

CHAPTER 3

Environmental Impacts, Settings, and Mitigation Measures

3.0 Introduction

This EIR evaluates the physical environmental effects that would potentially occur from implementation of the Proposed Project. The structure of the technical sections included in this chapter are discussed below, as well as definitions of key terms that are used throughout this EIR. A summary of those comments that were received during the scoping period are summarized herein as well. In addition, this section describes those environmental effects that are typically considered under CEQA would not be affected by the Proposed Project or would be determined to be less than significant and, pursuant to CEQA, and are not further analyzed in this EIR. This section also provides a discussion of the Adjusted Baseline Environmental Setting and the identification of other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects that are used in the analysis of cumulative impacts throughout this chapter.

3.0.1 Definitions of Terms Used in the EIR

This EIR uses a number of terms that have specific meaning under CEQA. Among the most important of the terms used in the EIR are those that refer to the significance of environmental impacts. The following terms to describe environmental effects of the Proposed Project:

- **Significance Criteria:** A set of criteria used by the lead agency (City of Inglewood) to determine at what level or threshold an impact would be considered significant. Thresholds of significance are identifiable quantitative, qualitative, or performance levels of a particular environmental effect that are supported by substantial evidence.¹ Thresholds of significance used in this EIR include those standards provided by the City of Inglewood unless otherwise specifically defined.
- **No Impact:** A project impact is considered to have no impact when the Proposed Project would result in no direct or indirect adverse changes (or impacts) to the environment, with respect to the applicable significance criterion. A project impact with a no impact determination would also be less than cumulatively considerable and thus not significant.

¹ State CEQA Guidelines, section 15064.7

- **Less-than-Significant Impact:** A project impact is considered less than significant when the physical change caused by the Proposed Project would not exceed the applicable significance criterion.
- **Potentially Significant Impact:** A potentially significant impact is identified where the Proposed Project may cause a substantial adverse change in the environment, depending on certain unknown conditions related to the project or the affected environment. For CEQA purposes, a potentially significant impact is treated as if it were a significant impact. A project impact is considered potentially significant if the Proposed Project is anticipated to exceed identified standards of significance thereby result in in a substantial adverse change in the physical conditions of the environment. Significant impacts are identified by the evaluation of project-related physical change compared to specified significance criteria. A significant impact is defined as “a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.”² In instances where potentially significant impacts are identified, the EIR must consider whether mitigation measures (as defined below) or alternatives to the project, would reduce those impacts.
- **Significant and Unavoidable Impact:** A project impact is considered significant and unavoidable if it would result in a substantial adverse physical change in the environment that cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
- **Cumulative Impact:** Under CEQA, a cumulative impact refers to “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.”³ Like any other significant impact, a project’s contribution to a cumulative impact is considerable (i.e., significant) when the cumulative adverse physical change would exceed the applicable significance criterion, thus making the Proposed Project’s contribution “cumulatively considerable.”⁴
- **Mitigation Measure:** Where a potentially significant impact or significant and unavoidable impact are identified, feasible mitigation measures that could minimize the identified significant adverse impacts are required.⁵ A mitigation measure is an action that could be taken that would avoid or reduce the magnitude of a significant impact. Section 15370 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines mitigation as:
 - a. Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action;
 - b. Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree of magnitude of the action and its implementation;
 - c. Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment;
 - d. Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action; and

² State CEQA Guidelines, section 15382.

³ State CEQA Guidelines, section 15355.

⁴ State CEQA Guidelines, section 15130(a).

⁵ State CEQA Guidelines, section 15126.4

- e. Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

3.0.2 Section Format

Chapter 3 is divided into technical sections (e.g., Section 3.1, Aesthetics) that present for each environmental resource issue area the physical environmental setting, the regulatory setting, standards of significance from which impacts are measured, analytical methods, an evaluation of potential impacts to the environment, and, where required, feasible mitigation measures for identified significant impacts. Each section includes an analysis of project-specific and cumulative impacts for each issue area.

The technical environmental sections each begin with a description of the project's **environmental setting** and the **regulatory setting** as it pertains to a particular issue. The environmental setting provides a point of reference for assessing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Project and project alternatives. The environmental setting discussion addresses the conditions that currently exist at the time the NOP was circulated for the Project (March 2018), prior to implementation of the project. In addition to the baseline environmental setting that exists as of March 2018 (and as described briefly in Section 2.4.3 of the Project Description), an **adjusted baseline environmental setting** is also considered in this EIR (see discussion below in Section 3.0.5). The regulatory setting presents relevant information about federal, state, regional, and/or local laws, regulations, plans or policies that pertain to the environmental resources addressed in each section.

Next, each section presents **significance criteria**, which identify the standards used by the City of Inglewood to determine the significance of effects of the Proposed Project. Section 15064.7 of the State CEQA Guidelines states that "... a lead agency may consider thresholds of significance previously adopted or recommended by other public agencies or recommended by experts, provided the decision of the lead agency to adopt such thresholds is supported by substantial evidence."

A **methodology and assumptions** description in each section presents the analytical methods and key assumptions used in the evaluation of effects of the Proposed Project, and is followed by an **impacts and mitigation measures** discussion. The impact and mitigation portion of each section includes one or more impact statements, prefaced by an impact number in bold-faced type. An explanation of each impact is followed by an analysis of its significance. The impact discussion ends with a concluding statement regarding the significance of the impact and any related need for mitigation measures (either none are required, or all feasible mitigation measures are presented to reduce an identified significant effect). The description of mitigation measures concludes with a description of the significance of the impact after application of the mitigation measure(s): either implementation of the mitigation measure(s) would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level, or the impact would remain significant and unavoidable after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures.

The analysis of environmental impacts considers both the construction and operational phases associated with implementation of the Proposed Project. As required by section 15126.2(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, direct, indirect, short-term, long-term, onsite, and/or off-site impacts are addressed, as appropriate, for the environmental issue area being analyzed. Depending on the significance criteria, the impact analysis may consist of a qualitative discussion, a quantitative analysis, or a combination of both. Detailed technical appendices are also provided for several technical sections, where appropriate, and can be located at the end of the document.

Under CEQA, economic or social changes of a project are not treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may, however, trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes.⁶ In addition, anticipated economic or social effects of a project may be used in the determination of the significance of physical changes caused by the project.⁷ As required by CEQA, the focus of the analysis in this EIR is on the physical changes that would result from the approval and implementation of the Proposed Project. Consistent with the requirements of CEQA, this EIR includes consideration of potential adverse physical environmental effects that could be the result of socioeconomic and/or economic changes that could be triggered by the Proposed Project, and as appropriate considers social and economic factors that may affect the significance of a physical effect. This topic is addressed in Chapter 4, Other CEQA Required Sections.

Mitigation measures pertinent to each individual impact, if necessary, appear after the impact discussion section. The magnitude of reduction of an impact and the potential effect of that reduction in magnitude on the significance of the impact is also disclosed. An example of the format is shown below.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact 3.X-1: Impact statement

A discussion of the Proposed Project's impact is provided in paragraph form. A statement level of significance before application of any mitigation measures is provided in **bold**.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 3.X-1

Mitigation measure presented in italics and numbered to match the impact number.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: This paragraph describes how the mitigation measure(s) reduces the impact and identifies the residual level of impact in **bold**.

⁶ State CEQA Guidelines, sections 15064(e), 15131(a).

⁷ State CEQA Guidelines, sections 15064(e), 15131(b).

Cumulative Impacts

Section 15130 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project’s incremental effect is cumulatively considerable. As defined in State CEQA Guidelines section 15355, a cumulative impact consists of an impact that is created as a result of the combination of a project evaluated in the EIR together with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects causing related impacts. State CEQA Guidelines section 15130(b) requires that the discussion of cumulative impacts shall “reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone.”

In each topical section of the EIR, an analysis of cumulative impacts follows the project-specific impacts and mitigation measures evaluation. An introductory discussion that identifies the cumulative impact methodology and defines the cumulative context being addressed in each respective analysis (e.g., the South Coast Air Basin) is included at the beginning of the cumulative impact analysis in each technical section. In some instances, a project-specific impact may be considered less than significant, but its contribution to a larger impact may be determined to be potentially significant when considered in combination with other cumulative development of the surrounding area or in combination with regional growth projections. In some instances, a potentially significant impact may result at the project-level but would not result in a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact. The cumulative impacts analyses are formatted the same as the project-specific impacts, as shown above in Section 3.0.2, Section Format.

3.0.3 Comments Received During Scoping

In response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP), the City of Inglewood received a total of 18 comment letters regarding the Proposed Project. Additionally, 57 written comments were provided during the public scoping meeting held on March 12, 2018. A number of scoping-related comments were also received following the close of the comment period. All scoping comments received are provided in Appendix B. Although a number specific comments were raised in the NOP comments, comments generally fall into several main categories:

- Vehicular traffic management, particularly along freeways and local roadways;
- Parking supply and availability;
- Potential impacts to public transit and public transit facilities;
- Potential impacts on the surrounding area that could occur from the Proposed Project’s provision of entertainment, retail, office, and hotel uses;
- Secondary economic impacts of the Proposed Project with respect to affordable housing;
- Adequate provision of public services and utilities;
- Noise and air quality impacts as a result of construction of the Proposed Project; and

- Cumulative impacts of the Proposed Project and other large venues nearby holding concurrent events.

3.0.4 Effects Not Found to be Significant

CEQA allows that an EIR contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and therefore not discussed in detail.⁸ Upon review of the Proposed Project and in consideration with comments received during the scoping period as summarized above, the City of Inglewood determined that due to the physical characteristics of the Project Site and the Project as proposed, there would be no impact to several environmental issues; therefore these topics need not be further considered in the Draft EIR.⁹ The discussions below provide brief statements of reasons, supported by citations, for the City's determination that these issues do not warrant further consideration in the EIR.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources

A significant impact to Agricultural and Forestry Resources would occur if the Proposed Project would:

1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use;
2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract;
3. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g));
4. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or
5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

The Proposed Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use. (No Impact)

⁸ State CEQA Guidelines, section 15128

⁹ Public Resources Code section 21003(e) states that “[t]o provide more meaningful public disclosure, reduce the time and cost required to prepare an environmental impact report, and focus on potentially significant effects on the environment of a proposed project, lead agencies shall, in accordance with Section 21100, focus the discussion in the environmental impact report on those potential effects on the environment of a proposed project which the lead agency has determined are or may be significant. Lead agencies may limit discussion on other effects to a brief explanation as to why those effects are not potentially significant.”

The area surrounding the Project Site is characterized by dense urban development, as well as vacant, undeveloped parcels that were previously developed over many years and more recently cleared for redevelopment. The Project Site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (collectively referred to as ‘Farmland’), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency.¹⁰ As such, the Proposed Project would not convert Farmland, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use. There would be **no impact**.

The Proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. (No Impact)

The Project Site is not included in the most recently released map showing Williamson Act contracts within Los Angeles County.¹¹ Subsequently, no portions of the Project Site are subject to a Williamson Act contract. The Proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and would not conflict with a Williamson Act contract. There would be **no impact**.

The Proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)). (No Impact)

The Project Site is not zoned for timberland or timberland production by the City of Inglewood. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. There would be **no impact**.

The Proposed Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. (No Impact)

The Project Site is characterized by dense, urban development. The Project Site is not located on land that is zoned as forest land, either by the County of Los Angeles or by the City of Inglewood. As discussed above, since the Project Site is not irrigated and is surrounded by urban land, it is classified as Urban Land by the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. There would be **no impact**.

¹⁰ California Department of Conservation Division of Land Resource Protection, 2016. California Important Farmland Finder. Available: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>. Accessed September 24, 2018.

¹¹ California Department of Conservation Division of Land Resource Protection, 2016. Los Angeles County Williamson Act FY 2015/2016 Map. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/LA_15_16_WA.pdf. Accessed September 24, 2018.

The Proposed Project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. (No Impact)

As discussed above, the Project Site is located within an urban environment characterized by dense development. The Project Site is not zoned as Farmland, and is classified as Urban Land. The Project Site is not under a Williamson Act contract. The Project Site is not zoned for agricultural use, nor is it designated for timberland, timberland production, or as forest land. Additionally, the Project Site is not currently utilized for agriculture, timberland or timberland production, or forest land. As such, the Proposed Project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use and would not result in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. There would be **no impact**.

Mineral Resources

A significant impact to Mineral Resources would occur if the Proposed Project would:

1. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; or
2. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.

The Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. (No Impact)

The Project Site is in a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) classified as MRZ-1, which covers those areas where available geologic information indicates that little likelihood exists for the presence of significant mineral resources.^{12,13,14,15} Although the Project Site is located within the San Gabriel Production-Consumption Region, the Project Site is not located within a MRZ-2 zone,

-
- 12 California Department of Conservation, 1982. California Department of Mines and Geology, Mineral Land Classification Map, Aggregate Resources Only, Inglewood Quadrangle, Special Report 143, Plate 4-15. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_143/PartIV/. Accessed September 25, 2018.
 - 13 California Department of Conservation, 1982. California Department of Mines and Geology, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of the Greater Los Angeles Area, Part IV: Classification of Sand and Gravel Resource Areas, San Gabriel Valley Production-Consumption Region, Special Report 143, Part IV. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_143/PartIV/. Accessed September 25, 2018.
 - 14 California Department of Conservation, 2010. California Department of Mines and Geology, Update of Mineral Land Classification for Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the San Gabriel Valley Production-Consumption Region, Los Angeles County, California, Special Report 209, Plate 1: San Gabriel Valley P-C Region Showing MRZ-2 Areas and Active Mine Operations. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_209/. Accessed September 25, 2018.
 - 15 California Department of Conservation, 2010. California Department of Mines and Geology, California Geological Survey, Update of Mineral Land Classification for Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the San Gabriel Valley Production-Consumption Region, Los Angeles County, California, Special Report 209. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_209/. Accessed September 25, 2018.

which would indicate that significant mineral resources are present.¹⁶ Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. There would be **no impact**.

The Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. (No Impact)

As discussed above, the Project Site is located within a MRZ-1 zone, which indicates that there is little likelihood that the Project Site contains significant mineral resources. The Project Site is not delineated or designated by the City of Inglewood as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. There would be no impact.

Wildfire

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, a significant impact related to wildfires would occur if the Proposed Project would:

1. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan;
2. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire;
3. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment; or
4. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

The Project Site is not within an area designated as a state responsibility area¹⁷ nor is it classified as very high fire hazard severity zone.¹⁸ Therefore, there would be no impact to or from wildfires.

3.0.5 Adjusted Baseline Environmental Setting

Construction of the Proposed Project is not expected to be complete and operational until mid-2024. At this time, the City of Inglewood has issued building permits for, and construction has

¹⁶ California Department of Conservation, 2010. California Department of Mines and Geology, Update of Mineral Land Classification for Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the San Gabriel Valley Production-Consumption Region, Los Angeles County, California, Special Report 209, Plate 1: San Gabriel Valley P-C Region Showing MRZ-2 Areas and Active Mine Operations. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_209/. Accessed: September 25, 2018.

¹⁷ California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, 2019. State Responsibility Area Viewer. Available: http://bofdata.fire.ca.gov/sra_viewer/. Accessed February 27, 2019.

¹⁸ California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, 2019. Wildland Hazard & Building Codes, California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map Update Project. Available: http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fire_prevention_wildland_zones_maps. Accessed: February 27, 2019.

commenced on, significant portions of the Hollywood Park Specific Plan (HPSP) located immediately north of the Project Site, including the construction of the 70,000-seat open air NFL Stadium, a 6,000-seat performance venue, 518,077 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, 466,000 square feet of office space, 314 residential units, an 11.89-acre park, and approximately 9,900 parking spaces, known as HPSP Phase 1 (see **Table 3.0-1**). Because of current and anticipated construction schedules, the City is reasonably assured that the HPSP Phase 1 projects will be built and operational by 2021 when construction of the Proposed Project is expected to be initiated, and prior to 2024 when operation of the Proposed Project would start. Construction and operation of the HPSP Phase 1 project will change from the physical conditions that currently exist in the Project vicinity for most of the environmental topics addressed in this EIR. Due to the certainty that this project will be constructed and in operation prior to construction and operation of the Proposed Project, the City has determined that it would be misleading to disregard these projects in the environmental setting, because these projects are certain to exist by the time the Proposed Project is constructed and commences operations. Accordingly, the changes associated with these developments are considered as part of the Adjusted Baseline Environmental Setting. How these associated changes affect the environmental setting is further described in each topical section under the heading Adjusted Baseline Environmental Setting.

**TABLE 3.0-1
 HOLLYWOOD PARK SPECIFIC PLAN**

Land Use	Adjusted Baseline	Remaining Development in Mixed-Use and Residential Areas	2.0 FAR in Interim Use Areas	Total Cumulative	Total HPSP Development Assumptions
Retail	518,077 sf	371,923 sf	0 sf	371,923 sf	890,000 sf
Office	466,000 sf	314,000 sf	3,253,314 sf	3,567,314 sf	4,033,314 sf
Residential	314 units	2,186 units	0 units	2,186 units	2,500 units
Hotel	0 rooms	300 rooms	0 rooms	300 rooms	300 units
Stadium	70,000 seats	0 seats	0 seats	0 seats	70,000 seats
Perform. Venue	6,000 seats	0 seats	0 seats	0 seats	6,000 seats
Open Space	11.89 ac	13.06 ac	0 ac	13.06 ac	24.95 ac
Civic Use	0 ac	4 ac	0 ac	4 ac	4 ac

3.0.6 Cumulative Projects

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15130(b)(1), either of the following are necessary to an adequate discussion of significant cumulative impacts:

- A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency; or
- A summary of projections contained in an adopted local, regional or statewide plan, or related planning document, that describes or evaluates conditions contributing the cumulative effect.

State CEQA Guidelines section 15125(a) states that the appropriate baseline is established when the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published. The City published the NOP in February 2018. Following publication of the NOP, and consistent with guidance provided in CEQA Guidelines section 15130(b), the City began identification of reasonably foreseeable projects to include in the cumulative environmental analysis.

Table 3.0-2 provides a list of all past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects. **Figure 3.0-1** identifies the locations of these cumulative projects. To understand the Project’s contribution to cumulative impacts, the City, in consultation with other surrounding jurisdictions, has assembled a list of other known past, present, and reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects in the vicinity of the Project Site. Projects on this list consist of development projects within the City or other identified surrounding jurisdictions which have a pending development application, are approved, or are under construction.

**TABLE 3.0-2
 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

No.	Project Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Size
1	6161 W. Centinela Boulevard	Culver City	Office	281.209 ksf
2	12712-12718 Washington Boulevard	Culver City	Apartments	5 units
			Retail	3.414 ksf
			Commercial	2.340 ksf
3	6002 Centinela Avenue	Culver City	Service Bays	14.668 ksf
			Parts and Service	12.900 ksf
4	6201 Bristol Parkway	Culver City	Commercial	16.000 ksf
			Apartments	775 units
			Hotel	-60.000 ksf
5	888, 892, and 898 N. Sepulveda Boulevard	El Segundo	Hotel	190 rooms
6	El Segundo South Campus Specific Plan – 2000-2100 East El Segundo Boulevard	El Segundo	Office	1,751.921 ksf
			Warehouse	73.577 ksf
			Retail	148.960 ksf
7	199 Continental Boulevard	El Segundo	Hotel	152 rooms
8	2265 E. El Segundo Boulevard	El Segundo	Warehouse	-3.050 ksf
			Office	3.050 ksf
9	400 Duley Road	El Segundo	Office	73.000 ksf
10	2275 Mariposa Avenue	El Segundo	Corporate Office	52.000 ksf
			Athletic Training Facility	68.300 ksf
11	201 N. Douglas	El Segundo	High School	1,200 students
			High School	-90.000 ksf
12	2125 Campus Drive	El Segundo	Hotel	121.450 ksf
			Office	63.550 ksf

**TABLE 3.0-2
 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

No.	Project Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Size
13	535 Indian Street	El Segundo	Condominiums	4 units
14	1700 E. Imperial Avenue	El Segundo	Office	96.898 ksf
15	710 N. Nash Street	El Segundo	Office	611.545 ksf
			Retail	13.660 ksf
16	1950 E. Grand Avenue	El Segundo	Office	93.569 ksf
17	445 N. Douglas Street	El Segundo	Office	106.000 ksf
			Warehouse Industrial Data Center	117.000 ksf
18	101 Continental Boulevard	El Segundo	Hotel	167 rooms
19	444 N. Nash Street	El Segundo	Data Center	180.422 ksf
20	SE Aviation Boulevard	El Segundo	Condominiums	525 units
			Office	-835.000 ksf
21	425-429 Indiana Street	El Segundo	Apartments	8 units
22	NE Sepulveda Boulevard	El Segundo	Retail	67.000 ksf
23	55 Continental Boulevard and 1955 E. Grand Avenue	El Segundo	Office Tower	300.000 ksf
24	1960 E. Grand Avenue	El Segundo	Hotel	150 rooms
25	525 N. Sepulveda Boulevard	El Segundo	Hotel Expansion	6.952 ksf
26	900, 950 Sepulveda Boulevard	El Segundo	Warehouse	20.819 ksf
			Office	139.558 ksf
			Manufacturing	14.025 ksf
27	600-630 N. Sepulveda Boulevard	El Segundo	Fast Food Restaurant with Drive-Through	3.714 ksf
28	2130 E. Maple Avenue	El Segundo	Office	20.955 ksf
29	555 N. Nash Street	El Segundo	Ice Skating Rink	17.315 ksf
30	14321 Van Ness Avenue	Gardena	Townhomes	40 townhomes
31	1720 West 135 th Street	Gardena	Industrial	100.438 ksf
32	13919 Normandie Avenue	Gardena	Single Room Occupancy	20 units
33	525 E. Rosecrans Avenue	Gardena	Retail	3.140 ksf
34	Aviation Boulevard/El Segundo Boulevard	Hawthorne	Condominiums	610 units
35	4500 West 116 th Street	Hawthorne	Condominiums	116 units
36	13806 Hawthorne Boulevard	Hawthorne	Apartments	171 units
			Office	32.500 ksf
37	Crenshaw Boulevard/Jack Northrop Avenue	Hawthorne	Dwelling Units	230 units
			Restaurant	33.700 ksf
38	14000 Yukon Avenue	Hawthorne	Apartments	6 units
39	4427 El Segundo Boulevard	Hawthorne	Hotel	350 rooms

**TABLE 3.0-2
 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

No.	Project Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Size
40	11519 Acacia Avenue	Hawthorne	Hotel	119 rooms
41	14135 Cersie Avenue	Hawthorne	Apartments	241 units
42	664 E. Manchester Terrace	Inglewood	Condominiums	4 units
43	844 N. Centinela Avenue	Inglewood	Apartments	4 units
44	501 E. 99 th Street	Inglewood	Condominiums	12 units
45	921 N. Edgewood Street	Inglewood	Apartments	38 units
46	222 W. Spruce Avenue	Inglewood	Apartments	10 units
47	961 E. 68 th Street	Inglewood	Condominiums	3 units
48	417 N. Market Street	Inglewood	Condominiums	12 units
49	819 E. La Palma Drive	Inglewood	Apartments	5 units
50	814 N. Market Street	Inglewood	Congregate Living Facility	18 beds
51	411 E. Hazel Street	Inglewood	Apartments	18 units
52	329 E. Hazel Street	Inglewood	Condominiums	4 units
53	11111 S. Prairie Avenue	Inglewood	Hotel	120 rooms
54	3920 W. 108 th Street	Inglewood	Apartments	3 units
55	125 E. Spruce Avenue	Inglewood	Apartments	7 units
56	704 N. Market Street	Inglewood	Apartments	12 units
57	408 E. Warren Lane	Inglewood	Commercial	2,542 ksf
58	508 S. Eucalyptus Avenue	Inglewood	Senior Housing	40 units
59	417-433 Centinela Avenue	Inglewood	Apartments	116 units
60	721 N. La Brea Avenue	Inglewood	Commercial	1,312 ksf
			Commercial	-1,210 ksf
61	101,125,139,140,150 Market Street	Inglewood	Retail	40,000 ksf
62	113-133 Plymouth Street	Inglewood	Townhomes	20 units
63	333 N. Prairie Avenue	Inglewood	Townhomes	310 units
64	705-715 N. Centinela Avenue	Inglewood	Self-Storage	81,613 ksf
65	3660 W. 107 th Street	Inglewood	Dwelling Units	3 units
66	614 E. Hyde Park Boulevard	Inglewood	Congregate Living Facility	18 beds
67	1050 S. Prairie Avenue	Inglewood	Residential	2,186 units
			Retail	371,923 ksf
			Office	3,567,314 ksf
			Hotel	300 rooms
			Open Space	13.06 acres
			Civic Site	30,000 ksf
68	D3 SITE (La Brea Avenue/Florence Avenue)	Inglewood	Apartments	121 units
			Retail	40,000 ksf

**TABLE 3.0-2
 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

No.	Project Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Size
69	101 S. La Brea	Inglewood	Philharmonic Association	25.500 ksf
70	316 Hardy Street	Inglewood	Condominiums	5 units
71	943-959 W. Hyde Park Boulevard	Inglewood	Self-Storage	159.498 ksf
72	8911 Aviation Boulevard	Inglewood	Car Rental	173.804 ksf
73	3900 W. Century Boulevard	Inglewood	Hotel	4 units
74	5206 W. Thornburn Street	Los Angeles	Elementary to Middle Private School	50 students
75	9800 S. Sepulveda Boulevard	Los Angeles	Hotel	178 rooms
76	10701 S. La Cienega Boulevard	Los Angeles	Bus Facility	1,006.236 ksf
77	7407 S. La Tijera Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	140 units
			Retail	2.600 ksf
78	8740 S. La Tijera Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	137 units
79	8521 S. Sepulveda Boulevard	Los Angeles	Fast Food Restaurant with Drive-Through	3.399 ksf
80	6801 Center Drive	Los Angeles	Apartments	600 units
81	1 World Way	Los Angeles	Land Access Modernization Program	- -
82	8721 S. Broadway	Los Angeles	Senior Housing	108 units
			Retail	4.000 ksf
83	5975 S. Western Avenue	Los Angeles	Industrial	225.000 ksf
84	1636 W. Manchester Avenue	Los Angeles	Office	68.250 ksf
85	8540 S. La Tijera Boulevard	Los Angeles	Middle School	525 students
86	8705 S. Western Avenue	Los Angeles	Middle School	616 students
87	8400 S. Vermont Avenue	Los Angeles	Shopping Center	740.000 ksf
88	9402 S. Broadway	Los Angeles	Senior Housing	49 units
89	8415 S. Hoover Street	Los Angeles	Condominiums	142 units
			Apartments	57 units
			Recreational Center	11.550 ksf
			Retail	7.500 ksf
			Bank	1.500 ksf
			Office	15.400 ksf
90	5816 S. Western Avenue	Los Angeles	Fueling Positions	4 positions
			Convenience Store	1.835 ksf
91	505 W. Century Boulevard	Los Angeles	Fueling Position	6 positions
92	6733 Sepulveda Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	176 units
93	5208 W. Centinela Avenue	Los Angeles	Fast Food Restaurant with Drive-Through	4.642 ksf
94	6711 S. Sepulveda Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	180 units

**TABLE 3.0-2
 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

No.	Project Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Size
95	6855 S. La Cienega Boulevard	Los Angeles	Supermarket	22.590 ksf
96	11604 Aviation Boulevard	Los Angeles	Condominiums	281 units
			Retail/Commercial	26.500 ksf
			Apartments	112 units
97	1248 W. 105 th Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	74 units
98	3816 W. 54 th Street	Los Angeles	Office Expansion	1.196 ksf
99	1252 W. 105 th Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	74 units
100	11814 Aviation Boulevard	Los Angeles	Hotel	128 rooms
101	11034 S. Western Avenue	Los Angeles	Laundromat	4.983 ksf
102	5550 S. La Brea Avenue	Los Angeles	Apartments	32 units
103	12000 S. Western Avenue	Los Angeles	Hotel	44 rooms
104	1743 Imperial Highway	Los Angeles	Apartments	39 units
105	10601 S. Vermont Street	Los Angeles	Laundromat	4.500 ksf
106	1423 W. 120 th Street	Los Angeles	Condominiums	57 units
107	1509 W. 102 nd Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	12 units
108	1539 102 nd Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	10 units
109	10501 S. Buford Avenue	Los Angeles	Townhomes	11 units
110	11824 Aviation Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	36 units
111	10505 Hawthorne Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	32 units
112	10609 S. Inglewood Avenue	Los Angeles	Apartments	9 units
113	10907 S. Inglewood Avenue	Los Angeles	Apartments	4 units
114	8910 S. Normandie Avenue	Los Angeles	Apartments	6 units
115	10136 Felton Avenue	Los Angeles	Apartments	19 units
116	5053 E. 109 th Street	Los Angeles	Condominiums	17 units
117	9223 S. Vermont Avenue	Los Angeles	Auto Repair	2.858 ksf
118	5301 W. Centinela Avenue	Los Angeles	Restaraunt	1.640 ksf
119	3838 W. Slauson Avenue	Los Angeles	Convenience Store	1.060 ksf
120	5101 Overhill Drive	Los Angeles	Condominiums	88 units
121	1240 W. 105 th Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	42 units
122	6109 Overhill Drive	Los Angeles	Duplex	2 units
123	1034 W. 109 th Place	Los Angeles	Apartments	9 units
124	11408-11412 S. New Hampshire Avenue	Los Angeles	Gas Station with Convenience Store	2.900 ksf
125	10335 S. Vermont Avenue	Los Angeles	Church	1.324 ksf
126	10401 S. Vermont Avenue	Los Angeles	Commercial	0.250 ksf
			Apartments	1 units
127	1023 W. 107 th Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	8 units

**TABLE 3.0-2
 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

No.	Project Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Size
128	LAX Northside Project Westchester Parkway between Pershing Drive and Sepulveda Boulevard	Los Angeles	Office	612.500 ksf
			Playing Fields	5 fields
			Dog Park	1 field
			Retail	270.000 ksf
			Research and Development	612.500 ksf
			Civic Site	215.000 ksf
			Park	130.680 ksf
129	Bounded by Century Boulevard, La Cienega Boulevard, Arbor Vitae Street, and Vicksburg Avenue	Los Angeles	Office	300.000 ksf
			Hotel	400 rooms
			Retail	200.000 ksf
			Conference Center	100.000 ksf
130	10341 Graham Avenue	Los Angeles	Theater	1,000 seats
			Education Center	12.417 ksf
131	3831 W. Stocker Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	127 units
132	3900 W. Martin Luther King Boulevard	Los Angeles	Office	50.00 ksf
			Condominiums	200 units
			College	3,600 students
133	4018 S. Buckingham Road	Los Angeles	Senior Housing	130 units
134	4115 W. Martin Luther King Boulevard	Los Angeles	Middle School	500 students
135	4252 S. Crenshaw Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	111 units
136	5950 W. Jefferson Boulevard	Los Angeles	Office	64.000 ksf
			Retail	4.000 ksf
			Quality Restaurant	2.000 ksf
			High Turnover Restaurant	2.000 ksf
137	6024 W. Jefferson Boulevard	Los Angeles	Office	123.572 ksf
			Manufacturing	64.206 ksf
			Coffee Shop with Drive-Through	2.200 ksf
138	6100 S. Hoover Street	Los Angeles	Laundromat	6.500 ksf
			Self-Service Car Wash	2.328 ksf
139	2178 Firestone Boulevard	Los Angeles County	Residential Care	16 beds

**TABLE 3.0-2
 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

No.	Project Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Size
140	905 E. El Segundo Boulevard	Los Angeles County	Community Center	1,000 ksf
			Amphitheater and Lawn	1,100 seats
			Music Center	1,000 ksf
			Nature Lab	1,000 ksf
			Museum – Gallery	1,000 ksf
			Museum – Art Storage	1,000 ksf
			Aquatic Center	1,000 ksf
			Gymnasium	1,000 ksf
			Multi-Purpose Stadium	3,000 seats
			Outdoor Athletic Fields	3 fields
			Equestrian Center	85 stables
141	1743 Imperial Highway	Los Angeles County	Apartments	39 units
142	12000 S. Western Avenue	Los Angeles County	Hotel	44 rooms
143	1854 E. 118 th Street	Los Angeles County	Apartments	100 units
144	13200 S. Avalon Boulevard	Los Angeles County	Homeless Shelter	79 rooms
145	11735 Holmes Avenue	Los Angeles County	Apartments	61 units
146	14733 S. Stanford Avenue	Los Angeles County	Apartments	85 units

SOURCE: City of Inglewood, 2019.

Figure 3.0-1 Cumulative Projects Map

This page intentionally left blank