
VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

E. ALTERNATIVE RU 3,500

This Alternative was selected as a possible scenario for future development to allow for increased residential development and more efficient use of the Project Site to further the objectives of the Merged Redevelopment Plan. Specifically, Alternative RU 3,500 would result in the development of approximately 3,500 dwelling units, approximately 620,000 sf of retail use, approximately 120,000 sf of casino use, a 300-room hotel with 20,000 sf of meeting room space, approximately 25,000 sf of office space, approximately 25 acres of open space, and approximately 10,000 sf of community space. A four-acre site would also be made available for civic uses which could be a combination of one or more uses such as a school, library, community center, etc., subject to economic feasibility.

As compared to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would result in an increase of 505 dwelling units and a reduction of 50,000 sf of commercial office space. The Equivalency Program could not be utilized under this Alternative to maximize the number of dwelling units constructed on-site in excess of 3,500 units. The proposed circulation plan and landscaping features, including the lake would be similar to what is proposed under the Proposed Project. A summary of the planned development under this Alternative is provided in Table VI.E-1, below.

**Table VI.E-1
Development Summary of Alternative RU 3,500**

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	FLOOR AREA (NET) ^[a]
Residential	3,500 du
Retail	620,000 sf
Casino	120,000 sf
Civic Use	4 Acres ^[b]
Hotel	300 rooms / 20,000 sf meeting space
Office	25,000 sf
Open Space	25 AC
Community Space (HOA Recreation Facility)	10,000 sf
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).	
^[b] For purposes of analyzing the most environmentally intensive development of a civic use, this use was assumed to include the development of a school use with up to 800 students for those impacts where a school would be the greatest and a library for all other impacts.	
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 3,500, the Project Site would be redeveloped in a manner that is substantially comparable to the Proposed Project in terms of visual character, views, and urban design. While the density of the project would be increased, the urban design and mix of land uses would be substantially the same, including the amount of open space provided and the landscaping features as described under the Proposed Project. Therefore, impacts to urban design and views 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 3,500 would generate new sources of light and glare in the form of street lighting, signage illumination and structural light illumination. Like the Proposed Project, buildings 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. As compared to the existing environment, similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative RU 3,500 would eliminate a substantial amount of light pollution that is currently generated by evening events at the racetrack. Light and glare impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant.

Shade and Shadow

The Proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant impact with respect to shade/shadow. Alternative RU 3,500 would be developed with most structures at or below 75 feet in height. The 300-room hotel structure would be the tallest structure at approximately 150 feet above grade level. As concluded for the Proposed Project, shade and shadow impacts from the development would not significantly impact neighboring land uses. Therefore, Alternative RU 3,500 would be developed at the same scale and massing as the Proposed Project, and this Alternative would also result in less than significant shade and shadow impacts. the Proposed Project.

Air Quality

Construction

Construction-related impacts on air quality under the Proposed Project would be significant and unavoidable. Alternative RU 3,500 would require more construction activity than the Proposed Project due to the additional 505 dwelling units. As such, pollutant emissions during the entire Alternative RU 3,500 construction period would be greater than pollutants emitted during the Proposed Project construction period. Accordingly, under Alternative RU 3,500, daily regional construction emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ would result in a significant and unavoidable air quality impact.

Operational

Alternative RU 3,500 would generate more mobile and area source emissions than the proposed project. Weekday emissions would be approximately 333 pounds per day (ppd) for VOC, 228 ppd for NO_x, 1,515 ppd for CO, two ppd for SO_x, 61 ppd for PM_{2.5}, and 312 ppd for PM₁₀. Weekend emissions would be approximately 372 pounds per day (ppd) for VOC, 306 ppd for NO_x, 2,143 ppd for CO, three ppd for SO_x, 87 ppd for PM_{2.5}, and 445 ppd for PM₁₀. Similar to the proposed project, regional operational emissions would exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀. As such, Alternative RU 3,500 regional operational emissions would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

Mobile source emissions associated with Alternative RU 3,500 would potentially increase localized CO emissions. Project-related one- and eight-hour CO concentrations were 3.2 and 2.2 ppm, respectively. These concentrations are well below the State one- and eight-hour standards of 9.0 and 20 ppm, respectively. Increased traffic associated with Alternative RU 3,500 would not substantially change the CO concentrations estimated for the proposed project, however they would be increased. As such, Alternative RU 3,500 would result in a less than significant localized CO impact.

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative RU 3500 would not be consistent with the land use designation or growth forecasts utilized to calculate the emissions budget in the most recent AQMP. As such, Alternative RU 3,500 would not be compatible with the AQMP and would result in a significant cumulative air quality impact. Alternative RU 3,500 would generate more GHG emissions than estimated for the proposed project. However, Alternative RU 3,500 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 3,500 would result in a less than significant global warming impact.

Overall, Alternative RU 3,500 emissions would be greater than proposed project emissions but would result in similar air quality impact conclusions. In summary, Alternative RU 3,500 significant and unavoidable operational 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 3,500 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 for the Proposed Project would carry over to this Alternative with minor modifications. Therefore, the geology and soils impacts under Alternative RU 3,500 would be less than significant.

Hazardous Materials and Risk of Upset

Construction

Construction impacts on hazardous materials and risk of upset under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. Similar to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would result in the demolition of most of the existing uses and would generate potentially significant impacts associated with potential exposure to ACMs, and LBP during construction. Similar to the Project, 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 3,500 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 3,500, like the Proposed Project, the retail, office, casino, hotel, civic and residential uses would not require or generate substantial hazardous materials. Therefore, this Alternative would have a less than significant-impact-with-mitigation with respect to hazardous materials during operation.

Cultural Resources

Archeological Resources

A cultural resources records search was conducted for the Hollywood Park Redevelopment Project Property by the South Central Coastal Information Center, California Historical Resources Information System in July 2007. Based on a review of all recorded archaeological sites within a ½-mile radius of the Project Site and cultural resource reports on file, database records for all California Points of Historical Interest, California Historical Landmarks, the California Register of Historical Resources, the National Register of Historic Places, and the California Historical Resources Inventory listings, no significant cultural resources are known to be located on the Project Site. Therefore, neither the Project nor Alternative RU 3,500 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. Similar to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would involve the demolition of all existing buildings on the Project Site and the construction of a new mixed-used development. Through a comprehensive historic 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 buildings currently existing on the Project Site are considered significant historic resources pursuant to CEQA. As such, Alternative RU 3,500 would not result in a significant impact to historic resources. Impacts upon historic resources would be less than significant.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Construction

Construction-related impacts on water quality under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. Under the RU 3,500 Alternative water quality impacts would be slightly increased but similar to the Proposed Project. The redevelopment of the site at a higher density would generate more construction activities and vehicles with an increased potential to impair the surface water flows during storm events. Implementation of prescribed best management practices and compliance with the RWQCB regulations would reduce potentially significant water quality impacts to less than significant levels. Water quality impacts under the Alternative RU 3,500 would be less than significant after mitigation..

Operational

Operational impacts to water quality under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. Under Alternative RU 3,500, the amount of pervious surface area would be the same as this alternative would also include 25 acres of open space. Similar to the Proposed Project, both scenarios would include 25 acres of open space which would help the site retain and control storm water flows in a manner that would ensure a less- than- significant impact upon the existing storm water infrastructure. Additionally, implementation of prescribed best management practices and compliance with the RWQCB regulations would reduce potentially significant water quality impacts to less than significant levels. Water quality impacts under the Alternative RU 3,500 would be less than significant after mitigation.

Noise

Construction

Construction-related impacts on noise under the Proposed Project would be significant and unavoidable after mitigation. Construction activity associated with Alternative RU 3,500 would generally result in similar noise levels as discussed for the Proposed Project. Construction-related noise exposure would be expected to be longer in duration due to increased development as compared to 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 also be longer in duration given the larger project size for this Alternative. Construction activity would however comply with the standards established in the Noise Ordinance. Nevertheless, like the Proposed Project, construction noise impacts associated with Alternative RU 3,500 would be considered significant and unavoidable after mitigation.

Operation

Operational impacts on noise under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. Alternative RU 3,500 would result in more daily vehicle trips than the proposed project and, accordingly, would result in higher mobile noise levels. Mobile noise associated with Alternative RU 3,500 may result in noise level increases greater than three decibels within the “normally unacceptable” or “clearly unacceptable” category (see Table IV.G-6), resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact. However, stationary noise sources associated with Alternative RU 3,500 would be similar to those sources identified for the proposed project. As such, stationary noise under Alternative RU 3,500 would result in a less than significant impact.

Overall, noise associated with Alternative RU 3,500 would be similar to noise levels estimated for the Proposed Project, except for mobile noise, which would be increased under Alternative RU 3,500 and would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

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 3,500 would be 18,821 construction-related jobs for the same time frame. 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, since this Alternative would likely result in slightly more construction jobs due to the increased density of development, impacts would be considered less than significant, although slightly more beneficial than the Proposed Project. Indirect impacts upon regional population, housing and employment conditions would be less than significant under this Alternative.

Operational Employment Displacement Impacts

Similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative RU 3,500 would eliminate horse racing at the Hollywood Park Racetrack, while maintaining the casino. Therefore, operational employment displacement impacts for this Alternative would be less than significant like the impacts of the Proposed Project.

Employment Generation Impacts

Indirect Employment Growth

This Alternative includes the same amount of retail and hotel space, but includes a reduction of 50,000 sf of office space and 505 additional residential units. However, employment opportunities typically associated with commercial, residential, hotel and retail uses would not likely result in substantial permanent population growth or associated housing demands. Indirect impacts to population and housing demographics generated by the residential, retail, hotel and commercial uses of this Alternative would be less than significant.

Direct Employment Growth

Under Alternative RU 3,500, the proposed retail, hotel, commercial and residential land uses are estimated to generate approximately 3,026 jobs, including the retention/relocation of approximately 1,071 existing casino-related jobs. When compared to the displacement of the 1,601 FTE jobs that are currently generated by the current horseracing operations on the property, this Alternative would result in a net increase of 408 jobs. As compared to the Proposed Project, which would generate approximately 517 net new jobs, the level of employment generated by this Alternative would be less. Nevertheless, as this Alternative would still generate a net positive amount of jobs, employment impacts would be considered less than significant.

Population/Housing Impacts

Alternative RU 3,500 would involve the construction of 3,500 new dwelling units resulting in the generation of 10,500 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 increase housing and population growth in the City.

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 3,500 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 SGAG's projection for 2015 by 820 dwelling units. Alternative RU 3,500 will add an additional 3,500 dwelling units to the City's housing inventory, resulting in a total of 42,469 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 4,320 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

exceed the housing projections of SCAG, and this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable due to this technical inconsistency with the growth forecasts.

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 3,500 would add approximately 10,500 persons to the City of Inglewood, which would increase the total population to 129,378 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 9,193 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 technically would not be consistent with the projections of SCAG, and would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

Notwithstanding the significant and unavoidable impacts created by Alternative RU 3500 due to the technical inconsistency with the regional population and housing growth forecasts, 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. With respect to addressing the City's housing needs, as discussed within the City's Housing Element, the City's housing inventory is relatively old, which is becoming a growing problem as many housing units are deteriorating and becoming dilapidated in the later stages of their physical life span. Creating 3,500 newly-constructed dwelling units presents an opportunity for the City to continue its efforts to add high-quality, new housing to its housing stock. Moreover, the creation of new dwelling units helps to meet the regional housing needs allocated to Inglewood under the current RHNA. Also, the variety in the types of housing proposed and the mixed-use nature of the development address the City's request for SCAG to focus on high housing costs and the mixed-use development concept to address the issue of jobs/housing imbalance in the City.

With respect to regional housing needs, the jobs-housing ratio for the entire South Bay region is projected to increase. As discussed in Section IV.H. Population, Housing and Employment, the jobs/housing ratio for the entire South Bay is expected to increase from 1.48 in 2000 to 1.59 in 2030. Thus, on a regional

basis, the region can support more housing given the level of jobs in the region. The Final 2007 RHNA indicates that the SBCCOG region needs to provide 13,733 housing units during the January 1, 2006 - June 30, 2014 planning period. The creation of additional housing by this Alternative is consistent with the goals of the broader region to locate housing in close proximity to jobs, although technically inconsistent with the specific growth amounts allocated to Inglewood. Furthermore, the this Alternative, like the Proposed Project, 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

Alternative RU 3,500 would include generally the same mix of land uses as proposed under the Proposed Project. As such, Alternative RU 3,500 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, a General Plan Amendment, amendment of 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. Also, as a mixed-use community like the Proposed Project, Alternative RU 3,500 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 operational solid waste, impacts on public utilities under the Proposed Project would be considered less than significant.

Water

As shown in Table VI.E-2, below, Alternative RU 3,500 would generate a demand for 712,692 gallons per day or approximately 798.32 AF/yr. Comparing the water demand estimated in the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan to the proposed water demands for RU 3,000 Alternative for the Hollywood Park Redevelopment Project yields the amount of water not accounted for in the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan for the Hollywood Park Redevelopment Project. Mathematically, this is shown as $29.53 \text{ AF/yr [H]} + 46.76 \text{ AF/yr [R]} - 359.96 \text{ AF/yr [EHP]} + 798.32 \text{ AF/yr [HPRP]} = 514.65 \text{ AF/yr}$.

**Table VI.E-2
Water Demands under the Proposed Land Use Equivalency Scenario**

Project Land Use	Quantity	Unit	Demand Factor		Total (GPD)
DOMESTIC WATER					
Mixed Use (R-M)	4.45	AC	5,210	GPD/AC ¹	23,185
Residential SFD (R-1)	35	DU	336	GPD/DU ¹	11,760
Residential SFD (R-1.5, R-2, R-2A)	16.35	AC	1,926	GPD/AC ¹	31,490
Residential TH (R-3)	71.36	AC	5,210	GPD/AC ¹	371,786
Residential WRAP/PODUIM (R-4, R-M)	35.07	AC	5,210	GPD/AC ¹	182,715
Subtotal Residential =					620,935
Commercial/Retail	36.36	AC	1,680	GPD/AC ¹	61,085
Hotel	4.95	AC	1,680	GPD/AC ¹	8,316
Casino/OTB	5.64	AC	1,680	GPD/AC ¹	9,475
Civic Use	4	AC	1,680	GPD/AC ¹	6,720
Lake Water Replenishment	4	AC	1,540	GPD/AC ²	6,161
TOTAL DOMESTIC USES =					712,692
RECYCLED WATER					
Parks (Recycled Water)	13	AC	3,445	GPD/AC ³	44,785
Public Streets (Recycled Water)	9.93	AC	3,445	GPD/AC ³	34,195
Private HOA Open Space	20.38	AC	3,445	GPD/AC ³	70,209
TOTAL RECYCLED WATER USES =					149,189
¹ Table I-2, City of Inglewood 25 Year Water Master Plan dated September 2003. ² Geosyntec Water Balance Report. ³ 3.86 acre-feet/year per acre irrigation demand. Based on information from the California Irrigation Management Information System. Source: Hollywood Park Redevelopment Project Water Demands, Letter Report, Stetson Engineers, Inc., July 17, 2008.					

The 514.65 AF/yr is the total projected water demand for the three future developments that were factored into the 2005 UWMP based upon available water usage data and the projected water demand for Alternative RU 3,500. As Only 360.60 AF/yr of water was attributed to the three developments in the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan, a water deficit of 154.05 AF/yr would result from implementation of this Alternative.

Table IV.E-3 shows the water supply and demand comparison for Alternative RU 3,500. The water demand of 154.05 AF/yr (rounded off to 154 AF/yr) was added to the water demand values presented in the 2005 UWMP for the years shown. The results show that there is a deficit of water supply in the later years (2025 and/or 2030) for the normal water years and the multiple dry water year's scenarios resulting from the increased water demand associated with the implementation of this Alternative. The deficits under Alternative RU 3,500 are slightly higher than those shown for the Proposed Project. This is to be expected because the water demand for Alternative RU 3,500 is higher than under the Proposed Project.

**Table VI.E-3
Water Supply and Demand Comparison for Alternative RU 3,500**

Normal Water Supply Year	Year				
	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
Projected Supplies ¹	14,553	14,553	14,553	14,553	14,553
Projected Demand ^{2,3}	13,783	14,083	14,383	14,683	14,983
Difference	770	470	170	(130)	(430)
Single Dry Water Year					
Projected Supplies ⁴	13,527	13,527	13,527	13,527	13,527
Projected Demand ^{5,3}	12,380	12,690	12,960	13,229	13,500
Difference	1,147	837	567	298	27
Multiple Dry Water Years					
Projected Supplies ⁶	14,553	14,553	14,553	14,553	
Projected Demand ^{7,3}	13,783	14,083	14,383	14,682	
Difference	770	470	170	(129)	
¹ From Table 13 in the City of Inglewood 2005 UWMP. ² From Table 13 in the City of Inglewood 2005 UWMP and increased by the additional domestic water demand for the Hollywood Park Redevelopment Project (154 AF) ³ Demand does not include additional demand for recycled water because it is presumed that the increase in demand for recycled water can be met without concern due to supply availability from WBMWD; adding the recycled water demand would skew the domestic analysis unfairly ⁴ From Table 16 in the City of Inglewood 2005 UWMP. ⁵ From Table 16 in the City of Inglewood 2005 UWMP and increased by the additional domestic water demand for the Hollywood Park Redevelopment Project (154 AF) ⁶ From Tables 19, 22, 25 & 28 in the City of Inglewood 2005 UWMP. ⁷ From Tables 19, 22, 25 & 28 in the City of Inglewood 2005 UWMP and increased by the additional domestic water demand for the Hollywood Park Redevelopment Project (154 AF) Source: Hollywood Park Redevelopment Project Water Demands, Letter Report, Stetson Engineers, Inc., July 17, 2008.					

Should the Alternative RU 3,500 be phased in over time, water demand impacts would be phased in as well. But ultimately, the full effect of the water demand impacts will be realized upon complete implementation of the project. At a minimum, the Hollywood Park Redevelopment Project would be responsible for providing the 154.05 AF/yr to meet its water demand resulting from Alternative RU 3,500. Ordinance No. 170,978 would still apply to Alternative RU 3,500, resulting in increased water conservation measures. Mitigation measures that are proposed for the Project are also required for Alternative RU 3,500 to secure a long term water supply, and the Alternative would impose conservation measures similar to those that would be imposed during dry or multiple dry years. As discussed in the Water Supply Assessment (Appendix F-6), the water supply deficit generated by Alternative RU 3,500 can be addressed through the acquisition of water rights, without impacts to the aquifer. Consequently, water supply impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Wastewater

As shown in Table VI.E-4 below, Alternative RU 3,500 would generate a net increase of approximately 489,000 gpd of wastewater over existing conditions. In comparison to the Proposed Project, which is anticipated to generate 393,000 net gpd of wastewater, this Alternative would represent a 106,000 gpd

increase in wastewater generation. It is anticipated that the existing wastewater infrastructure would be sufficient to handle the increased wastewater generated under this Alternative. While the demand for sewer and wastewater services would be increased under this Alternative, impacts would remain less than significant.

**Table VI.E-4
Estimated Wastewater Generation by Alternative RU 3,500**

Land Use	Unit/Quantity	Generation Rate (gpd/unit) ^a	Total (gallons/day)
Existing			
Existing Uses^b	--	--	524,000
Subtotal Existing:			
Alternative RU 3,500			
Residential	3,500 du	200gal/unit/day	700,000
Retail	620,000 sf	0.325 gal/sf/day	201,500
Casino	120,000 sf	0.35 gal/sf/day	42,000
Civic Use	4 Acres ^c	20 gal/student/day	16,000
Hotel (rooms)	300 rooms	125 gal/room/day	37,500
Hotel (meeting space)	20,000 sf	0.3 gal/sf/day	6,000
Office	25,000 sf	0.2 gal/sf/day	5,000
Open Space	25 AC	--	--
Community Space (HOA Recreation Facility)	10,000 sf	0.5 gal/sf/day	5,000
Subtotal Proposed			1,013,000
Total Net Water Demand			489,000
<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. 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 For purposes of analyzing the most environmentally intensive development of a civic use for this impact, this use was assumed to include the development of a school use with up to 800 students.			
Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.			

Energy

Electricity

As shown in Table VI-E-5, below, Alternative RU 3,500 would consume a net increase of 9,030,726 kilowatt hours per year (KW-Hr/yr) of electricity. In comparison, the Proposed Project would result in a net increased demand of approximately 6,836,844 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 increased loads of Alternative RU 3,500. Therefore, the energy demands for this Alternative would be less than significant.

**Table VI.E-5
Estimated Electricity Demands – Alternative RU 3,500**

Land Use	Size (SF)	Demand (Kilowatt hours/unit/year) ^a	Total (kilowatt hours/year)
Existing Uses ^b	--		26,010,004
Alternative RU 3,500			
Residential	3,500 units	5,626.50 KW-Hr/unit	19,692,750
HOA Facility	10,000 sf	10.5 KW-Hr/sf/yr	105,000
Retail	620,000 sf	13.55 KW-Hr/sf/yr	8,401,000
Casino/OTB	120,000 sf	19.23 KW-Hr/sf/yr ^c	2,307,930
Civic Use ^d	4 AC ^e	10.5 KW-Hr/sf/yr	772,800
Hotel			
300 Rooms ^f	210,000 sf	9.95 KW-Hr/sf/yr	2,089,500
Meeting Space	20,000 sf	12.95 KW-Hr/sf/yr	259,000
Office	25,000 sf	12.95 KW-Hr/sf/yr	323,750
Open Space	25 AC	1 KW-Hr/sf/yr	1,089,000
Subtotal Alternative	-	-	35,040,730
Total Net Electricity Demand			9,030,726
<p><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 The electricity generation rate was based on existing electricity demands for the casino as provided by the Hollywood Park Land Company. ^d The proposed Civic Use could consist of a school, library, community center or other civic use. For purposes of this impact analysis, generation rates for public utilities are based on a school use because it would be the most intensive civic use for this impact. ^e Based on California Department of Education, 2000, Guide to School Site Analysis and Development. A 4-acre school site could be developed with a 73,600 sf school with 800 students (92 sf/pupil). ^f Hotel use based on 700 square feet per room. Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.</p>			

Natural Gas

Under Alternative RU 3,500, an increase in approximately 3,500 new dwelling units would further increase demands for natural gas resources. Similar to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would draw an increased number of employees, residents and visitors to the Project Site. As shown in Table VI.E-6, below, Alternative RU 3,500 would generate a demand for a net increase in 23,175,800 cubic feet of natural gas per month. In comparison to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would result in an increased consumption of approximately 3,265,825 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, while demands for natural gas would be increased as compared to the Proposed Project, impacts to natural gas infrastructure and supplies would be less than significant.

**Table VI.E-6
Estimated Natural Gas Consumption – Alternative RU 3,500**

Land Use	Unit/Quantity	Consumption Rate ^a	Total (cf/month)
Existing Uses ^b	--	--	3,894,900
Alternative RU 3,500			
Residential	3,500 units	6,665 cf/du/month	23,327,500
HOA Facility	10,000 sf	2 cf/sf/month	20,000
Office/Commercial	25,000 sf	2 cf/sf/month	50,000
Retail	620,000 sf	3 cf/sf/month	1,860,000
Casino/OTB	120,000 sf	4.80cf/sf/month	576,000
Hotel			
Rooms-300 Rooms ^c	210,000 sf	5 cf/sf/month	1,050,000
Meeting Space	20,000 sf	2 cf/sf/month	40,000
Civic Use ^d	4 AC ^e	2 cf/sf/month	147,200
Open Space	25 AC	--	--
Subtotal			27,070,700
Net Total			23,175,800
^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 Hotel use based on 700 square feet per room.			
^d The proposed Civic Use could consist of a school, library, community center or other civic use. For purposes of this impact analysis, generation rates for public utilities are based on a school use because it would be the most intensive civic use for this impact..			
^e Based on California Department of Education, 2000, Guide to School Site Analysis and Development. A 4-acre school site could be developed with a 73,600 sf school with 800 students (92 sf/pupil). Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.			

Solid Waste

Demolition activities under Alternative RU 3,500 would involve the same amount of demolition debris as the Proposed Project (i.e., 67,735 tons), since the same buildings would be removed from the site under either scenario and this Alternative would also involve the remodeling and reconfiguration of the casino as described for the Proposed Project. However, as this Alternative would result in an increase of floor area as compared to the Proposed Project, the amount of building construction waste generated under Alternative RU 3,500 would be more than the construction waste generated under the Proposed Project. As shown in Table VI.E-7, below, Alternative RU 3,500 would generate approximately 14,422 tons of construction debris, for a total of 82,157 tons of construction and demolition debris. As compared to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would result in an increased generation of solid waste by approximately

1,562 tons. While demands for solid waste disposal needs would be increased as compared to the Proposed Project, increased impacts to regional landfill capacity would be negligible as adequate landfill capacity is anticipated during the construction timeline for the proposed Alternative. Accordingly, Alternative RU 3,500 would have less than significant impacts on construction-related solid waste.

**Table VI.E-7
Construction Solid Waste Generation – Alternative RU 3,500**

Construction Activity	Size (sf)	Rate (lbs./sf)	Generated Waste (tons)
<i>Demolition-Existing</i>		<i>Subtotal</i>	67,735
Construction-Alternative RU 3,500			
Residential ^a	3,500 units	4.38	11,498
HOA Facility	10,000 sf	3.89	19
Office/Commercial	25,000 sf	3.89	49
Retail	620,000 sf	3.89	1,206
Casino/OTB	120,000 sf	17.67	1,060
Hotel			
Rooms	300 rooms ^b	3.89	408
Meeting Space	20,000 sf	3.89	39
Civic Use ^c	4 AC ^d	3.89	143
Open Space	25 acres	N/A	-
		Subtotal	14,422
		Total	82,157
^a Assumes an average of 1,500 sf per dwelling unit. ^b Based on an average of 700 sf per hotel room. ^c The proposed Civic Use could consist of a school, library, community center or other civic use. For purposes of this EIR, generation rates for public utilities are based on a school use because it would be the most intensive civic use. ^d Based on California Department of Education, 2000, Guide to School Site Analysis and Development. A 4-acre school site could be developed with a 73,600 sf school with 800 students (92 sf/pupil). Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.			

As shown in Table VI.E-8, below, net operational solid waste generation for Alternative RU 3,500 would be approximately 13,976 tons of solid waste per day. As compared to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would result in an increased generation of solid waste by approximately 1,720 pounds per day. 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.

Table IV.E-8
Estimated Operational Solid Waste Generation by Alternative RU 3,500

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 3,500			
Residential	3,500 units	4.00 lbs/unit/day	14,000
HOA Facility	10,000 sf	0.006 lbs/sf/day	60
Office/Commercial	25,000 sf	0.006 lbs/sf/day	150
Retail	620,000 sf	0.005 lbs/sf/day	3,100
Casino/OTB	120,000 sf	0.005 lbs/sf/day	600
Hotel			
Rooms	300 rooms	2.0 lbs/room/day	600
Meeting Space	20,000 sf	0.006 lbs/sf/day	120
Civic Use ^c	4 AC	0.007 lbs/sf/day	515
Open Space	25 AC	--	--
		<i>Subtotal</i>	19,145
		Net Total	13,976
^a Generation Rates based on City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation Solid Waste Generation, 1981. Uses not listed are estimated by the closest type of use available in the table. ^b Does not include the Pavilion area which has been abandoned and is not in use. ^c Based on California Department of Education, 2000, Guide to School Site Analysis and Development. A 4-acre school site could be developed with a 73,600 sf school with 800 students (92 sf/pupil). 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 services is based on the number and types of land uses and anticipated on-site population. Since this Alternative would result in the development of more residences as compared to the Proposed Project, it would place an increased demand on the IPD 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 approximately 19 additional police officers, or roughly 3 more police officers than the Proposed Project. Similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative RU 3,500 would generate tax revenue that the City could use to hire new officers. Additionally, this Alternative would incorporate mitigation measures to reduce the potential for

increasing demands upon police services in the area, such as strategically positioned lighting, building security systems, and implementation of an on-site security plan. This Alternative would also include a police substation on the Project Site to be operated and staffed by the Inglewood Police Department. Therefore, the impact on police protection services under Alternative RU 3,500 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 in the intensity of development as compared to the Proposed Project, it would place an increased demand on the LACoFD for fire protection services. As discussed in Section IV.K.2, Fire Protection, fire flow requirements would be determined by the LACoFD. Overall, the impact on fire protection services under this Alternative would be less than significant.

Schools

As shown in Table VI.E-9, Estimated Student Generation by Alternative RU 3,500, this Alternative is anticipated to yield approximately 625 K-12 students, including 303 elementary school students, 148 middle school students, and 174 high school students. Based on the existing school district boundary and school attendance areas, the 303 elementary school students generated from this Alternative would be required to attend Lane (Warren) K-8 School. Additionally, the projected students will be able to attend Kelso and Woodworth Elementary schools on a needed basis. These three schools are currently operating under capacity and can accommodate the projected students. If the schools were to be expanded, including but not limited to the purchase and installation of additional temporary classrooms and/or the construction of new facilities, they could be financed by State and local bond funds, as well as developer fees.¹

Monroe Middle School would serve the projected 148 middle school students, and Morningside High would serve the projected 174 high school students. While these schools are operating under capacity, it is anticipated that both schools could serve the incremental increase of middle and high school students. Expansion of the existing schools, including but not limited to the purchase and installation of additional temporary classrooms and/or the construction of new facilities, can be financed by State and local bond funds, as well as developer fees. As discussed in Section IV.K-3, Public Services - Schools, the Applicant and IUSD are discussing the possibility of a facility and financing program and mitigation agreement that would be mutually agreeable for all affected parties.² Impacts associated with the increase in student enrollment at nearby schools resulting from the Proposed Project are being jointly evaluated. The Applicant will work with IUSD to ensure that any new school that could be developed would be built

¹ Government Code Section 65995(h). Web accessed on 5/19/2008, Jeanette C. Justus Associates.

² Government Code Section 65995.7(c). Web accessed on 5/19/2008, Jeanette C. Justus Associates.

in accordance to local and state standards and requirements and are available for all Project students. If no mitigation agreement is completed, the Applicant would be required to pay the adopted Developer Fees, which would fully and completely mitigate all school impacts.³ Therefore, impacts to school facilities under Alternative RU 3,500 would be less than significant.

**Table VI.E-9
Estimated Student Generation by Alternative RU 3,500**

Product Type	Student Projections			
	K-5	6-8	9-12	K-12
Single Family Detached	132	63	72	267
Single Family Attached	102	56	77	253
Multi-Family	51	29	26	105
TOTAL	303	148	174	625
Classrooms^a	12	6	7	23

^a Classroom size is based on state standards of 25 students per elementary classroom and 27 students per middle and high school classrooms.

Recreation and Parks

Under the Proposed Project, the Project Applicant is proposing to provide 25-acres of open space that would be available for community use. This Alternative would also include 25-acres of open space, however this Alternative would include an additional 505 dwelling units that would place an increased demand on recreation and parks as compared to the Proposed Project. Based on a standard goal of one acre per 1,000 persons, this Alternative would generate a need for approximately 10.5 acres of open space. The Alternative would provide approximately 2.4 acres per 1,000 residents, and thus provides an amount of parks and open space in excess of the General Plan goal. Therefore, Alternative RU 3,500 would result in less than significant impacts on recreation and parks.

Libraries

Alternative RU 3,500 would generate approximately 10,500 new residents to the City of Inglewood, generating an increased demand for library services. Based on written correspondence from the IPL, the City's libraries are currently meeting the needs of the City, within the limits of existing funding levels. Alternative 3,500 would generate tax revenue that the City could use to expand library services if necessary. Additionally, this Alternative, like the Proposed Project, includes a 4-acre civic site which could be used as a joint us school, including a library that can be utilized by all city residents. Therefore, Alternative RU 3,500 would result in a less-than-significant impact to the Inglewood Library system and this impact would be slightly increased as compared to the Proposed Project.

³ Government Code Section 65995(h). Web accessed on 5/19/2008, Jeanette C. Justus Associates.

Traffic and Transportation

Impacts on traffic and transportation under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. The site access scheme under the Alternative RU 3,500 would be consistent with the Proposed Project.

Alternative RU 3500 Weekday Trip Generation Summary

The weekday trip generation forecast for Alternative RU 3,500 is summarized in Table VI.E-10. As presented in Table VI.E-10, Alternative RU 3,500 is expected to generate an additional 1,690 vehicle trips (539 more inbound trips and 1,151 more outbound trips) during the weekday AM peak hour. During the weekday PM peak hour, Alternative RU 3,500 is expected to generate an additional 141 vehicle trips (1,444 more inbound trips and 1,303 fewer outbound trips). Over a 24-hour period, Alternative RU 3,500 project is forecast to generate an additional 19,348 daily trip ends during a typical weekday (9,674 inbound trips and 9,674 outbound trips).

Table VI.E-10
Alternative RU 3,500 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
Shopping Center ^c	620,000 GLSF	15,406	193	124	317	679	735	1,414
Casino/OTB ^d	120,000 SF	4,926	201	140	341	371	614	985
Residential	3,500 DU	14,952	184	900	1,084	888	437	1,325
Civic Use ^e	800 Students/30,000 SF	810	69	57	126	51	55	106
Hotel	300 rms/ 20,000sf mtg. space	2,820	123	86	209	102	117	219
Office	25,000	370	41	5	46	13	66	79
Subtotal		39,284	811	1,312	2,123	2,104	2,204	4,128
Existing Uses to be Removed	10,000 Attend.	(19,936)	(272)	(161)	(433)	(660)	(3,327)	(3,987)
Net Total Trip Generation		19,348	539	1,151	1,690	1,444	(1,303)	141

Notes:

^a Source: ITE "trip Generation" 7th Edition, 2003.

^b Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.

^c ITE Land Use Code 820 (shopping Center) trip generation equation rates were applied to the combined 620,000 SF commercial (retail and restaurants).

^d Based on weekday traffic count data collected on Thursday, September 28, 2006, at the various Hollywood Park driveways. No live horse racing event was held. Daily trips were calculated based on the assumption that number of PM peak hour trips represents 20% of the daily traffic volumes.

^e For purposes of analyzing Weekday traffic impacts, it was assumed during the weekday AM peak hour that the civic sue could be developed as an elementary school with 800 students since that civic use would generate the most traffic during the AM peak hour. It was assumed that during the daily PM peak hour that the civic use could be developed as a 30,000 sf library since a library generates more PM peak hour traffic impacts than an elementary school.

Source: Linscott Law and Greenspan Engineers, August 1, 2008. (See Appendix G-1 for internal trip reduction assumptions).

Alternative RU 3,500 Weekend Trip Generation Summary

The Saturday trip generation forecast for Alternative RU 3,500 is summarized in Table VI.E-11. As presented in Table VI.E-11, Alternative RU 3,500 is expected to generate an additional 1,569 vehicle trips (209 more inbound trips and 1,360 more outbound trips) during the weekend mid-day peak hour. Over a 24-hour period, the Alternative RU 3,500 project is forecast to generate an additional 27,790 daily trip ends during a typical weekend day (approximately 13,895 inbound trips and 13,895 outbound trips).

Table VI.E-11
Alternative RU 3,500 Weekend Trip Generation^a

Land Use	Size	Daily Trip Ends Volumes ^b	Midday Peak Hour Volumes ^b		
			In	Out	Total
Shopping Center ^c	620,000 GLSF	19,424	971	895	1,866
Casino/OTB ^d	120,000 SF	5,136	592	435	1,027
Residential	3,500 DU	13,462	597	509	1,106
Civic Use ^e	30,000 SF	698	54	47	101
Hotel	300 rms/ 20,000sf mtg. space	2,998	143	115	258
Office	25,000	58	4	4	8
Subtotal		41,776	2,361	2,005	4,366
Existing Uses to be Removed	10,000 Attend.	(13,986)	(2,152)	(645)	(2,797)
Net Total Trip Generation		27,790	209	1,360	1,569

Notes:
^a Source: ITE "trip Generation" 7th Edition, 2003.
^b Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.
^c ITE Land Use Code 820 (shopping Center) trip generation equation rates were applied to the combined 620,000 SF commercial (retail and restaurants).
^d Based on weekday traffic count data collected on Thursday, September 28, 2006, at the various Hollywood Park driveways. No live horse racing event was held. Daily trips were calculated based on the assumption that number of PM peak hour trips represents 20% of the daily traffic volumes.
^e To analyze weekend traffic impacts, it was assumed that the civic site would be developed as a library since a library generates more weekend traffic than an elementary school.
Source: Linscott Law and Greenspan Engineers, August 1, 2008. (See Appendix G-1 for internal trip reduction assumptions).

Traffic Impact Comparison

Alternative RU 3,500 Project Impact Analysis

In order to determine the operating conditions of the street system in the year 2014 with the Alternative RU 3,500 project, traffic associated with the Alternative RU 3,500 project was assigned to the local roadway system based on the trip distribution and assignment characteristics consistent with the Proposed Project.

As shown in Table VI.E-12, application of the City of Inglewood's threshold criteria to the "With Alternative RU 3,500 Project" scenario indicates that the Alternative RU 3,500 project is expected to create a significant impact at six of the study intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, PM peak hour, and/or Saturday mid-day peak hour. Incremental but not significant impacts are noted at the remaining 60 study intersections due to the Alternative RU 3,500 project.

The six study intersections forecast to be significantly impacted by the Alternative RU 3,500 project are intersections forecast to be significantly impacted by the Proposed Project. The traffic mitigation measures recommended for the Proposed Project are anticipated to reduce the traffic impacts associated with the Alternative RU 3,500 project to less than significant levels at five of the six impacted study intersections. Additional mitigation measures beyond those identified for the Proposed Project will be necessary in order to mitigate the impact due to the Alternative RU 3,500 project to less than significant levels at the intersection of Crenshaw Boulevard and Century Boulevard. The following additional mitigation measures are proposed:

- Int. No. 47: Crenshaw Boulevard/Century Boulevard

In addition to the mitigation measures recommended for the proposed project, widen and restripe Crenshaw Boulevard north of Century Boulevard to provide a southbound right-turn only lane. The resultant southbound approach lane configuration would provide one left-turn lane, three through lanes, and one right-turn only lane. It should be noted that the existing sidewalk widths on Crenshaw Boulevard north of Century Boulevard may need to be reduced to accommodate this measure. In addition, modify the existing traffic signal to provide a southbound right-turn overlapping phase to be operated concurrently during the eastbound left-turn phase. As shown in Appendix G-1 to the Draft EIR (see Table E-3), the proposed mitigation measures are expected to mitigate the forecast alternative project impact at this intersection to less than significant levels.

Alternative RU 3,500 Cumulative Impact Analysis

The v/c ratio at the 66 study intersections are incrementally increased by the addition of traffic generated by other related projects. As summarized in Table VI.E-12, application of the City's threshold criteria to the "Future Cumulative Conditions" scenario indicates that the cumulative development of the Alternative RU 3,500 project and the related projects are expected to create cumulative impacts at 27 study intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, PM peak hour, and/or Saturday mid-day peak hour. Incremental, but not significant, cumulative impacts are noted at the remaining 39 study intersections.

Of the 27 study intersections forecast to be cumulatively impacted by the Alternative RU 3,500 project and the related projects, 26 are forecast to be cumulatively impacted by the proposed project and the related projects. It should be noted that the intersection of La Brea Avenue and Arbor Vitae Street, which is not forecast to be cumulatively impacted by the Proposed Project and the related projects, is forecast to be cumulatively impacted by Alternative RU 3,500 and the related projects. The cumulative

**Table VI.E-12
Alternative RU 3,500 Project Summary of Volume to Capacity Ratios and Levels of Service -
AM and PM Weekday Peak Hours and Saturday Mid-Day Peak Hour**

#	PEAK HOUR	YEAR 2006 EXISTING		YEAR 2014 W/ AMBIENT GROWTH		YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 PROJECT		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ RELATED PROJECTS		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ REGIONAL MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS		V/C	LOS		V/C	LOS		V/C	LOS		
1	Sepulveda Boulevard/ Slauson Avenue ^a	AM	0.704	C	0.739	C	0.752	C	0.013	0.752	C	0.013	0.945	E	0.206	0.889	D	0.150
	PM	0.721	C	0.757	C	0.763	C	0.006	0.763	C	0.006	1.056	F	0.299	0.981	E	0.224	
	SAT	0.710	C	0.746	C	0.758	C	0.012	0.758	C	0.012	0.903	E	0.157	0.834	D	0.088	
2	Sepulveda Boulevard/ Centinela Avenue ^b	AM	0.762	C	0.800	C	0.814	D	0.014	0.814	D	0.014	1.156	F	0.356	0.952	E	0.152
	PM	0.839	D	0.881	D	0.887	D	0.006	0.887	D	0.006	1.178	F	0.297	0.985	E	0.104	
	SAT	0.665	B	0.698	B	0.711	C	0.013	0.711	C	0.013	1.095	F	0.397	0.889	D	0.191	
3	La Cienega Boulevard (SB)/Slauson Avenue ^c	AM	0.704	C	0.736	C	0.745	C	0.009	0.745	C	0.009	0.892	D	0.156	0.792	C	0.056
	PM	0.850	D	0.889	D	0.900	D	0.011	0.900	D	0.011	1.080	F	0.191	0.980	E	0.091	
	SAT	0.711	C	0.743	C	0.751	C	0.008	0.751	C	0.008	0.866	D	0.123	0.766	C	0.023	
4	La Cienega Boulevard (NB)/Slauson Avenue ^c	AM	0.730	C	0.762	C	0.772	C	0.010	0.772	C	0.010	0.923	E	0.161	0.923	E	0.161
	PM	0.613	B	0.640	B	0.647	B	0.007	0.647	B	0.007	0.781	C	0.141	0.781	C	0.141	
	SAT	0.583	A	0.608	B	0.615	B	0.007	0.615	B	0.007	0.714	C	0.106	0.714	C	0.106	
5	La Tijera Boulevard/ Centinela Avenue ^b	AM	0.853	D	0.896	D	0.909	E	0.013	0.909	E	0.013	1.032	F	0.136	0.847	D	-0.049
	PM	0.823	D	0.864	D	0.822	D	-0.042	0.822	D	-0.042	0.937	E	0.073	0.850	D	-0.014	
	SAT	0.769	C	0.807	D	0.818	D	0.011	0.818	D	0.011	0.900	D	0.093	0.742	C	-0.065	
6	La Cienega Boulevard/ La Tijera Boulevard ^b	AM	0.739	C	0.776	C	0.779	C	0.003	0.779	C	0.003	0.798	C	0.022	0.798	C	0.022
	PM	0.864	D	0.907	E	0.916	E	0.009	0.916	E	0.009	0.954	E	0.047	0.954	E	0.047	
	SAT	0.668	B	0.701	C	0.708	C	0.007	0.708	C	0.007	0.731	C	0.030	0.731	C	0.030	
7	La Cienega Boulevard/ Centinela Avenue ^b	AM	0.959	E	1.008	F	1.021	F	0.013	1.021	F	0.013	1.136	F	0.128	1.009	F	0.001
	PM	0.918	E	0.965	E	0.994	E	0.029	0.994	E	0.029	1.121	F	0.156	1.000	E	0.035	
	SAT	0.828	D	0.869	D	0.878	D	0.009	0.878	D	0.009	0.992	E	0.123	0.874	D	0.005	
8	La Cienega Boulevard/ Manchester Boulevard ^d	AM	1.005	F	1.052	F	1.051	F	-0.001	1.051	F	-0.001	1.141	F	0.089	1.141	F	0.089
	PM	0.815	D	0.852	D	0.851	D	-0.001	0.851	D	-0.001	1.023	F	0.171	1.023	F	0.171	
	SAT	0.726	C	0.759	C	0.741	C	-0.018	0.741	C	-0.018	0.911	E	0.152	0.911	E	0.152	

Table VI.E-12 (Continued)
Alternative RU 3,500 Project Summary of Volume to Capacity Ratios and Levels of Service -
AM and PM Weekday Peak Hours and Saturday Mid-Day Peak Hour

#	PEAK HOUR	YEAR 2006 EXISTING		YEAR 2014 W/ AMBIENT GROWTH		YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 PROJECT		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ RELATED PROJECTS		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ REGIONAL MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS		V/C	LOS		V/C	LOS		V/C	LOS		
9	I-405 Freeway NB Ramps/Manchester Boulevard ^d	AM	0.884	D	0.925	E	0.926	E	0.001	0.926	E	0.001	0.985	E	0.060	0.985	E	0.060
	PM	0.681	B	0.711	C	0.704	C	-0.007	0.704	C	-0.007	0.866	D	0.155	0.866	D	0.155	
	SAT	0.569	A	0.593	A	0.593	A	0.000	0.593	A	0.000	0.725	C	0.132	0.725	C	0.132	
10	La Cienega Boulevard/Arbor Vitae Street ^d	AM	0.800	C	0.836	D	0.837	D	0.001	0.837	D	0.001	0.870	D	0.034	0.770	C	-0.066
	PM	0.961	E	1.006	F	1.014	F	0.008	1.014	F	0.008	1.104	F	0.098	1.004	F	-0.002	
	SAT	0.509	A	0.531	A	0.508	A	-0.023	0.508	A	-0.023	0.611	B	0.080	0.511	A	-0.020	
11	La Cienega Boulevard/I-405 Freeway SB Ramps (n/o Century Boulevard) ^b	AM	0.837	D	0.879	D	0.900	D	0.021	0.900	D	0.021	0.960	E	0.081	0.960	E	0.081
	PM	0.610	B	0.640	B	0.689	B	0.049	0.689	B	0.049	0.765	C	0.125	0.765	C	0.125	
	SAT	0.465	A	0.488	A	0.510	A	0.022	0.510	A	0.022	0.594	A	0.106	0.594	A	0.106	
12	La Cienega Boulevard/Century Boulevard ^b	AM	0.733	C	0.770	C	0.824	D	0.054	0.824	D	0.054	0.889	D	0.119	0.818	D	0.048
	PM	0.690	B	0.724	C	0.783	C	0.059	0.783	C	0.059	1.034	F	0.310	0.979	E	0.255	
	SAT	0.530	A	0.556	A	0.658	B	0.102	0.658	B	0.102	0.991	E	0.435	0.943	E	0.387	
13	La Cienega Boulevard/I-405 Freeway SB Ramps (s/o Century Boulevard) ^b	AM	0.455	A	0.477	A	0.509	A	0.032	0.509	A	0.032	0.560	A	0.083	0.560	A	0.083
	PM	0.577	A	0.605	B	0.578	A	-0.027	0.578	A	-0.027	0.661	B	0.056	0.661	B	0.056	
	SAT	0.385	A	0.404	A	0.442	A	0.038	0.442	A	0.038	0.529	A	0.125	0.529	A	0.125	
14	I-405 Freeway NB Ramps/Century Boulevard ^d	AM	0.814	D	0.851	D	0.909	E	0.058	0.909	E	0.058	0.961	E	0.110	0.861	D	0.010
	PM	0.661	B	0.690	B	0.779	C	0.089	0.779	C	0.089	0.957	E	0.267	0.857	D	0.167	
	SAT	0.446	A	0.464	A	0.517	A	0.053	0.517	A	0.053	0.799	C	0.335	0.699	B	0.235	
15	Inglewood Avenue/Arbor Vitae Street ^d	AM	0.930	E	0.973	E	0.982	E	0.009	0.982	E	0.009	1.073	F	0.100	0.924	E	-0.049
	PM	0.913	E	0.955	E	0.996	E	0.041	0.996	E	0.041	1.134	F	0.179	0.911	E	-0.044	
	SAT	0.688	B	0.718	C	0.705	C	-0.013	0.705	C	-0.013	0.824	D	0.106	0.824	D	0.106	
16	Inglewood Avenue/Century Boulevard ^d	AM	0.744	C	0.777	C	0.837	D	0.060	0.837	D	0.060	0.898	D	0.121	0.798	C	0.021
	PM	0.780	C	0.816	D	0.885	D	0.069	0.885	D	0.069	1.046	F	0.230	0.946	E	0.130	
	SAT	0.590	A	0.615	B	0.680	B	0.065	0.680	B	0.065	0.862	D	0.247	0.762	C	0.147	

Table VI.E-12 (Continued)
Alternative RU 3,500 Project Summary of Volume to Capacity Ratios and Levels of Service -
AM and PM Weekday Peak Hours and Saturday Mid-Day Peak Hour

#	PEAK HOUR	YEAR 2006 EXISTING		YEAR 2014 W/ AMBIENT GROWTH		YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 PROJECT		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ RELATED PROJECTS		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ REGIONAL MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS			
17	La Brea Avenue/ Slauson Avenue ^c	AM	0.768	C	0.803	D	0.834	D	0.031	0.834	D	0.031	1.002	F	0.199	0.861	D	0.058
	PM	0.895	D	0.937	E	0.974	E	0.037	0.974	E	0.037	1.174	F	0.237	0.977	E	0.040	
	SAT	0.800	C	0.837	D	0.858	D	0.021	0.858	D	0.021	1.072	F	0.235	0.901	E	0.064	
18	La Brea Avenue/ Centinela Avenue ^d	AM	0.925	E	0.968	E	1.008	F	0.040	0.908	E	-0.060	1.048	F	0.080	1.048	F	0.080
	PM	0.829	D	0.867	D	0.871	D	0.004	0.771	C	-0.096	0.989	E	0.122	0.989	E	0.122	
	SAT	0.886	D	0.927	E	0.976	E	0.049	0.876	D	-0.051	1.091	F	0.164	1.091	F	0.164	
19	La Brea Avenue/ Florence Avenue ^d	AM	1.153	F	1.208	F	1.241	F	0.033	1.141	F	-0.067	1.220	F	0.012	1.220	F	0.012
	PM	1.109	F	1.162	F	1.197	F	0.035	1.097	F	-0.065	1.253	F	0.091	1.253	F	0.091	
	SAT	0.716	C	0.748	C	0.771	C	0.023	0.671	B	-0.077	0.842	D	0.094	0.842	D	0.094	
20	La Brea Avenue/ Manchester Boulevard ^d	AM	0.916	E	0.959	E	0.983	E	0.024	0.983	E	0.024	1.116	F	0.157	0.917	E	-0.042
	PM	0.754	C	0.788	C	0.780	C	-0.008	0.780	C	-0.008	1.046	F	0.258	0.905	E	0.117	
	SAT	0.848	D	0.887	D	0.930	E	0.043	0.930	E	0.043	1.230	F	0.343	0.973	E	0.086	
21	La Brea Avenue/ Arbor Vitae Street ^d	AM	0.643	B	0.671	B	0.686	B	0.015	0.686	B	0.015	0.751	C	0.080	0.651	B	-0.020
	PM	0.787	C	0.822	D	0.859	D	0.037	0.859	D	0.037	1.003	F	0.181	0.903	E	0.081	
	SAT	0.637	B	0.665	B	0.640	B	-0.025	0.640	B	-0.025	0.810	D	0.145	0.710	C	0.045	
22	La Brea Avenue/ Century Boulevard ^d	AM	0.783	C	0.819	D	0.875	D	0.056	0.775	C	-0.044	0.867	D	0.048	0.867	D	0.048
	PM	0.893	D	0.934	E	1.005	F	0.071	0.905	E	-0.029	1.105	F	0.171	1.105	F	0.171	
	SAT	0.738	C	0.771	C	0.828	D	0.057	0.728	C	-0.043	1.011	F	0.240	1.011	F	0.240	
23	Hawthorne Boulevard/ Imperial Highway ^e	AM	0.799	C	0.835	D	0.841	D	0.006	0.841	D	0.006	0.940	E	0.105	0.756	C	-0.079
	PM	0.910	E	0.952	E	0.964	E	0.012	0.964	E	0.012	1.385	F	0.433	0.987	E	0.035	
	SAT	0.599	A	0.625	B	0.642	B	0.017	0.642	B	0.017	0.950	E	0.325	0.653	B	0.028	
24	Centinela Avenue/ Florence Avenue ^d	AM	0.950	E	0.994	E	1.003	F	0.009	1.003	F	0.009	1.071	F	0.077	0.916	E	-0.078
	PM	0.942	E	0.985	E	1.001	F	0.016	1.001	F	0.016	1.145	F	0.160	0.921	E	-0.064	
	SAT	0.694	B	0.725	C	0.745	C	0.020	0.745	C	0.020	0.853	D	0.128	0.704	C	-0.021	

Table VI.E-12 (Continued)
Alternative RU 3,500 Project Summary of Volume to Capacity Ratios and Levels of Service -
AM and PM Weekday Peak Hours and Saturday Mid-Day Peak Hour

#	PEAK HOUR	YEAR 2006 EXISTING		YEAR 2014 W/ AMBIENT GROWTH		YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 PROJECT		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ RELATED PROJECTS		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ REGIONAL MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS			
25	Prairie Avenue/ Florence Avenue ^d	AM	0.984	E	1.030	F	1.056	F	0.026	0.956	E	-0.074	1.023	F	-0.007	1.023	F	-0.007
	PM	0.975	E	1.020	F	1.050	F	0.030	0.950	E	-0.070	1.089	F	0.069	1.089	F	0.069	
	SAT	0.634	B	0.662	B	0.641	B	-0.021	0.541	A	-0.121	0.675	B	0.013	0.675	B	0.013	
26	Prairie Avenue/ Manchester Boulevard ^d	AM	0.688	B	0.719	C	0.747	C	0.028	0.747	C	0.028	0.842	D	0.123	0.742	C	0.023
	PM	0.901	E	0.942	E	0.993	E	0.051	0.993	E	0.051	1.185	F	0.243	0.992	E	0.050	
	SAT	0.719	C	0.751	C	0.742	C	-0.009	0.742	C	-0.009	0.974	E	0.223	0.833	D	0.082	
27	Prairie Avenue/ Kelso Street-Pincay Drive ^d	AM	0.554	A	0.577	A	0.674	B	0.097	0.674	B	0.097	0.723	C	0.146	0.723	C	0.146
	PM	0.769	C	0.804	D	0.752	C	-0.052	0.752	C	-0.052	0.980	E	0.176	0.980	E	0.176	
	SAT	0.520	A	0.541	A	0.650	B	0.109	0.650	B	0.109	0.946	E	0.405	0.946	E	0.405	
28	Prairie Avenue/ Arbor Vitae Street-Gate 2 ^d	AM	0.553	A	0.576	A	0.612	B	0.036	0.612	B	0.036	0.682	B	0.106	0.682	B	0.106
	PM	0.794	C	0.826	D	0.750	C	-0.076	0.750	C	-0.076	0.912	E	0.086	0.912	E	0.086	
	SAT	0.731	C	0.751	C	0.654	B	-0.097	0.654	B	-0.097	0.860	D	0.109	0.860	D	0.109	
29	Prairie Avenue/ Hardy Street-Gate 3 ^d	AM	0.449	A	0.467	A	0.546	A	0.079	0.546	A	0.079	0.579	A	0.112	0.579	A	0.112
	PM	0.760	C	0.785	C	0.658	B	-0.127	0.658	B	-0.127	0.739	C	-0.046	0.739	C	-0.046	
	SAT	0.739	C	0.754	C	0.643	B	-0.111	0.643	B	-0.111	0.740	C	-0.014	0.740	C	-0.014	
30	Prairie Avenue/ Century Boulevard ^d	AM	0.814	D	0.851	D	0.891	D	0.040	0.891	D	0.040	1.035	F	0.184	0.935	E	0.084
	PM	0.982	E	1.028	F	1.019	F	-0.009	1.019	F	-0.009	1.467	F	0.439	1.367	F	0.339	
	SAT	0.964	E	1.009	F	1.004	F	-0.005	1.004	F	-0.005	1.672	F	0.663	1.572	F	0.563	
31	Prairie Avenue/ I-105 Freeway EB -WB Off Ramps- 112th Street ^d	AM	0.668	B	0.697	B	0.730	C	0.033	0.730	C	0.033	0.822	D	0.125	0.822	D	0.125
	PM	0.756	C	0.790	C	0.713	C	-0.077	0.713	C	-0.077	0.926	E	0.136	0.926	E	0.136	
	SAT	0.669	B	0.699	B	0.733	C	0.034	0.733	C	0.034	0.992	E	0.293	0.992	E	0.293	
32	I-105 Freeway EB On Ramp-Freeman Avenue/Imperial Highway ^e	AM	0.699	B	0.730	C	0.743	C	0.013	0.743	C	0.013	0.834	D	0.104	0.834	D	0.104
	PM	0.548	A	0.572	A	0.539	A	-0.033	0.539	A	-0.033	0.749	C	0.177	0.749	C	0.177	
	SAT	0.546	A	0.570	A	0.584	A	0.014	0.584	A	0.014	0.786	C	0.216	0.786	C	0.216	

Table VI.E-12 (Continued)
Alternative RU 3,500 Project Summary of Volume to Capacity Ratios and Levels of Service -
AM and PM Weekday Peak Hours and Saturday Mid-Day Peak Hour

#	PEAK HOUR	YEAR 2006 EXISTING		YEAR 2014 W/ AMBIENT GROWTH		YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 PROJECT		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ RELATED PROJECTS		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ REGIONAL MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS		
33	Prairie Avenue/ Imperial Highway ^e	AM	0.868	D	0.908	E	0.922	E	0.014	0.922	E	0.014	1.005	F	0.097	0.905	E	-0.003
	PM	0.872	D	0.912	E	0.868	D	-0.044	0.868	D	-0.044	1.020	F	0.108	0.920	E	0.008	
	SAT	0.686	B	0.717	C	0.735	C	0.018	0.735	C	0.018	0.985	E	0.268	0.885	D	0.168	
34	Cemetery Driveway- Kareem Court/ Manchester Boulevard ^d	AM	0.593	A	0.618	B	0.624	B	0.006	0.624	B	0.006	0.669	B	0.051	0.669	B	0.051
	PM	0.491	A	0.512	A	0.462	A	-0.050	0.462	A	-0.050	0.673	B	0.161	0.673	B	0.161	
	SAT	0.387	A	0.402	A	0.395	A	-0.007	0.395	A	-0.00	0.662	B	0.260	0.662	B	0.260	
35	Crenshaw Drive-Briarwood Lane/ Manchester Boulevard ^d	AM	0.913	E	0.955	E	0.966	E	0.011	0.966	E	0.011	1.021	F	0.066	0.921	E	-0.034
	PM	0.552	A	0.576	A	0.571	A	-0.005	0.571	A	-0.005	0.720	C	0.144	0.620	B	0.044	
	SAT	0.577	A	0.602	B	0.597	A	-0.005	0.597	A	-0.005	0.759	C	0.157	0.659	B	0.057	
36	Kareem Court-Gate 8 Pinecay Drive ^d	AM	0.275	A	0.284	A	0.313	A	0.029	0.313	A	0.029	0.391	A	0.107	0.391	A	0.107
	PM	0.334	A	0.345	A	0.308	A	-0.037	0.308	A	-0.037	0.859	D	0.5014	0.859	D	0.514	
	SAT	0.237	A	0.246	A	0.272	A	0.026	0.272	A	0.026	0.985	E	0.739	0.985	E	0.739	
37	Carlton Drive-Gate 7-7A Pinecay Drive ^d	AM	0.310	A	0.320	A	0.497	A	0.177	0.497	A	0.177	0.542	A	0.222	0.542	A	0.222
	PM	0.332	A	0.339	A	0.468	A	0.029	0.468	A	0.029	0.586	A	0.247	0.586	A	0.247	
	SAT	0.306	A	0.312	A	0.469	A	0.157	0.469	A	0.157	0.606	B	0.294	0.606	B	0.294	
38	Doty Avenue-Gate 4/ Century Boulevard ^d	AM	0.410	A	0.424	A	0.504	A	0.080	0.504	A	0.080	0.570	A	0.146	0.470	A	0.046
	PM	0.590	A	0.608	B	0.754	C	0.146	0.754	C	0.146	0.960	E	0.352	0.860	D	0.252	
	SAT	0.650	B	0.662	B	0.797	C	0.135	0.797	C	0.135	1.086	F	0.424	0.986	E	0.324	
39	Yukon Avenue-Gate 5/ Century Boulevard ^d	AM	0.408	A	0.424	A	0.632	B	0.208	0.632	B	0.208	0.698	B	0.274	0.501	A	0.177
	PM	0.719	C	0.751	C	0.847	D	0.096	0.847	D	0.096	1.069	F	0.318	0.895	D	0.144	
	SAT	0.678	B	0.708	C	0.835	D	0.127	0.835	D	0.127	1.104	F	0.396	0.969	E	0.261	
40	Club Drive/ Century Boulevard ^d	AM	0.494	A	0.515	A	0.547	A	0.032	0.547	A	0.032	0.613	B	0.098	0.513	A	-0.002
	PM	0.641	B	0.670	B	0.740	C	0.070	0.740	C	0.070	0.946	E	0.276	0.846	D	0.176	
	SAT	0.670	B	0.699	B	0.754	C	0.055	0.754	C	0.055	1.034	F	0.335	0.934	E	0.235	

Table VI.E-12 (Continued)
Alternative RU 3,500 Project Summary of Volume to Capacity Ratios and Levels of Service -
AM and PM Weekday Peak Hours and Saturday Mid-Day Peak Hour

#	PEAK HOUR	YEAR 2006 EXISTING		YEAR 2014 W/ AMBIENT GROWTH		YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 PROJECT		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ RELATED PROJECTS		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ REGIONAL MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS		V/C	LOS		V/C	LOS		V/C	LOS		
41	Crenshaw Boulevard/ Slauson Avenue ^b	AM	0.815	D	0.852	D	0.851	D	-0.001	0.851	D	-0.001	1.025	F	0.173	0.955	E	0.103
	PM	0.769	C	0.803	D	0.827	D	0.024	0.827	D	0.024	1.031	F	0.228	0.961	E	0.158	
	SAT	0.965	E	1.010	F	1.004	F	-0.006	1.004	F	-0.006	1.204	F	0.194	1.134	F	0.124	
42	Crenshaw Boulevard/ Florence Avenue ^b	AM	0.784	C	0.820	D	0.833	D	0.013	0.833	D	0.013	0.911	E	0.091	0.841	D	0.021
	PM	0.750	C	0.784	C	0.804	D	0.020	0.804	D	0.020	0.932	E	0.148	0.862	D	0.078	
	SAT	0.790	C	0.826	D	0.831	D	0.005	0.831	D	0.005	1.024	F	0.198	0.954	E	0.128	
43	Crenshaw Boulevard/ 82nd Street-Crenshaw Drive ^d	AM	0.548	A	0.569	A	0.586	A	0.017	0.586	A	0.017	0.617	B	0.048	0.617	B	0.048
	PM	0.507	A	0.525	A	0.520	A	-0.005	0.520	A	-0.005	0.604	B	0.079	0.604	B	0.079	
	SAT	0.501	A	0.520	A	0.558	A	0.038	0.558	A	0.038	0.668	B	0.148	0.668	B	0.148	
44	Crenshaw Boulevard/ 8th Avenue ^d	AM	0.572	A	0.597	A	0.614	B	0.017	0.614	B	0.017	0.631	B	0.034	0.631	B	0.034
	PM	0.471	A	0.490	A	0.501	A	0.011	0.501	A	0.011	0.554	A	0.064	0.554	A	0.064	
	SAT	0.482	A	0.501	A	0.531	A	0.030	0.531	A	0.030	0.605	B	0.104	0.605	B	0.104	
45	Crenshaw Boulevard/ Manchester Boulevard ^d	AM	0.719	C	0.751	C	0.782	C	0.031	0.682	B	-0.069	0.732	C	-0.019	0.732	C	-0.019
	PM	0.947	E	0.991	E	1.024	F	0.033	0.924	E	-0.067	1.156	F	0.165	1.156	F	0.165	
	SAT	0.964	E	1.009	F	1.054	F	0.045	0.954	E	-0.055	1.239	F	0.230	1.239	F	0.230	
46	Crenshaw Boulevard/ Pincay Drive-90th Street ^d	AM	0.646	B	0.675	B	0.729	C	0.054	0.729	C	0.054	0.814	D	0.139	0.714	C	0.039
	PM	0.728	C	0.760	C	0.782	C	-0.022	0.782	C	0.022	1.024	F	0.264	0.924	E	0.164	
	SAT	0.689	B	0.720	C	0.794	C	0.074	0.794	C	0.074	1.154	F	0.434	0.933	E	0.213	
47	Crenshaw Boulevard/ Century Boulevard ^d	AM	0.776	C	0.811	D	0.898	D	0.087	0.764	C	-0.047	0.881	D	0.070	0.881	D	0.070
	PM	1.004	F	1.051	F	1.067	F	0.016	0.896	D	-0.155	1.278	F	0.227	1.278	F	0.227	
	SAT	0.991	E	1.038	F	1.160	F	0.122	0.953	E	0.085	1.522	F	0.484	1.522	F	0.484	
48	Crenshaw Boulevard/ Imperial Highway ^d	AM	0.806	D	0.842	D	0.867	D	0.025	0.867	D	0.025	0.915	E	0.073	0.815	D	-0.027
	PM	0.844	D	0.882	D	0.891	D	0.009	0.891	D	0.009	1.071	F	0.189	0.971	E	0.089	
	SAT	0.736	C	0.769	C	0.780	C	0.011	0.780	C	0.011	1.002	F	0.233	0.902	E	0.133	

Table VI.E-12 (Continued)
Alternative RU 3,500 Project Summary of Volume to Capacity Ratios and Levels of Service -
AM and PM Weekday Peak Hours and Saturday Mid-Day Peak Hour

#	PEAK HOUR	YEAR 2006 EXISTING		YEAR 2014 W/ AMBIENT GROWTH		YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 PROJECT		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ RELATED PROJECTS		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ REGIONAL MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS		V/C	LOS		V/C	LOS		V/C	LOS		
49	Crenshaw Boulevard/ Shopping Center Driveway (s/o Imperial Highway) ^d	AM	0.390	A	0.405	A	0.429	A	0.024	0.429	A	0.024	0.449	A	0.044	0.449	A	0.044
	PM	0.477	A	0.496	A	0.529	A	0.033	0.529	A	0.033	0.598	A	0.102	0.598	A	0.102	
	SAT	0.474	A	0.493	A	0.479	A	-0.014	0.479	A	-0.014	0.574	A	0.081	0.574	A	0.081	
50	Crenshaw Boulevard/ 116th Street ^d	AM	0.543	A	0.566	A	0.591	A	0.025	0.591	A	0.025	0.610	B	0.044	0.610	B	0.044
	PM	0.570	A	0.594	A	0.601	B	0.007	0.601	B	0.007	0.669	B	0.075	0.669	B	0.075	
	SAT	0.643	B	0.671	B	0.694	B	0.023	0.694	B	0.023	0.782	C	0.111	0.782	C	0.111	
51	Crenshaw Boulevard/ 118th Place-I-105 Freeway WB Ramps ^d	AM	0.739	C	0.772	C	0.797	C	0.025	0.797	C	0.025	0.827	D	0.055	0.827	D	0.055
	PM	0.763	C	0.798	C	0.764	C	-0.034	0.764	C	-0.034	0.860	D	0.062	0.860	D	0.062	
	SAT	0.720	C	0.753	C	0.766	C	0.013	0.766	C	0.013	0.887	D	0.134	0.887	D	0.134	
52	I-105 Freeway EB Ramps/ 120th Street ^e	AM	0.908	E	0.950	E	0.965	E	0.015	0.965	E	0.015	0.978	E	0.028	0.978	E	0.028
	PM	0.759	C	0.794	C	0.694	B	-0.100	0.694	B	-0.100	0.730	C	-0.064	0.730	C	-0.064	
	SAT	0.676	B	0.706	C	0.721	C	0.015	0.721	C	0.015	0.766	C	0.060	0.766	C	0.060	
53	Crenshaw Boulevard/ 120th Street ^e	AM	0.796	C	0.832	D	0.873	D	0.041	0.873	D	0.041	0.894	D	0.062	0.894	D	0.062
	PM	0.723	C	0.755	C	0.744	C	-0.011	0.744	C	-0.011	0.793	C	0.038	0.793	C	0.038	
	SAT	0.795	C	0.831	D	0.862	D	0.031	0.862	D	0.031	0.975	E	0.144	0.975	E	0.144	
54	Western Avenue/ Manchester Avenue ^b	AM	0.781	C	0.817	D	0.830	D	0.013	0.830	D	0.013	0.909	E	0.092	0.909	E	0.092
	PM	0.775	C	0.810	D	0.780	C	-0.030	0.780	C	-0.030	0.914	E	0.104	0.914	E	0.104	
	SAT	0.778	C	0.813	D	0.843	D	0.030	0.843	D	0.030	0.992	E	0.179	0.992	E	0.179	
55	Western Avenue/ Century Boulevard ^b	AM	0.760	C	0.794	C	0.816	D	0.022	0.816	D	0.022	0.908	E	0.114	0.838	D	0.044
	PM	0.778	C	0.814	D	0.870	D	0.056	0.870	D	0.056	1.029	F	0.215	0.959	E	0.145	
	SAT	0.692	B	0.723	C	0.765	C	0.042	0.765	C	0.042	0.958	E	0.235	0.888	D	0.165	
56	Vermont Avenue/ Manchester Avenue ^b	AM	0.864	D	0.903	E	0.915	E	0.012	0.915	E	0.012	1.057	F	0.154	0.904	E	0.001
	PM	0.919	E	0.962	E	0.987	E	0.025	0.987	E	0.025	1.176	F	0.214	0.985	E	0.023	
	SAT	0.674	B	0.704	C	0.737	C	0.033	0.737	C	0.033	0.872	D	0.168	0.623	B	-0.081	

Table VI.E-12 (Continued)
Alternative RU 3,500 Project Summary of Volume to Capacity Ratios and Levels of Service -
AM and PM Weekday Peak Hours and Saturday Mid-Day Peak Hour

#	PEAK HOUR	YEAR 2006 EXISTING		YEAR 2014 W/ AMBIENT GROWTH		YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 PROJECT		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ RELATED PROJECTS		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ REGIONAL MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS			
57	Vermont Avenue/ Century Boulevard ^b	AM	0.652	B	0.681	B	0.695	B	0.014	0.695	B	0.014	0.772	C	0.091	0.772	C	0.091
	PM	0.691	B	0.721	C	0.709	C	-0.012	0.709	C	-0.012	0.863	D	0.142	0.863	D	0.142	
	SAT	0.623	B	0.650	B	0.672	B	0.022	0.672	B	0.022	0.830	D	0.180	0.830	D	0.180	
58	Figueroa Street/ Manchester Avenue ^b	AM	0.762	C	0.800	C	0.808	D	0.008	0.808	D	0.008	0.892	D	0.092	0.892	D	0.092
	PM	0.711	C	0.746	C	0.708	C	-0.038	0.708	C	-0.038	0.845	D	0.099	0.845	D	0.099	
	SAT	0.762	C	0.800	C	0.792	C	-0.008	0.792	C	-0.008	0.929	E	0.129	0.929	E	0.129	
59	I-110 Freeway SB Ramps/Manchester Avenue ^b	AM	0.631	B	0.662	B	0.669	B	0.007	0.669	B	0.007	0.699	B	0.037	0.699	B	0.037
	PM	0.549	A	0.576	A	0.561	A	-0.015	0.561	A	-0.015	0.676	B	0.100	0.676	B	0.100	
	SAT	0.519	A	0.544	A	0.567	A	0.023	0.567	A	0.023	0.669	B	0.125	0.669	B	0.125	
60	I-110 Freeway NB Ramps/Manchester Avenue ^b	AM	0.743	C	0.780	C	0.781	C	0.001	0.781	C	0.001	0.842	D	0.062	0.842	D	0.062
	PM	0.596	A	0.625	B	0.631	B	0.006	0.631	B	0.006	0.688	B	0.063	0.688	B	0.063	
	SAT	0.584	A	0.613	B	0.604	B	-0.009	0.604	B	-0.009	0.673	B	0.060	0.673	B	0.060	
61	Figueroa Street/ Century Boulevard ^b	AM	0.771	C	0.806	D	0.813	D	0.007	0.813	D	0.007	0.891	D	0.085	0.891	D	0.085
	PM	0.717	C	0.749	C	0.741	C	-0.008	0.741	C	-0.008	0.850	D	0.101	0.850	D	0.101	
	SAT	0.711	C	0.742	C	0.771	C	0.029	0.771	C	0.029	0.968	E	0.226	0.968	E	0.226	
62	I-110 Freeway SB Off Ramp-Grand Avenue/Century Boulevard ^b	AM	0.447	A	0.465	A	0.480	A	0.015	0.480	A	0.015	0.559	A	0.094	0.559	A	0.094
	PM	0.521	A	0.543	A	0.554	A	0.011	0.554	A	0.011	0.702	C	0.159	0.702	C	0.159	
	SAT	0.532	A	0.555	A	0.584	A	0.029	0.584	A	0.029	0.769	C	0.214	0.769	C	0.214	
63	I-110 Freeway NB On Ramp-Olive Street/Century Boulevard ^b	AM	0.569	A	0.593	A	0.609	B	0.016	0.609	B	0.016	0.689	B	0.096	0.689	B	0.096
	PM	0.487	A	0.507	A	0.529	A	0.022	0.529	A	0.022	0.701	C	0.194	0.701	C	0.194	
	SAT	0.575	A	0.600	A	0.640	B	0.040	0.640	B	0.040	0.859	D	0.259	0.859	D	0.259	
64	Crenshaw Boulevard/ 104th Street ^d	AM	0.674	B	0.704	C	0.733	C	0.029	0.733	C	0.029	0.753	C	0.049	0.753	C	0.049
	PM	0.645	B	0.674	B	0.699	B	0.025	0.699	B	0.025	0.778	C	0.104	0.778	C	0.104	
	SAT	0.575	A	0.600	A	0.631	B	0.031	0.631	B	0.031	0.733	C	0.133	0.733	C	0.133	

Table VI.E-12 (Continued)
Alternative RU 3,500 Project Summary of Volume to Capacity Ratios and Levels of Service -
AM and PM Weekday Peak Hours and Saturday Mid-Day Peak Hour

#	PEAK HOUR	YEAR 2006 EXISTING		YEAR 2014 W/ AMBIENT GROWTH		YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 PROJECT		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ ALT RU 3500 MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ RELATED PROJECTS		CHANGE V/C	YEAR 2014 W/ REGIONAL MITIGATION		CHANGE V/C	
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS			
65	New Signalized Project Driveway/Century Boulevard ^b	AM	f	f	f	f	0.496	A	0.496	0.496	A	0.496	0.562	A	0.562	0.562	A	0.562
	PM	f	f	f	f	0.690	B	0.690	0.690	B	0.690	0.895	D	0.895	0.895	D	0.895	
	SAT	f	f	f	f	0.694	B	0.694	0.694	B	0.694	0.983	E	0.983	0.983	E	0.983	
66	Prairie Avenue/97 th Street ^d	AM	0.371	A	0.385	A	0.427	A	0.042	0.427	A	0.042	0.448	A	0.063	0.448	A	0.063
	PM	0.487	A	0.507	A	0.530	A	0.023	0.530	A	0.023	0.610	B	0.103	0.610	B	0.103	
	SAT	0.449	A	0.467	A	0.542	A	0.075	0.542	A	0.075	0.639	B	0.172	0.639	B	0.172	

Notes: Significant impacts are denoted with shaded cells and bold numbers.

^a City of Culver City Intersection.

^b City of Los Angeles Intersection.

^c County of Los Angeles Intersection.

^d City of Inglewood Intersection.

^e City of Hawthorne Intersection.

^f Future Intersection.

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

mitigation measures recommended for the Proposed Project and the related projects are anticipated to reduce the cumulative impacts to less than significant levels at 23 of the 27 study intersections. Additional mitigation measures beyond those identified for the Proposed Project and related projects will be necessary in order to mitigate the cumulative impacts due to the Alternative RU 3,500 project and the related projects to less than significant levels at the following intersections:

5. La Tijera Boulevard/Centinela Avenue;
12. La Cienega Boulevard/Century Boulevard;
21. La Brea Avenue/Arbor Vitae Street; and
39. Yukon Avenue-Gate 5/Century Boulevard.

The following paragraphs summarize the recommended additional transportation mitigation measures for the study intersections to mitigate the cumulative traffic impacts due to the Alternative RU 3,500 project and the related projects to less than significant levels:

- Int. No. 5: La Tijera Boulevard/Centinela Avenue (City of Los Angeles)

In addition to the cumulative mitigation identified in the traffic study for the proposed project and related projects, it is proposed that the westbound approach on Centinela Avenue at La Tijera Boulevard be modified to provide one additional through lane. The resultant westbound approach lane configuration would provide one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one shared through/right-turn lane through the intersection. As shown in Table VI.E-12, these mitigation measures would reduce the forecast cumulative impact at this intersection to less than significant levels.

- Int. No. 12: La Cienega Boulevard/Century Boulevard (City of Los Angeles)

In addition to the cumulative mitigation identified in the traffic study for the proposed project and related projects, it is proposed that the northbound approach on La Cienega Boulevard at Century Boulevard be modified to provide one additional through lane. The resultant northbound approach lane configuration would provide one left-turn lane, two through lanes, one shared through/right-turn lane, and one right-turn only lane through the intersection. It should be noted that there are three existing departure lanes on La Cienega Boulevard north of Century Boulevard. As shown in Table VI.E-12, these mitigation measures would reduce the forecast cumulative impact at this intersection to less than significant levels.

- Int. No. 21: La Brea Avenue/Arbor Vitae Street (City of Inglewood)

This intersection is anticipated to be cumulatively impacted by the Alternative RU 3,500 project and the related projects. The recommended cumulative mitigation consists of the funding

contribution to develop and enhance the City of Inglewood ITS program at this intersection. As shown in Table VI.E-12, this mitigation measure would reduce the forecast cumulative impact at this intersection to less than significant levels.

- Int. No. 39: Yukon Avenue-Gate 5/Century Boulevard (City of Inglewood)

In addition to the cumulative mitigation identified in the traffic study for the proposed project and related projects, it is proposed that the existing traffic signal be modified to provide a southbound right-turn overlapping phase to be operated concurrently during the eastbound left-turn phase. As shown in Table VI.E-12, these mitigation measures would reduce the forecast cumulative impacts at this intersection to less than significant levels.

Parking

Impacts on parking from the Proposed Project would be less than significant. Like the Proposed Project, the parking demands for Alternative RU 3,500 will be met through use of the Hollywood Park Specific Plan. Alternative RU 3,500 would generate more parking demand related to the additional residential units to be constructed on-site, but would generate slightly less demand in the Mixed-Use Zone because 50,000 sf less of office/commercial spaces would be developed. This Alternative would be subject to the same shared parking analysis as required under the Proposed Project to ensure the parking supply is adequate to support the proposed development in the mixed-use area. Therefore, Alternative RU 3,500 would result in a less than significant impact to parking.

Conclusion

Alternative RU 3,500 would not reduce any environmental impacts of the Proposed Project. Specifically, this Alternative would not reduce the following significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the Proposed Project: Air Quality (construction and operation), Noise (construction), Population, Housing and Employment (Population growth forecasts and Housing Growth Forecast), and solid waste (operation). Additionally, Alternative RU 3,500 would result in an additional significant and unavoidable impact resulting from operational noise as a result of additional mobile sources on-site.

As described in Table VI.E-13, below, Alternative RU 3,500 would achieve all of the Project Objectives to approximately the same degree as the Proposed Project.

**Table VI.E-13
Assessment of Alternative RU 3,500 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 3,500 would be consistent with this project objective, as this alternative would include the same types of uses as included for the Proposed 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 3,500 would be consistent with this project objective, as this alternative would include the same types of uses as included for the Proposed Project.
3. To preserve the Casino/Gambling Facility on the Hollywood Park Site.	Alternative RU 3,500 would be consistent with this project objective, as the Casino and Gambling facility would continue to operate.
4. To provide land for a civic/public use.	Alternative RU 3,500 would meet this objective as it would include four acres for civic/public use.
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 3,500 would meet this objective as it would include 25-acres of open space. Based on the goal of one acre per 1,000 persons, this alternative would generate a need for approximately 10.5 acres of open space. Therefore, this alternative would provide approximately 14.5 acres above the goal.
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 3,500 would meet this objective as it would include 3,500 dwelling units that would vary in size and price to accommodate the demands of the region.
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 3,500 would meet this objective as it would include 620,000 sf of retail uses and 25,000 sf of office uses.
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 3,500 would meet this objective as it would include redevelopment of the Project Site and would provide a similar development scenario as the Proposed Project that would include open space features and improved landscape elements as compared to the existing conditions.
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.	Alternative RU 3,500 would meet this objective as it would include the development of 25-acres of open space, 620,000 sf of retail, and 4-acres of civic use. Additionally, this alternative would include a police substation similar to 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 3,500 would meet this objective as it would include the same types of project design features that are included under the Proposed Project to help increase sustainability with respect to water use, wastewater generation, energy demand, solid waste generation and more.
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 3,500 would meet this objective as it would include similar characteristics as compared to the Proposed Project and would include a similar circulation and pedestrian plan that would promote walking and bicycle use.

Project Objectives	Assessment of the Alternative to Meet Objectives
12. To promote a safe pedestrian-oriented environment by providing extensive streetscape amenities.	Alternative RU 3,500 would meet this objective as it would include similar characteristics as compared to the Proposed Project and would include a similar pedestrian-oriented environment with comparable streetscape amenities as the Proposed Project.
13. To enhance the visual appearance and appeal of the neighborhood by providing perimeter and interior landscaping.	Alternative RU 3,500 would meet this objective as it would include similar visual characteristics and landscape features as compared to the Proposed Project.