
VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

F. MAXIMUM HOUSING ALTERNATIVE

This Alternative was selected as a possible scenario for future development to incorporate the creation of both on-site and off-site affordable housing into the overall project, and to maximize the development of overall housing. No specific affordable housing is created as a result of the Proposed Project. Rather, the creation of new affordable housing is left to future implementation by the Redevelopment Agency, in accordance with the existing Redevelopment Plan for the Merged In Town, La Cienega, Manchester-Prairie, North Inglewood Industrial Park, Century and Imperial-Prairie Redevelopment Project Areas (the “Merged Redevelopment Plan”). The Project, as proposed, indirectly funds the creation of affordable housing by generating additional tax increment for the Redevelopment Agency to increase and improve the supply of affordable housing for persons and families of very low and moderate income.

Under this Alternative, the developer would be involved in creating affordable dwelling units as part of the project. This Alternative analyzes a range of potential options for accomplishing the creation of the 15% affordable units set forth in the Merged Redevelopment Plan. In accordance with Redevelopment Law, 40% of the affordable dwelling units would be created for persons and families with very low income, and 60% would be created for persons and families with moderate income, as defined in Community Redevelopment Law, Health and Safety Code, Section 33000 *et seq.* The affordable dwelling units could be located: 1) on the Project Site, 2) off the Project Site, but within the In Town, La Cienega, Manchester-Prairie, North Inglewood Industrial Park, Century and Imperial-Prairie Redevelopment Project Areas (each, a “Constituent Redevelopment Project Area,” or collectively, the “Merged Redevelopment Project Area”), or 3) a combination of on the Project Site and off the Project Site, but within the Merged Redevelopment Project Area. If the affordable dwelling units are aggregated in the Merged Redevelopment Project Area, the Redevelopment Agency must find that to do so will not cause or exacerbate racial, ethnic, or economic segregation. If the affordable dwelling units are created outside of the Merged Redevelopment Project Area, two affordable dwelling units will be required for each unit that otherwise would have been required to be available inside the Merged Redevelopment Project Area.

The Maximum Housing Alternative would result in the development of a maximum of 3,500 dwelling units on the Project Site, a maximum of 525 affordable dwelling units off the Project Site, 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. Although a certain amount of affordable dwelling units may be created on the Project Site, for the purposes of studying the environmental impacts of this Alternative, a “worst-case scenario” is assumed, which provides for 3,500 market rate units on the Project Site and 525 affordable units off the Project Site. This provides a maximum envelope of potential impact to permit the lead agency wide latitude in determining how much affordable housing to be included specifically within

this Project, and where such housing could or should be located. All affordable dwelling units are expected to be “for rent,” including any affordable units that may be built on the Project Site.

There are a variety of methods that could be used to create the affordable dwelling units, including, but not limited to: (1) new construction on the Project Site; (2) new construction off the Project Site; (3) rehabilitation of old, existing units within the Merged Redevelopment Project Area; (4) purchasing or acquiring long-term affordability covenants on existing multifamily units within the Merged Redevelopment Project Area that restrict the cost of renting or purchasing those units that either: (i) are not presently available at affordable housing cost to persons and families of low or very low income households; or (ii) are units that are presently available at affordable housing costs to this same group of persons or families, but the that the Redevelopment Agency finds cannot reasonably be expected to remain affordable to this same group of persons or families; or (5) any other method permitted by law.

As compared to the Proposed Project, this Alternative could result in an increase of 1,030 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.F-1, below.

**Table VI.F-1
Development Summary of Maximum Housing Alternative**

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	FLOOR AREA (NET)^[a]
Residential (on the Project Site)	3,500 du (maximum)
Residential (off the Project Site)	525 du (maximum)
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 or a public library, depending on the impact being analyzed. For those impacts where a school produces greater impacts, a school was assumed. In all other cases, a public library was assumed as the use on the civic site.	
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 the Maximum Housing Alternative, the Project Site would be redeveloped in a manner that is substantially comparable to the Proposed Project in terms of visual character and views. While the density of the project would be slightly increased if 3,500 dwelling units are built on-site, the urban design and mix of land uses would be substantially the same. To the extent the affordable dwelling units are new construction off-site, there would not be significant impacts to visual character and views since the units will be located in an already built-out, urbanized area and would be constructed and designed to be compatible with the surrounding uses. To the extent the affordable dwelling units are created via rehabilitation of older, existing buildings, there would not be a not be a significant impact to visual character and views since the affordable dwelling units created will be in existing dwelling units in the Merged Redevelopment Project Area. And, in most cases, the rehabilitation of older buildings results in improved visual character to the site and surrounding area. 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, the Maximum Housing Alternative would generate new sources of light and glare in the form of street lighting, signage illumination and structural light illumination. To the extent the affordable units are new construction off-site, new sources of light and glare in the form of structural light illumination could occur, although 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. To the extent affordable dwelling units are created via rehabilitation located off the Project Site, the off-site affordable units would not generate new sources of light and glare since the units already exist within a developed community and the redevelopment of the potential sites would occur in urbanized areas and would be designed to include directional and security lighting in a manner to reduce light glare impacts upon adjacent uses to the maximum extent feasible. As compared to the existing environment, the Maximum Housing Alternative would eliminate a substantial amount of light pollution that is currently generated by evening events at the racetrack. Accordingly, 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 and shadow. The Maximum Housing Alternative would also be developed with most structures at or below 75 feet in height. Similar to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would include the 300-room hotel structure and it would be the tallest structure at approximately 150 feet above grade. To the extent that affordable units are new construction off-site, it is possible that the new structures could shade sensitive uses. The extent

of the shade and shadow impacts from new construction off-site cannot be determined until specific sites are selected for the affordable dwelling units. To the extent the affordable units are created via rehabilitation of older, existing buildings, no new shade and shadow impacts would be anticipated since the units would be located in already existing structures. As concluded for the Proposed Project, shade and shadow impacts from the development would not significantly impact sensitive land uses. Therefore, the Maximum Housing Alternative 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.

Air Quality

Construction

Constructed-related impacts on air quality under the Proposed Project would be significant and unavoidable. The Maximum Housing Alternative would require more construction activity than the Proposed Project due to the additional 505 dwelling units on the Project Site and the construction activity from the potential rehabilitation or new construction of 525 dwelling units off-site to create the affordable dwelling units. To the extent the affordable units are new construction off-site, the total pollutant emissions during the Maximum Housing Alternative construction period would be greater than pollutants emitted during the Proposed Project construction period. Completion of all affordable dwelling units could extend beyond 2014, thus air quality impacts from construction could endure longer than the timeline for the Proposed Project. To assume a worst-case impact, the development of the additional 505 dwelling units on the Project Site plus the 525 affordable units that could be developed off-site would result in 34% increase in residential construction as compared to the Proposed Project. As such, construction-related air quality impacts would be expected to increase proportionally at 34% above project emission levels for VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ and would result in a significant and unavoidable air quality impact. Additionally, the Maximum Housing Alternative daily regional construction emissions would occur over a longer construction period than the Proposed Project and the duration of construction would be increased. To the extent the affordable units are created via rehabilitation of older, existing buildings, a significant unavoidable impact would still occur, although the rehabilitation of 525 units may result in decreased air quality impacts from construction, since less demolition and construction activity would be required as compared to the construction of 525 new affordable units. The overall impact of the alternative would nonetheless result in a significant and unavoidable impact. Therefore, the Maximum Housing Alternative would result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts.

Operational

The 1,030 additional dwelling units associated with the Maximum Housing Alternative would generate more mobile and area source emissions than the Proposed Project. Weekday emissions would be approximately 380 ppd for VOC, 260 ppd for NO_x, 1,743 ppd for CO, two ppd for SO_x, 70 ppd for PM_{2.5}, and 358 ppd for PM₁₀. Weekend emissions would be approximately 419 ppd for VOC, 338 ppd for NO_x, 2,366 ppd for CO, three ppd for SO_x, 96 ppd for PM_{2.5}, and 490 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, the Maximum Housing Alternative regional operational emissions would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

Mobile source emissions associated with the Maximum Housing Alternative would potentially increase localized CO emissions. Project-related one- and eight-hour CO concentrations were 3.2 and 2.2 ppm, respectively. These concentrations are well below the State one- and eight-hour standards of 9.0 and 20 ppm, respectively. The increase of 505 affordable dwelling units on the Project Site and the 525 affordable dwelling units off the Project Site would increase traffic in the vicinity of the Project Site. However, it is not expected these increases associated with the Maximum Housing Alternative would increase the CO concentrations beyond the threshold one- and eight-hour concentration levels. As such, the Maximum Housing Alternative would result in a less than significant localized CO impact.

Similar to the Proposed Project, the Maximum Housing Alternative would not be consistent with the current General Plan land use designation, which was utilized to calculate the regional emissions budget in the most recent AQMP. As such, the Maximum Housing Alternative would not be compatible with the AQMP. And, with respect to cumulative impacts, the Maximum Housing Alternative would result in a net increase in housing and thus generate more greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions than estimated for the Proposed Project. It should be noted that while this Alternative could result in an increased amount of new residential development, to the extent affordable units are created via rehabilitation of older, existing buildings, this Alternative would increase the useful life of existing buildings and also involve the rehabilitation of older residences which would result in improved sustainability of those units as compared to their existing conditions. These features would include improved insulation, use of low-flow faucets and toilets, and energy star appliances. To the extent the affordable units are new construction, sustainability features would also be incorporated in these units. Additionally, the Maximum Housing Alternative would be typical of redevelopment in an urban environment and would not generate a disproportionate amount of vehicle miles traveled, and would not have unique and disproportionately high fuel consumption characteristics since this Alternative creates more infill housing close to jobs. Therefore, the Maximum Housing Alternative would result in a less than significant global warming 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 the Maximum Housing Alternative 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 the Project 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 for on-site development. With respect to the affordable dwelling units potentially created off-site whether through new construction or rehabilitation of older, existing buildings, the geological conditions and associated seismic risks would be analyzed once the precise location of the affordable units is determined. In the

absence of site specific geotechnical investigations, it is assumed that each potential development site would be subject to a geotechnical survey and investigation to ensure the site(s) are suitable from a geotechnical perspective as part of the building permit process on a case-by-case basis.

The geology and soils impacts under the Maximum Housing Alternative would therefore 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 on the Project Site and would generate potentially significant impacts associated with potential exposure to ACMs and LBP during construction. To the extent that the affordable units are developed off-site via new construction, the potential exposure to ACMs or LBP would depend upon whether the site is vacant or contains structures to be demolished. To the extent that the affordable units are created via rehabilitation of older, existing dwelling units, the rehabilitation process may generate potentially significant impacts associated with potential exposure to ACMs and LBP in older buildings. Similar to the Project, however, these impacts would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with adherence to all applicable laws and regulations, and with respect to the on-site development, implementation of the mitigation measures prescribed for the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Maximum Housing Alternative would have a less than significant impact with respect to hazardous materials during construction.

Operation

Operational impacts with respect to hazardous materials and risk of upset under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. Under the Maximum Housing Alternative, the retail, office, casino, hotel, school and residential uses would not require or generate substantial hazardous materials, which would be similar to the land uses developed under the Proposed Project. To the extent that affordable units are created off-site via new construction or rehabilitation of older, existing buildings, the residential units would not require or generate substantial hazardous materials. Therefore, this Alternative would have a less than significant impact after 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. Additionally, prior to construction or rehabilitation for any the affordable housing units located off the Project Site, each potential affordable housing site would be required to conduct site-specific research regarding cultural resources and any necessary mitigation would be assigned on a site-by-site basis to ensure impacts would be reduced to the maximum extent feasible. Therefore, the Maximum Housing Alternative would result in a less than significant impact on cultural resources. Additionally, this Alternative would include mitigation measures to ensure the impacts associated with the accidental discovery of unknown cultural resources would be less than significant.

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 most of the 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, that none of the buildings currently existing on the Project Site are considered significant historic resources pursuant to CEQA. Additionally, impacts, if any, to historic resources from the creation of affordable dwelling units off-site, whether through new construction or rehabilitation, will be addressed on a site-by-site basis and proper mitigation measures will be implemented, if applicable. As such, the Maximum Housing Alternative would result in less than significant impacts on historic resources.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Construction

Construction-related impacts on water quality under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. Under the Maximum Housing 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 cars and activities with an inherent increased potential to impair the surface water flows during storm events. Additionally, this Alternative could also result in the construction and/or rehabilitation of affordable housing units off the Project Site which would result in additional disturbed surface area during construction activities. Implementation of prescribed best management practices and compliance with the RWQCB regulations on and off the Project Site would reduce potentially significant water quality impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, the Maximum Housing Alternative would result in less than significant impacts after mitigation on hydrology/water quality.

Operational

Operational impacts to water quality under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. Under the Maximum Housing Alternative, the amount of pervious surface area on the Project Site would be approximately the same as the Proposed Project since this Alternative would include all 25 acres of open space and is appropriately designed to retain and treat surface water flows on site with controlled release into the receiving storm drains. Additionally, this Alternative could also result in the operation of affordable housing units off the Project Site which would also be designed to retain and treat surface water flows on-site at each respective location, with controlled release into the receiving storm drains. Therefore, the Maximum Housing Alternative would result in less than significant impacts after mitigation with respect to operational hydrology/water quality.

Noise

Construction

Under the Proposed Project, mitigated construction noise levels would exceed the five dBA significance threshold at sensitive receptors near the Project Site. As such, construction activity would result in a significant and unavoidable short-term construction noise impact. Construction activity associated with the Maximum Housing Alternative for the Project Site would generally result in similar noise levels as discussed for the Proposed Project. For the off-site development, construction-related noise exposure would be expected to reach similar levels as compared to the Proposed Project, but would be more dispersed throughout the City since the 525 affordable units would be created off-site. If noise level increases from construction would occur in proximity to noise sensitive uses, mitigation measures would be required to reduce noise levels to the maximum extent feasible. Construction activity on and off the Project Site would comply with the standards established in the Noise Ordinance. Nevertheless, short-term construction-related noise impacts associated with the Maximum Housing Alternative would result in a significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation.

Operational

Operational impacts on noise under the Proposed Project would be less than significant after mitigation. The Maximum Housing Alternative would result in more daily vehicle trips to the Project Site than the Proposed Project due to the increased residential component and therefore would result in higher mobile noise levels. Mobile noise resulting from vehicle trips to the affordable dwelling units that could be located off-site would be essentially equivalent to the existing conditions for rehabilitated dwelling units since the units already exist and generate a certain amount of trips; however, for newly constructed affordable units, mobile noise resulting from vehicle trips would be an increase over existing conditions. Mobile noise associated with the Maximum Housing Alternative may result in noise level increases greater than three decibels within the “normally unacceptable” or “clearly unacceptable” category, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact. Therefore, the Maximum Housing Alternative would result in a significant and unavoidable operational noise impact due to mobile sources.

Stationary noise sources associated with Maximum Housing Alternative for the additional development on the Project Site would be similar to those sources identified for the Proposed Project. To the extent affordable units are created off-site via new construction, potential stationary noise sources, including mechanical equipment, for the new buildings could be located near other residences and could cause an increase in ambient noise levels. However, it is anticipated that the increase in ambient noise levels would be less than the three dBA audibility threshold, because the mechanical equipment could generally be located within enclosures or otherwise shielded from any nearby sensitive land uses. To the extent the affordable units are created off-site via rehabilitation of older existing buildings, the baseline ambient noise level from stationary noise sources could be maintained, or even improved upon because of the rehabilitation of the building. As such, stationary noise under the Maximum Housing Alternative would result in a less than significant impact.

And, similar to the Proposed Project, all residential units constructed under this Alternative (including newly constructed or rehabilitated affordable housing located off-site) would be designed to maintain noise levels at interior spaces to be within the 45 dBA noise standard. In addition, any proposed residential uses that fall within the Los Angeles International Airport Influence Area's 65 dBA CNEL contour would be required to be developed in a manner that achieves a 45 dBA interior noise level. With respect to affordable units created via rehabilitation of older, existing buildings, this could be an improvement over current conditions to the extent that buildings being rehabilitated fall within the 65 dB CNEL noise contour and are not currently providing a 45 dB CNEL interior noise level.

Population, Housing, and Employment

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

Construction Impacts

The Proposed Project would generate approximately 17,105 construction-related jobs over the 10-year buildout and stabilization horizon period. It is estimated that employment opportunities associated with construction of the improvements and structures on the Project Site and the rehabilitation of existing dwelling units or construction of new off-site units for affordable housing under the Maximum Housing Alternative would be similar to Alternative RU 3,500 which would generate approximately 18,821 construction-related jobs. This increase in construction jobs would be considered a beneficial impact of this Alternative and would not indirectly create an increase in the City's population or the need for housing. Indirect impacts upon regional population, housing and employment conditions would be less than significant under this Alternative.

Construction impacts to population and housing can sometimes cause displacement. If the affordable dwelling units created off-site result from new construction, there would not be a displacement impact since the new units would be constructed on currently vacant land. However, if the creation of 525 off-site affordable dwelling units is achieved by rehabilitating of older, existing buildings, the creation of the

affordable units could lead to housing displacement impacts. The significance of this impact cannot be determined without knowing the specific sites for the location of the affordable housing. However, to the extent feasible, rehabilitation would be completed in a manner that is consistent with normal attrition within the units and relocation assistance would be provided in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local housing regulations. Under this Alternative, the change to housing would result in a net increase of affordable housing units, which would be beneficial in terms of meeting the City's affordable housing goals.

Operational Impacts

Employment Displacement Impacts

Similar to the Proposed Project, the Maximum Housing Alternative would eliminate horse racing at the Hollywood Park Racetrack. Therefore, operational employment displacement impacts for this Alternative would be less than significant, like the Proposed Project.

Employment Generation Impacts

Indirect Employment Growth

The increase in on-site employment generated by the commercial uses of this Alternative would generate indirect population and housing growth if households relocate from communities outside the Southern California region to be closer to their place of employment. The increase in on-site employment opportunities generated by the commercial uses of this Alternative would generate less indirect population and housing growth than anticipated under the Proposed Project. This Alternative includes the same amount of retail space, but includes a reduction of 50,000 sf of office space. Employment opportunities typically associated with commercial 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 commercial uses of this Alternative would be less than significant.

Direct Employment Growth

Under the Maximum Housing Alternative, the proposed commercial and residential land uses on the Project Site are estimated to generate approximately 3,094 jobs, including the retention of approximately 1,071 existing casino-related jobs. Although this Alternative would result in 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 476 new jobs overall. As compared to the Proposed Project, which would generate approximately 517 new jobs, the level of employment generated by this Alternative would be slightly less. Nevertheless, as this Alternative would still generate a net positive amount of jobs, and employment impacts from direct employment growth would be considered less than significant.

Population/Housing Impacts

Regional Housing Growth Forecasts

The Maximum Housing Alternative could involve the construction of 3,500 new dwelling units on the Project Site resulting in the generation of 10,500 new residents to the City of Inglewood. In addition, this Alternative could result in the development of 525 affordable dwelling units off-site within the Merged Redevelopment Project Area. In the event the affordable housing is developed with new housing off-site, assuming 3.0 persons per dwelling unit, this Alternative could generate up to 1,575 additional residents for a total of 12,075 new residents. However, this represents a worst-case scenario as some of the off-site affordable housing could involve rehabilitation of existing residential units. Under this scenario, the potential for population growth would be off-set by the existing residents in the buildings. As such, the net gain in resident population would be in the range of 10,500 to 12,075 additional residents. 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 estimates by up to 3,090 new residents.

With respect to housing, the 2,995 dwelling units included for the Proposed Project would be inconsistent with the housing identified for the City of Inglewood. The SCAG housing forecasts for Inglewood for the year 2015 is estimated at 38,149 dwelling units. The construction of the 2,995 dwelling units under the Proposed Project would therefore result in a total of 41,964 dwelling units by 2014. Accordingly, under the Proposed Project, the 2015 housing forecast would not be within SCAG's estimate by 3,815 dwelling units. As the Maximum Housing Alternative would include an increase of up to 505 additional dwelling units on-site and up to 525 affordable dwelling units off-site as compared to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would exceed SCAG's 2015 housing forecast by approximately 4,845 dwelling units. However, it should be noted that creating affordable housing furthers the goals of the Inglewood General Plan, the Merged Redevelopment Plan and the RHNA because there is a shortage of affordable housing in the planning area. Furthermore, this Alternative would add more housing in an area with policies geared to increase housing stock, both affordable and market rate, and can be accommodated by existing utilities, public services, and roadway infrastructure without resulting in significant environmental impacts. However, like the Proposed Project's technical inconsistency with the housing growth projections for the City, although consistent with the region, the impacts related to housing growth would be a significant and unavoidable impact.

Regional Population Growth Forecasts

With respect to population, the 2,995 dwelling units included for the Proposed Project would result in approximately 8,985 new permanent residents. This increase would not be consistent with the population growth forecast identified for the City of Inglewood. The SCAG population forecasts for the Inglewood Subregion for the year 2015 is estimated at 120,185 persons. The construction of the 2,995 dwelling units under the Proposed Project would result in a new population of approximately 127,863 persons by 2014. Accordingly, under the Proposed Project, the 2014 population would exceed SCAG's 2015 forecast by

7,678 persons. As the Maximum Housing Alternative would include an increase of up to 3,090 persons as compared to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would exceed SCAG's 2015 housing forecast by approximately 10,768 persons. Accordingly, this impact would be technically significant and unavoidable. However, as noted above, since there is a shortage of housing in the City, the creation of up to 525 affordable units may not in reality generate new residents to the City; it is possible that the units will be filled by current City residents. Additionally, since the Project Site and any off-site development would be considered infill development, this Alternative creates development in areas that are already accommodated by existing utilities, public services and roadway infrastructure without resulting in additional significant environmental impacts. Additionally, as discussed under the Proposed Project's impacts, 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, both affordable and market-rate, 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. Nonetheless, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable since it exceeds the population growth forecasts for the City.

Land Use and Planning

The Maximum Housing Alternative would include generally the same mix of land uses on the Project Site as included under the Proposed Project. In addition, this Alternative contemplates the potential development of off-site affordable dwelling units. Similar to the Proposed Project, the Maximum Housing Alternative would require an amendment to the General Plan and the Merged Redevelopment Plan, adoption of a Specific Plan, and a zone change to achieve consistency with the City's land use planning policies. To the extent that there is off-site creation of affordable dwelling units, the units are expected to be developed in areas where residential units are currently allowed by the IMC and General Plan and Redevelopment Plan designations. Until specific sites are selected, the full impacts with regard to these land uses are not known. With approval of the discretionary requests for the Project Site, land use consistency impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant. In the event the construction of affordable housing involves additional discretionary requests that are not identified and evaluated within the scope of this EIR, further CEQA review would be required.

Public Utilities

With the exception of solid waste, impacts on public utilities under the Proposed Project would be considered less than significant. For purposes of a "worst-case" analysis, all of the 525 affordable housing units that could be created through new construction or rehabilitation of existing units off the Project Site are assumed to be new construction in order to forecast this Alternative's "worst-case" impact.

Water

As shown in Table VI.F-2, below, assuming all 525 affordable housing units are created via new construction off-site, the Maximum Housing Alternative would generate a demand for 797,335 gallons per day or approximately 996.57 AF/yr. Comparing the water demand estimated in the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan (which accounted for some level of development on the Hollywood Park Site in addition to the Renaissance and Haagan projects) to the proposed water demands for the Maximum Housing Alternative yields the amount of water not accounted for in the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan for the Maximum Housing Alternative of the Hollywood Park Redevelopment Project. Mathematically, this is shown as 29.53 AF/yr [H] + 46.76 AF/yr [R] – 359.96 AF/yr [EHP] + 996.57 AF/yr [HPRP] = 712.9 AF/yr.

**Table VI.F-2
Water Demands Under the Maximum Housing Alternative**

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—Affordable Off-Site ⁴	525	DU	336	GPD/DU	176,400
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 =					797,335
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 =					889,092
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 1-2, 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. ⁴ The generation rates provided in the WSA are generally based upon the acreage of the applicable land use. For comparison purposes, this analysis assumes a “worst case” scenario and uses the generation rate for SFD R-1 to estimate the water demanded by 525 affordable units off-site, since the acreage of the affordable units is unknown at this time. It is anticipated that the affordable units would actually use less water than the SFD R-1 units since the affordable units would be for-rent apartments. Source: Hollywood Park Redevelopment Project Water Demands, Letter Report, Stetson Engineers, Inc., July 17, 2008.					

Since the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan attributed 360.60 AF/yr the three development projects, the Maximum Housing Alternative would leave a deficit of a maximum of 353 AF/yr. At a minimum, this Alternative would be responsible for securing water sources up to this amount.

It is anticipated that like Alternative RU 3,500 there would be 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 the Maximum Housing Alternative are higher than those shown for the Proposed Project. This is to be expected because the water demand for the Maximum Housing Alternative could include up to 525 affordable housing units off-site and an additional 505 dwelling units on-site.

Should the Maximum Housing Alternative 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. It should be noted that to the extent the affordable dwelling units are created through rehabilitation of older, existing buildings, the impacts to water demand would be less than estimated since water is currently demanded by those existing units and is being serviced by current water supply. Ordinance No. 170,978 would still apply to the Maximum Housing Alternative, resulting in increased water conservation measures. Mitigation measures that are proposed for the Project are also required for the Maximum Housing Alternative to secure water rights for the projected deficit, and the Alternative would impose conservation measures similar to those that would be imposed during dry or multiple dry years. Under Mitigation Measure J.1-1, the Project Applicant would provide the precise amount of water that would ultimately be required for the Alternative once more information is known about the actual water needs of the affordable housing units. As discussed in the Water Supply Assessment, the water supply deficit generated by the Maximum Housing Alternative can be made up with ground water leases and the acquisition of water rights. Therefore, water supply impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Wastewater

As shown in Table VI.F-3 below, the Maximum Housing Alternative would generate a net increase of approximately 589,000 gpd of wastewater. In comparison to the Proposed Project, which is anticipated to generate 393,000 net gpd of wastewater, this Alternative would generate approximately 196,000 gpd more than estimated to be generated by the Proposed Project. Similar to the Proposed Project, it is expected that the existing wastewater infrastructure would be sufficient to handle the increased demands from this Alternative. Therefore, the Maximum Housing Alternative would result in less than significant impacts.

**Table VI.F-3
Estimated Wastewater Generation by Maximum Housing Alternative**

Land Use	Unit/Quantity	Generation Rate (gpd/unit)^a	Total (gallons/day)
Existing Uses^b	--	--	524,000
<i>Subtotal Existing:</i>			
Maximum Housing Alternative			
Residential	3,500 du	200 gal/unit/day	700,000
Affordable Residential on/off Site	525	200gal/unit/day	105,000
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		--
<i>Subtotal Alternative</i>	-	-	1,113,000
Total Net Water Demand			589,000
<i>Notes:</i>			
<i>du: Dwelling units</i>			
<i>sf: Square feet</i>			
<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.</i>			
<i>^b Hall and Foreman, EIR Technical Appendix - Public Utilities Report, May 2008.</i>			
<i>^c 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.</i>			
<i>Source: Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, July 2008.</i>			

Energy Conservation

Electricity

As shown in Table VI.F-4, the Maximum Housing Alternative would consume a net increase of 12,729,889 kilowatt hours per year (KW-Hr/yr) of electricity as compared to existing conditions. In comparison to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would result in a net increased demand of approximately 5,893,045 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 the Maximum Housing Alternative. Therefore, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts on electricity demands.

**Table VI.F-4
Estimated Electricity Demands – Maximum Housing Alternative**

Land Use	Size (SF)	Demand (Kilowatt hours/unit/year)^a	Total (kilowatt hours/year)
Existing Uses ^b	--		26,010,004
<i>Subtotal Existing</i>	-	-	
<i>Maximum Housing Alternative</i>			
Residential	3,500	5,626.50 KW-Hr/unit	19,692,750
HOA Facility	10,000 sf	10.5 KW-Hr/sf/yr	105,000
Affordable Residential on/off Site	525	5,626.50 KW-Hr/unit	2,953,913
Retail	675,000 sf	13.55 KW-Hr/sf/yr	9,146,250
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
<i>Subtotal Alternative</i>	-	-	38,739,893
Total Net Electricity Demand			12,729,889
<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 EIR, generation rates for public utilities are based on a school use because it would be the most intensive civic use.			
^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.			

Natural Gas

Under the Maximum Housing Alternative, an increase in approximately 3,500 new dwelling units and rehabilitation or construction of 525 dwelling units off-site for affordable housing would further increase demands for natural gas resources. As shown in Table VI.F-5, the Maximum Housing Alternative would generate a demand for a net increase in 26,674,925 cubic feet of natural gas per month as compared to existing conditions. In comparison to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would result in an increased consumption of approximately 6,764,950 cubic feet of natural gas per month.

**Table VI.F-5
Estimated Natural Gas Consumption – Maximum Housing Alternative**

Land Use	Unit/Quantity	Consumption Rate^a	Total
Existing Uses ^b	--	--	3,894,900
<i>Maximum Housing Alternative</i>			
Residential	3,500 units	6.665 cf/du/month	23,327,500
HOA Facility	10,000 sf	2 cf/sf/month	20,000
Affordable Residential on/off Site	525 units	6.665 cf/du/month	3,499,125
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			30,569,825
Net Total			26,674,925
^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 EIR, generation rates for public utilities are based on a school use because it would be the most intensive civic use for these impacts. ^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.			

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.

Solid Waste

Demolition activities under the Maximum Housing Alternative would involve approximately the same amount of demolition debris on the Project Site as the Proposed Project (i.e., 67,735 tons), since the same existing buildings would be removed from the Project Site under either scenario. In addition, an unknown quantity of demolition debris would result from rehabilitation if the affordable units are not new construction on vacant lots. This Alternative would also result in an increase of floor area on the Project Site and off-site dwelling units as compared to the Proposed Project; thus, the amount of construction

waste generated under the Maximum Housing Alternative would be more than the construction waste generated under the Proposed Project. As shown in Table VI.F-6, below, the portion of the on-site development of the Maximum Housing Alternative would generate approximately 67,735 tons of demolition debris and 16,722 tons of construction debris, for a total of 84,457 tons of debris. As compared to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would result in an increased generation of solid waste by approximately 3,035 tons.

**Table VI.F-6
Estimated Construction Solid Waste Generation – Maximum Housing Alternative**

Construction Activity	Size (sf)	Rate (lbs./sf)	Generated Waste (tons)
<i>Demolition-Existing Uses</i>		<i>Subtotal</i>	67,735
<i>Construction-Maximum Housing Alternative</i>			
Residential ^a	3,500 units	4.38	11,498
HOA Facility	10,000 sf	3.89	19
Affordable Residential on/off Site	525 units	4.38	2,300
Office/Commercial	25,000 sf	3.89	49
Retail	620,000 sf	3.89	1,206
Casino/OTB	120,000 sf	17.67 ^b	1,060
Hotel			
Rooms	300 rooms ^c	3.89	408
Meeting Space	20,000 sf	3.89	39
Civic Use ^d	4 AC ^e	3.89	143
Open Space	25 acres	N/A	-
		<i>Subtotal</i>	16,722
		Total	84,457
^a Assumes an average of 1,500 sf per dwelling unit. ^b Based on renovation rate provided in <i>Characterization of Building-Related Construction and Demolition Debris in the United States</i> , U.S. E.P.A., June, 1998. ^c Based on an average of 700 sf per hotel room. ^d 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. ^e Based on California Department of Education, 2000, <i>Guide to School Site Analysis and Development</i> . 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, August 2008.			

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 of the proposed Alternative. Accordingly, the Maximum Housing Alternative would result in less than significant solid waste impacts during construction.

As shown in Table VI.F-7, net operational solid waste generation for the Maximum Housing Alternative would be approximately 16,076 tons of solid waste per day as compared to existing conditions. As compared to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would result in an increased generation of solid waste by approximately 3,820 pounds per day.

**Table IV.F-7
Estimated Operational Solid Waste Generation by Maximum Housing Alternative**

Land Use	Unit/Quantity	Generation Rate ^a (lbs/unit/day)	Total
Existing Uses			
Main Building/Grandstand	594,000	.006	3,564
Casino ^b	321,000	.005	1,605
		<i>Subtotal</i>	5,169
Maximum Housing Alternative			
Residential	3,500 units	4.00 lbs/unit/day	14,000
HOA Facility	10,000 sf	0.006 lbs/sf/day	60
Affordable Residential on/off Site	525 units	4.00 lbs/unit/day	2,100
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>	21,245
		Net Total	16,076
^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.			

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. Accordingly, the Maximum Housing Alternative would result in significant and unavoidable operational solid waste impacts.

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 on the Project Site and off-site, 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), the Maximum Housing Alternative would generate a demand for 22 additional police officers, or roughly 6 more police officers than the Proposed Project. Similar to the Proposed Project, the Maximum Housing Alternative 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 the Maximum Housing Alternative would be less than significant.

Fire Protection

The projected demand for fire protection services is based on the amount and size of new structures on a site. Since this Alternative would result in an increase in the intensity of development on the Project Site as compared to the Proposed Project, it would place an increased demand on the LACoFD for fire protection services. To the extent affordable units are created off-site, there will also be an increased demand on the LACoFD if the affordable units are new construction; rehabilitation of older, existing units would not increase demand on fire protection services since these buildings are already served by the LACoFD. 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.F-8, below, the Maximum Housing Alternative would generate approximately 810 new students; approximately 236 more students than the Proposed Project. This assumes the most impactful scenario whereby 525 affordable units are created as a result of new construction off-site, which would generate new residents and thus new students not currently served by the IUSD. As discussed in Section IV.K.3, 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. 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 in accordance with 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. Therefore, this Alternative would result in a less than significant impact after mitigation on schools.

**Table VI.F-8
Estimated Student Generation by Maximum Housing Alternative ^a**

Product Type	Student Projections			
	K-5	6-8	9-12	K-12
Single Family Detached	132	63	72	267
Single Family Attached	121	56	76	253
Multi-Family	140	78	71	290
TOTAL	393	197	219	810
Classrooms ^b	16	7	8	-

^a Includes the 525 off-site affordable units

^b 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 and this Alternative, the Project Applicant is proposing to provide 25-acres of open space that would be provided for community use. Based on the General Plan Open Space Element goal of one acre per 1,000 persons, this Alternative would generate a need for approximately 12 acres of open space. The Alternative would provide over 2 acres per 1,000 residents, and would thus provides an amount of parks and open space in excess of the General Plan goal. Therefore, under the Maximum Housing Alternative, impacts on recreation and parks would be less than significant.

Libraries

The Maximum Housing Alternative would generate up to approximately 12,075 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. The Maximum Housing Alternative would generate tax revenue that the city could use to expand library services if needed. Additionally, this Alternative, like the Proposed Project, includes a 4-acre civic site which could be used as a joint use school, including a library that can be utilized by all city residents. Therefore, the Maximum Housing Alternative would also 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.

Traffic and Transportation

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

The Project Site access scheme under the Maximum Housing Alternative would be consistent with the Proposed Project (See pg. VI.L-25).

With respect to the traffic impacts from on-site development under the Maximum Housing Alternative, the impacts would be the same as those analyzed under Alternative RU 3,500. Please refer to the Traffic and Transportation analysis in Section VI.E for a complete discussion of traffic and transportation impacts that would also be associated with the Maximum Housing Alternative.

Traffic Impact Comparison

Maximum Housing Alternative Project Impact Analysis

To the extent that affordable dwelling units are new construction off-site, traffic associated with the creation of those would be determined once the specific sites are selected in the Merged Redevelopment Project Area; at that time, the additional trips would be assigned to the local roadway system to determine the impacts. To the extent that affordable units are created via rehabilitation, it is assumed that there would be no additional traffic generated since the buildings are already existing and create a certain amount of traffic that would be in the City's baseline conditions (See pg. VI.E-25).

Parking

Impacts on parking from the Proposed Project would be less than significant. Like the Proposed Project, the parking demands for the on-site development under the Maximum Housing Alternative will be met through use of the Hollywood Park Specific Plan. The Maximum Housing Alternative 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. The Maximum Housing 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 zone on the Project Site. To the extent affordable units are new construction off-site, parking will be provided according to the requirements of the Inglewood Municipal Code. To the extent affordable units are rehabilitation of older, existing buildings, at least the same number of parking spaces will be provided as currently exists. Therefore, the Maximum Housing Alternative would result in a less than significant impact to parking.

Conclusion

The Maximum Housing Alternative would not reduce any environmental impacts as compared to the Proposed Project, and 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 & Employment (Population growth forecasts and Housing growth forecasts), and Solid Waste (Operation). Additionally, the Maximum Housing Alternative would lead to an additional significant and unavoidable impact resulting from operational noise as a result of additional mobile sources on the Project Site.

As described in Table VI.F-9, below, the Maximum Housing Alternative would achieve all of the Project Objectives to approximately the same degree as the Proposed Project in addition to directly increasing the supply of affordable housing for persons and families of very low and moderate income levels.

**Table VI.F-9
Assessment of Maximum Housing Alternative to Meet the Project Objectives**

Project Objectives	Assessment of the Alternative to Meet Objectives
1. To contribute to the revitalization of the City of Inglewood by providing an example of “smart-growth” infill development consisting of mixed-use retail, office, hotel, residential development, and integrated open space;	The Maximum Housing Alternative would be consistent with this project objective, as this alternative would include the same types of uses as included for the Proposed Project. Additionally, creating affordable units on vacant lots or rehabilitating older, existing buildings will also provide “smart growth.”
2. To provide an economically viable project that promotes the City’s economic well-being by significantly increasing property and sales tax revenues and providing high-quality retail uses and the opportunity for transient occupancy tax;	The Maximum Housing Alternative 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.	The Maximum Housing Alternative would be consistent with this project objective, as the Casino and Gambling facility would continue to operate.
4. To provide land for a civic/public use.	The Maximum Housing Alternative 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;	The Maximum Housing Alternative 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 12 acres of open space. Therefore, this alternative would provide approximately 13 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;	The Maximum Housing Alternative 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. Additionally, affordable rental units would be made available to very low and moderate income persons and families.

Project Objectives	Assessment of the Alternative to Meet Objectives
7. To provide opportunities for viable retail and creative office space in a manner that is complimentary to the existing character of the adjoining residential neighborhood;	The Maximum Housing Alternative 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;	The Maximum Housing Alternative 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. In addition, vacant lots could be used to construct affordable housing and/or older, existing buildings could be rehabilitated to provide affordable housing.
9. To create safe, secure and defensible spaces through project design, while also allowing public spaces, such as parks and retail, to be open to the public;	The Maximum Housing Alternative 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;	The Maximum Housing Alternative 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;	The Maximum Housing Alternative 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. Any affordable units that could be located off-site would already be connected to existing bicycle pathways and pedestrian connections that currently exist in Inglewood.
12. To promote a safe pedestrian-oriented environment by providing extensive streetscape amenities; and	The Maximum Housing Alternative would meet this objective as it would include similar characteristics as compared to the Proposed Project and would include a similar pedestrian-oriented environment on the Project Site 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.	The Maximum Housing Alternative would meet this objective as it would include similar visual characteristics and landscape features on the Project Site as compared to the Proposed Project.