

Memorandum

date June 12, 2020

to Mindy Wilcox, City of Inglewood

cc Christopher E. Jackson, City of Inglewood
Fred Jackson, City of Inglewood
Royce Jones, City of Inglewood

from Brian D. Boxer, AICP, ESA

subject Feasibility of IBEC Alternatives

The EIR identified and analyzed in detail seven alternatives to the Proposed Project. These alternatives were selected for detailed analysis because, among other things, they were identified as “potentially feasible.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6, subd. (a).) Alternatives that are identified as not “potentially feasible” may be eliminated from detailed analysis in the EIR.¹

The purpose of this memorandum is to examine in greater detail whether these seven alternatives are, in fact, feasible. The determination of whether these alternatives are feasible will ultimately be made by the City Council. This memorandum is intended to aid the Council in its consideration of this issue.

ESA has prepared this memorandum based on its knowledge of CEQA, the Proposed Project, and of the alternatives analyzed in detail in the EIR. As the City’s lead consultant on the Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center (IBEC) Environmental Impact Report (EIR), ESA has intimate knowledge of the Proposed Project and the environmental impacts it would cause. ESA also performed the alternatives analysis in the EIR, and therefore has substantial information concerning the relative merits of the alternatives from an environmental perspective. ESA has also obtained information concerning the Proposed Project and alternatives from City staff, from other City consultants, from the project applicant and its architects and other consultants, and from other agencies. In the last decade, ESA has also served as lead environmental consultant on other projects centered on an NBA arena (to wit, Golden 1 Center in Sacramento, Chase Center in San Francisco, and the New Arena at Seattle Center in Seattle), as well as Major League Baseball and Major League Soccer stadia, and has drawn on that experience as well.

¹ Such alternatives that were considered but dismissed from further evaluation in the Draft EIR are described in section 6.3 of the Draft EIR, pages 6-12 through 6-18, and include use of the Project Site for an entertainment venue, a substantially reduced arena, housing, or an employment center/business park, and also include alternative locations in the City of Inglewood and elsewhere in the region.

The following discussion addresses whether the alternatives analyzed in detail in the EIR are, in fact, feasible. The discussion draws largely from the EIR, but it also relies on additional evidence elsewhere in the City's record. The aim is to provide City decision-makers with information that may be useful in adopting CEQA findings concerning the alternatives analyzed in the EIR.

Alternative 1: No Project

This alternative appears to not be feasible for the following reasons: (1) none of the City's and Applicant's stated objectives for the Proposed Project would be achieved; (2) the vacant parcels on the Project Site would likely remain vacant/underutilized for the foreseeable future without development of the Proposed Project; and (3) as a result of the parcels remaining vacant, the City's economic development goals for the Project Site would not be met. A more detailed discussion of each reason is provided below.

City and Applicant Objectives

Under the No Project Alternative none of the City's or applicant's objectives for the Proposed Project would be achieved. Specifically, none of the City's or applicant's objectives to enhance the community would be accomplished. For example, the City would be unable to achieve its goals of promoting the City as a premier regional sports and entertainment center (City Objective 1), enhancing the City's general economic health by stimulating new business and economic activity (City Objective 2), and constructing (with private funds) a public assembly space to host sporting, cultural, business, and community events (City Objective 8). Similarly, the applicant would be unable to achieve its goals of creating a lively, visitor- and community-serving environment year-round for patrons, employees, community members, and visitors (Applicant Objective 1e) and contributing to the economic and social well-being of the surrounding community by providing public benefits and increasing revenues (Applicant Objective 1f).

Project Site Utilization

During the post-World War II era, the parcels on and around the Project Site were developed with apartment buildings with some limited commercial and single-family uses also present. The Project Site is located approximately 2 miles east of Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), along the extended centerlines of Runways 25R and 25L, and noise from aircraft approaching the runways negatively affected the residential uses on the Project Site, which are considered noise sensitive. Starting in the 1980s, the City started acquiring residential parcels on the Project Site and relocating residents with the objective of recycling the incompatible noise-sensitive residential land uses with land uses deemed compatible with the existing noise environment, such commercial and light industrial land uses. After the residents were relocated, the City began demolishing the residential structures on the Project Site starting in the 1990s with demolition continuing into the early 2000s.

Since that time the parcels acquired by the City on the Project Site have remained vacant for the following reasons: (1) the recessions during the 1990s and 2000s, including the "Great Recession" of 2007-2012 hindered development; and (2) projects that have been proposed on the Project Site ended up not being economically feasible and failed to proceed to construction. In 1993, the City approved the Inglewood International Business Park Specific Plan, which encompassed portions of the Project Site. The EIR acknowledges and describes this plan (see Draft EIR, pages 3.10-24 – 3.10-25). Under this plan, the Project Site was considered as a possible location for a technology park. However, there were hurdles to that potential use including a partially occupied and partially vacant site, and no project entitlements have ever been approved by the City. For these reasons, the uses proposed

under this plan have not been implemented, and the Project Site remains largely vacant. Without construction of the Proposed Project, the vacant and underutilized parcels on the Project Site would continue to remain vacant and/or underutilized.

The Project Site has been identified as the potential location for off-site parking spaces to accommodate parking demands during large events at the NFL Stadium located within the Hollywood Park Specific Plan. The NFL Stadium was approved by initiative in 2015. At that time, transportation and parking studies were performed to analyze how stadium patrons would travel to and from the Stadium site. These studies identified the Project Site as a likely location to provide parking for the Stadium on game days. The studies concluded that the Project Site could provide 3,600 parking spaces.² Under Alternative 1, the Project Site would remain undeveloped. For this reason, the Project Site would be available for off-site stadium parking. This parking would be needed, however, on only an intermittent basis (likely 20 to 40 times per year). For the vast majority of the year, the Project Site would remain largely vacant and underutilized. For this reason, although the use of the Project Site for overflow parking for the NFL Stadium would have some utility, this use would be very limited, and the Project Site would remain significantly underutilized.

Inconsistency with Federal Aviation Administration Airport Improvement Program Grant

A vast majority of the Project Site was acquired by the City pursuant to funding through Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA's) Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grants. The intent of the AIP program is to provide funds to airports for disbursement to states and local governments in the form of grants to facilitate the reduction or elimination of incompatible uses through the acquisition of lands that fall into 65 dBA or greater noise contours.³ The intent of the AIP program is that the land in question is to be acquired, cleared of incompatible uses, and then sold at fair market value for development with airport compatible uses. Specifically, the AIP Handbook describes the land disposal requirements under 49 U.S.C. section 47107(c)(2), which states:

(2) The Secretary of Transportation may approve an application under this subchapter for an airport development project grant only if the Secretary receives written assurances, satisfactory to the Secretary, that if an airport owner or operator has received or will receive a grant for acquiring land and—

(A) if the land was or will be acquired for a noise compatibility purpose (including land serving as a noise buffer either by being undeveloped or developed in a way that is compatible with using the land for noise buffering purposes)—

(i) the owner or operator will dispose of the land at fair market value at the earliest practicable time after the land no longer is needed for a noise compatibility purpose;

² Linscott, Law and Greenspan, *Transportation and Parking Plan, Hollywood Park Stadium Alternative Project* (February 2015); Linscott, Law and Greenspan, *Traffic Impact Analysis, Hollywood Park Stadium Alternative Project* (February 2015).

³ Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Airport Planning & Programming, *Noise Land Management and Requirements for Disposal of Noise Land or Development Land Funded with AIP*, June 2014, page 1.

(ii) the disposition will be subject to retaining or reserving an interest in the land necessary to ensure that the land will be used in a way that is compatible with noise levels associated with operating the airport; and

(iii) the part of the proceeds from disposing of the land that is proportional to the Government's share of the cost of acquiring the land will be reinvested in another project at the airport or transferred to another airport as the Secretary prescribes under paragraph (4);

As such, under section 47107(c)(2)(A)(i), above, the grant requires that the City "dispose of the land at fair market value at the earliest practicable time..."

This requirement is embodied in the City's objectives for the Project, which include:

5. Transform vacant or underutilized land within the City in to compatible land uses within aircraft noise contours generated by operations at LAX, in compliance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grants to the City.

This objective is consistent with provisions in grant agreements into which the City and the former Inglewood Redevelopment Agency entered with the FAA between 1994 and 2006, which include the following provision:

It is agreed that land in this project purchased for noise compatibility purposes may be subject to disposal at the earliest practicable time. After Grant Agreement, the FAA may designate such land which must be sold by the Sponsor [the City of Inglewood]. The Sponsor will use its best efforts to dispose of such land subject to retention or reservation of any interest or right therein necessary to insure that such land is used only for purposes which are compatible with the noise levels of operation of the airport. The proceed of such disposition either shall be refunded to the United States for the Airport and Airway Trust Fund on a basis proportioned to the United States share of the cost of acquisition of such land, or shall be reinvested in an approved project, pursuant to such instruction as the FAA will issue.

Pursuant to these agreements, the City and the former Inglewood Redevelopment Agency (now the City of Inglewood as the Successor Agency to the Inglewood Redevelopment Agency, "Successor Agency") must use its best efforts to dispose of these parcels at a fair market value at the earliest practicable time. Holding the Project Site vacant and/or underutilized under the No Project Alternative would be inconsistent with the obligation to use such best efforts, as specified in the grant agreements under the FAA AIP program.

City of Inglewood Economic Development Goals

The City of Inglewood identifies goals of the City to promote economic development in the City's General Plan Land Use Element. In particular, it identifies a goal to "[h]elp promote sound economic development and increase employment opportunities for the City's residents by responding to changing economic conditions."⁴ It further articulates a goal to "[p]romote the development of commercial/recreational uses which will complement

⁴ City of Inglewood, *General Plan Land Use Element*, January 1980, page 6.

those which already are located in Inglewood.”⁵ Consistent with those goals, the Proposed Project would redevelop the site into a new state-of-the-art sports and entertainment facility with related uses that promotes economic development and generates employment opportunities during the construction period and during the subsequent operational life of the Project. As discussed above, the vacant parcels on the Project Site have remained vacant for years, thus frustrating the City’s economic development goals of increasing employment on the Project Site and promoting economic development. Under the No Project Alternative, the parcels on the Project Site would remain vacant without the construction of the Proposed Project, and the City’s economic development goals will not be achieved.

These parcels have remained vacant and underutilized despite the City’s efforts to encourage investment and redevelopment. In particular, in 1993 the City approved the Inglewood International Business Park Specific Plan encompassing much of the site. This plan envisioned the development of an attractive, campus-like business park, and established guidelines designed to encourage this use. During the intervening 27 years, however, the development anticipated and encouraged under the plan has not occurred due to a lack of investment interest in such a project. Available evidence indicates, therefore, that if the business park plan remains the operative land-use plan for the Project Site, it will remain vacant and/or underutilized. None of the City’s economic development goals, as expressed in the City’s adopted plans and policies, will be achieved.

Loss of Public Benefits

As described in the Development Agreement, the Proposed Project would provide the City, its residents, and the surrounding region with an extensive array of public benefits. The public benefits would total approximately \$100 million and would include (1) the creation of local jobs and workforce equity; (2) commitments to affordable housing and renter support; (3) rehabilitation of Morningside Park Library and creation of a community center; (4) support for City of Inglewood youth and education; (5) support for social and educational programs at the Inglewood Senior Center; (6) renovation of public basketball courts in Inglewood; (7) community engagement and collaboration, including use of the arena for charitable causes, and access to NBA games for community groups. These public benefits would not be provided under Alternative 1

Alternative 2: Reduced Project Size

Alternative 2 does not appear to be feasible for the following reasons: (1) inconsistency with the City’s economic development goals; (2) the lack of ability of the LA Clippers to consolidate their uses at a single site in the region, (3) loss amenities and the inability to hold pre- and post-game events would diminish customer and fan experience; (4) adverse effects on arrival and departure patterns; and (5) inconsistency with the requirements of the City’s FAA AIP grants.

City of Inglewood Economic Development Goals

As discussed under No Project Alternative, above, the City of Inglewood has long-standing goals articulated in the General Plan Land Use Element which call for the promotion of economic development that would generate opportunities and employment for the City’s residents. Contrary to these goals, compared to the fully developed Proposed Project, Alternative 2 would generate a materially lower level of economic activity on the Project Site.

⁵ City of Inglewood, *General Plan Land Use Element*, January 1980, page 7.

Extrapolating from data included in an economic and fiscal study submitted by the project applicant⁶ and verified by economic experts retained by the City⁷, Alternative 2 would result in the following approximate reductions in direct and indirect economic activity in the City of Inglewood economy compared to the fully developed Proposed Project:

- Construction of the smaller Alternative 2 would result in up to approximately 1,109 fewer jobs, with construction employee compensation reduced by up to a net of approximately \$66.7 million, and a reduction of total economic activity of up to approximately \$150.2 million.⁸
- On-going operations of Alternative 2, net of elimination of existing uses, would result in a decrease in employment of up to approximately 545 jobs, with annual employee compensation reduced by up to approximately \$38.7 million, and annual total economic activity reduced by up to approximately \$81.6 million.⁹

In addition to overall reductions in employment and economic activity in the City of Inglewood, Alternative 2 would have correlative reductions in revenues to the City. Pursuant to the same study cited above, Alternative 2 would result in a reduction in revenue to the City of up to approximately \$2.8 million per year, as further described below:

- The City's share of increased property taxes would be reduced by up to approximately \$1.5 million per year;¹⁰
- The City's share of increased sales taxes would be reduced by up to approximately \$210,000 per year;¹¹
- The City's share of increased utility users' taxes would be reduced by up to approximately \$68,000 per year;¹²

⁶ HR&A, *Economic and Fiscal Impact Report: Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center*, May 2020, Table 1, *One-Time Employment and Other Economic Impacts in the City of Inglewood Economy from Construction of IBEC (in 2019\$)*.

⁷ Keyser Marston Associates, *Peer Review – Economic and Fiscal Impact Report: Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center*, Memorandum from James Rabe, CRE, to Christopher E. Jackson, Director, Inglewood Economic & Community Development Department, June 10, 2020.

⁸ HR&A, *Economic and Fiscal Impact Report: Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center*, May 2020, Table 1, *One-Time Employment and Other Economic Impacts in the City of Inglewood Economy from Construction of IBEC (in 2019\$)*, page 15. The estimates that would be precluded by Alternative 2 include construction of Ancillary Buildings, Hotel, and an estimated 16.5% of Arena construction (to account for smaller arena and exclusion of team practice and training facility, administrative offices, and sports medicine clinic).

⁹ HR&A, *Economic and Fiscal Impact Report: Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center*, May 2020, Table 2, *Ongoing Employment and Other Economic Impacts in the City of Inglewood Economy from Annual Operations of IBEC (in 2019\$)*, page 17. The estimates that would be precluded by Alternative 2 include operations of the following uses eliminated under Alternative 2: Basketball Team Business Operations, Shopping Center/Retail, Restaurants Outside of the Arena, Community Center, Sports Medicine Clinic, and Hotel.

¹⁰ HR&A, *Economic and Fiscal Impact Report: Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center*, May 2020, Appendix B, Table 3, *Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center Estimated Property Taxes*, page 35. The estimates are based on elimination of the assessed value of the Ancillary Buildings (\$19,000,000), Hotel (\$16,400,000), and a 16.5% reduction in the assessed value of the Arena Structure (reduction of \$108,900,000), with associated reductions of \$1,440,000 in the City share of the general levy, and a reduction of \$11,486 in the MVLF in lieu.

¹¹ HR&A, *Economic and Fiscal Impact Report: Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center*, May 2020, Appendix B, Table 4, *Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center Estimated Sales Tax*, page 36. The estimates are based on elimination of taxable sales revenues of approximately \$14.1 million from the ancillary retail, restaurant, and hotel uses. Since under the arena capacity would be 500 seats less under Alternative 2, there could also be a correlative reduction in attendance, however an estimated change in attendance and related spending in the arena are not accounted for in this estimate, which is, thus, conservative.

¹² HR&A, *Economic and Fiscal Impact Report: Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center*, May 2020, Appendix B, Table 4, *Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center Estimated Utility Users' Tax*, page 37. Estimates are based on elimination of utility

- The City's revenues from Transient Occupancy Tax from the eliminated hotel would be reduced by up to approximately \$1 million per year;¹³ and
- The City's revenues from Business License-Gross Receipts Tax would be reduced by up to approximately \$33,000 per year.¹⁴

The overall estimate of reduced revenues to the City described above is conservative in that it does not account for potential reductions in parking taxes (there would be fewer parking spaces in Alternative 2 than the Proposed Project, but this has not been accounted for because displaced parking could still occur in the City), and construction taxes which are based on factors such as contractor earnings in the City, construction materials sales in the City, and the commercial building value permit based on total construction costs. Each of these would likely be reduced under Alternative 2 but have not been specifically estimated.

In addition to reduced revenues to the City, the reduction in construction under Alternative 2 would reduce the revenue to the Inglewood Unified School District by up to approximately \$175,000 as a result of reduced payment of school impact in-lieu fees. This estimate of reduced school impact in-lieu fees under Alternative 2 is based on elimination of the ancillary retail uses, along with the administrative offices and sports medicine clinic, and a 16.5% reduction in the size of the arena structure.¹⁵

Compared to a fully developed Proposed Project, implementation of Alternative 2 would eliminate approximately 1,100 construction jobs and 545 on-going operational jobs, and up to approximately \$150 million in economic activity in the City during construction. In addition, once the project commences operations, each year up to approximately \$82 million in economic activity in the City, and up to approximately \$2.8 million in annual revenues to the City would be eliminated compared to a fully developed Proposed Project. Finally, compared to the Proposed Project, under Alternative 2 a one-time payment of in-lieu fees to the Inglewood Unified School District would be reduced by up to approximately \$175,000. For each and all of these reasons, Alternative 2 would be materially worse than the Proposed Project in terms of its ability to meet the City's goals to promote economic development that would generate opportunities for the City's residents.¹⁶

users' tax for water use for the Restaurant/Bar/Lounge, Office, Team Store and Retail, and Hotel uses; the elimination of the utility users' taxes for electricity and natural gas for the Hotel and 16.5% of the Arena and associated uses.

¹³ HR&A, *Economic and Fiscal Impact Report: Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center*, May 2020, Appendix B, Table 7, *Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center Estimated Transient Occupancy Tax*, page 38. Estimates are based on elimination of utility users' tax for water use for the Restaurant/Bar/Lounge, Office, Team Store and Retail, and Hotel uses; the elimination of the utility users' taxes for electricity and natural gas for the Hotel and 16.5% of the Arena and associated uses.

¹⁴ HR&A, *Economic and Fiscal Impact Report: Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center*, May 2020, Appendix B, Table 9, *Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center Estimated Business License Tax*, page 40. Estimates are based on elimination of gross receipts tax from approximately \$26.9 million in gross receipts from the ancillary Retail and Restaurant businesses, the Sports Medicine Clinic, and Hotel uses.

¹⁵ HR&A, *Economic and Fiscal Impact Report: Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center*, May 2020, Appendix B, Table 13, *Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center Estimated City Fee Costs*, page 44. Estimates are based on elimination of gross receipts tax from approximately \$26.9 million in gross receipts from the ancillary Retail and Restaurant businesses, the Sports Medicine Clinic, and Hotel uses.

¹⁶ The results discussed above are based on analyses in the main body of the May 2020 HR&A report entitled *Economic and Fiscal Impact Report: Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center*. The estimates of reductions in economic activity, employment, and associated revenues to the City are based on the full development of the Proposed Project, as described in Chapter 2 of the EIR. Appendix D of the HR&A report presents a sensitivity analysis that considers the economic and fiscal effects of the Proposed Project under a scenario that involves a lower estimate of non-basketball events and a reduction in the amount of ancillary retail development than described in the EIR. Compared to the results of the Proposed Project reflected in this sensitivity analysis, the reductions between the Project and Alternative 2 would be less than described herein.

Team Operations

LA Clipper's team front office personnel often are required to attend games as part of their job responsibilities. Currently the LA Clippers' team offices are located in Downtown Los Angeles, two blocks away from the Staples Center, which is the LA Clipper's current home area, thus resulting in a short trip to the arena to attend games. It is assumed that the LA Clipper's offices would remain in Downtown Los Angeles under Alternative 2. As a result, members of the team front office would have a longer trip from the team's offices in Downtown Los Angeles and to the new arena in Inglewood to attend games.

Further, consistent with the project applicant's stated objective to "[b]uild the long-term home of the LA Clippers basketball team," the project architect states that state-of-the-art sports training at the NBA level requires a close relationship between the training, management, and game facilities. As such, the integration of the Arena, the training facility, LA Clippers administrative offices, as described for the Proposed Project, would provide for an immersive, secure environment for players to train, eat, receive medical support, and play games, and would allow for close and regular interaction between the LA Clippers players, coaches, trainers, medical personnel, nutritionists, senior management, and other support staff.¹⁷ Under Alternative 2, with a smaller Arena located at the Project Site, LA Clippers administrative offices in downtown Los Angeles, and the team's training facility remaining in Playa Vista, and very limited other support and ancillary uses at the Project Site, would compromise the ability to achieve the optimal training environment determined necessary by the project applicant.

Community, Customer and Fan Experience

The project architect has noted that "[s]uccessful, modern sports facilities also seek to create a destination that integrates into the urban fabric of the community."¹⁸ Project applicant objective 3.a and the design of the Proposed Project reflect the intent to create a year-round, active environment, with a daily population on-site that would support nearby retail and community-serving uses, and avoid creating an area that would be devoid of activity outside of the period immediately before and after scheduled events.

In recent years, most privately funded major league sports facilities are being developed in concert with a mix of other complimentary uses. Prior to this recent trend, arenas and stadiums often developed as isolated uses in suburban settings, meaning that there was nothing for the customer or fan to do prior to or after the event, leading to higher levels of peak traffic congestion as attendees arrived late and left as soon as the event was over. Arenas and stadiums were frequently dark zones with essentially no activity outside of event times, an issue that was considered acceptable when such venues were located in suburban settings surrounded by surface parking lots, but considered an eyesore in more highly urbanized settings.

The location of the Project Site in an urbanized setting, and the inclusion of complimentary uses on the Project Site, provide the opportunity for activity on an ongoing basis throughout the year. In such a setting, activity throughout the day and throughout the year may occur. Restaurants, bars, and stores in immediate proximity to the venue can provide an attraction for attendees to arrive early, and to stay late, after the event, which can have the benefit of spreading out arrival and departure traffic and travel. In this fashion, peak travel can be reduced

¹⁷ AECOM, *Design and Operations Considerations of EIR Alternatives*, Letter from Bill Hanway, Executive Vice President, Global Sports Leader, AECOM to Chris Holmquist, Wilson Meany, May 7, 2020.

¹⁸ AECOM, *Design and Operations Considerations of EIR Alternatives*, Letter from Bill Hanway, Executive Vice President, Global Sports Leader, AECOM to Chris Holmquist, Wilson Meany, May 7, 2020.

because the same amount of traffic is distributed over a longer period of time. One notable example is Staples Center in downtown Los Angeles, where LA Live was developed as a commercial compliment to the arena building. Other similar recent examples in California include:

- Golden 1 Center in Sacramento, where the NBA Sacramento Kings have developed retail, restaurant, hotel, and residential uses around the arena which opened in 2016;
- Chase Center in San Francisco, where the NBA Golden State Warriors developed a mixed use office and retail development on the same parcel as the new arena; and
- Oracle Park in San Francisco, where the Major League Baseball San Francisco Giants are in the planning stages of a mixed use, residential retail and office near the ballpark.

There are numerous other examples around the United States, including the Deer District development around the recently opened Fiserv Forum in Milwaukee, Wisconsin (home of the NBA Milwaukee Bucks) and the Battery Atlanta development adjacent to Truist Park in Cumberland County, Georgia (home of the MLB Atlanta Braves), both of which have opened in the last couple of years.

More specific to the design of the proposed Plaza, from an operational perspective, modern major league sports facilities are designed to provide for multiple layers of security and control, as opposed to a single point of control for entry and exit of fans and visitors. The project architect indicates that the design of the Plaza for the Proposed Project allow for the separation of the initial screening process (typically providing for use of metal detectors and bag checks) from the ticket check; this is typically accomplished through a secure initial checkpoint set away from the physical entrance to the Arena, to be followed by a second check at the door. This provides a more flexible and secure operation that can adapt to the specific requirements of different events, the needs for which can be affected by such factors as size of the crowd, weather, and other factors. As such, the project architect indicates that features such as Plaza buildings and other structures and landscaping elements are considered part of the Arena security plan, serving as both security features and urban design elements.¹⁹

Adverse Changes to Arrival/Departure Patterns

As discussed above, one of the key intents of the integration of LA Clippers uses and the development of complimentary ancillary uses on the Project Site is to achieve transportation benefits. As described on page 6-30 of the Draft EIR “eliminating the potential to consolidate LA Clippers team uses, including the arena, practice facility, sports medicine and treatment facilities, and team offices in a single location, Alternative 2 would likely increase the amount of travel between these uses that are currently located disparately throughout the region.” Further changes could result from changes to arrival and departure patterns for event attendees, as described further below.

The differentiation between arrival patterns at highly urbanized arenas that are part of mixed-use developments compared to single-purpose, more isolated arenas with limited or no ancillary uses can be readily understood by reviewing the data at two such venues in Sacramento Ca. As part of planning studies for the development of Golden 1 Center, NBA game arrivals were observed at the then home of the NBA Sacramento Kings, Sleep Train

¹⁹ AECOM, *Design and Operations Considerations of EIR Alternatives*, Letter from Bill Hanway, Executive Vice President, Global Sports Leader, AECOM to Chris Holmquist, Wilson Meany, May 7, 2020.

Arena, which was an arena surrounded by surface parking with no food or beverage establishments in its proximity. At this venue, the peak hour arrival accounted for approximately 67% of all attendees.²⁰ After the opening of Golden 1 Center, located in downtown Sacramento as part of a mixed-use development referred to as Downtown Commons, the measured proportion of total arrivals during the pre-event peak hour was 60%.²¹ It was also determined that based on surveys of actual attendees to NBA Games held at Golden 1 Center in 2017, 29% reported that they had visited a restaurant, bar, or retail uses in the immediate vicinity of Golden 1 Center prior to the event start.²²

Both the measured peaking of traffic and attendee survey results indicate that placement of complementary land uses, such as food-and-beverage establishments, adjacent to an arena tends to disperse arriving and departing traffic flows. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that one of the effects of Alternative 2 would be to concentrate the peak arrival and departure patterns for events at the Alternative 2 arena compared to the Proposed Project. This would tend to exacerbate transportation and other operational impacts of arena events.

Inconsistency with Federal Aviation Administration Airport Improvement Program Grant

As discussed above under Alternative 1, the intent of the AIP program is that the land in question acquired by the City and Successor Agency be cleared of incompatible uses, and that the grant recipients use their best efforts to dispose of the land at fair market value for development with airport compatible uses. Under Alternative 2, the East Transportation Hub and Hotel site would not be developed as under the Proposed Project. These parcels would instead remain vacant. Alternative 2 would therefore be less responsive than the Proposed Project to the City's objective to "transform vacant or underutilized land within the City into compatible land uses within aircraft noise contours generated by operations at LAX, in compliance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grants to the City."

Alternative 3: City Services Center Alternative Site

This alternative does not appear to be feasible for the following reasons: (1) lengthened construction schedule and increased construction costs; (2) failure to achieve the City's economic development goals for the Project Site; (3) the site of the firefighter training academy may not be available for purchase; (4) the elimination of other team facilities under this alternative would be detrimental to team operations; and (5) constraints associated with the local roadway system. A more detailed discussion of each reason is provided below.

Project Schedule and Costs

As described on Draft EIR page 6-43, "[b]ecause constructing on the City Services Center Alternative site would first require designing and constructing replacement uses on the Project Site, it is uncertain if this alternative site would allow the applicant to begin hosting LA Clippers home games in the 2024–2025 season..." In addition to planning, design, and construction of a new City Services Center and firefighter training academy, the proposed arena and associated development would require a complete redesign, including necessary NBA review and

²⁰ City of Sacramento, *Sacramento Sports and Entertainment Center & Related Development Draft Environmental Impact Report*, December 2013, page 4.10-43.

²¹ Fehr & Peers, on behalf of the City of Sacramento and Sacramento Downtown Arena LLC, *Final Golden 1 Center Year One Travel Monitoring Report*, October 2017, page 20.

²² Fehr & Peers, on behalf of the City of Sacramento and Sacramento Downtown Arena LLC, *Final Golden 1 Center Year One Travel Monitoring Report*, October 2017, Table 4, page 39.

approval, as well as likely preparation of additional supplementary CEQA analysis pursuant to PRC section 21166.

The Alternative 3 site does not meet the definition of “project area” included in PRC section 21168.6.8(a)(5). Thus, Alternative 3 would not meet the requirements for compliance with AB 987. As a result of this change, should the adequacy of the EIR be litigated, rather than the AB 987 dictated 270-day process for legal proceedings, including any potential appeals, the project would be subject to the established legal process which can take three or more years. As a result of a more extended legal process, litigation regarding the adequacy of the EIR for Alternative 2 would likely obstruct the ability to meet the project applicant’s schedule objective to open in time for the 2024-25 NBA season. That is because construction financing is often unavailable while CEQA litigation is pending, meaning that construction would not be able to proceed until after litigation is resolved even if no injunction is issued. Indeed, the extent to which CEQA litigation interferes with the ability to move forward with projects while such litigation is pending is a central aim of statutes, such as AB 987, establishing an accelerated time frame for the resolution of CEQA litigation. (See, e.g., Legislative Findings adopted pursuant to Assembly Bill 734 (2018 Stats. Chapter 959, § 1), Senate Bill 743 (2013 Stats, Chapter 386, § 1.) The same considerations apply here.

In addition to schedule extension, the project costs would likely increase under Alternative 3. With this alternative, the City’s corporation yard and the firefighter training academy would be relocated to the Project Site. Structures and uses within the City’s corporation yard include a three-story warehouse and administrative office building, small structures utilized for police training, parking for 300 vehicles, fuel stations for gasoline, propane, and compressed natural gas, a car wash, and material bins while structures on the firefighter training academy site include a classroom building, burn building, and training tower. There is adequate space on the Project Site to construct replacement facilities. In addition, these uses appear to be consistent with restrictions on the use of the Project Site under FAA grants. Nevertheless, the City would likely have to bear the cost of replacing these facilities, which the City Department of Public Works preliminarily estimated the cost at approximately \$75 - 100 million.

Loss of Environmental Benefits

Under AB 987, the project applicant has committed to a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction plan that includes a number of local measures that would provide benefits in the City of Inglewood. These measures include such commitments as (1) replacement of 10 municipal fleet vehicles with Zero Emissions Vehicles (ZEVs) and construction of related infrastructure for those vehicles; (2) replacement of 2 transit vehicles that operate within the City with ZEVs and construction of related infrastructure for those vehicles; (3) installation of 20 electric vehicle charging stations at locations within the City available for public user for charging electric vehicles; (4) development of a program for planting of 1,000 trees within the City; and (5) implementation of a program to purchase and installation of 1,000 electric vehicle charging units for residential use in local communities near the Project Site, with City residents given a priority for participation. Because AB 987 would not apply at this site, these measures would not be implemented under Alternative 3.

Economic Development Goals

As discussed under No Project Alternative, above, the City of Inglewood has long-standing goals articulated in the General Plan Land Use Element which call for the promotion of economic development that would generate opportunities and employment for the City’s residents. Contrary to these goals, similar to Alternative 2, the

overall revenues to the City and the Inglewood Unified School District would be materially reduced (at a level similar to that described for Alternative 2 because the development would be similarly scaled down compared to the Proposed Project). Further, compared to the Proposed Project, Alternative 3 would generate a materially lower level of economic activity on the Project Site. While the Project Site is large enough to accommodate the City Services Center and fire academy, these uses are not the type of employment and revenue generating uses that the City envisions for the Project Site as the work force employed by the City Services Center and fire academy already exists and no revenue would be generated as both the City and the El Camino Community College District (ECCCD), which owns and operates the firefighter training academy, are public entities.

Inconsistency with Federal Aviation Administration Airport Improvement Program Grant

As discussed above under Alternative 1, the intent of the AIP program is that the land in question acquired by the City and Successor Agency be cleared of incompatible uses, and that the grant recipients use their best efforts to dispose of the land at fair market value for development with airport compatible uses. Under Alternative 3, the proposed Project Site would not be developed as under the Proposed Project. Rather, portions of the Project Site would be developed with a replacement City Services Center and firefighter training academy. These uses would be compatible with the location of the Project Site. Nevertheless, because these portions of the site would continue to be owned by the City and the Successor Agency, and other parts of the Project Site would remain vacant or underutilized, Alternative 3 would be less responsive than the Proposed Project to the City's objective to "transform vacant or underutilized land within the City into compatible land uses within aircraft noise contours generated by operations at LAX, in compliance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grants to the City."

Site Availability

A majority of the 9.7-acre Alternative 3 site is under the control of the City of Inglewood, and an approximately 1.6-acre firefighter academy portion of the site is under the control of the ECCCD. It is unknown if the ECCCD is willing to sell the firefighter training academy site and/or relocate the academy to the Project Site. Therefore, the property may not be available for development. Although the ECCCD-controlled portion of the Alternative 3 site is only 1.6 of the total 9.7-acre site, its removal would leave this alternative site at only 8.1 acres, and an awkward shape. As such, because of the already limited size and the specific configuration of parcels, unavailability of the firefighting training academy site would make Alternative 3 infeasible.

Site Configuration

The limited size of the portion of the Alternative 3 site available to be dedicated to the Arena (approximately 4.65 acres, an area approximately 450 feet on each side) is considered by the project architect to be very tight for a modern arena. It would require the Arena structure to sit directly against the back of the curb on West Ivy Avenue and Cable Place, which would severely restrict the ability to design either (1) an operationally functional loading dock area at ground level, or (2) a ramp down to a subterranean loading dock on the main event level. The project architect indicates that the provision of such a loading dock is a prerequisite of a modern arena.²³

In addition, the proximity of the Arena structure to the street curb edge would create concerns about public safety in the event of an emergency egress situation, and could be challenging even during normal event conditions.

²³ AECOM, *Design and Operations Considerations of EIR Alternatives*, Letter from Bill Hanway, Executive Vice President, Global Sports Leader, AECOM to Chris Holmquist, Wilson Meany, May 7, 2020.

Community, Customer and Fan Experience

From an operational perspective, modern sports facilities rely on multiple layers of security and control, and not on a single point of control for entry and exit of fans and visitors. The Proposed Project would separate the initial screening process from the ticket check to allow for a secure checkpoint away from the physical entrance to the Arena, to be followed by a second check at the door. This provides a more flexible and secure operation that can adapt to the specific requirements of different events. In addition, because of the relatively long and narrow configuration of the open space, the project architect indicates that Alternative 3 would not provide a clear entry and could become unsafe in larger gatherings. The project architect has reviewed the configuration of Alternative 3 (see Draft EIR Figure 6-2), and determined that the linear configuration of the Plaza under Alternative 3 would compromise the ability to achieve optimal security operations at the Arena.²⁴

One of the basic objectives of the project applicant is “synergistic with nearby existing and proposed uses and incorporates state-of-the-art urban design and venue design principles.” The project architect has stated that to achieve this objective, the open space needs to be “of a reasonable size and shape, and supported by a balanced mix of sizes that create a destination, integrates the site into the urban fabric of the community and connects the development to other neighborhood amenities.” The architect has indicated that the creation of a “Champions Plaza,” where fans can gather to celebrate significant wins or achievements, is essential to meeting that objective. Alternative 3, as presented in the Draft EIR, would include a relatively narrow linear open space that connects to North Eucalyptus Avenue, West Beach Avenue, and Cable Plaza, each of which leads to industrial facilities and associated parking areas and loading docks.²⁵ Because of the nature of the adjacent uses and the linear configuration of the open space that would serve to funnel people toward those uses, Alternative 3 would not create the synergistic connections to the community sought by the project applicant.

Team Operations

Similar to Alternative 2, the LA Clipper’s team front office would remain in Downtown Los Angeles under Alternative 3, and the LA Clippers would continue to use their practice and training facility in the Playa Vista neighborhood of Los Angeles. As a result, members of the team front office would be required to travel back and forth between the team’s offices and the downtown arena to attend games. Similar to Alternative 2, this trip would take approximately 20-25 minutes during the non-peak hour, although it would be faster to take the I-10 freeway west and South La Brea Avenue south to the City Services Center site. However, during the PM peak hour, which would occur shortly before games typically start on weekdays, travel time could approximately double. As a result, employees would spend up to an hour traveling, which is time that could be put to more productive use if their offices were co-located with the arena.

Further, consistent with the project applicant’s stated objective to “[b]uild the long-term home of the LA Clippers basketball team,” the project architect states that state-of-the-art sports training at the NBA level requires a close relationship between the training, management, and game facilities. As such, the integration of the Arena, the training facility, LA Clippers administrative offices, as described for the Proposed Project, would provide for an immersive, secure environment for players to train, eat, receive medical support, and play games, and would

²⁴ AECOM, *Design and Operations Considerations of EIR Alternatives*, Letter from Bill Hanway, Executive Vice President, Global Sports Leader, AECOM to Chris Holmquist, Wilson Meany, May 7, 2020.

²⁵ AECOM, *Design and Operations Considerations of EIR Alternatives*, Letter from Bill Hanway, Executive Vice President, Global Sports Leader, AECOM to Chris Holmquist, Wilson Meany, May 7, 2020.

allow for close and regular interaction between the LA Clippers players, coaches, trainers, medical personnel, nutritionists, senior management, and other support staff.²⁶ Under Alternative 3, the LA Clippers administrative offices would remain in downtown Los Angeles, the team's training facility would remain in Playa Vista, and there would be limited other support and ancillary uses at the City Services Center Alternative Site, which would compromise the ability to achieve the optimal training environment determined necessary by the project applicant.

Traffic Constraints

The streets in the vicinity of the City Services Center site are curvier, more discontinuous, and have less arterial capacity than the streets in the vicinity of the Project Site. Similar to the Proposed Project, under Alternative 3 a total of 4,215 parking spaces would be provided in two 8-story and one 7-story parking structures on the City Services Center site. One garage (2,300 spaces) would be accessible via Eucalyptus Avenue and two garages (1,915 spaces) that would be accessible via Beach Avenue. Both Eucalyptus and Beach Avenues are two lane streets that provide direct access the two major arterials near the Project Site – Florence Avenue one block to the south and La Brea Avenue one block to the north/east. Traffic generated by up 4,215 vehicles entering/leaving the City Services Center site before/after events would quickly overwhelm the nearby intersections along Florence and La Brea Avenues, thus forcing traffic through neighborhoods to the north of the site. This traffic would quickly overwhelm the capacity of local street system, thus resulting in traffic gridlock. In addition, although the City Services Center Alternative site is closer to the I-405 freeway (0.6 miles) than is the Proposed Project (1.3 miles), it is farther from the I-110 and I-105 freeways; thus, regional trips would not be distributed as evenly and freeway impacts would be concentrated on the I-405.

Alternative 4: Baldwin Hills Alternative Site

This alternative does not appear to be feasible for the following reasons: (1) the alternative site is located in a different jurisdiction; (2) the alternative site may not be available for purchase; (3) construction of the Proposed Project on the alternative site may not be feasible; (4) constraints associated with the local roadway system; and (5) none of the City's stated objectives for the Proposed Project would be achieved. A more detailed discussion of each reason is provided below.

Jurisdictional Constraints

The Baldwin Hills Alternative Site is located within the City of Los Angeles. Construction of the Proposed Project on the Baldwin Hills Alternative site would require approval by the City of Los Angeles City Council. The City of Los Angeles approved a plan to modernize and redevelop the existing Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza shopping mall in 2018. The plan calls for the demolition of approximately 13,400 square feet of retail/restaurant space and the construction of about 44,200 square feet of retail/restaurant space, a 400-room hotel, and 410 apartment units on the Baldwin Hills Alternative site; the existing mall buildings and theater are planned to remain. Although no project-specific permits have been submitted for the Baldwin Hills Alternative Site,²⁷ given the amount of development planned for the site, it is uncertain as to whether the City would consider an alternative plan for the site so soon after approval.

²⁶ AECOM, *Design and Operations Considerations of EIR Alternatives*, Letter from Bill Hanway, Executive Vice President, Global Sports Leader, AECOM to Chris Holmquist, Wilson Meany, May 7, 2020.

²⁷ Luciralia Ibarra, City Planner, City of Los Angeles, personal communication, March 25, 2020.

Site Availability

The project applicant does not control or own the Baldwin Hills Alternative Site. In addition, as discussed above, a plan to modernize and redevelop the existing Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza shopping mall was approved by the Los Angeles City Council in 2018. Given the amount of development proposed for the site and the effort that went into obtaining the approval of these entitlements, it is unknown if the Baldwin Hills Alternative site is available for purchase, or if the owner of the site would be willing to sell to the project applicant. In addition, the plan to modernize and redevelop the site is currently subject to ongoing litigation, which could put a damper on the ability of the project applicant to purchase the property before the litigation is resolved.²⁸

Site Feasibility

The proximity of existing and future on-site retail uses and nearby residential neighborhoods bring the feasibility of Alternative 4 into question. Much of the parking that supports the current retail uses on the site would also be required to serve employees and attendees before, during, and after events at the Arena. Although some sharing is possible, the conflicting and overlapping schedules with the cinema and other major retail facilities that would remain on the northern part of the Alternative 4 site would create a significant parking, traffic, and operational challenges that could result in adverse effects to the existing and remaining businesses, or result in spillover effects in nearby neighborhoods (discussed further below under Traffic Constraints).

Traffic Constraints

With the retained commercial/retail facilities on the site fronting on Crenshaw Boulevard and West Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, access to the Arena-related parking would be limited to Santa Rosalia Drive, Stocker Street, and Marlton Avenue, all four-lane streets designed to meet the needs of a regional shopping center, but not to accommodate the peaking. Santa Rosalia Drive, in particular, connected to significant residential neighborhoods, and this could create conflicts during the overlap between rush hour and event traffic.

While the Baldwin Hills Alternative site is located adjacent to arterial roadways with large capacities, similar to the Proposed Project, regional highway facilities are located further from the site than the regional highway facilities that serve the Project Site. In particular, the Santa Monica Freeway (I-10) is located approximately 1.6 miles to the north, the Harbor Freeway (I-110) is located about 3.1 miles to the east, and the San Diego Freeway (I-405) is located approximately 3.5 miles to the west. As a result, traffic generated under Alternative 4 would have to travel farther to and from regional highway facilities, resulting in more potential affected intersections that could be adversely affected along roadways leading to the Baldwin Hills Alternative site.

City Objectives

Under the Baldwin Hills Alternative none of the City's objectives for the Proposed Project would be achieved. Specifically, none of the City's objectives to enhance the community would be accomplished. For example, the City would be unable to achieve its goals of promoting the City as a premier regional sports and entertainment center (City Objective 1), enhancing the City's general economic health by stimulating new business and economic activity (City Objective 2), and constructing (with private funds) a public assembly space that would host sporting, cultural, business, and community events (City Objective 8).

²⁸ Luciralia Ibarra, City Planner, City of Los Angeles, personal communication, March 25, 2020.

City of Inglewood Economic Development Goals

As discussed under No Project Alternative, above, the City of Inglewood has long-standing goals articulated in the General Plan Land Use Element which call for the promotion of economic development that would generate opportunities and employment for the City's residents. Contrary to these goals, Alternative 4 would eliminate all increases in revenues to the City and the Inglewood Unified School District, including if the Proposed Project were fully developed the addition of up to approximately 7,300 jobs over \$1 billion in economic activity due to project construction, up to approximately 1,500 net new ongoing jobs and up to approximately \$250 million in annual economic output.²⁹ While under the Baldwin Hills Alternative an equivalent level of economic benefits would likely accrue in the City of Los Angeles, none of the noted economic development benefits would accrue to the City of Inglewood.

Inconsistency with Federal Aviation Administration Airport Improvement Program Grant

As discussed above under Alternative 1, the intent of the AIP program is that the land in question acquired by the City and Successor Agency be cleared of incompatible uses, and that the grant recipients use their best efforts to dispose of the land at fair market value for development with airport compatible uses. Under Alternative 4, the proposed Project Site would not be developed as under the Proposed Project. Similar to the No Project Alternative, the Project Site would remain vacant and under-developed. Agreements between the FAA and the City under the AIP program provide that the City and the Successor Agency must use their best efforts to dispose of parcels acquired under this program at a fair market value at the earliest practicable time. Holding the Project Site vacant under Alternative 4 would be inconsistent with the obligation to use such best efforts, as specified in grant agreements under the FAA AIP program. Alternative 4 would also be inconsistent with the City's objective to "transform vacant or underutilized land within the City into compatible land uses within aircraft noise contours generated by operations at LAX, in compliance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grants to the City."

Project Schedule and Costs

In addition to site acquisition, the proposed arena and associated development would require a complete redesign, including necessary NBA review and approval, along with review and approval through the City of Los Angeles, including preparation of a new CEQA document. The need to restart the planning and entitlement process would result in schedule extensions that would obstruct the ability to meet the project applicant's schedule objective to open in time for the 2024-25 NBA season.

The Alternative 4 site also does not meet the definition of "project area" included in PRC section 21168.6.8(a)(5). Thus, Alternative 4 would not meet the requirements for compliance with AB 987. As a result of this change, should the adequacy of the EIR be litigated, rather than the AB 987 dictated 270-day process for legal proceedings, including any potential appeals, the project would be subject to the established legal process which can take three or more years. As a result of a more extended legal process, litigation regarding the adequacy of the EIR for Alternative 2 would likely obstruct the ability to meet the project applicant's schedule objective to open in time for the 2024-25 NBA season. That is because construction financing is often unavailable while CEQA litigation is pending, meaning that construction would not be able to proceed until after litigation is resolved even if no injunction is issued. Indeed, the extent to which CEQA litigation interferes with the ability to move forward with projects while such litigation is pending is a central aim of statutes, such as AB 987,

²⁹ HR&A, *Economic and Fiscal Impact Report: Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center*, May 2020, pages 4 to 5.

establishing an accelerated time frame for the resolution of CEQA litigation. (See, e.g., Legislative Findings adopted pursuant to Assembly Bill 734 (2018 Stats. Chapter 959, § 1), Senate Bill 743 (2013 Stats, Chapter 386, § 1.) The same considerations apply here.

Loss of Environmental Benefits

Under AB 987, the project applicant has committed to a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction plan that includes a number of local measures that would provide benefits in the City of Inglewood. These measures include such commitments as (1) replacement of 10 municipal fleet vehicles with Zero Emissions Vehicles (ZEVs) and construction of related infrastructure for those vehicles; (2) replacement of 2 transit vehicles that operate within the City with ZEVs and construction of related infrastructure for those vehicles; (3) installation of 20 electric vehicle charging stations at locations within the City available for public user for charging electric vehicles; (4) development of a program for planting of 1,000 trees within the City; and (5) implementation of a program to purchase and installation of 1,000 electric vehicle charging units for residential use in local communities near the Project Site, with City residents given a priority for participation. Because AB 987 would not apply at this site, these measures would not be implemented under Alternative 4.

Loss of Public Benefits

As described in the Development Agreement, the Proposed Project would provide the City, its residents, and the surrounding region with an extensive array of public benefits. The public benefits would total approximately \$100 million and would include (1) the creation of local jobs and workforce equity; (2) commitments to affordable housing and renter support; (3) rehabilitation of Morningside Park Library and creation of a community center; (4) support for City of Inglewood youth and education; (5) support for social and educational programs at the Inglewood Senior Center; (6) renovation of public basketball courts in Inglewood; (7) community engagement and collaboration, including use of the arena for charitable causes, and access to NBA games for community groups. These public benefits would not be provided to the City of Inglewood under Alternative 4.

Alternative 5: The District at South Bay Alternative Site

This alternative does not appear to be feasible for the following reasons: (1) the alternative site is located in a different jurisdiction; (2) the alternative site may not be available for purchase; (3) unique constraints associated with the alternative site's former use as a land fill; (4) accessibility to public transit; (5) fan base proximity; and (6) none of the City's stated objectives for the Proposed Project would be achieved. A more detailed discussion of each reason is provided below.

Jurisdictional Constraints

The District at South Bay Alternative Site is located within the City of Carson. Construction of the Proposed Project on the alternative site, would require approval by the Carson City Council. In 2006, the City of Carson adopted the Carson Marketplace Specific Plan, which proposed constructing a mix of commercial and residential uses. In 2011, the specific plan was amended and renamed "The Boulevards at South Bay Specific Plan." In 2015, the specific plan area was proposed as the location for an NFL Stadium that would have served as the home for the San Diego Chargers and Oakland Raiders franchises; however, the site was ultimately not chosen. In 2018, the specific plan was further amended to allow for regional commercial uses and renamed "The District at South Bay Specific Plan." Under the current adopted plan, the site would be developed with a total of 1,250

residential units and approximately 1.8 million square feet of commercial uses including approximately 711,500 square feet of regional commercial uses, including outlet and restaurant uses, and 890,000 square feet of regional retail center, neighborhood-serving commercial, restaurant, and commercial recreation/entertainment uses, as well as 350 total rooms in two hotels. The 711,500-square-foot regional commercial center (Los Angeles Premium Outlets) is currently under construction on the approximately 30-acre eastern portion of the specific plan area, adjacent to the I-405. Given the amount of development planned for the site and the extensive planning that has been previously undertaken, it is uncertain if the City would consider an alternative plan for the site so soon after approval of the current plan.

Site Availability

The project applicant does not control or own the District at South Bay Alternative Site. As discussed above, development on the District at South Bay Alternative Site has been contemplated for a number of years, and construction of a commercial center on a portion of the site is underway. Given the amount of development proposed for the site and the effort that went into obtaining the approval of these entitlements, it is unknown if the undeveloped portion of the site is available for purchase or if the owner of the site would be willing to sell to the project applicant. In addition, the City of Carson is currently in negotiations with a developer to construct commercial retail/entertainment and industrial uses on a 90-acre portion of the site, and if the negotiations are successful, then a large portion of the site would be unavailable for purchase.³⁰

Hazardous Materials Constraints

The District at South Bay Alternative site is a former Class II landfill that is currently undergoing remediation and closure. The DTSC Remedial Action Plan for the alternative site requires the creation of an impervious cap across the site underlain by clean fill. Thus, in order to avoid damaging the cap, instead of excavating to a depth of up to 35 feet and removing approximately 376,000 cubic yards of earth, construction of an arena on the alternative site would require the import of a similar amount of soil in order to build up the land underneath the arena to avoid disturbing buried landfill materials. Even with the build-up of the site, penetration of the cap would be required in order to put in place support piles to bear the weight of the structure. Any penetration of the cap would require re-sealing and repair of the cap.

The need to build the Arena above ground would also create significant operational challenges and increase the costs of the building structure itself. The project architect indicates that in a typical modern arena, the main concourse, typically feeds the lower bowl of an arena, and thus is usually 30 to 50 feet above the event floor. The City has observed that this is the case in recently constructed arenas in San Francisco and Sacramento. Under Alternative 5, the elevation of the concourse 30 to 50 feet above ground level would, according to the project architect, create a challenge for the safe movement of fans and would require the entire development to be raised on a podium, including the public plaza/open space, which would involve significant cost increases.³¹

The costs and time associated with importing backfill sufficient to raise both the Arena and the surrounding development area; repairs to the impervious cap and other work within the contaminated and ongoing remediation of soils; and additional building structure, façade, and internal features such as escalators and elevators due to a

³⁰ Raymond, John, Assistant City Manager, City of Carson, personal communication, March 25, 2020.

³¹ AECOM, *Design and Operations Considerations of EIR Alternatives*, Letter from Bill Hanway, Executive Vice President, Global Sports Leader, AECOM to Chris Holmquist, Wilson Meany, May 7, 2020.

higher above ground structure, would be significant, and would add to the cost and extend the schedule of constructing the arena at the District at South Bay Alternative Site, as compared to the Proposed Project. The added cost for the Arena, not including the costs for raising the surrounding development area, is estimated to range from \$35-70 million, an additional \$5-15 million for special construction within contaminated soils and ongoing remediation, and considerable extended time to accommodate additional design and construction.³²

As a result of the need to minimize any potential damage to the cap and disturbance of other ongoing remediation activities, the only way to supply the necessary parking for the Arena would be to create an Arena that would be an “island” type destination, surrounded by a large expanse of surface parking. The project architect has indicated that this type of development is inconsistent with modern best practice arena design and urban placemaking.³³ As such, Alternative 5 would be inconsistent with project applicant objective 3, which is to “[d]esign a Project that is synergistic with nearby existing and proposed uses and incorporates state-of-the-art urban design and venue design principles.”

Public Transit Inaccessibility

Bus service to the District at South Bay Alternative site is provided by the City of Carson’s bus system, Carson Circuit, which provides connections to the Metro Blue Line (Light Rail), Metro Silver Line (Bus Rapid Transit) and to regional bus service provided by Torrance Transit, the MTA, Long Beach Transit and Gardena Municipal Bus Lines. The nearest bus stop is located at the intersection of Del Amo Boulevard and Main Street, located adjacent to the northwest corner of the project site, and multiple bus lines running north-south along Avalon Boulevard. The District at South Bay Alternative site is not as close to expansive public transit, such as light rail and regional bus transit, as the Proposed Project and several of the proposed alternatives. The site is located approximately 3.5 miles from the Metro Blue Line station at Del Amo Boulevard, approximately 1.5 miles from the Metro Silver Line station on the I-110 freeway at Carson Street, and approximately 1.8 miles from the Harbor Gateway Transit Center. Although it is assumed that the Proposed Project would provide shuttle service to the Blue and Silver Lines similar to the proposed shuttle service to the Crenshaw/LAX and Green Lines to be provided as part of the Proposed Project, given the distance of stations from the District at South Bay Alternative site, these transit options might not be as desirable as driving to the site given the close proximity of the I-405 freeway, which is adjacent to the site.

Fan Base Proximity

Alternative 5 does not meet one of the project applicant’s basic objectives for the project. Objective 1(b) states: “Locate a basketball and entertainment center on a site that is geographically desirable and accessible to the LA Clippers’ current and anticipated fan base.” The District at South Bay Alternative site is located approximately 11 miles southeast of the Project Site. As such, the site is located 11 miles further away from the Clippers’ current home at Staples Arena in downtown Los Angeles. As part of its site selection process, the project applicant engaged a team of experienced professionals to identify sites in the greater Los Angeles area that could accommodate a new, state-of-the-art Arena and Arena support uses. The preliminary analysis included sites in and around downtown Los Angeles, on the west side of Los Angeles, and also sites as far south as Long Beach.

³² AECOM, *Design and Operations Considerations of EIR Alternatives*, Letter from Bill Hanway, Executive Vice President, Global Sports Leader, AECOM to Chris Holmquist, Wilson Meany, May 7, 2020.

³³ AECOM, *Design and Operations Considerations of EIR Alternatives*, Letter from Bill Hanway, Executive Vice President, Global Sports Leader, AECOM to Chris Holmquist, Wilson Meany, May 7, 2020.

Of the sites to the south, the District at South Bay site was the closest to the preferred west side location, but was ultimately deemed less desirable than other options that were closer to the current and anticipated future fan base.³⁴ For these reasons, the project applicant has indicated that this location would not achieve project applicant Objective 1(b).

City Objectives

Under the District at South Bay Alternative none of the City's objectives for the Proposed Project would be achieved. Specifically, none of the City's objectives to enhance the community would be accomplished. For example, the City would be unable to achieve its goals of promoting the City as a premier regional sports and entertainment center (City Objective 1), enhancing the City's general economic health by stimulating new business and economic activity (City Objective 2), and constructing (with private funds) a public assembly space that would host sporting, cultural, business, and community events (City Objective 8).

City of Inglewood Economic Development Goals

As discussed under No Project Alternative, above, the City of Inglewood has long-standing goals articulated in the General Plan Land Use Element which call for the promotion of economic development that would generate opportunities and employment for the City's residents. Contrary to these goals, the District at South Bay Alternative would eliminate all increases in revenues to the City and the Inglewood Unified School District, including approximately 7,300 jobs and over \$1 billion in economic activity due to project construction, approximately 1,500 net new ongoing jobs, and approximately \$250 million in annual economic output.³⁵ While under the District at South Bay Alternative an equivalent level of economic benefits would likely accrue in the City of Carson, none of the noted economic development benefits would accrue to the City of Inglewood.

Inconsistency with Federal Aviation Administration Airport Improvement Program Grant

As discussed above under Alternative 1, the intent of the AIP program is that the land in question acquired by the City and Successor Agency be cleared of incompatible uses, and that the grant recipients use their best efforts to dispose of the land at fair market value for development with airport compatible uses. Under Alternative 5, the proposed Project Site would not be developed as under the Proposed Project. Similar to the No Project Alternative, the Project Site would remain vacant and under-developed. Agreements between the FAA and the City under the AIP program provide that the City and the Successor Agency must use their best efforts to dispose of parcels acquired under this program at a fair market value at the earliest practicable time. Holding the Project Site vacant under Alternative 5 would be inconsistent with the obligation to use such best efforts, as specified in grant agreements under the FAA AIP program. Alternative 5 would also be inconsistent with the City's objective to "transform vacant or underutilized land within the City into compatible land uses within aircraft noise contours generated by operations at LAX, in compliance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grants to the City."

Project Schedule and Costs

In addition to site acquisition, the proposed arena and associated development would require a complete redesign, including necessary NBA review and approval, along with review and approval through the City of Carson,

³⁴ AECOM, *Design and Operations Considerations of EIR Alternatives*, Letter from Bill Hanway, Executive Vice President, Global Sports Leader, AECOM to Chris Holmquist, Wilson Meany, May 7, 2020.

³⁵ HR&A, *Economic and Fiscal Impact Report: Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center*, May 2020, pages 4 to 5.

including preparation of a new CEQA document. As noted above, the redesigned project would have to account for the presence of hazardous materials at the site, which would increase design and construction costs as compared to the Proposed Project. In addition, the need to restart the planning and entitlement process would result in schedule extensions that would obstruct the ability to meet the project applicant's schedule objective to open in time for the 2024-25 NBA season.

The District at South Bay Alternative site also does not meet the definition of "project area" included in PRC section 21168.6.8(a)(5). Thus, Alternative 5 would not meet the requirements for compliance with AB 987. As a result of this change, should the adequacy of the EIR be litigated, rather than the AB 987 dictated 270-day process for legal proceedings, including any potential appeals, the project would be subject to the established legal process which can take three or more years. As a result of a more extended legal process, litigation regarding the adequacy of the EIR for Alternative 2 would likely obstruct the ability to meet the project applicant's schedule objective to open in time for the 2024-25 NBA season. That is because construction financing is often unavailable while CEQA litigation is pending, meaning that construction would not be able to proceed until after litigation is resolved even if no injunction is issued. Indeed, the extent to which CEQA litigation interferes with the ability to move forward with projects while such litigation is pending is a central aim of statutes, such as AB 987, establishing an accelerated time frame for the resolution of CEQA litigation. (See, e.g., Legislative Findings adopted pursuant to Assembly Bill 734 (2018 Stats. Chapter 959, § 1), Senate Bill 743 (2013 Stats. Chapter 386, § 1.) The same considerations apply here.

Loss of Environmental Benefits

Under AB 987, the project applicant has committed to a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction plan that includes a number of local measures that would provide benefits in the City of Inglewood. These measures include such commitments as (1) replacement of 10 municipal fleet vehicles with Zero Emissions Vehicles (ZEVs) and construction of related infrastructure for those vehicles; (2) replacement of 2 transit vehicles that operate within the City with ZEVs and construction of related infrastructure for those vehicles; (3) installation of 20 electric vehicle charging stations at locations within the City available for public user for charging electric vehicles; (4) development of a program for planting of 1,000 trees within the City; and (5) implementation of a program to purchase and installation of 1,000 electric vehicle charging units for residential use in local communities near the Project Site, with City residents given a priority for participation. Because AB 987 would not apply at this site, these measures would not be implemented under Alternative 5.

Loss of Public Benefits

As described in the Development Agreement, the Proposed Project would provide the City, its residents, and the surrounding region with an extensive array of public benefits. The public benefits would total approximately \$100 million and would include (1) the creation of local jobs and workforce equity; (2) commitments to affordable housing and renter support; (3) rehabilitation of Morningside Park Library and creation of a community center; (4) support for City of Inglewood youth and education; (5) support for social and educational programs at the Inglewood Senior Center; (6) renovation of public basketball courts in Inglewood; (7) community engagement and collaboration, including use of the arena for charitable causes, and access to NBA games for community groups. These public benefits would not be provided to the City of Inglewood under Alternative 5.

Alternative 6: Hollywood Park Specific Plan Alternative Site

The Hollywood Park Specific Plan Alternative does not appear to be feasible for the following reasons: (1) the alternative site may not be available for purchase; (2) it may not be feasible to construct the Proposed Project on the alternative site; (3) the Project Site would remain underutilized, thus not meeting the City's vision for the site; and (4) parking on the alternative site is constrained. A more detailed discussion of each reason is provided below.

Site Availability

The project applicant does not control or own the Hollywood Park Specific Plan Alternative Site within the HPSP area, which is located directly to the north of the Project Site across West Century Boulevard. In 2009, the City of Inglewood adopted the Hollywood Park Specific Plan, which proposed constructing a mix of office, commercial, residential, and community serving uses on the 238-acre site. In 2015, the Specific Plan was amended to include an NFL stadium. The City of Inglewood has approved construction plans or issued building permits for, and construction has commenced on, significant portions of the HPSP area, including the construction of a 70,000-seat open air NFL Stadium, a 6,000-seat performance venue, 518,077 square feet (sf) of retail and restaurant uses, 466,000 sf of office space, 314 residential units, an 11.89-acre park, a 4-acre civic use, and approximately 9,900 parking spaces. Given the amount of development proposed within the HPSP area and the effort that went into obtaining the approval of these entitlements, it is unknown if the site is available for purchase or if the owner of the site would be willing to sell to the project applicant.

Site Feasibility

Development of the Hollywood Park Specific Plan Alternative within the HPSP area would displace uses planned under the Hollywood Park Specific Plan Alternative site to other portions of the HPSP area, and there may not be sufficient space within the HPSP area to accommodate these displaced uses.

Because of the desire to limit the displacement of previously planned and approved uses in the HPSP area, the Alternative 6 site would provide limited amount of plaza space (approximately 104,650 sf as shown in Draft EIR Figure 6-5, page 6-70) that may be insufficient to meet the requirements necessary for safe ingress and egress of Arena crowds, and may not provide sufficient space or the proper configuration to accommodate the project applicant's "Champions Plaza" concept. Because of the limited size of the site and available plaza space, it is likely that Arena crowds would spill over into adjacent landscaped open spaces that are part of the Lake Park in the Hollywood Park Specific Plan. This small size and lack of plaza area would exacerbate safety and operational concerns if simultaneous events are held at the NFL Stadium and the Alternative 6 arena, as the current Lake Park open space was designed, in part, to accommodate the crowd flows before and after Stadium events.³⁶

Inconsistency with Federal Aviation Administration Airport Improvement Program Grant

As discussed above under Alternative 1, the intent of the AIP program is that the land in question acquired by the City and Successor Agency be cleared of incompatible uses, and that the grant recipients use their best efforts to dispose of the land at fair market value for development with airport compatible uses. Under Alternative 6, the proposed Project Site would not be developed as under the Proposed Project. Similar to the No Project

³⁶ AECOM, *Design and Operations Considerations of EIR Alternatives*, Letter from Bill Hanway, Executive Vice President, Global Sports Leader, AECOM to Chris Holmquist, Wilson Meany, May 7, 2020.

Alternative, the Project Site would remain vacant and under-developed. Agreements between the FAA and the City under the AIP program provide that the City and the Successor Agency must use their best efforts to dispose of parcels acquired under this program at a fair market value at the earliest practicable time. Holding the Project Site vacant under Alternative 6 would be inconsistent with the obligation to use such best efforts, as specified in grant agreements under the FAA AIP program. Alternative 6 would also be inconsistent with the City's objective to "transform vacant or underutilized land within the City into compatible land uses within aircraft noise contours generated by operations at LAX, in compliance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grants to the City."

Parking Constraints

The Proposed Project would demand approximately 7,700 parking spaces for LA Clippers basketball games, and up to 8,100 parking spaces for sold out concert events. According to City's Municipal Code, the Proposed Project would be required to provide 4,125 parking spaces with the remaining parking spaces provided off-site. The Hollywood Park Specific Plan Alternative would provide 1,045 spaces, which is only about a quarter of the spaces required by code. As a result, up to approximately 7,000 off-site parking spaces would be required under this alternative, most likely among the 9,900 spaces provided within the HPSP area. However, the HPSP requires that "no less than 9,000 spaces located throughout the HPSP area be made available" for the NFL Stadium. As a result, under the Hollywood Park Specific Plan Alternative events at the arena and stadium could not overlap; events at the arena would have to be scheduled when the stadium is not in use, thus potentially resulting in fewer events at the arena.

City of Inglewood Economic Development Goals

As discussed under No Project Alternative, above, the City of Inglewood has long-standing goals articulated in the General Plan Land Use Element which call for the promotion of economic development that would generate opportunities and employment for the City's residents. The Hollywood Park Specific Plan Alternative would involve the development of the same or substantially similar components of the Proposed Project on approximately 12 acres. It is assumed that it would generate the same approximate revenues to the City and the Inglewood Unified School District as the Proposed Project.

City Objectives for the Proposed Project

Alternative 6 would not be responsive to City Objective 5 to "[t]ransform vacant or underutilized land within the City into compatible land uses within aircraft noise contours generated by operations at LAX, in compliance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grants to the City."

Project Schedule and Costs

In addition to site acquisition, the proposed arena and associated development would require a complete redesign, including necessary NBA review and approval, along with review and approval through the City Inglewood, including preparation of a new CEQA document to support changes to the Hollywood Park Specific Plan. The need to restart the planning and entitlement process would result in schedule extensions that would obstruct the ability to meet the project applicant's schedule objective to open in time for the 2024-25 NBA season.

Further, the Alternative 6 site also does not meet the definition of "project area" included in PRC section 21168.6.8(a)(5). Thus, Hollywood Park Specific Plan Alternative would not meet the requirements for compliance with AB 987. As a result of this change, should the adequacy of the EIR be litigated, rather than the

AB 987 dictated 270-day process for legal proceedings, including any potential appeals, the project would be subject to the established legal process which can take three or more years. As a result of a more extended legal process, litigation regarding the adequacy of the EIR for Alternative 2 would likely obstruct the ability to meet the project applicant's schedule objective to open in time for the 2024-25 NBA season. That is because construction financing is often unavailable while CEQA litigation is pending, meaning that construction would not be able to proceed until after litigation is resolved even if no injunction is issued. Indeed, the extent to which CEQA litigation interferes with the ability to move forward with projects while such litigation is pending is a central aim of statutes, such as AB 987, establishing an accelerated time frame for the resolution of CEQA litigation. (See, e.g., Legislative Findings adopted pursuant to Assembly Bill 734 (2018 Stats. Chapter 959, § 1), Senate Bill 743 (2013 Stats, Chapter 386, § 1.) The same considerations apply here.

Loss of Environmental Benefits

Under AB 987, the project applicant has committed to a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction plan that includes a number of local measures that would provide benefits in the City of Inglewood. These measures include such commitments as (1) replacement of 10 municipal fleet vehicles with Zero Emissions Vehicles (ZEVs) and construction of related infrastructure for those vehicles; (2) replacement of 2 transit vehicles that operate within the City with ZEVs and construction of related infrastructure for those vehicles; (3) installation of 20 electric vehicle charging stations at locations within the City available for public user for charging electric vehicles; (4) development of a program for planting of 1,000 trees within the City; and (5) implementation of a program to purchase and installation of 1,000 electric vehicle charging units for residential use in local communities near the Project Site, with City residents given a priority for participation. Because AB 987 would not apply at this site, these measures would not be implemented under Alternative 6.

Alternative 7: The Forum Alternative Site

This alternative does not appear to be feasible for the following reasons: (1) it may not be feasible to construct the Proposed Project on the alternative site; (2) the Project Site would remain underutilized, and thus not meet the City's vision for the site; and (3) construction of the Proposed Project would result in the loss of an historic resource. A more detailed discussion of each reason is provided below.

Site Feasibility

To efficiently distribute parking for the operation of the Arena on the Alternative 7 site, the main parking structure under this Alternative would be located on the north side of the site, along West Manchester Boulevard, and additional surface parking would be accessed from the east, off of Kareem Court and Pincay Drive. As a result of these access requirements, the primary plaza and open space for Alternative 7 would be aligned along the western edge of the site, between the arena structure and South Prairie Avenue. The project architect has stated that the resulting linear shape of the plaza, and high level of exposure to South Prairie Avenue, a 6-lane arterial, would inhibit the creation of a unique urban environment and would be contrary to best practices in urban placemaking.³⁷

³⁷ AECOM, *Design and Operations Considerations of EIR Alternatives*, Letter from Bill Hanway, Executive Vice President, Global Sports Leader, AECOM to Chris Holmquist, Wilson Meany, May 7, 2020.

Loss of Historic Resource

The Forum Alternative site is currently developed with an historic concert venue known as The Forum. The Forum is an approximately 350,000 sf arena that opened in 1967 and until 1999 was the home of the NBA Los Angeles Lakers, the NHL Los Angeles Kings, and the WNBA Los Angeles Sparks, and hosted other major sporting events and other athletic competitions, concerts, and events. In 2012, The Forum underwent comprehensive renovation and rehabilitation that included structural, aesthetic, and amenity improvements completed in 2014 to convert The Forum into a world-class concert and event venue. In addition, The Forum was listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historic Resources in 2014 as an architecturally significant historic place worthy of preservation. The renovation of The Forum was funded in part by federal tax credits for its restoration as a National Register-listed building and an \$18 million loan from the City of Inglewood for the restoration and rehabilitation of the structure. As it is not structurally feasible to renovate the existing Forum building to meet the requirements of a modern NBA arena, the existing Forum building would need to be demolished under this alternative, thus resulting in the significant and unavoidable impact associated with the loss of a historic resource. Finally, even if it was structurally feasible to renovate the arena, these changes would remove or substantially alter the character defining features of The Forum that make it eligible for listing on the National Register and California Register.

City Objectives for the Proposed Project

The Forum Alternative would meet some of City's objectives for the Proposed Project. The Forum Alternative would meet the City's goals of becoming a regional sports and entertainment center (City Objective 1) and stimulating economic development (City Objective 2), however because this alternative would involve demolition of an existing entertainment venue, The Forum, in order to build a new sports and entertainment venue of similar size, it would not achieve these goals to the same extent as the Proposed Project. As explained above, The Forum site is currently developed with a large entertainment venue, and while there are surrounding surface parking lots that can be seen as underdeveloped, the Forum Alternative site is not underutilized to the same degree as the Project Site.

Because City Objective 5 is to "[t]ransform vacant or underutilized land within the City into compatible land uses within aircraft noise contours generated by operations at LAX, in compliance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grants to the City," Alternative 7 would not be as responsive to this objective as the Proposed Project. Finally, because the Forum Alternative would result in a new significant and unavoidable impact as a result of the demolition of the historic Forum building, it would be less responsive than the Proposed Project to City Objective 10, which calls for the project objectives to be achieved "in an expeditious and environmentally conscious manner."

City of Inglewood Economic Development Goals

As discussed under No Project Alternative, above, the City of Inglewood has long-standing goals articulated in the General Plan Land Use Element which call for the promotion of economic development that would generate opportunities and employment for the City's residents. Contrary to these goals. The Forum Alternative would involve the development of the same or substantially similar components of the Proposed Project on approximately 28 acres currently occupied by the historic Forum concert and event venue and ancillary structures and surface parking, it would generate the same approximate revenues to the City and the Inglewood Unified School District as the Proposed Project. However, it would result in the demolition of The Forum entertainment venue, and would eliminate the current revenue that is generated to the City, which is materially larger than the

revenue generation from the uses on the proposed Project Site. As such, The Forum Alternative would generate a materially smaller level of net new economic development than the Proposed Project.

Inconsistency with Federal Aviation Administration Airport Improvement Program Grant

As discussed above under Alternative 1, the intent of the AIP program is that the land in question acquired by the City and Successor Agency be cleared of incompatible uses, and that the grant recipients use their best efforts to dispose of the land at fair market value for development with airport compatible uses. Under Alternative 7, the proposed Project Site would not be developed as under the Proposed Project. Similar to the No Project Alternative, the Project Site would remain vacant and under-developed. Agreements between the FAA and the City under the AIP program provide that the City and the Successor Agency must use their best efforts to dispose of parcels acquired under this program at a fair market value at the earliest practicable time. Holding the Project Site vacant under Alternative 7 would be inconsistent with the obligation to use such best efforts, as specified in grant agreements under the FAA AIP program. Alternative 7 would also be inconsistent with the City's objective to "transform vacant or underutilized land within the City into compatible land uses within aircraft noise contours generated by operations at LAX, in compliance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grants to the City."

Project Schedule and Costs

In addition to site acquisition, the proposed arena and associated development would require a complete redesign, including necessary NBA review and approval, along with review and approval through the City of Inglewood, including preparation of a new CEQA document. The need to restart the planning and entitlement process would result in schedule extensions that would obstruct the ability to meet the project applicant's schedule objective to open in time for the 2024-25 NBA season.

The Alternative 7 site also does not meet the definition of "project area" included in PRC section 21168.6.8(a)(5). Thus, The Forum Alternative would not meet the requirements for compliance with AB 987. As a result of this change, should the adequacy of the EIR be litigated, rather than the AB 987 dictated 270-day process for legal proceedings, including any potential appeals, the project would be subject to the established legal process which can take three or more years. As a result of a more extended legal process, litigation regarding the adequacy of the EIR for Alternative 2 would likely obstruct the ability to meet the project applicant's schedule objective to open in time for the 2024-25 NBA season. That is because construction financing is often unavailable while CEQA litigation is pending, meaning that construction would not be able to proceed until after litigation is resolved even if no injunction is issued. Indeed, the extent to which CEQA litigation interferes with the ability to move forward with projects while such litigation is pending is a central aim of statutes, such as AB 987, establishing an accelerated time frame for the resolution of CEQA litigation. (See, e.g., Legislative Findings adopted pursuant to Assembly Bill 734 (2018 Stats. Chapter 959, § 1), Senate Bill 743 (2013 Stats, Chapter 386, § 1.) The same considerations apply here.

Loss of Environmental Benefits

Under AB 987, the project applicant has committed to a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction plan that includes a number of local measures that would provide benefits in the City of Inglewood. These measures include such commitments as (1) replacement of 10 municipal fleet vehicles with Zero Emissions Vehicles (ZEVs) and construction of related infrastructure for those vehicles; (2) replacement of 2 transit vehicles that operate within the City with ZEVs and construction of related infrastructure for those vehicles; (3) installation of 20 electric

vehicle charging stations at locations within the City available for public user for charging electric vehicles; (4) development of a program for planting of 1,000 trees within the City; and (5) implementation of a program to purchase and installation of 1,000 electric vehicle charging units for residential use in local communities near the Project Site, with City residents given a priority for participation. Because AB 987 would not apply at this site, these measures would not be implemented under Alternative 7.

Project Site Underutilization

As discussed above, parcels on the Project Site have remained vacant for a variety of reasons. If the Proposed Project were not to be constructed on the Project Site, these parcels would likely remain vacant for the foreseeable future, and thus the site would not be transformed to include land uses that are compatible with the existing noise environment.