant.

Air Quality

Construction

The Proposed Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact with respect to air quality as a result of construction activities. Alternative RU 800 would require a shorter construction duration than that assumed for the Proposed Project because although the barns would be relocated to the infield area of the Main Track, only 800 dwelling units (compared to 2,995 units under the Proposed Project) would be constructed on the Project Site, and no retail, office or civic uses would be constructed. Additionally, this Alternative would retain the racetrack and grandstand and would require less demolition activity as compared to the Proposed Project. As such, pollutant emissions during the Alternative RU 800 construction period would be less than the pollutants emitted during the construction period for the Proposed Project. However, assuming that Alternative RU 800 would require more than 13 acres to be graded per day, construction emissions would exceed the SCAQMD regional and localized significance thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. As such, Alternative RU 800 daily construction emissions would result in a significant and unavoidable air quality impact.

Operational

Alternative RU 800 would result in fewer mobile and area source emissions than the proposed project due to the elimination of proposed commercial, retail, hotel, civic and casino/gaming uses and 2,195 dwelling units. Weekday emissions would be approximately 185 ppd for VOC, 43 ppd for NO_x, 494 ppd for CO, one ppd for SO_x, six ppd for PM_{2.5}, and 33 ppd for PM₁₀. Weekend emissions would be approximately 186 ppd for VOC, 45 ppd for NO_x, 507 ppd for CO, one ppd for SO_x, 7 ppd for PM_{2.5}, and 35 ppd for PM₁₀. The reduction in development would eliminate the NO_x, CO, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ regional operational impact associated with the Proposed Project. However, VOC operational emissions would exceed the SCAQMD significance threshold. As such, Alternative RU 800 daily operational emissions would result in a significant and unavoidable air quality impact.

Alternative RU 800 would result in fewer daily vehicle trips than the Proposed Project and, as such, would result in less localized CO concentrations. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, Alternative RU 800 would result in a less than significant localized CO impact.

Similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative RU 800 would not be consistent with the land use designation and the population growth forecasts utilized to calculate the emissions budget in the most recent AQMP. As such, Alternative RU 800 would not be compatible with the AQMP and would result in a significant cumulative air quality impact. Due to the reduced size, density, and type of development, Alternative RU 800 would generate less GHG emissions than the Proposed Project. In addition, Alternative RU 800 would be typical of an urban environment, would not generate a disproportionate amount of vehicle miles of travel, and would not have unique and disproportionately high fuel consumption characteristics. Similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative RU 800 would result in a less than significant global warming impact. While Alternative RU 800 would result in reduced air quality emissions as compared to

the Proposed Project, both scenarios would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds, thereby resulting in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts.

Geology and Soils

Impacts on geology and soils under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. The same geological conditions and associated seismic risks would occur under Alternative RU 800 as described for the Proposed Project. Development of the Proposed Project has been determined generally feasible from a geotechnical perspective. The geotechnical recommendations associated with site preparation, earthwork and foundations and Restricted Use Zone (RUZ) that are identified in the EIR would also apply under this Alternative with minor modifications. Therefore, the geology and soils impacts under Alternative RU 800 would be less than significant.

Hazardous Materials and Risk of Upset

Construction

Construction-related impacts on hazardous materials and risk of upset under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. This Alternative would retain the racetrack and demolish the casino and the Practice Track. The barns would be relocated to the infield of the Main Track. As such, this Alternative would generate potentially significant impacts associated with potential exposure to ACMs and LBP during demolition. ACMs and LBP present within the existing facilities that are proposed to remain would not pose a health hazard, as these materials would remain stable and would not be disturbed. Similar to the Project, the impacts associated with potential exposure to ACMs and LBP during demolition would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with adherence to all applicable laws and regulations and implementation of the mitigation measures prescribed for the Proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative RU 800 would result in less than significant impacts after mitigation with respect to hazardous materials and risk of upset during construction.

Operational

Operational impacts with respect to hazardous materials and risk of upset under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. Under Alternative RU 800, the retail, office, hotel, and civic uses would not be constructed. The existing racetrack and proposed residential uses would not require or generate substantial hazardous materials. Therefore, this Alternative would have a less than significant impact with respect to hazardous materials during operation.

Cultural Resources

Archaeological 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 Alternative RU 800 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

Impacts on historic resources under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. This Alternative would retain the existing racetrack, but would demolish the casino and practice track, and relocate the barns to the infield of the Main Track. 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, Alternative RU 800 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 Alternative RU 800, portions of the Project Site would continue to operate under the current NPDES permit. Water quality impacts currently associated with horseracing facilities would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by implementing standard best management practices and permitting reporting actions that are already in place. The redevelopment of a portion of the site to accommodate new residential uses would have similar water quality impacts as the proposed project. Again, implementation of best management practices and compliance with the RWQCB regulations would ensure impacts are reduced to less-than-significant levels. Water quality impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant after mitigation.

Operational

Operational impacts on water quality under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. Under Alternative RU 800, the amount of pervious surface area would be increased as compared to the Proposed Project. This Alternative would retain the Grandstand and the Main Track, but since the barns would be relocated to the infield of the Main Track, the Project Site would become less pervious. Under this alternative, a smaller volume of surface water would be able to be retained on site thus generating more surface water runoff into the storm drains. Similar to the Proposed Project, this Alternative may be able to retain and control storm water flows in a manner that would ensure a less-than-

significant impact upon the existing storm water infrastructure. Therefore, this Alternative would result in a less than significant impact after mitigation with respect to operational hydrology/water quality.

Noise

Construction

Impacts on noise due to construction activities under the Proposed Project would be significant and unavoidable after mitigation. Construction activity associated with Alternative RU 800 would generally result in similar noise levels as the Proposed Project. Therefore, it is anticipated that even with the 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. Construction-related noise exposure would however be shorter in duration given the smaller project size for this Alternative and construction activity associated with the alternative would comply with the standards established in the Noise Ordinance. Nevertheless, construction noise impacts associated with Alternative RU 800 would be considered significant and unavoidable after mitigation. .

Construction activity associated with Alternative RU 800 would impact thoroughbred horses stabled at the project site. Unexpected noises can frighten or irritate horses and can interfere with their ability to respond to the handler or behave in a relaxed manner. Based on a horse's tendency to be frightened or startled, a sudden increase in noise levels greater than 3 dBA would result in a significant impact. Construction activity that would occur in close proximity to horses would increase ambient noise levels by more than 3 dBA. Alternative RU 800 would require mitigation measures to reduce the exposure of horses to construction noise. These mitigation measures would potentially include, but would not be limited to, scheduling construction activity that would be located near horses during the non-racing season, delaying construction activity while horses are exercising and until they are returned to the stables, temporarily moving stables away from construction areas, and installing noise barriers between where horses are located and construction activity. Even with implementation of mitigation measures horses would be exposed to construction noise levels 3 dBA greater than existing ambient noise levels. As such, construction activity under this Alternative would significantly impact horses on the project site.

Operation

Alternative RU 800 would result in fewer daily vehicle trips than the Proposed Project and would consequently result in lower mobile noise levels. Mobile noise is not anticipated to increase by more than three dBA CNEL and, as such, this Alternative would result in a less than significant impact on the ambient noise environment. Additionally, Alternative RU 800 would include residential stationary noise sources comparable to those discussed for the Proposed Project, and similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative RU 800 would also result in a less than significant stationary source operational noise impact.

Overall, Alternative RU 800 would result in similar stationary source operational noise and less mobile source noise as the Proposed Project. Therefore, like the Proposed Project, operational noise impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant.

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. It is estimated that employment opportunities associated with the construction of Alternative RU 800 would be substantially less than the Proposed Project. Like the Proposed Project, these temporary construction-related jobs will not indirectly create an increase in the City's population or the need for housing. Also, although indirect impacts upon regional population and housing conditions would be decreased under this Alternative as the Proposed Project would provide more construction jobs and result in a more beneficial construction employment scenario, this Alternative would still provide some temporary construction jobs and impacts would be considered less than significant, although increased as compared to the Proposed Project.

Operation Impacts

Employment Displacement Impacts

Unlike the Proposed Project, Alternative RU 800 would retain horse racing at the Hollywood Park Racetrack for the foreseeable future and therefore, would not result in any employment displacement of the associated jobs. Although due to economic conditions within the horseracing industry, it is speculative to predict how long horseracing will continue to operate on-site. Additionally, Alternative RU 800 eliminates the casino on-site and therefore would displace the 1,017 jobs associated with the casino. The number of jobs generated by Alternative RU 800 is not sufficient to compensate for the number of jobs displaced by the Alternative. Therefore, Alternative RU 800 would result in a significant and unavoidable employment displacement impact.

Employment Generation Impacts

Indirect Employment Growth

The increase in population or the need for housing generated by the new on-site employment generated by the new residential uses on-site under RU 800 would be negligible. Indirect impacts to population and housing demographics generated by the new residential uses of this Alternative would be less than significant.

Direct Employment Growth

Alternative RU 800 would retain the racetrack and include the development of 800 dwelling units. This Alternative would thus result in approximately 104 new jobs associated with operational services and maintenance for the residential uses (i.e., security, landscape, HOA management, etc). In addition to the new jobs created by the residential uses, this Alternative would retain the 1,601 full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs that currently exist from the racetrack. As compared to the Proposed Project, which would generate approximately 517 net new jobs, this Alternative would result in a reduction of jobs as compared to the Proposed Project since this Alternative eliminates the 1,017 jobs associated with the Hollywood Park Casino. This result is inconsistent with the jobs forecasts for Inglewood since the forecast predicts growth in the number of jobs. Although this Alternative creates 104 new jobs from the 800 residential dwelling units proposed, the net result of this Alternative is a loss of 913 jobs, therefore resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact. .

**Table VI.C-2
Summary of Employment Generation - Alternative RU 800**

Land Use	Full Time	[Seasonal/ Part Time] FTE ^a	Total (Full Time +FTE)
<i>Existing Uses^b</i>			
Hollywood Park Racetrack			
Racing Association Related Employees	374	[522] 193	567
Casual Laborers	885	[404] 149	1,034
Subtotal Hollywood Park Racetrack	1,259	[926] 342	1,601
Hollywood Park Casino	--	--	1,017
<i>Subtotal Existing Jobs</i>			2,618
<i>RU 800</i>			
Land Use	Size	Generation Rate ^c	Total
Hollywood Park Racetrack	N/A	N/A	1,601
Residential	800 du	0.13/du ^e	104
<i>Subtotal Proposed Employment Generation (Proposed Plus Existing)</i>			1,705
<i>Net Total (Proposed less Existing)</i>			(913)
<i>Notes:</i>			
^a Hollywood Park Land Company, LLC, based on the 2007 budget. The FTE calculation is based on a standard 8 hour work day, 52 work week year. In 2007 there were 96 live race days.			
^b Existing employment data provided by Hollywood Park Racing Association.			
^c Residential Job Generation Study, RRC Associates and the Housing Collaborative (December 2000).			
Source: Hollywood Park Land Company and Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.			

Population/Housing Impacts

Alternative RU 800 would involve the construction of 800 new dwelling units resulting in the generation of approximately 2,400 new residents to the City of Inglewood. 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 reduce the amount of housing and population growth created.

Regional Housing Growth Forecasts

Based on SCAG's current housing growth forecast data (RTP 2008), the City of Inglewood is anticipated to experience a housing rate increase of 1,343 dwelling units for the City between the years 2005 to 2015, from 36,806 units in 2005 to 38,149 units in 2015. Development of this Alternative would add 800 units to the City of Inglewood. The housing data reported by the California Department of Finance currently indicates that the City of Inglewood has 38,969 households, which has already exceeded SGAC's projection for 2015 by 820 dwelling units. Alternative RU 800 will add an additional 800 dwelling units to the City's housing inventory, resulting in a total of 39,769 dwelling units by 2014. This increase would be inconsistent with the 2008 RTP, as this Alternative would exceed the City's 2015 growth projection by 1,620 dwelling units. However, it should be noted that the 2008 RTP did not anticipate a substantial amount of housing growth in the City of Inglewood as the City is currently built out and has few remaining undeveloped parcels for new housing. Nevertheless, like the Proposed Project, this Alternative would exceed the housing projections of SCAG, and this impact would be considered technically significant and unavoidable.

Regional Population Growth Forecasts

Based on 2008 SCAG population projections, the City of Inglewood is anticipated to experience a population increase of 2,396 persons between the years of 2005 to 2015, from 117,789 persons in 2005 to 120,185 persons in 2015. According to recent statistics published by the State of California Department of Finance, the City of Inglewood's current (2008) population is estimated at 118,878 persons. Alternative RU 800 would add approximately 2,400 persons to the City of Inglewood, which would increase the total population to 121,278 persons by 2014. This Alternative's population increase would not be consistent with the regional growth projections as the population growth would exceed the total anticipated growth for 2015 by 1,093 persons.

This inconsistency, however, is attributed to the fact that the City of Inglewood is built out and has few remaining undeveloped parcels available to accommodate future growth. This Alternative would redevelop an existing non-residential use and would require an adoption of a Specific Plan and amendment to the City's General Plan and the Merged Redevelopment Plan for the property. As this Alternative was not anticipated at the time SCAG prepared their 2008 RTP, the anticipated population and housing growth associated with the Alternative was not included within the 2008 RTP update. Nevertheless, like the Proposed Project, the population growth anticipated by this Alternative would not

be consistent with the projections of SCAG, and would result in a technically significant and unavoidable impact.

Notwithstanding the technically significant and unavoidable impact, like the Proposed Project, this Alternative presents an opportunity to address the housing needs of the City and the surrounding region given the City's proximity to the South Bay and the Westside jobs markets, which are jobs-rich. Additionally, the Alternative's creation of 800 newly-constructed dwelling units presents an opportunity for the City to continue its efforts to add high-quality, new housing to its housing stock. Overall, the Alternative will add housing in an area with policies geared to increase housing stock, and can be accommodated by existing utilities, public services, and roadway infrastructure without resulting in significant environmental impacts.

Land Use and Planning

Impacts on land use and planning under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. Similar to the Proposed Project, since residential dwelling units are proposed, Alternative RU 800 would not be consistent with the existing Commercial-Recreation designations of the current Zoning district, General Plan designations, nor Redevelopment Plan Land Use designations. And, the development of residential uses would require a zone change, a General Plan Amendment and adoption of a Specific Plan. However, with the approval of the discretionary actions required for this Alternative to be developed, impacts to consistency with land use plans would be less than significant. However, the placement of 800 dwelling units directly adjacent to a horseracing facility would create potential use conflicts caused by dust, vectors, odors, and racing related noises. This would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to land use compatibility with the existing community.

Public Utilities

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

Water

As shown in Table VI.C-3, Alternative RU 800 would generate a demand for approximately 580,464 gallons per day or approximately 650 acre-feet of water per year, representing a net increase of approximately 290 acre-feet of water per year, as compared to the existing conditions. This represents an approximate 19 percent decrease in water consumption as compared to the Proposed Project. 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 (in addition to the Renaissance and Haagan projects). Based on the formula presented in that Section, 366.36 AF/yr is the total projected water demand for the three developments in the 2005 UWMP based upon available water usage data of the Renaissance and Haagan projects and the projected water demand for Alternative RU 800. Only 360.60 AF/yr was attributed to the three developments in the 2005 UWMP, leaving a deficit of 5.73 AF/yr. At a minimum, this Alternative would be responsible for securing water sources up to this amount.

Ordinance No. 170,978 would still apply to Alternative RU 800, resulting in increased water conservation measures. Also, mitigation measures proposed under the Proposed Project to conserve water would also be implemented under Alternative RU 800. Therefore, impacts associated with water availability under this Alternative would be considered less than significant.

**Table VI.C-3
Estimated Water Consumption - Alternative RU 800**

Land Use	Unit/Quantity	Water Use (gal/day/unit) ^a	Total (gpd)	Total (AF/year)
Existing Uses Total^b	--	--	321,139	360
Alternative RU 800				
Residential	800 du ^c	336 gal/ day/du	268,800	301
Racetrack/Grandstand	--	--	311,664 ^d	349
Subtotal Proposed	-	-	580,464	650
Total Net Water Demand			259,325	290
<i>Notes:</i>				
<i>du: Dwelling units</i>				
<i>sf: Square feet</i>				
<i>AFY: Acre feet per year.</i>				
^a Hall and Foreman, EIR Technical Appendix - Public Utilities Report, May 2008.				
^b Hall and Foreman, EIR Technical Appendix - Public Utilities Report, May 2008.				
^c Assumes all dwelling units are developed as SFD (R-1) to analyze the maximum impact to water demand.				
^d Of the total for existing uses, it was determined the Casino would utilize 9,475 gpd of water. Therefore, it is estimated the racetrack/grandstand would demand the remaining 311,664 gpd of water.				
Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.				

Wastewater

As shown in Table VI.C-4, Alternative RU 800 would generate approximately 571,650 gpd of wastewater per day, approximately 47,650 gpd above existing conditions. In comparison to the Proposed Project, which is anticipated to generate approximately 393,000 net gpd of wastewater, this Alternative would represent a 345,350 gpd decrease in wastewater generation. Similar to the Proposed Project, it is expected that the existing wastewater infrastructure would be sufficient to handle the net increase in demand. As a result, impacts would remain less than significant. This impact would be reduced as compared to the Proposed Project.

Energy

Electricity

As shown in Table VI.C-5 below, Alternative RU 800 would generate a demand for approximately 21,747,904 kilowatt hours per year (KW-Hr/yr) of electricity, which would represent a decrease of approximately 4,262,100 KW-Hr/yr of electricity as compared to the existing conditions. In comparison to the Proposed Project, which would generate a net demand for 6,836,844 KW-Hr/yr of electricity, this Alternative would result in a decreased demand of approximately 11,098,944 KW-Hr/yr of electricity per

year. Similar to the Proposed Project, it is expected that existing electrical facilities would be sufficient to handle the loads created by this Alternative. Thus, impacts to electricity demands for this Alternative would be considered less than significant.

**Table VI.C-4
Estimated Wastewater Generation – Alternative RU 800**

Land Use	Unit/Quantity	Generation Rate (gpd/unit) ^a	Total (gallons/day)
Existing			
Existing Uses ^b	--	--	524,000
Subtotal Existing:			
Alternative RU 800			
Residential	800 du	200gal/unit/day	160,000
Racetrack/Grandstand	--	--	411,650 ^c
Subtotal Alternative			571,650
Total Net Wastewater Generation			47,650
<i>Notes:</i>			
<i>du: Dwelling units</i>			
<i>sf: Square feet</i>			
^a Generation Rates based on County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County wastewater generation rates. Uses not listed are estimated by the closest type of use available in the table.			
^b Hall & Foreman, Inc., Hollywood Park Project, Utilities and Infrastructure Technical Report, August 29, 2008.			
^c Of the total for existing uses, it was determined the Casino would generate 112,350 gpd of wastewater. Therefore, it is estimated the racetrack/grandstand would generate the remaining 411,650 gpd of wastewater.			
Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.			

**Table VI.C-5
Estimated Electricity Consumption – Alternative RU 800**

Land Use	Size (SF)	Demand (Kilowatt hours/unit/year) ^a	Total (kilowatt hours/year)
Existing Uses ^b	--		26,010,004
Proposed Alternative RU 800			
Residential	800 units	5,626.50 KW-Hr/unit	4,501,200
Racetrack/Grandstand	--	--	17,246,704 ^c
Subtotal Alternative			21,747,904
Total Net Electricity Demand			-4,262,100
<i>Notes:</i>			
<i>du: dwelling unit</i>			
<i>sf: square feet</i>			
^a Rates based on SCAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Table A9-12-A, 1993, unless footnoted otherwise.			
^b Hollywood Park Land Company, June 8, 2007.			
^c Of the total for existing uses, it was determined the Casino would require 8,763,300 KW-HR per year. Therefore, it is estimated the racetrack/grandstand would require the remaining 17,246,704 KW-HR per year.			
Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.			

Natural Gas

Under Alternative RU 800, an increase in approximately 800 new dwelling units would increase demands for natural gas resources. As shown in Table VI.C-6, Alternative RU 800 would generate a demand for 7,668,940 cubic feet of natural gas per month, or approximately 3,774,040 cf more than the existing conditions. In comparison to the Proposed Project, which would generate a demand for 19,909,975 cf of natural gas per month, this Alternative would result in a demand decrease of approximately 12,241,035 cubic feet 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 respect to demands for natural gas would be less than significant.

**Table VI.C-6
Estimated Natural Gas Consumption – Alternative RU 800**

Land Use	Unit/Quantity	Consumption Rate ^a	Total (cf/month)
Existing Uses ^b	--	--	3,894,900
Alternative RU 800			
Residential	800 units	6,665 cf/du/month	5,332,000
Racetrack/Grandstand	--	--	2,336,940 ^c
<i>Subtotal</i>			7,668,940
Net Total Natural Gas			3,774,040
^a Rates based on SCAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Table A9-12-A, 1993, unless footnoted otherwise. ^b Hollywood Park Land Company, June 8, 2007. ^c Per Hollywood Park Land Company, the racetrack/grandstand is estimated to use approximately 60% of the existing natural gas demand. Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.			

Solid Waste

Demolition activities under Alternative RU 800 would generate substantially less demolition debris than the Proposed Project as the Alternative would retain the existing racetrack and grandstand. Based on an average construction debris factor of 4.48 lbs per sf for the dwelling units (assuming an average of 1,500 square feet per dwelling unit), this Alternative would generate approximately 2,628 tons of building construction debris. And, for demolition of the casino, this Alternative would generate approximately 31,000 tons of debris. Therefore, in combination, this Alternative would generate a total of approximately 33,628 tons of total construction debris, or approximately 46,967 tons less than the construction and demolition debris generated by the Proposed Project. This reduction is primarily due to the retention of the existing racetrack. Accordingly, since less demolition debris would be generated, this Alternative, like the Proposed Project, would have a less than significant impact on construction-related solid waste..

As shown in Table VI.C-7 the net operational solid waste generation for Alternative RU 800 would be approximately 1,595 tons of solid waste per day. This Alternative would result in a reduction of operational solid waste generation by approximately 10,661 pounds per day as compared to the Proposed Project. Accordingly, solid waste disposal needs would be reduced under this Alternative. 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 project-specific and cumulative level. Therefore, impacts on solid waste under this Alternative would be significant and unavoidable.

**Table VI.C-7
Estimated Operational Solid Waste Generation - Alternative RU 800**

Land Use	Unit/Quantity	Generation Rate ^a (lbs/unit/day)	Total (Pounds/Day)
Existing Uses			
Main Building/Grandstand	594,000	.006	3,564
Casino ^b	321,000	.005	1,605
		<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>5,169</i>
Alternative RU 800			
Main Building/Grandstand	594,000	.006	3,564
Residential	800 units	4.00 lbs/unit/day	3,200
		<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>6,764</i>
		Net Total	1,595
^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. 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 projected demand for police protection service is based on the size and type of land use and anticipated on-site population. Since this Alternative would result in the development of 800 more residences than currently exist, it would place an increased demand on the Inglewood Police Department for police protection services. Based on the number of sworn officers that are currently authorized for the IPD (i.e., 1.8 officers per 1,000 inhabitants), this Alternative would generate a demand for 4 additional police officers, or roughly 12 less police officers than the Proposed Project. Similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative RU 800 would generate tax revenue that the City could use to hire new

officers. Additionally, this Alternative would incorporate mitigation measures to reduce demands on police services, such as strategically positioned lighting and implementation of an on-site HOA-operated security plan. This Alternative would not include a police substation on the Project Site as no new commercial or retail land use would be developed to generate a need for one. Nevertheless, it is expected impacts on police protection services under this Alternative would be less than significant.

Fire Protection

The projected demand for fire protection services is based on the amount and size of new structures on a site. Since this Alternative would result in an increase of residential units and the continued operation of the racetrack use, the intensity of this development would be altered compared to existing conditions, but it would not place a substantially increased demand on the LACoFD for fire protection services. Fire flow requirements for this Alternative would be determined by the LACoFD. Overall, the impact on fire protection services under Alternative RU 800 would be considered less than significant.

Schools

As shown in Table VI.C-8, Alternative RU 800 would generate approximately 316 new students; approximately 258 fewer students than the Proposed Project. It should be noted that for the purposes of studying the maximum impacts to schools under this Alternative, the student generation rate for single-family detached homes was used. In contrast to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would not include the 4-acre site for civic uses. Accordingly, the potential for the Inglewood Unified School District to develop a school site within the Project Site would be precluded. As discussed in Section IV.K.3, the Project Applicant would be required to pay school fees to the Inglewood Unified School District in compliance with SB 50. The payment of this fee would fully mitigate any potential school impacts. Therefore, this Alternative would result in a less than significant impact after mitigation. However, this Alternative would preclude any funding through the payment of developer fees and the 4-acre site which could be utilized by the Inglewood Unified School District, subject to economic feasibility and determinations of the School District and the City of Inglewood to develop this public benefit area. Therefore, the Proposed Project could be more beneficial than Alternative RU 800 with respect to school services.

**Table VI.C-8
Estimated Student Generation by Alternative RU 800**

Product Type	Student Projections			
	K-5	6-8	9-12	K-12
Single Family Detached	157	74	85	316
TOTAL	157	74	85	316

Notes: Student generation rates based on Residential Development School Fee Justification Studies, Los Angeles Unified School District, February 2008. Alternative RU 800 would include the following unit breakdown: 180 Single Family Detached, 540 Single Family Attached, and 80 Multi-Family.

Recreation and Parks

Under the Proposed Project, the Project Applicant is proposing to provide 25 acres of open space that would be provided for community use. Due to the retention of the existing racetrack under this Alternative, Alternative RU 800 may include only enough common open space to satisfy the project's demand. Based on the standard target in the Open Space Element of one acre per 1,000 persons, this Alternative would generate a need for approximately 2.4 acres of open space. Unlike Alternative RU 800, the Proposed Project would provide substantial public benefit by increasing the amount of common open space that is available within the City. Although the Proposed Project would provide an amount of open space in excess of the Open Space Element goal and thus would be more beneficial than Alternative RU 800, impacts under the Alternative would still remain less than significant.

Libraries

Alternative RU 800 would generate approximately 2,400 new residents to the City of Inglewood, generating an increased demand for library services. Based on written correspondence from the Inglewood Public Library, the City's libraries are currently meeting the needs of the City, within the limits of existing funding levels. Therefore, Alternative RU 800 would result in a less than significant impact to the Inglewood Library system. However, the Proposed Project could be more beneficial than Alternative RU 800 since the Proposed Project could potentially allocate the four-acre civic site to be used as a joint use school, including a library, which can be utilized by all City residents.

Traffic and Transportation

Impacts on traffic and transportation under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation.

Alternative RU 800 Weekday Trip Generation Summary

The weekday trip generation forecast for Alternative RU 800 is summarized in Table VI.C-9. As presented in Table VI.C-9, Alternative RU 800 is expected to generate an additional 210 vehicle trips (70 fewer inbound trips and 280 more outbound trips) during the weekday AM peak hour. During the weekday PM peak hour, Alternative RU 800 is expected to generate 340 fewer vehicle trips (48 more inbound trips and 388 fewer outbound trips). Over a 24-hour period, Alternative RU 800 is forecast to generate an additional 1,858 daily trip ends during a typical weekday (approximately 929 inbound trips and 929 outbound trips).

Alternative RU 800 Weekend Trip Generation Summary

The weekend trip generation forecast for Alternative RU 800 is summarized in Table VI.C-10. As presented in Table VI.C-10, Alternative RU 800 is expected to generate 358 fewer vehicle trips (233 fewer inbound trips and 125 fewer outbound trips) during the weekend mid-day peak hour. Over a 24-hour period, Alternative RU 800 is forecast to generate an additional 2,026 daily trip ends during a typical weekend day (approximately 1,013 inbound trips and 1,013 outbound trips).

**Table VI.C-9
Alternative RU 800 Weekday Trip Generation^a**

Land Use	Size	Daily Trip Ends ^b Volumes	AM Peak Hour Volumes ^b			PM Peak Hour Volumes ^b		
			In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Residential ^c	800 DU	7,044	142	427	569	439	258	697
Existing Casino to be Removed ^d	120,000 sf	(5,186)	(212)	(147)	(359)	(391)	(646)	(1,037)
Net Total Trip Generation		1,858	(70)	280	210	48	(388)	(340)

Notes:^a Source: ITE "trip Generation" 7th Edition, 2003.^b Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.^c ITE Land Use Code 210 (Single-Family Detached Housing) trip generation equation rates.^d Based on weekday traffic count data collected.

Source: Linscott Law and Greenspan Engineers, Revised Traffic Study August 1, 2008..

**Table VI.C-10
Alternative RU 800 Weekend Trip Generation^a**

Land Use	Size	Daily Trip Ends ^b Volumes	Mid Day Peak Hour Volumes ^b		
			In	Out	Total
Residential ^c	800 DU	7,432	390	333	723
Existing Casino to be Removed	120,000 ^d	(5,406)	(623)	(458)	(1,081)
Net Total Trip Generation		2,026	(233)	(125)	(358)

Notes:^a Source: ITE "trip Generation" 7th Edition, 2003.^b Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.^c ITE Land Use Code 210 (Single-Family Detached Housing) trip generation equation rates.^d Based on weekend traffic count data collected.

Source: Linscott Law and Greenspan Engineers, Revised Traffic Study August 1, 2008.

Traffic Impact Comparison

Weekday Conditions

A qualitative review was conducted to determine if Alternative RU 800 would likely result in an increase in project impacts compared to the Proposed Project. During the weekday conditions, Alternative RU 800 is expected to generate 1,394 fewer vehicle trips than the Proposed Project during the AM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, Alternative RU 800 is expected to generate 301 fewer vehicle trips than the Proposed Project. Over a 24-hour period, Alternative RU 800 is forecast to generate 15,364 fewer daily trip ends during a typical weekday. Based on this comparison, it is determined that Alternative RU 800 would likely result in an overall decrease in traffic impacts compared to the Proposed Project.

Weekend Conditions

A qualitative review was conducted to determine if Alternative RU 800 would likely result in an increase in project impacts when compared to the Proposed Project. During the weekend conditions, Alternative RU 800 is expected to generate 1,732 fewer vehicle trips than the Proposed Project during the mid-day peak hour and 23,482 fewer trips over a 24-hour typical weekend period. Based on this comparison, it is determined that Alternative RU 800 would likely result in an overall decrease in traffic impacts compared to the Proposed Project.

Overall, Alternative RU 800 would result in a less than significant impact to traffic and transportation with implementation of mitigation measures. However, given the level of proposed mitigation measures and the fact that Alternative RU 800 does not contain any retail, office/commercial or casino/gaming uses that could generate a source of revenue to fund implementation of the street and frontage improvements, it may be necessary to locate a source of funding to implement the level of improvements proposed by the Proposed Project's mitigation measures to achieve a less than significant impact to traffic and transportation under this Alternative.

Parking

Impacts on parking from the Proposed Project would be less than significant. Alternative RU 800 would result in the continued parking supply required to meet the operating demands of the racetrack use. Additionally, based on the IMC, this Alternative would be required to supply 1,600 spaces for the residents. Alternative RU 800 would satisfy the parking requirements as stipulated by code for the residential uses. Therefore, impacts related to parking would be less than significant.

CONCLUSION

Alternative RU 800 would not reduce the following significant and unavoidable impacts to levels of insignificance associated with the Proposed Project: Air Quality (Construction and Operation), Noise (Construction), Population, Housing & Employment (Population growth forecasts and Housing growth forecasts), and Solid Waste (Operations). In addition, Alternative RU 800 creates additional significant and unavoidable impacts to Population, Housing & Employment (Employment Displacement and Employment Generation) due to the significant loss of jobs on the Project Site, and to Land Use (Compatibility with existing area) due to the potential use conflicts caused by dust, vectors, odors, and racing related noises caused by placing 800 dwelling units directly adjacent to a horseracing facility.

As described in Table VI.C-11, below, Alternative RU 800 would fail to achieve 3 of the 13 Project Objectives. Objective 10 and 13 would be completely satisfied by this alternative. Objectives 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 would be met to some degree by Alternative RU 800, but not to the same degree as the Proposed Project. Objectives 3, 5, and 7 would not be met at all under this Alternative.

**Table VI.C-11
Assessment of the Alternative RU 800 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.	Alternative RU 800 would not meet this objective as fully as the Proposed Project as it would only result in single family redevelopment on the Project Site and would not provide the mix of uses proposed by the Project.
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.	Alternative RU 800 would involve the retention of the existing Hollywood Park Racetrack which contributes to the City’s sales tax and OTB revenue. However, RU 800 eliminates the Casino use from the Project Site. While Alternative RU 800 may prove economically viable for the near future, the racing industry may or may not support the continued operation of the Hollywood Park Racetrack in the long-term.
3. To preserve the Casino/Gambling Facility on the Hollywood Park Site.	This objective would not be met since the Casino is eliminated under Alternative RU 800.
4. To provide land for a civic/public use.	Alternative RU 800 would not meet this objective in the same manner as the project. The existing Hollywood Park Racetrack is however a regional recreational land use that is enjoyed by the public.
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.	Alternative RU 800 would not create any new community park and open space areas. Therefore this objective would not be met.
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.	Alternative RU 800 would be partially consistent with this project objective, as it would provide single-family housing opportunities. It would not provide the same variety of product types as the Proposed Project.
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.	Alternative RU 800 would not add any office space opportunities. As such, this objective would not be met.
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.	Alternative RU 800 would involve the construction of single-family residential units and retain the existing racetrack. While the existing use of the Site as a racetrack would remain operational for some period of time, the racing industry may or may not support the continued operation of the Hollywood Park Racetrack in the long-term. If the site becomes inoperable as a racetrack, it may lead to deterioration of the facilities. Further, Alternative RU 800 would not provide, retail and restaurant uses, or public open space within the Merged Redevelopment Project Areas. Therefore, this objective would not fully be met.
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 Hollywood Park Racetrack is operated and maintained in a manner that creates a safe, secure and defensible environment for visitors and employees. Alternative RU 800 would not provide new public spaces, such as parks and retail, as such this objective would be satisfied, but to a lesser 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.	Alternative RU 800 would involve the construction of single family homes. As such the opportunity to provide sustainable building practices would be permitted.

Project Objectives	Assessment of the Alternative to Meet Objectives
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.	Alternative RU 800 could incorporate pedestrian connections and bicycle paths in a residential environment. However, the exclusion of the mixed-use component would to a large degree preclude walkability. As such this objective would not fully be met.
12. To promote a safe pedestrian-oriented environment by providing extensive streetscape amenities.	Alternative RU 800 could incorporate streetscape amenities in a single family residential environment. However, the exclusion of the mixed-use component would to a large degree preclude the variety of amenities and streetscape character of the Proposed Project.
13. To enhance the visual appearance and appeal of the neighborhood by providing perimeter and interior landscaping.	The existing Hollywood Park Racetrack grounds are currently landscaped to enhance the visual appearance and appeal of the facility. Alternative RU 800 would integrate landscaping features into the common areas and along pedestrian corridors and paseos. Therefore, this alternative would be met.