

---

---

## VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

### G. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

---

---

Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative be selected among the alternatives that are evaluated in the EIR. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the fewest adverse impacts. As summarized in Table VI.G-1, Proposed Project and Project Alternatives Environmental Impact Comparison, the environmentally superior alternative would be the No Project Alternative - Continuation of Existing Land Uses. However, as required by CEQA, when the No Project Alternative is shown to be environmentally superior over the Proposed Project, an Alternative Environmentally Superior Project Alternative shall be identified. For purposes of this analysis, Alternative RU 1,000 is identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Although Alternative RU 1,000 does not meet all of the Proposed Project’s objectives, does not avoid the significant impacts of the Proposed Project, and results in an additional significant impact, it is nonetheless selected as the environmentally superior project because its impacts would be less as compared to the Proposed Project. Alternative RU 1,000 would help further the General Plan and Merged Redevelopment Plan goals, as it would add new dwelling units to the City’s housing stock and provide new recreation and open space for Inglewood in a manner that is complimentary to the existing character of the adjoining residential neighborhood. Since one of the City’s goals is revitalizing the housing stock, of the alternatives that contain a residential component, Alternative RU 1,000 generally lessens the impacts on a relative basis, because it is a less intensive development. As discussed in Section IV.H. Population, Housing and Employment, the existing level of dwelling units is inconsistent with SCAG’s regional growth projections for the City. Therefore, any redevelopment that contains a residential component would be incapable of avoiding the technical significant impact of the Project’s inconsistency with regional growth projections. Additionally, any new development would also be incapable of avoiding the significant cumulative impact to operational solid waste because a regional solution to landfill capacity in the future has not been developed at this point. It is also likely that construction activities for any type of redevelopment would also create a significant, but temporary noise impact, and thus only no development alternative would be capable of reducing this significant impact of the Project.

Alternative RU 1,000 does not maintain the current racing activities or the casino on the Project Site, and does not have a commercial or retail component to off-set the number of jobs lost. As a result, the analysis for Alternative RU 1,000 concludes that employment displacement is a significant impact. Notwithstanding this analysis, the loss of jobs could be considered an economic or social effect of a project, and under CEQA Guidelines (Section 15131), it would not be treated as a significant effect on the physical environment. Viewed in this light, Alternative RU 1,000 would not result in an additional significant impact and would therefore result in the same level of impacts as the Proposed Project. Given that Alternative RU 1,000 is a less intensive development scenario than the Proposed Project, it overall would likely lessen the intensity of the impacts as compared to the Proposed Project.

**Table VI.G-1  
Project Alternatives Environmental Impact Comparison**

Impact Area	Proposed Project	No Project Alternatives			Alternative RU 800	Alternative RU 1,000	Alternative RU 3,500	Maximum Housing Alternative
		Continuation of Existing Land Uses <sup>1</sup>	Reasonably Foreseeable Stadium Alternative	Reasonably Foreseeable Convention Center Alternative				
<b>Aesthetics</b>								
Views and Urban Design	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Light/Glare	LTS	SU (+)	SU (+)	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Shade/Shadow	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Air Quality</b>								
Construction	SU	NI (-)	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU
Operational	SU	SU	SU	LTS	SU	SU	SU	SU
<b>Geology and Soils</b>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset</b>								
Construction	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Operation	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Cultural Resources</b>								
Archaeological Resources	LTS	NI (-)	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Historic Resources	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Hydrology/Water Quality</b>								
Construction	LTS	NI (-)	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Operation	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Noise</b>								
Construction	SU	NI (-)	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU
Operation	LTS	NI	SU (+)	LTS	LTS	LTS	SU	SU (+)
<b>Population, Housing &amp; Employment</b>								
Employment Displacement	LTS	SU (+) <sup>3</sup>	LTS	LTS	SU (+)	SU (+)	LTS	LTS
Employment Generation	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	SU (+)	SU (+)	LTS	LTS
Population/Housing	SU	NI	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU
<b>Land Use and Planning</b>	LTS	LTS	SU (+)	SU (+)	SU (+)	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Public Utilities</b>								
Water	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Wastewater	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Energy – Electricity	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Energy – Natural Gas	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Solid Waste	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU

Impact Area	Proposed Project	No Project Alternatives			Alternative RU 800	Alternative RU 1,000	Alternative RU 3,500	Maximum Housing Alternative
		Continuation of Existing Land Uses <sup>1</sup>	Reasonably Foreseeable Stadium Alternative	Reasonably Foreseeable Convention Center Alternative				
<b>Public Services</b>								
Police	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Fire	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Schools	LTS	NI (-)	LTS	NI (-)	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Recreation and Parks	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Libraries	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI (-)	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Traffic and Transportation</b> (Intersection LOS)	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS <sup>2</sup>	LTS <sup>2</sup>	LTS <sup>2</sup>	LTS	LTS
<b>Parking</b>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<p><u>Notes:</u>                      NI: No Impact                      LTS: Less-Than-Significant Impact.                      SU: Significant Unavoidable Impact.  <sup>1</sup> For comparative purposes, the impacts analysis analyzes "Continuation of Existing Land Uses" as if it were a stand-alone project and not the baseline conditions.  <sup>2</sup> Assumes funding for the same level of mitigation as the Proposed Project.  <sup>3</sup> Assumes that over the long run, due to the continued decline of the economic viability of horse racing, racing-related jobs on site could be lost.                      (+) Denotes the level of impact under the alternative would be increased as compared to the Proposed Project.                      (-) Denotes the level of impact under the alternative would be reduced as compared to the Proposed Project.                      Source: Christopher A. Joseph &amp; Associates, October 2008.</p>								