
VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

D. ALTERNATIVE RU 1,000

This Alternative was selected as a possible scenario for future development to allow for reduced development on the Project Site in an effort to reduce the Proposed Project’s environmental impact while achieving some, but not all of the Project objectives. Rather than a large, mixed-use development, Alternative RU 1,000 would result in the development of approximately 1,000 single-family dwelling units, with the removal of the existing casino and racetrack. This Alternative would include approximately 25 acres of open space. The existing racetrack, grandstand and casino would be demolished to provide for the redevelopment of the site with the proposed residential land uses. A summary of the planned development under this Alternative is provided in Table VI.D-1, below.

**Table VI.D-1
Development Summary of Alternative RU 1,000**

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	UNITS/ FLOOR AREA (NET) ^a
Residential	1,000 du
Retail	N/A
Casino	N/A
Civic	N/A
Hotel	N/A
Office	N/A
Open Space	25 Acres
Community Space	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 1,000, the Project Site would be redeveloped in a manner that is substantially similar to the residential uses of the Proposed Project in terms of views and urban design. This Alternative would involve the demolition of the existing casino, racetrack and grandstand, but would not include the development of the retail, office, civic or hotel components that are proposed under the Proposed Project. While the density and mix of land uses would differ from the Proposed Project, the urban design would be substantially similar and this Alternative would be designed to yield resulting views and urban design

characteristics that would be consistent with the Merged Redevelopment Plan, as Alternative RU 1,000 would provide several visual improvements as compared to the existing conditions of the Project Site. 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 1,000 would generate new sources of light and glare in the form of street lighting and structural light illumination associated with the 1,000 new dwelling units. As compared to the existing environment, Alternative RU 1,000 would eliminate a substantial amount of light pollution that is currently generated by evening events at the racetrack and casino. Additionally, the new sources of light associated with the dwelling units would be designed to include directional and security lighting in a manner to reduce light and glare impacts on adjacent uses to the maximum extent feasible. For this reason, light and glare impacts would be less than significant under Alternative RU 1,000.

Shade and Shadow

The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact to shade/shadow. Alternative RU 1,000 would exclude the retail, civic, hotel and office development and would be solely developed with single family homes with all structures substantially below the 75 foot height of the buildings associated with the Proposed Project. Additionally, this Alternative would involve the removal of the casino and grandstand uses, which would substantially decrease shadow lengths cast from the Project Site. Accordingly, shade and shadow impacts from this Alternative would not significantly impact neighboring land uses. Therefore, shade and shadow impacts under Alternative RU 1,000 would be less than significant.

Air Quality

Construction

The Proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable construction-related impacts. Alternative RU 1,000 would require similar amounts of demolition activity as compared to the Proposed Project as this Alternative would demolish all uses on the Project Site. Additionally, a shorter construction duration would be assumed than for the Proposed Project since only 1,000 dwelling units (compared to 2,995 units and the other retail, office/commercial, hotel and civic uses under the Proposed Project) would be constructed on the Project Site. As such, pollutant emissions during the Alternative RU 1,000 construction period would be less than pollutants emitted during the construction period for the Proposed Project. However, assuming that Alternative RU 1,000 would require more than 13 acres to be graded per day, construction emissions would exceed the SCAQMD regional and localized significance thresholds for NO_x, PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. As such, Alternative RU 1,000 daily construction emissions would result in a significant and unavoidable air quality impact.

Operational

Alternative RU 1,000 would generate fewer daily vehicle trips than currently exist on the Project Site. As such, this Alternative would result in less regional operational emissions than are currently generated on the Project Site and less emissions than generated by the Proposed Project. The reduction in development would eliminate the VOC, NO_x, CO, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ regional operational impact associated with the Proposed Project. As such, Alternative RU 1,000 daily operational emissions would result in a less than significant regional operational air quality impact.

Alternative RU 1,000 would result in less 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 1,000 would result in a less than significant localized CO impact.

Similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative RU 1,000 technically would not be consistent with the land use designation and population growth forecasts utilized to calculate the emissions budget in the most recent AQMP. As such, Alternative RU 1,000 would not be compatible with the AQMP and would result in a significant and unavoidable air quality impact due to this technical inconsistency.

Due to the reduced size, density, and type of development, Alternative RU 1,000 would generate less GHG emissions than the Proposed Project. Similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative RU 1,000 would result in a less than significant global warming impact.

Overall, Alternative RU 1,000 emissions would be less than the Proposed Project's emissions; however, since Alternative RU 1,000 would be inconsistent with the AQMP for the same reasons as the Proposed Project, the Alternative would also technically result in a significant and unavoidable operational air quality impact.

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 1,000 as described for the Proposed Project. Development of the Proposed Project has been determined to be 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 for the Proposed Project would carry over to this Alternative with minor modifications. Therefore, the geology and soils impacts under Alternative RU 1,000 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. Similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative RU 1,000 would generate potentially significant impacts associated with potential exposure to ACMs and LBP during

construction. However, these impacts 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 1,000 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 Alternative RU 1,000, the proposed residential uses would not generate a substantial amount of potentially hazardous materials and there are no commercial, office, civic, retail or casino/gaming uses. Therefore, this Alternative would have a less than significant impact 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 Alternative RU 1,000 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 impact upon a significant historic resource. Alternative RU 1,000 would involve the demolition of all existing buildings on the Project Site and the construction of single-family homes. Through a comprehensive cultural resource analysis (refer to Section IV.E Cultural Resources), 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 historic resources pursuant to CEQA. As such, Alternative RU 1,000 would result in a less than significant impact to historical 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 1,000, water quality impacts during construction would be substantially similar to the Proposed Project. The redevelopment of the site with new residential uses would include implementation of best management practices and compliance with the RWQCB regulations to ensure impacts are reduced to less-than-significant levels. Water quality impacts under this Alternative would therefore be less than significant.

Operational

Operational impacts on water quality under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. Under the Alternative RU 1,000, the amount of pervious surface area would be increased as compared to the Proposed Project, as this alternative would include the 25 acres of open space, the removal of the casino and related parking lots, reduced overall sizes of structural footprints, and larger lots to accommodate single family homes. Thus, a greater volume of surface water would be able to be retained on site thus generating less surface water runoff into the storm drains. Similar to the Proposed Project, this scenario would 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, water quality impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant after mitigation.

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 1,000 would generally result in similar noise levels as discussed for 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 1,000 would be considered significant and unavoidable after mitigation.

Operational

Alternative RU 1,000 would result in less daily vehicle trips than the Proposed Project and as such, would result in lower mobile noise levels. Mobile noise is not anticipated to increase by more than three dBA CNEL and, as such, would result in a less than significant impact. Alternative RU 1,000 would include stationary noise sources comparable to those discussed for the Proposed Project. Alternative RU 1,000

also eliminates the noise generated by the casino/gaming facility. Similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative RU 1,000 would result in a less than significant stationary source operational noise impact.

Overall, Alternative RU 1,000 would result in similar construction-related noise levels, less stationary source operational noise, and less mobile source noise compared to the Proposed Project. Therefore, 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 population and housing growth forecasts.

Construction Impacts

The Proposed Project would generate approximately 17,105 construction-related jobs over the 10-year buildout and stabilization horizon period. It is estimated that employment opportunities associated with construction of Alternative RU 1,000 would be substantially less than the Proposed Project as this Alternative would not include any of the otherwise proposed commercial, hotel, retail, civic and casino/gaming uses. 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 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.

Operation Impacts

Employment Displacement Impacts

Similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative RU 1,000 would displace the existing horseracing activities at the Hollywood Park Racetrack. However, due to economic conditions within the horseracing industry, this impact is considered less than significant as it is speculative to predict how long horseracing will be able to continue to operate on-site in the absence of any changes in state law regarding gaming. Impacts to the displacement of horseracing-related jobs at Hollywood Park would be the same as described for the Proposed Project, resulting in a loss of 1,601 FTE horseracing association jobs. In contrast to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would also result in the loss of the 1,017 jobs associated with the existing casino. The number of jobs generated by RU 1,000 is not sufficient to compensate for the number of jobs displaced by this Alternative. This Alternative creates a new significant and unavoidable employment displacement impact that is not created by the Proposed Project.

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 1,000 would be negligible. Indirect impacts to population, housing and employment demographics generated by the increased residential land uses of this Alternative would be less than significant.

Direct Employment Growth

Alternative RU 1,000 would demolish all existing uses on the Project Site and would include the new development of 1,000 single-family dwelling units. This Alternative would thus result in approximately 130 new jobs associated with operational services and maintenance for the residential uses (i.e., security, landscape, HOA management, etc), but would result in the loss of the existing 2,618 jobs associated with the current operations on the Project Site. Compared to the Proposed Project, which would generate approximately 517 net new jobs, Alternative RU 1,000 results in a permanent net loss of 2,488 jobs. Therefore, this Alternative would result in substantial decrease in jobs as compared to the existing conditions and this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable since it is inconsistent with the net positive job growth forecasts for the City.

Population/Housing Impacts

Alternative RU 1,000 would involve the construction of 1,000 new dwelling units resulting in the generation of 3,000 new residents to the City of Inglewood. 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 decrease the amount of new housing and population growth within the City of Inglewood.

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 1,000 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 SCAG's projection for 2015 by 820 dwelling units. Alternative RU 1,000 will add an additional 1,000 dwelling units to the City's housing inventory, resulting in a total of 39,969 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 1,820 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, this Alternative would

technically exceed the housing projections of SCAG, and this impact, like the Proposed Project, would be considered 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 1,000 would add approximately 3,000 persons to the City of Inglewood, which would increase the total population to 121,878 persons by 2014. This Alternative's population increase would not be consistent with the regional growth projections for the City as the population growth would exceed the total anticipated growth for 2015 by 1,693 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, the population growth anticipated by this Alternative technically would not be consistent with the projections of SCAG, and would result in a 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 1,000 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. Alternative RU 1,000 would demolish all existing uses on the Project Site and would include a single family residential development. As such, Alternative RU 1,000 would not be consistent with the existing Commercial-Recreation designations of the current Zoning district, General Plan designations, and the Merged Redevelopment Plan Land Use designations. Similar to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would include requests for a zone change, amendments to the General Plan and the Merged Redevelopment Plan and adoption of a Specific Plan. With approval of these requests, impacts from consistency with land use plans would be less than significant. Additionally, as a development of single family residences, Alternative RU 1,000 would be compatible with the surrounding area, which is

comprised of a mix of low-to medium-density residential, commercial, motel, and office uses. As such, impacts from compatibility with the existing community would be less than significant.

Public Utilities

With the exception of solid waste from operations, impacts on public utilities under the Proposed Project would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Water

As shown in Table VI.D-2, below, Alternative RU 1,000 would generate a net increase in water demand by approximately 17 acre-feet of water per year over existing conditions.

Table VI.D-2
Estimated Water (Potable) Consumption by Alternative RU 1,000

Land Use	Unit/Quantity	Water Use (gal/day/unit) ^a	Total (gpd)	Total (AF/year)
Existing				
Existing Uses ^a	--	--	321,139	360
Subtotal Existing:				
Alternative RU 1,000				
Residential	1,000 du	336gpd/du	336,000	377
Subtotal Alternative	-	-	336,000	377
Total Net Water Demand			14,861	17
<i>Notes:</i>				
<i>du: Dwelling units</i>				
<i>AFY: Acre feet per year.</i>				
<i>^a Hall & Foreman, Inc., Hollywood Park Project, Utilities and Infrastructure Technical Report, August 29, 2008. The 1,000 du assumed to be SFD (R-1) as provided in the Water Supply Assessment for Hollywood Park.</i>				
<i>Source: 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 (in addition to the Renaissance and Haagan projects). Based on the formula presented in that Section, the 93.33 AF/yr is the total projected water demand for the three developments included in the 2005 UWMP based upon available water usage data of the Renaissance and Haagan projects and the projected water demand for Alternative RU 1,000. 360.60 AF/yr was attributed to the three developments in the 2005 UWMP, leaving a surplus of 267.27 AF/yr. Therefore, all of the water demanded by Alternative RU 1,000 has already been accounted for in the 2005 UWMP. Ordinance No. 170,978 would still apply to Alternative RU 1,000, resulting in increased water conservation measures although no mitigation measures are proposed. Impacts associated with water availability under Alternative RU 1,000 would be less than significant.

Wastewater

As shown in Table VI.D-3 below, Alternative RU 1,000 would generate approximately 200,000 gpd of wastewater per day, which would be a reduction of 324,000 gpd as compared to 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 717,000 gpd decrease in wastewater generation. It is expected that the existing wastewater infrastructure would be sufficient to handle the wastewater generation since this Alternative generates a net decrease as compared to the existing uses on the site. Impacts to sewer infrastructure and wastewater treatment facilities would thus be less than significant under this Alternative.

**Table VI.D-3
Estimated Wastewater Generation by Alternative RU 1,000**

Land Use	Unit/Quantity	Generation Rate (gpd/unit) ^a	Total (gallons/day)
Existing			
Existing Uses ^b	--	--	524,000
Subtotal Existing:			
Alternative RU 1,000			
Residential	1,000 du	200gal/unit/day	200,000
Open Space	25 AC	--	--
Subtotal			200,000
Net Wastewater Generation			-324,000
<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.			
^b Hall & Foreman, Inc., Hollywood Park Project, Utilities and Infrastructure Technical Report, August 29, 2008.			
Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.			

*Energy*Electricity

As shown in Table VI.D-4, Alternative RU 1,000 would generate an electricity demand for approximately 6,715,500 kilowatt hours per year (KW-Hr/yr). In comparison to the existing uses, this Alternative would reduce electricity demand by approximately 19,294,504 KW-Hr/yr. Compared to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would result in an electricity use reduction of approximately 26,131,348 KW-Hr/yr per year. It is anticipated that the existing electrical facilities can support this Alternative since it generates a net decrease in demand as compared to the existing uses on the site. Therefore, the energy demands for this Alternative would be less than significant.

**Table VI.D-4
Estimated Electricity Consumption – Alternative RU 1,000**

Land Use	Size (SF)	Demand (Kilowatt hours/unit/year) ^a	Total (kilowatt hours/year)
Existing Uses ^b	--		26,010,004
<i>Subtotal Existing</i>	-	-	
Alternative RU 1,000			
Residential	1,000 units	5,626.50 KW-Hr/unit	5,626,500
Open Space	25 AC	1 KW-Hr/sf/yr	1,089,000
<i>Subtotal Alternative</i>			6,715,500
Net Electricity Demand			-19,294,504
<i>Notes:</i>			
<i>du: dwelling unit</i>			
<i>^a Rates based on SCAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Table A9-12-A, 1993, unless footnoted otherwise.</i>			
<i>^b Hollywood Park Land Company, June 8, 2007.</i>			
<i>Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.</i>			

Natural Gas

As shown in Table VI.D-5, Alternative RU 1,000 would generate a demand for a net increase in 2,770,100 cubic feet of natural gas per month. In comparison to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would result in a decrease in demand by approximately 17,139,875 cubic feet of natural gas per month. As is the case under the Proposed Project, existing natural gas infrastructure would be sufficient to serve the needs of this Alternative. Impacts would be considered less than significant under this Alternative.

**Table VI.D-5
Estimated Natural Gas Consumption – Alternative RU 1,000**

Land Use	Unit/Quantity	Consumption Rate ^a	Total (cf/month)
Existing Uses ^b	--	--	3,894,900
Alternative RU 1,000			
Residential	1,000 units	6,665 cf/du/month	6,665,000
Open Space	25 AC	--	--
<i>Subtotal</i>			6,665,000
Net Natural Gas Demand			2,770,100
<i>^a Rates based on SCAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Table A9-12-A, 1993, unless footnoted otherwise.</i>			
<i>^b Hollywood Park Land Company, June 8, 2007.</i>			
<i>Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.</i>			

Solid Waste

Demolition activities under Alternative RU 1,000 would involve demolition of all existing uses on the Project Site, which would be a slight increase as compared to the Proposed Project, which proposes to demolish all existing structures and improvements except for the casino. As shown in Table VI.D-6, this Alternative would generate approximately 77,035 tons of demolition debris. The amount of construction waste generated under Alternative RU 1,000 would be approximately 3,285 tons, resulting in a total of 80,320 tons of construction and demolition debris. As compared to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would result in an increase in solid waste generation by approximately 275 tons. Although demands for solid waste disposal needs would be increased compared to the Proposed Project, it is anticipated that adequate landfill capacity would be available to accommodate this Alternative's construction solid waste generation, and impacts to regional landfill capacity would be considered less than significant. This impact would be increased as compared to the Proposed Project.

**Table VI.D-6
Construction Solid Waste Generation – Alternative RU 1,000**

Activity	Size	Rate (lbs./sf)	Generated Waste (tons)
<i>Demolition-Existing Uses</i>			
Casino/Pavilion	400,000	155	31,000
Main	594,000	155	46,035
<i>Subtotal</i>			77,035
<i>Construction-Alternative RU 1,000</i>			
Residential ^a	1,000 units	4.38	3,285
Open Space	25 acres	N/A	-
<i>Subtotal</i>			3,285
Total			80,320
^a Assumes an average of 1,500 sf per dwelling unit. Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.			

As shown in Table VI.D-7, below, net operational solid waste generation for Alternative RU 1,000 would be approximately 4,000 pounds of solid waste per day. This Alternative would result in a decreased generation of solid waste by approximately 1,169 pounds per day as compared to existing conditions, which would represent a decrease in approximately 13,425 ppd as compared to the Proposed Project. Nevertheless, 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.D-7
Estimated Operational Solid Waste Generation by Alternative RU 1,000**

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>	5,169
Alternative RU 1,000			
Residential	1,000 units	4.00 lbs/unit/day	4,000
Open Space	25 acres	--	--
		<i>Subtotal</i>	4,000
		Net Total	1,169
^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 Hollywood Park Land Company, 2007. Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.			

Public Services

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

Police Protection

The projected demand for police protection services is based on the size and types of land uses and anticipated on-site population. Since this Alternative would result in the development of 1,000 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 5 additional police officers, or roughly 11 less police officers than the Proposed Project. Similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative RU 1,000 would generate tax revenue that the City could use to hire new officers. Additionally, this Alternative would incorporate mitigation measures to reduce the demands on police services in the area, 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 land uses would be developed to generate a need for one. Therefore, the impact on police protection services under Alternative RU 1,000 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. This Alternative would result in the creation of new residential units and an on-site population, and would include the removal of all existing uses on the Project Site. The types and amount of uses under

this Alternative would be different as compared to the existing conditions and the intensity of development under this Alternative would be less when compared to the Proposed Project. However, since this Alternative would result in the development of 1,000 more residences than currently exist, it would place an increased demand on the LACoFD for fire protection services. Fire flow requirements would be determined by the LACoFD. Overall, the impact on fire protection services under Alternative RU 1,000 would be considered less than significant. .

Schools

As shown in Table VI.D-8, Alternative RU 1,000 would generate approximately 395 new students; approximately 180 less than the Proposed Project. However, in contrast to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would not include the 4-acre site proposed for civic uses in the Proposed Project. Accordingly, the potential for the Inglewood Unified School District to develop a school site within the Proposed Project 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, like the Proposed Project, this Alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact with 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 1,000.

**Table VI.D-8
Estimated Student Generation by Alternative RU 1,000**

Product Type	Student Projections			
	K-5	6-8	9-12	K-12
Single Family Detached	196	93	106	395
<i>Notes: Student generation rates based on Residential Development School Fee Justification Studies, Los Angeles Unified School District, February 2008. Alternative RU 1,000 would include all units as Single Family Detached.</i>				

Recreation and Parks

Under the Proposed Project, approximately 25 acres of open space would be provided. Alternative RU 1,000 would also provide 25 acres of open space. Based on the standard goal of one acre per 1,000 persons, this Alternative would generate a need for approximately 2.5 acres of open space. As such, this Alternative would exceed the City’s open space goals; therefore, impacts upon recreational demands would be less than significant. Similar to the Proposed Project, impacts this Alternative would provide substantial public benefit by increasing the amount of common open space that is available within the City. Therefore, impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant..

Libraries

Alternative RU 1,000 would generate approximately 3,000 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 1,000 would result in a less than significant impact to the Inglewood Library system. However, the Proposed Project could be more beneficial than Alternative RU 1,000 since the Proposed Project could potentially allocate the four-acre civic site to be used as a joint use school, including a library that can be utilized by all City residents.

Traffic and Transportation

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

Alternative RU 1,000 Weekday Trip Generation Summary

The weekday trip generation forecast for Alternative RU 1,000 is summarized in Table VI.D-9. As presented in Table VI.D-9, Alternative RU 1,000 is expected to generate an additional 276 vehicle trips (95 fewer inbound trips and 371 more outbound trips) during the weekday AM peak hour compared to existing conditions.

**Table VI.D-9
Alternative RU 1,000 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	1,000 DU	8,648	177	532	709	536	315	851
Existing Uses to be Removed ^d	(10,000 attend.)	(19,936)	(272)	(161)	(433)	(660)	(3,327)	(3,987)
Net Total Trip Generation		(11,288)	(95)	371	276	(124)	(3,012)	(3,136)

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 Daily Trips were calculated based on the assumption that number of PM peak hour trips represents 20% of the daily traffic volumes.
 Source: Linscott Law and Greenspan Engineers, Revised Traffic Study, August 1, 2008.

During the weekday PM peak hour, Alternative RU 1000 is expected to generate 3,136 fewer vehicle trips (124 fewer inbound trips and 3,012 fewer outbound trips). Over a 24-hour period, Alternative RU 1,000 is forecast to generate 11,288 fewer daily trip ends during a typical weekday (approximately 5,644 fewer inbound trips and 5,644 fewer outbound trips).

Alternative RU 1,000 Weekend Trip Generation Summary

The weekend trip generation forecast for Alternative RU 1,000 is summarized in Table VI.D-10. As presented in Table VI.D-10, Alternative RU 1,000 is expected to generate 1,896 fewer vehicle trips (1,665 fewer inbound trips and 231 fewer outbound trips) during the weekend mid-day peak hour compared to existing conditions. Over a 24-hour period, Alternative RU 1,000 is forecast to generate 4,820 fewer daily trip ends during a typical weekend day (approximately 2,410 fewer inbound trips and 2,410 fewer outbound trips).

**Table VI.D-10
Alternative RU 1,000 Weekend Trip Generation ^a**

Land Use	Size	Daily Trip Ends ^b Volumes	Midday Peak Hour Volumes ^b		
			In	Out	Total
Residential ^c	1,000 DU	9,166	487	414	901
Existing Uses to be Removed ^d	(10,000 attend)	(13,986)	(2,152)	(645)	(2,797)
Net Total Trip Generation		(4,820)	(1,665)	(231)	(1,896)

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 Daily Trips were calculated based on the assumption that number of PM peak hour trips represents 20% of the daily traffic volumes.
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 1,000 would likely result in an increase in project impacts when compared to the Proposed Project. During weekday conditions, Alternative RU 1,000 is expected to generate 1,328 fewer vehicle trips than the Proposed Project during the AM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, Alternative RU 1,000 is expected to generate 3,097 fewer vehicle trips than the Proposed Project. Over a 24-hour period, Alternative RU 1,000 is forecast to generate 28,510 fewer daily trip ends during a typical weekday. Based on this comparison, it is determined that Alternative RU 1,000 would likely result in an overall decrease in traffic impacts when compared to the Proposed Project.

Weekend Conditions

A qualitative review was conducted to determine if Alternative RU 1,000 would likely result in an increase in environmental impacts compared to the Proposed Project. During weekend conditions, Alternative RU 1,000 is expected to generate 3,270 fewer vehicle trips than the Proposed Project during the mid-day peak hour and 30,328 fewer trips over a 24-hour typical weekend period. Based on this

comparison, it is determined that Alternative RU 1,000 would likely result in an overall decrease in traffic impacts compared to the Proposed Project.

Overall, Alternative RU 1,000 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 1,000 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 mitigation measures to achieve a less than significant impact to traffic and transportation.

Parking

Impacts on parking from the Proposed Project would be less than significant. Alternative RU 1,000 would result in the demolition of all existing uses and parking spaces on the Project Site. Based on the IMC, this Alternative would be required to supply 2,000 parking spaces for the residents. Alternative RU 1,000 would satisfy the parking requirements as stipulated by code for the residential uses. Therefore, under Alternative RU 1,000, impacts related to parking would be less than significant, and essentially equivalent to the Proposed Project.

CONCLUSION

Alternative RU 1,000 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 (Operation). In addition, Alternative RU 1,000 creates an additional significant and unavoidable impact to Population, Housing & Employment (Employment Displacement) due to the significant loss of jobs on the Project Site. This impact is not an impact of the Proposed Project.

As described in Table VI.D-11, below, Alternative RU 1,000 would fail to achieve 4 of the 13 Project Objectives. Objective 5, 9, 10 and 13 would be completely satisfied by this alternative. Objectives 1, 6, 8, 11 and 12 would be met to some degree by Alternative RU 1,000, but not to the same degree as the Proposed Project. Objectives 2, 3, 4, and 7 would not be met at all under this Alternative.

**Table VI.D-11
Assessment of Alternative RU 1,000 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 1,000 would not meet this objective as fully as the Proposed Project as it would only result in single family redevelopment and open space on the Project Site.
2. To provide an economically viable project that promotes the City’s economic well-being by significantly increasing property and sales tax	Alternative RU 1,000 has no retail, hotel or other sales generating uses and would thus not meet this objective.

Project Objectives	Assessment of the Alternative to Meet Objectives
revenues and providing high-quality retail uses and the opportunity for transient occupancy tax.	
3. To preserve the Casino/Gambling Facility on the Hollywood Park Site.	Alternative RU 1,000 would not be consistent with this project objective, as the Casino and Gambling facility would cease to operate.
4. To provide land for a civic/public use.	Alternative RU 1,000 would not meet this objective.
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 1,000 would create 25 acres of new community park and open space areas, which is in excess of the General Plan's goal of one acre per 1,000 residents. Therefore this objective would 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 1,000 would be 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 1,000 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 the Merged Redevelopment Project Area.	Alternative RU 1,000 would involve the construction of single-family residential units. However, Alternative RU 1,000 would not provide, retail and restaurant uses, or public open space within the Redevelopment Project Area. 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.	Although Alternative RU 1,000 does not contain retail space, it would meet this objective because the community would be designed to create defensible spaces while allowing park and open space areas to be open to the public.
10. To provide a state-of-the-art sustainability program to be incorporated into the buildout and operation of the Proposed Project.	Alternative RU 1,000 would involve the construction of single family homes. As such the opportunity to provide sustainable building practices would be permitted.
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 1,000 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 1,000 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.	Alternative RU 1,000 would integrate landscaping features into the common areas and along pedestrian corridors and paseos. Therefore, this alternative would be met.