

[The discussion contained in this Preliminary Draft section contains discussions of the consistency of the Alternatives with the Project Objectives. These discussions are preliminary, and are subject to review and approval by the City of Inglewood.]

CHAPTER 6

Project Alternatives

6.1 Overview

An EIR must describe and comparatively evaluate a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives to the Proposed Project that would “accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects.” An EIR is not required to consider alternatives that are infeasible. The EIR focuses on alternatives that are “potentially feasible.” Whether an alternative is ultimately found to be feasible is determined by the lead agency—in this case the Inglewood City Council—based on a variety of factors including, but not limited to, site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and site accessibility and control (CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(f)(1)).

This chapter presents the Proposed Project objectives (as described in Chapter 2, Project Description), summarizes the significant impacts of the Proposed Project, describes the alternatives that were considered but dismissed from further evaluation and the alternatives selected for evaluation, and then discloses the comparative effects of the alternatives relative to the Proposed Project. As required under section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines, an environmentally superior alternative is identified and addressed at the end of this chapter

6.2 Factors in the Selection of Alternatives

6.2.1 Project Objectives

As stated above, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(a), the reasonable range of alternatives considered in this EIR must be capable of achieving “most of the basic objectives of the project,” while avoiding or lessening one or more of the significant impacts that would result from the project as proposed. Thus, the objectives of the Proposed Project are restated below.

The following are the City’s stated objectives for the Proposed Project:

1. Support the revitalization of the City of Inglewood, promote the City as a premier regional sports and entertainment center recognized at the local, regional, national, and international levels, and support its City of Champions identity by bringing back an NBA franchise to the City.
2. Facilitate a project that promotes the City’s objectives related to economic development, and that enhances the general economic health and welfare of the City by encouraging viable

development, stimulating new business and economic activity, and increasing City revenue (property, sales, admissions and transient occupancy taxes).

3. Expand the opportunities for the City's residents and visitors to participate in a wide range of sporting, cultural, civic and business events.
4. Strengthen the community by providing public and youth-oriented space, outdoor community gathering space, and outdoor plazas.
5. 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.
6. Encourage sustainable, modern, integrated development that includes coordinated traffic event management strategies, encourages public transit opportunities to the Project Site, provides safe and adequate pedestrian circulation, and reflects a high level of architectural design quality and landscape amenities.
7. Establish a world class basketball and event center that increases sports and entertainment employment and construction-related employment opportunities in the City of Inglewood.
8. Achieve the objectives described above in an expeditious and environmentally conscious manner.

The following are the Project Applicant's stated objectives for the Proposed Project:

- 1. Build the long-term home of the LA Clippers NBA basketball team.**
 - a. Construct a state-of-the-art multi-purpose basketball and entertainment center with a capacity of up to 18,000 fixed seats to host LA Clippers home games beginning in the 2024-2025 NBA season.
 - b. Locate a basketball and entertainment center on a site that is geographically desirable and accessible to the LA Clippers' current and anticipated fan base.
 - c. Consolidate LA Clippers team operations and facilities in a single location that includes practice facilities, team executive and management offices, a sports medicine clinic, and adequate parking for both events and daily operations.
 - d. Design and develop the basketball and entertainment center to accommodate up to 18,500 attendees for other entertainment, cultural, sporting, business and community events when not in use for LA Clippers home games.
 - e. Create a lively, visitor- and community-serving environment year-round for patrons, employees, community members, and visitors to the surrounding neighborhood and nearby sports and entertainment venues by providing complementary onsite retail, dining, and/or community spaces.
 - f. Contribute to the economic and social well-being of the surrounding community by providing public benefits such as opportunities for youth- and community-oriented

programs, and increasing revenues generated by property and sales taxes, admissions taxes, and potential transient occupancy taxes.

- 2. Develop a financially viable Project that is constructed and operated from private funding sources.**
 - a. Locate the Project on a site that can be readily assembled and entitled to enable the feasible development of the Project to host the LA Clippers home basketball games in the 2024-2025 NBA season.
 - b. Create a unique visitor experience that is competitive with other new major event venues, including state-of-the-art media, sound, and lighting systems; patron amenities; and other features.
 - c. Enhance the future success of the Project by providing signage, naming rights, and sponsorship opportunities to assist in the private financing of the Project.
 - d. Support the financial viability of the Project by developing sufficient complementary on-site uses to enhance the productive use of the site on event and non-event days, including retail, dining, and potential hotel uses.
- 3. Design a Project that is synergistic with nearby existing and proposed uses and incorporates state-of-the-art urban design and venue design principles.**
 - a. Locate the Project on a site near other existing and planned mixed-use development to create a dynamic, year-round sports and entertainment district destination.
 - b. Develop the basketball and entertainment center with features that enhance the Project's sense of place as a major urban sports and entertainment venue, including gathering spaces, signage, and other amenities.
 - c. Create inviting and appropriately-scaled pedestrian environments to facilitate the movement of pedestrians and create safe and secure assembly areas for fans and visitors.
 - d. Develop the Project to meet high-quality urban design and sustainability standards.
 - e. Design the Project to take advantage of existing and planned public transit, and incorporate appropriate vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle access and amenities that encourage sustainable transportation options.
 - f. Increase walkability and improve the pedestrian experience on adjacent public rights-of-way near the Project Site, and enhance the streetscape appearance by providing perimeter and interior landscaping.

6.2.2 Significant Effects of the Proposed Project

The following project-specific and cumulative potentially significant impacts have been identified for the Proposed Project, as discussed in Chapter 3, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.

Aesthetics

[TBD]

Air Quality

[TBD]

Biological Resources

Impact 3.3-2: Construction of the Proposed Project could have the potential to interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites

Impact 3.3-3: Construction of the Proposed Project could have the potential to conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resource, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources

Impact 3.4-1: Construction of the Proposed Project could have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.

Impact 3.4-2: Construction of the Proposed Project could have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.

Impact 3.4-3: Construction of the Proposed Project could have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is:

- i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k).
- ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.

Impact 3.4-4: Construction of the Proposed Project could have the potential to disturb human remains including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

[INCLUDE Impact 3.4-5?]

Impact 3.4-6: Construction of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with construction of other cumulative development, could have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts on archaeological resources.

Impact 3.4-7: Construction of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with construction of other cumulative development, could have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts on the significance of a Tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074.

Impact 3.4-8: Construction of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with construction of other cumulative development, could have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts on human remains including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

Energy Demand and Conservation

Impact 3.5-2: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project could have the potential to conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Impact 3.5-4: Implementation of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with other cumulative development, could conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Geology and Soils

Impact 3.6-1: Construction of the Proposed Project could have the potential to result in the substantial erosion or the loss of topsoil.

Impact 3.6-2: Construction of the Proposed Project could have the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

[ADD IMPACT 3.6-3?]

Impact 3.6-4: Construction of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with construction of other cumulative development, would contribute to cumulative impacts on paleontological resources.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact 3.7-1: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project could generate "net new" GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that could have a significant impact on the environment.

Impact 3.7-2: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project could have the potential to be inconsistent with applicable plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact 3.8-4: Construction of the Proposed Project would be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5

and, as a result, could have the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

[ADD IMPACT 3.8-10?]

Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact 3.9-1: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project could have the potential to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality, or conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan.

Impact 3.9-3: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project could have the potential to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which has the potential to: result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or impede or redirect flow.

Impact 3.9-4: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with other cumulative development within the Dominguez Channel Watershed, would have the potentially to cumulatively violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

Impact 3.9-6: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with other cumulative development in the Dominguez Channel Watershed, could have the potential to cumulatively alter the drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or impede or redirect flow.

Land Use and Planning

No significant impacts under Land Use and Planning.

Noise

[TBD]

Population, Employment and Housing

No significant impacts under Population, Employment and Housing.

Public Services

No significant impacts under Public Services.

Transportation and Circulation

[TBD]

Utilities and Service Systems

Impact 3.15-7: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project could have the potential to require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction or relocation of which could have the potential to cause significant environmental effects.

Impact 3.15-8: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with other cumulative projects, could result in the relocation or construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction or relocation of which could have the potential to cause significant environmental effects.

6.3 Alternatives Considered but Dismissed from Further Evaluation

In identifying alternatives, consideration was given to alternatives that could avoid or substantially lessen potentially significant impacts resulting from the Proposed Project. Certain impacts that are identified as being significant under the Proposed Project are due primarily to intensifying development activity in an area that is currently underutilized; such intensity-related impacts include increased traffic congestion, air emissions, nighttime lighting, and the like. These impacts potentially could be substantially lessened by limiting the size of the project. Other impacts are specific to the location of the Project Site, including but not limited to traffic impacts on South Prairie Avenue, West Century Boulevard, and other major and minor streets in the vicinity of the Project Site, as well as construction and operational noise impacts on nearby residences and other sensitive receptors. Such impacts are largely unavoidable at the Project Site but it may be possible to avoid or substantially lessen these impacts by constructing a version of the Proposed Project at a different location. For these reasons, alternatives that reduce the intensity of development on the Project Site or change the location of the Project Site are addressed in this chapter.

The following alternatives were considered but dismissed from further analysis because they would not fulfill most of the basic objectives of the project, would not avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental impacts, and/or would otherwise be infeasible.

6.3.1 Entertainment Venue

Under this alternative the Project Site would be developed with retail, restaurants, an entertainment center, and a major hotel. The purpose of the alternative would be to create a

unique destination that would complement planned uses located within the Hollywood Park Specific Plan (HPSP) and the existing venue at The Forum. The alternative would be patterned and sized similar to other entertainment venues within the Southern California region including Downtown Disney in Anaheim (20 acres), Universal Citywalk in Universal City (23 acres), The Grove in Los Angeles (17.5 acres), and Great Wolf Lodge in Garden Grove (13 acres).

This alternative was dismissed from further consideration because the Project Site is fragmented, does not provide a single parcel of sufficient size on which to develop a thoughtfully arranged entertainment district. This alternative was also dismissed because it could draw business away from similar land uses approved for development within the neighboring HPSP, and thus could negatively affect the City's economic development goals for the HPSP area. Finally, this alternative would fail to meet most of the basic objectives of the Proposed Project, including the City's objective to establish a world class basketball and event center and to bring an NBA franchise back to Inglewood (City Objective 1), and the Applicant's goals to build the long-term home of the LA Clippers NBA basketball team (Applicant Objectives 1a-f).

6.3.2 Substantially Reduced Arena

Under this alternative the size of the arena on the Project Site would be materially reduced sufficiently to substantially lessen the significant transportation and related air quality impacts of the Proposed Project. In order to achieve such a lessening, in this alternative the capacity of the arena would have to be reduced by 50 percent or more, leading to a maximum capacity of no more than 9,000 attendees. This alternative would result in fewer people visiting the site and thus fewer trips being generated on the local and regional transportation system. In turn, this alternative would reduce impacts associated with traffic and traffic-related air pollutant emissions and noise.

This alternative was dismissed from further consideration because the material reduction in the size of the arena (e.g. 50 percent reduction in seats) that would be needed to substantially lessen traffic-related impacts would not meet the NBA's sizing requirements for the arena. The smallest recently-constructed NBA arenas include those built in Sacramento (Golden 1 Center, opened in 2016) and Milwaukee (Fiserv Forum, opened in 2018) which were built with an NBA game capacity of approximately 17,500. The smallest arena that is home to an NBA team is the Smoothie King Center in New Orleans, built in 1999 with a capacity of 16,867. An arena that would meet NBA standards and is of a size comparable to the recently-opened arenas in Sacramento and Milwaukee is discussed below under Alternative 2.

Because this alternative would be below the capacity required by the NBA, it would fail to meet most of the basic objectives of the Proposed Project, including the City's objective to establish a world class basketball and event center and to bring an NBA franchise back to Inglewood (City Objective 1), and the Applicant's goals to build the long-term home of the LA Clippers NBA basketball team (Applicant Objectives 1a-f).

6.3.3 Housing

A comment on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) suggested consideration of an alternative consisting of the development of housing on the Project Site, consistent with the R-3 zone that existed on the project site prior to 1980 (see Appendix B). Under this alternative the Project Site would be developed with a variety of housing types, including single-family, condominium/townhome, and multi-family uses.

This alternative was eliminated from further consideration because of inconsistency with the existing and anticipated noise environment associated with Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). The Project Site is located approximately two miles east of LAX, along the extended centerlines of Runways 25R and 25L. As such, the Project Site is located within the planning boundary/airport influence area (AIA) established for LAX in the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP). According to the Los Angeles County Airport ALUP, the Project Site is located in areas exposed to noise levels ranging from CNEL 65 dB-70dB, and from CNEL 70 dB-75 dB. Consistent with ALUP Policies G-1 and N-3, the compatibility of proposed land uses is determined by consulting the land use compatibility table provided in Section V of the ALUP, and according to the table, residential land uses located in areas exposed to noise levels of CNEL 65 dB – 70 dB must be reviewed for noise insulation needs while residential land uses in areas exposed to noise levels of CNEL 70 dB – 75 dB are to be avoided unless they are related to airport services. Given these restrictions, between the 1980's and the early 2000's, the City engaged in a property purchase program, supported by FAA noise mitigation funds, to remove residential uses within these noise contours. This alternative would consist of reversing this program, and constructing new housing on the site. Because housing would require noise insulation on portions of the Project Site and would be prohibited on other portions of the Project Site, this alternative was dismissed from further consideration.

In addition, this alternative was eliminated from further consideration because it would fail to meet most of the basic objectives of the Proposed Project, including the City's objective to promote the City as a premier regional sports and entertainment center and to establish a world class basketball and event center and to bring an NBA franchise back to Inglewood (City Objective 1); to establish a world class basketball and event center that increases sports and entertainment and construction-related employment opportunities; to expand opportunities for City residents and visitors to participate in sporting, cultural and civic events (City Objective 3); and to transform the Project Site to uses compatible with the aircraft noise contours generated by operations at LAX and in compliance with the FAA grants to the City (City Objective 5).

Further, development of a housing alternative would not meet the Applicant's objectives to build the long-term home of the LA Clippers NBA basketball team (Applicant Objectives 1a-e); to contribute to the economic and social well-being of the surrounding community by providing public benefits such as opportunities for youth- and community-oriented programs, and increasing revenues generated by property and sales taxes, admissions taxes, and potential transient occupancy taxes (Applicant Objective 1f); to create a unique visitor experience that is

competitive with other new major event venues, including state-of-the-art media, sound, and lighting systems; patron amenities; and other features (Applicant Objective 2b); and to develop a basketball and entertainment center with features that enhance the Project's sense of place as a major urban sports and entertainment venue, including gathering spaces, signage, and other amenities (Applicant Objective 3b).

6.3.4 Employment Center/Business Park

As requested by several comments on the NOP and consistent with the Inglewood International Business Park (IIBP) Specific Plan, the City considered an alternative under which the Project Site would be developed with employment generating uses such as a business park or light industrial uses. This alternative was dismissed from further consideration because since the approval of the IIBP Specific Plan in 1993 the City has sought to attract businesses to the Project Site, but has not been able to generate momentum or build interest in the site from private sector business park developers. The inability to construct a business park on the site, despite decades-long City efforts to encourage such uses, indicates that a business park is economically infeasible at this location. In addition, a very substantial amount of commercial office space is planned in the neighboring HPSP, including 466,000 square feet in the Adjusted Baseline projects and another 3,567,314 square feet under cumulative conditions (see Section 3.0, subsections 3.0.6 and 3.0.7). Development of this amount of commercial office space would meet demand for office and employment generating uses in the area, and accomplish the City's goals for job generation.

Also, this alternative was eliminated from further consideration because it would fail to meet most of the basic objectives of the Proposed Project, including the City's objective to promote the City as a premier regional sports and entertainment center and to establish a world class basketball and event center and to bring an NBA franchise back to Inglewood (City Objective 1); to expand opportunities for City residents and visitors to participate in sporting, cultural and civic events (City Objective 3); and to establish a world class basketball and event center that increases sports and entertainment and construction-related employment opportunities (City Objective 7).

Further, development of a housing alternative would not meet the Applicant's objectives to build the long-term home of the LA Clippers NBA basketball team (Applicant Objectives 1a-e); to contribute to the economic and social well-being of the surrounding community by providing public benefits such as opportunities for youth- and community-oriented programs, and increasing revenues generated by property and sales taxes, admissions taxes, and potential transient occupancy taxes (Applicant Objective 1f); to create a unique visitor experience that is competitive with other new major event venues, including state-of-the-art media, sound, and lighting systems; patron amenities; and other features (Applicant Objective 2b); and to develop a basketball and entertainment center with features that enhance the Project's sense of place as a major urban sports and entertainment venue, including gathering spaces, signage, and other amenities (Applicant Objective 3b).

6.3.5 Alternative Locations in the City of Inglewood

The City has identified Alternative 3 – the City Services Center Alternative Site – as an alternative location within the City that is potentially feasible. The City has also considered whether there are other sites in the City that are potentially feasible. As set forth below, the City considered the following, alternative sites, and determined that the alternative sites were infeasible, would not meet most of the City’s or applicant’s basic project objectives, or would not avoid or substantially lessen the project’s significant environmental effects.

[INSERT SITES CONSIDERED AND ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER ANALYSIS – TBD]

6.4 Alternatives Selected for Further Consideration

The City selected a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Project for further consideration and analysis in this Draft EIR. Consistent with CEQA, the selection of the range of alternatives considered in this Draft EIR was governed by the rule of reason. As is stated in CEQA Guideline section 15126.6(a):

An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible.

In identifying a range of alternatives for consideration in this Draft EIR, the City focused on avoiding or substantially lessening one or more significant impacts of the Proposed Project, while achieving most of the basic objectives of the project, including construction and operation of a new entertainment and sports facility sufficient to serve as the home of the NBA LA Clippers. The selection of alternatives for this EIR is constrained by several factors, including the NBA requirements for the size of an arena, the proximity of the Project Site to other major sports and entertainment facilities, and access to major transportation corridors and freeways. As such, the focus of several of the selected alternatives is on an evaluation of the comparative environmental effects of alternative locations for development of the Proposed Project. In addition, the City has considered a project of reduced size on the same site, while still providing an arena sufficient to meet the NBA’s requirements.

The alternatives to the Proposed Project analyzed in this Draft EIR are:

- Alternative 1: No Project Alternative;
- Alternative 2: Reduced Project Size Alternative;
- Alternative 3: City Services Center Alternative Site;
- Alternative 4: Baldwin Hills Alternative Site; and
- Alternative 5: The District at South Bay Alternative Site.

Table 6-1 summarizes the development assumptions for each of the alternatives, and **Figure 6-1** shows the geographic location of each alternative. Each of the alternatives is described in more detail and analyzed in the following subsections.

**TABLE 6-1
PROJECT ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY**

Project Elements	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Reduced Project Size Alternative	Alternative 3: City Services Center Alternative Site	Alternative 4: Baldwin Hills Alternative Site	Alternative 5: The District at South Bay Alternative Site
Arena size (sf / seats)	915,000 / 18,000	0 / 0	915,000 / 17,500	915,000 / 18,000	915,000 / 18,000	915,000 / 18,000
LA Clippers Team Offices (sf)	71,000	0	0	0	71,000	71,000
LA Clippers Team Practice and Training Facility (sf)	85,000	0	0	0	85,000	85,000
Sports Medicine Clinic (sf)	25,000	0	0	0	25,000	25,000
Community Space (sf)	15,000	0	0	0	15,000	15,000
Commercial/Retail (sf)	48,000	0	0	48,000	48,000	48,000
Plaza Area (sf)	80,000	0	124,000	98,700	250,000	150,000
Onsite Parking (spaces)	4,125	0	3,775	4,125	4,060	8,000
Hotel (rooms)	150	0	0	0	0	0
Well Relocation (yes or no)	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No

SOURCE: ESA, 2019.

6.4.1 Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

Description

Under CEQA, the No Project Alternative must consider the effects of not approving the project. The No Project Alternative describes the environmental conditions that exist at the time that the environmental analysis commences, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved (CEQA Guidelines, section 15126.6 (e)(2)). In the case of the Proposed Project, the Project Site is partially developed, so continuation of existing conditions would involve continued operation of businesses and re-tenanting of current developed land uses on the Project Site. Existing conditions are described in the Environmental Settings of each section within Chapter 3, Environmental Impacts, Settings, and Mitigation Measures, of this Draft EIR.

Under the No Project Alternative, the City Council would not approve any project on the Project Site, and none of the mitigation measures identified within this Draft EIR would be implemented. No demolition would occur under the No Project Alternative, because the existing structures on the site would be retained. The vacant parcels on the Project Site would continue to be vacant. The developed parcels on the Project Site would continue to be used, existing uses would continue, and those buildings that are currently vacant would be re-tenanted.

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) states that “[i]f disapproval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others, such as the proposal of some other project, this ‘no project’ consequence should be discussed.” In this case, the Project Site is largely located within the IIBP Specific Plan, which calls for the development of light industrial and general commercial uses. The City adopted the IIBP Specific Plan in 1993. During the intervening 26 years, the development envisioned in the IIBP has not occurred. In light of the lack of development activity within the IIBP Specific Plan area over nearly three decades, it is not foreseeable that “predictable actions by others” would lead to development of the vacant parcels for uses consistent with the IIBP Specific Plan. Because these parcels have remained vacant for such a long time, and the City has not received any development applications for the vacant parcels, it is a reasonable assumption that no development of currently vacant parcels on the Project Site would occur within the foreseeable future. Although the IIBP would remain in place, development as contemplated by the IIBP would not occur.

Under the No Project Alternative, it is assumed that for the foreseeable future the LA Clippers would continue playing at the Staples Center in Downtown Los Angeles, and the LA Clippers’ team offices would continue to be located on Flower Street, within two blocks of Staples Center. In addition, the LA Clippers would continue to use its practice and training facility in the Playa Vista neighborhood within Los Angeles. It is also reasonable to assume that the LA Clippers would either remain at Staples Center or seek an alternate location for the development of a new arena. While there is currently no identified alternate location under consideration, the discussion under section 6.3.6 provides a description of the evaluation process previously undertaken by the LA Clippers, and the discussion under Alternatives 3, 4 and 5 provides a description of the comparative environmental effects of development of the Proposed Project at three alternative locations in the region, including another site in the City of Inglewood.

Comparative Analysis of Environmental Effects

Table 6-5 at the end of this chapter provides an impact-by-impact comparison of the significant impacts of the Proposed Project and Alternative 1. Because no new development would occur at the Project Site, the effects of the No Project Alternative would be a continuation of the existing conditions described in Chapter 3, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures. Because the Proposed Project would not be constructed or operated at the Project Site under this alternative, none of the impacts identified for the Proposed Project would occur under the No Project alternative.

The Arena Site contains two developed parcels that are currently unoccupied. One unoccupied building is a two-story warehouse/light manufacturing facility located on the north side of West 102nd Street. The other unoccupied building is a one- and two-story concrete commercial building with an access driveway and small parking area located at 3838 West 102nd Street. Under Alternative 1, it is foreseeable that these buildings would be leased to new tenants, and warehouse/light industrial/ commercial activities in those buildings would resume. These activities would foreseeably be similar in nature and scope to those activities that have occurred in the past.

The effects of continued use of Staples Center for LA Clippers games would continue to create a range of environmental effects in and around downtown Los Angeles and the region, including the generation of Vehicle Miles Travel (VMT) and associated congestion during pre- and post-event hours, and generation of criteria air pollutants including ozone precursors and small particulate matter. Because these effects are ongoing, they are considered part of the regional environmental setting and would not be subject to mitigation through the CEQA process.

Relationship to Project Objectives

Under the No Project Alternative none of the City's or applicant's objectives the Proposed Project would be achieved.

6.4.2 Alternative 2: Reduced Project Size Alternative

Description

Under Alternative 2, the Proposed Project would be reduced in size to the maximum extent potentially feasible so as to avoid or substantially lessen impacts that would be associated with the intensity of development on the Project Site. Alternative 2 examines the impacts of a project that would still provide an arena sized consistent with the smallest recently-constructed NBA arenas, while eliminating all other uses that are not absolutely essential to the construction and operation of the arena itself. In this fashion, Alternative 2 would eliminate all uses other than the arena itself, the plaza that supports arena entry and exit, and the infrastructure (primarily parking) necessary to serve the arena. Further downsizing the arena is considered infeasible because an arena with further reduced capacity would be smaller than any other recently constructed arenas serving an NBA franchise. An alternative that eliminates the arena, or includes an arena smaller than the minimum size required for an NBA franchise, would not meet a basic project objective. Alternative 2 would meet this basic project objective, while minimizing, to the extent feasible, impacts in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site. As such, under this alternative only the Arena, pedestrian plaza, and South Parking Garage would be constructed on the Arena Site. None of the other Proposed Project elements (i.e., team practice facility, sports medical clinic, and team administrative offices, retail shops and restaurants, outdoor plaza stage, and community-type uses) would be constructed. The LA Clippers' team offices would continue to be located on Flower Street within two blocks of Staples Center, while the LA Clippers would continue to use their practice and training facility in the Playa Vista neighborhood of Los Angeles.

Under this alternative, the seating capacity of the Arena would be reduced by approximately three percent to approximately 17,500 (up to 18,000 attendees in certain concert configurations), consistent with the seating capacity of the most recently built NBA arena (i.e., Fiserv Forum in Milwaukee, Wisconsin).¹ Without inclusion of team practice facility, sports medical clinic, and team offices, the arena structure would be further reduced in size. Furthermore, elimination of retail and community uses would mean that the pedestrian plaza would also be larger under this alternative as compared to the Proposed Project.

Parking provided under Alternative 2 would comply with parking supply requirements established in the Inglewood Municipal Code, section 12-47, which require provision of parking spaces at a ratio of 1 space per 5 attendees. With a total capacity of 18,000 attendees at the arena, this alternative would require a minimum of 3,600 parking spaces. Alternative 2 would provide 3,775 onsite parking spaces, slightly more than required by the Municipal Code, compared to the 4,125 onsite parking spaces provided by the Proposed Project. The West Parking Garage would be constructed with 3,110 spaces across six stories, the same as under the Proposed Project. In addition, the proposed Prairie Avenue pedestrian bridge linking the West Parking Structure to the plaza on the Arena Site would still be included. Similar to the Proposed Project, the South Parking Garage would be located immediately to the south of the arena on the Arena Site, providing 625 parking spaces across three stories, a decrease from 800 spaces on four floors under the Proposed Project.

Under Alternative 2, on the East Transportation and Hotel Site, no parking structure nor public parking use would be provided; the site would only serve buses, Transportation Network Company (TNC) vehicles and taxis via a surface parking and pickup/drop-off lot. Further, under this alternative no hotel would be constructed on the Hotel Site, a decrease in the size of the Project Site of 1.25 acres, or about 4.5%.

Finally, construction of the proposed replacement well on the Well Relocation Site would take place under Alternative 2.

Under Alternative 2, employment on the Project Site would be reduced because the LA Clippers would not move their team offices and practice facility to the Project Site, and the sports medicine, hotel, retail/restaurant, and community uses would be eliminated. In total, this would reduce the employment on the Project Site from 768 under the Proposed Project to 75 under Alternative 2. Event-related employment would remain the same as under the Proposed Project.

Comparative Analysis of Environmental Effects

Table 6-2 at the end of this chapter provides an impact-by-impact comparison of the significant impacts of the Proposed Project and Alternative 2.

¹ Wikipedia, List of National Basketball Association arenas, accessed July 7, 2019, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_National_Basketball_Association_arenas

Impacts Identified as Being the Same or Similar to the Proposed Project

Although a number of uses would be removed from the Proposed Project, many of the impacts of the Proposed Project on environmental resources affected by the size and location of the Project Site would be either the same, or nearly so. Alternative 2 would include the Arena Structure and West Parking Garage essentially as proposed, including the South Prairie Avenue pedestrian bridge. As such, aesthetic impacts to views north and south on South Prairie Avenue would remain unchanged. There would be a modest reduction in the amount of development visible to motorists on West Century Boulevard due to the elimination of the hotel development on the East Transportation Site and the elimination of the plaza development on the Arena Site, however the larger structures that would remain, including the Arena and the West Parking Garage, would continue to be visually present in views east and west on West Century Boulevard.

Because the same tree removal would occur under Alternative 2 as under the Proposed Project, impacts related to disturbance to nesting raptors or migratory birds (Impact 3.3-2) and loss of protected trees (Impacts 3.3-3) would be identical to those described for the Proposed Project. Other impacts would be somewhat reduced, in proportion to the reduction in the size of the Project Site. For example, because the Project Site would be essentially the same as under the Proposed Project, the construction impacts of Alternative 2 that are related to demolition, ground-disturbance and excavation would be similar to the Proposed Project although lessened by approximately 5% as there would be no ground disturbance associated with the planned hotel on 1.25 acres of the East Transportation Site under Alternative 2. Therefore, damage to historical resources, archaeological resources, human remains, and paleontological resources (Impacts 3.4-1, 3.4-2, 3.4-4, 3.4-6, 3.4-8, 3.8-8, 3.6-2 and 3.6-4), and exposure to contaminated soils (Impact 3.8-4) would be reduced, but would still require mitigation.

Impacts related to the transport, handling, and disposal of hazardous materials would remain essentially the same as under the Proposed Project, with the same required mitigation measures. There would be a decrease in the numbers and types of businesses on the Project Site under Alternative 2, but these decreases would be insufficient to change the conclusions about significance or the requirement for implementation of mitigation measures.

Impacts of Alternative 2 associated with soil erosion during construction and storm water drainage post-construction would also be similar to the Proposed Project but somewhat lessened as the planned hotel on the East Transportation and Hotel Site would not be constructed under Alternative 2. As a result of the site being reduced in size by about 1.25 acres, impacts related to degradation of water quality during construction and post-construction (Impacts 3.9-1 and 3.9-4), inadequate site drainage (Impacts 3.9-3 and 3.9-6), and inadequate stormwater drainage capacity during construction and post construction (Impacts 3.15-7 and 3.15-8) would be reduced by about 4.5%, but would still require mitigation.

Like the Proposed Project, Alternative 2 would have less-than significant-impacts related to land use and planning (Impacts 3.10-1 through 3.10-4). Because impacts of the Proposed Project on public services, including fire and police protection, and parks and recreation facilities would be

largely driven by event activity at the proposed arena, these impacts would remain largely unchanged and would continue to be less than significant (see Impacts 3.13-1 through 3.13-10), and would remain less than significant under Alternative 2.

[ADD DISCUSSION OF TRANSPORTATION AND NOISE IMPACTS RELATED TO ARENA EVENTS]

Because the amount of impervious surfaces in Alternative 2 would be very similar to those under the Proposed Project, impacts of Alternative 2 related to storm drainage system capacity and groundwater would be essentially the same as under the Proposed Project, with the same required mitigation measures (see Impacts 3.9-1 through 3.9-6).

Impacts Identified as Being Less Severe than the Proposed Project

Air Quality and GHG emissions during construction and operation under Alternative 2 would be similar to the Proposed Project but lessened as the seating capacity of the arena would be reduced by three percent and none of the other proposed facilities (i.e. retail shops, outdoor stage, team practice facility, sports medical clinic, and team offices) on the Arena Site would be constructed. In addition, the planned hotel on the East Transportation Site would also not be constructed. Therefore, impacts associated with the emission of criteria air pollutants (Impacts 3.2-2 and 3.2-6) and GHG emissions (Impact 3.7-1) would be reduced by approximately __ percent, but would still require the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.2-1, which would require the implementation of a transportation demand management (TDM) plan, Mitigation Measure 3.7-1a, which would require the implementation of an energy minimization and GHG reduction plan, and Mitigation Measure 3.7-1b, which would require the preparation of an annual GHG verification report to determine the number of GHG offsets required to bring the project below the net neutral threshold of significance.

[INSERT RE: AQ IMPACTS]

Noise levels under Alternative 2 would similar to the Proposed Project but lessened as the seating capacity of the arena would be reduced by three percent and none of the other proposed facilities (i.e. retail shops, outdoor stage, team practice facility, sports medical clinic, and team offices) on the Arena Site would not be constructed. In addition, the planned hotel on the East Transportation Site would be constructed. Therefore, impacts associated with a temporary increase in noise during construction and a permanent increase in noise during operation (Impacts 3.11-1 and 3.11-5) would be reduced as the duration of construction noise would be shorter (due to less building space) and the amount of traffic would decrease (due to fewer trips). In addition, vibration levels under Alternative 2 would also be similar to the Proposed Project but lessened for the same reasons. As a result, vibration impacts with respect to structural damage and human annoyance (Impacts 3.11-2 and 3.11-6) would be reduced, but would still require the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.11-2, which requires minimum distances of construction equipment from sensitive receptors and the designation of a construction relations officer to field vibration-related complaints.

Unlike the Proposed Project, Alternative 2 would not expose people within portions of the Project Site where there is an expectation of quiet to excessive noise levels from aircraft operations at nearby LAX as the hotel and team medical clinic would not be constructed on the Project Site. For this reason, noise impacts associated with aircraft operations (Impacts 3.11-3 and 3.11-7) would be avoided and the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.11-3, which requires the preparation of an acoustical report detailing sound installation techniques to be employed for the hotel and team medical clinic, would not be required.

Impacts related to Population, Employment and Housing would remain less than significant under Alternative 2, although non-event-related employment generation on the Project Site would be reduced by about 90%. Because under Alternative 2 non-event-related employment on the Project Site would be reduced by about 90%, impacts on public schools, already less than significant for the Proposed Project, would be further reduced under Alternative 2. As described in Table 3.13-9, Alternative 2 would be expected to generate a total of 35 new school students, a reduction of 15 students compared to the Proposed Project.

[ADD DISCUSSION OF TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVE 2]

Under Alternative 2, utility demands would be proportionately decreased as a result of the decreased capacity of the arena, and elimination of the practice facility, team offices, and sports medicine clinic in the Arena Structure, as well as the retail/restaurant, community, and hotel uses. Wastewater generation of Alternative 2 would be about 31% lower than under the Proposed Project. Solid waste generation of Alternative 2 would be approximately about 29% lower than under the Proposed Project.² These impacts would be less than significant under both the Proposed Project and Alternative 2.

Impacts Identified as Being More Severe than the Proposed Project

The impact of event-related noise on nearby sensitive receptors could be exacerbated under the Reduced Project Site Alternative. Plaza events that utilize amplified sound, including pre- or post-game concerts, would be more exposed due to the lack of intervening structures in the plaza. As such, sensitive receptors, especially those located to the northwest of the intersection of South Prairie Avenue and West Century Boulevard, could be exposed to higher levels of noise than disclosed for the Proposed Project in Impact 3.11- . Mitigation of these effects would either involve (1) reductions in the level of amplification for plaza events, or (2) construction of intervening walls or structures to obstruct line-of-sight between the plaza and nearby sensitive receptors.

Although few of the impacts of the Reduced Project Size Alternative would be more severe than those of the Proposed Project, it is notable that Alternative 2 would fail to respond to several policies of the City of Inglewood General Plan which encourage the development of employment-generating uses in the City. Further, by eliminating the potential to consolidate LA Clippers team uses, including the arena, practice facility, sports medicine and treatment facilities,

² [add citation to memo with calcs, in the file]

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. The result of this would be increased trip-making and increased VMT. Further, the elimination of complimentary ancillary uses on the Project Site would likely- increase trip-making and VMT for both regular daytime employees as well as for event attendees who would have to travel to other locations for food and drink, hotels, and other activities. These effects would tend to exacerbate the generation of air pollutants, GHG emissions, congestion, and other such effects at a regional level.

Relationship to Project Objectives

The Reduced Project Size Alternative would meet some, but not all the City's objectives for the project. The City objectives to promote economic development, the economic health and welfare, and City revenues (City Objective 2); to strengthen the community by providing public and youth-oriented space (City Objective 4); and to increase sports and entertainment employment opportunities (City Objective 6) would only be partially met under this alternative as no retail use, team practice facility, sports medical clinic or team offices would be included. Further, the elimination of the team practice facility, sports medical clinic, and team office means that the LA Clippers would continue to generate VMT and associated air pollutants and GHG emissions during commute trips between these uses located around the Los Angeles basin. As such, Alternative 2 would be less responsive to City Objective 8 because it would be less environmentally conscious than the Proposed Project.

The Reduced Project Size Alternative would also meet some but not all of the Project Applicant's objectives for the Proposed Project. Under this alternative the arena would have 500 fewer seats than identified in Applicant Objectives 1a and 1d. In addition, the Project Applicant's goal of consolidating team facilities (Applicant Objective 1c) and providing complementary retail (Project Applicant Objective 1e) would also not be met under the Reduced Project Size Alternative, as no team facilities and retail development would be provided. The elimination of retail and hotel uses under this alternative would fail to meet the intent of Applicant Objective 1f related to providing public benefits such as opportunities for youth- and community-oriented programs and increasing revenues by property and sales taxes and potential transient occupancy taxes. Finally, the absence of a complementary uses such as a team practice facility, sports medical clinic, team offices, retail and public uses under this alternative would fail to meet Applicant Objectives 2 and 2d.

6.4.3 Alternative 3: City Services Center Alternative Site Description

Under Alternative 3, key elements of the Proposed Project would be developed on a site in Downtown Inglewood, located approximately 1.5 miles northwest of the Project Site (see **Figure 6-2**). The focus of this alternative is to identify the impacts that would occur if the arena and as much of the other elements of the Proposed Project as feasible are developed at another site within the City of Inglewood that is not as proximate to The Forum and the NFL Stadium, as a means of avoiding or lessening the traffic and related impacts of concurrent events at these

facilities. The City determined that there is one such site that may meet these criteria and provides sufficient land to accommodate the arena and related structures potentially available.

Specifically, Alternative 3 would be located on an approximately 9.7-acre site that encompasses the majority of a block bound by West Beach Avenue on the north, West Ivy Avenue on the east, Cable Place and the future Crenshaw/LAX light rail right-of-way on the south, and North Eucalyptus Avenue on the west. The Alternative 3 site is presently occupied by a City-owned corporation yard, known as the Inglewood City Services Center, and a firefighter training academy owned and operated by El Camino College. One existing building on the Alternative 3 site includes ground-level maintenance bays for vehicle and equipment maintenance, uncovered parking and a fuel island on the second floor accessible from Cable Place to the south of the site, and three floors of office space. Uncovered parking and material stockpiles and storage areas are also present in the City Services Center. Facilities on the firefighter training academy portion of the site include a classroom building, practice tower, and a “burn” building.

Regional access to the Alternative 3 site is provided by the San Diego Freeway (I-405), located approximately 0.6 miles to the west, and the Glenn Anderson Freeway & Transitway (I-105), located 2.3 miles to the south. Interstate 405 is located about 0.7 miles closer to the City Services Center site than to the Project Site, while I-105 is located about three times as far from the City Services Center site (2.4 miles) than from the Project Site (0.8 miles). Local access to the City Services Center site is provided by several major arterials, including Florence Avenue and La Brea Avenue, which serve the area near the City Services Center site. Transit access to the City Services Center site is provided by several bus lines and the future Crenshaw/LAX light rail line. The closest bus stop to the City Services Center site is a block north along North La Brea Avenue, and the nearest light rail station to the City Services Center site is about one quarter mile to the east along Florence Avenue. The Alternative 3 site is located approximately 1.5 miles northwest of The Forum, and approximately 2 miles northwest of the site of the NFL stadium.

Uses in the immediate vicinity of the City Services Center site include the Marvin Engineering Company industrial complex north and adjacent to the City Services Center site, manufacturing and single family residential uses to the north across West Beach Avenue and manufacturing and warehouse uses to the east across Ivy Avenue. There are also churches to the west of the site across North Eucalyptus Avenue. With the exception of a three-story structure along West Beach Avenue, all of the remaining uses to the north and east of the site are located in one-story structures, including three single family homes on the north side of West Beach Avenue, east of West Hazel Street. An electrical substation is located across the future Crenshaw/LAX light rail line right-of-way to the south and a single-story commercial wholesale building is located to the south across Cable Place. The City’s Sanford M. Anderson Water Treatment Plant is located to the west across North Eucalyptus Avenue.

The City Services Center site and the surrounding area are designated Downtown Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) in the City of Inglewood General Plan. The City Services Center

site and the area to the north, east, and south of the site is zoned MU-2, TOD Mixed Use 2, while the area to the west of the site is zoned O-S, Open Space.

Alternative 3 would involve the demolition of the facilities that presently occupy the City Services Center and firefighter training academy areas and the construction of an arena and parking structures that would open to a pedestrian plaza that would include an outdoor stage (see Figure 6.2). Similar to the Proposed Project, the arena under this alternative would have a capacity of 18,000 attendees in an NBA basketball configuration, and up to 18,500 in certain concert configurations. The arena would be located on the southeast portion of the site while Parking Structure A would be situated on the southwestern portion of the site and Parking Structures B and C would be situated on the northeastern portion of the site. Access to the arena would be provided on West Beach and North Eucalyptus avenues via a pedestrian plaza. Parking Structure A would be accessed from North Eucalyptus Avenue while Parking Structures B and C would be accessed from West Beach Avenue. In addition, approximately 48,000 square feet of ground floor retail oriented towards the pedestrian plaza would be provided on the lower level of Parking Garages A and B and along the northwestern border of the site.

The proposed parking structures on the City Services Center site would include 4,215 parking spaces, which is the same amount of parking provided by the Proposed Project. In addition, offsite parking for events at the arena would be provided by an existing parking structure owned and operated by the Faith Central Bible Church. The existing structure is located approximately 800 feet to the southwest of the Project Site along Florence Avenue and would provide up to 860 additional parking spaces.

At 9.7 acres, the Alternative 3 site would be approximately 35 percent of the size of the Project Site. As a result, none of the other team facilities proposed by the Proposed Project (e.g., team practice facility, sports medical clinic, and team offices) would be constructed under Alternative 3 as the site is not of sufficient size to accommodate the additional square footage. The LA Clippers' team offices would continue to be located on Flower Street within two blocks of Staples Center while the LA Clippers would continue to use their practice and training facility in the Playa Vista neighborhood of Los Angeles. In addition, this alternative would not include a hotel or a new potable water well because existing uses would remain in their existing locations on the Project Site.

Finally, under Alternative 3, all of the uses that presently occupy the City Services Center and the firefighter training academy would be relocated to the Arena Site along Century Boulevard. Unlike the Proposed Project, the relocation of these uses would not require the vacation of either West 101st Street or West 102nd Street. In addition, these uses would only require approximately 10 acres of the Arena Site.

Comparative Analysis of Environmental Effects

Table 6-5 at the end of this chapter provides an impact-by-impact comparison of the significant impacts of the Proposed Project and Alternative 3. In addition, the comparative analysis of

environmental effects provided below was informed by the Downtown Inglewood and Fairview Heights Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Plan Program EIR³, which provided information relating to existing conditions in and around the City Services Center site.

Impacts Identified as Being the Same or Similar to the Proposed Project

Although the City Services Center site is about 65% smaller than the Project Site, Alternative 3 also involves relocation of uses from the City Services Center site to the Project Site, and thus a number of impacts would be similarly likely to occur despite the reduced size of the site for the construction of the Proposed Project.

A number of trees are located on and/or adjacent to the City Services Center site. In addition, as discussed in Section 3.3, Biological Resources, a number of trees are also located on and/or adjacent to the Arena Site where the City Services Center and fire academy would be relocated. As a result, Alternative 3 could disturb nesting raptors or migratory birds (Impact 3.3-2) and result in the loss of protected trees (Impact 3.3-3). Mitigation Measures 3.3-2 and 3.3-3 would reduce these impacts by requiring that steps be taken to protect these resources during construction. As a result, impacts on nesting raptors or migratory birds and protected trees would be similar to those described for the Proposed Project.

Like the Project Site, there are no known archaeological or paleontological resources located on the City Services Center site. However, according to the TOD EIR, it is likely that development in Downtown Inglewood, including on the City Services Center site, could disturb buried archaeological resources,⁴ destroy previous unknown unique paleontological resources,⁵ and disturb unknown human remains.⁶ In addition, as discussed in Section 3.4, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources, and Section 3.6, Geology and Soils, unknown archaeological resources, paleontological resources and human remains may also be located on the Arena Site where the City Services Center and fire academy would be relocated. For these reasons, it is possible that, like with the Proposed Project, implementation of Alternative 3 could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historic and archaeological resources (Impacts 3.4-1, 3.4-2, and 3.4-6), paleontological resources (Impacts 3.6-2 and 3.6-4) and human remains (Impacts 3.4-4 and 3.4-8). Mitigation Measures 3.4-1 and 3.6-2 would reduce these impacts by requiring that work stop if such resources are uncovered, and that the resources be appropriately evaluated and treated. Therefore, impacts on archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains would be similar to the Proposed Project.

³ City of Inglewood, 2016. *Downtown Inglewood and Fairview Heights Transit Oriented Development Plan Program EIR*. November 1, 2016.

⁴ City of Inglewood, 2016. *Downtown Inglewood and Fairview Heights Transit Oriented Development Plan Program EIR*. November 1, 2016. p. 4.D-14.

⁵ City of Inglewood, 2016. *Downtown Inglewood and Fairview Heights Transit Oriented Development Plan Program EIR*. November 1, 2016. p. 4.D-16.

⁶ City of Inglewood, 2016. *Downtown Inglewood and Fairview Heights Transit Oriented Development Plan Program EIR*. November 1, 2016. p. 4.D-18.

A known Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) is located approximately 0.14 miles to the southwest of the City Services Center site and a petroleum spill occurred approximately 100 feet to the south of the site.⁷ It is possible that releases from these sites may have migrated to the City Services Center site. In addition, the presence of a fuel island and ongoing vehicle and equipment maintenance activities in the service bays could indicate that unknown soil contamination may be present on the City Services Center site. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 3.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, unknown soil contamination may be present on the Arena Site given its land use history and the results of soil testing. As a result of these conditions at the City Services Center site, under Alternative 3, as with the Proposed Project, it is possible that construction workers could be exposed to contamination during ground disturbing activities (Impact 3.8-4). Mitigation Measure 3.8-4 would require the preparation and approval of the Soil Management Plan prior to initiating earthwork activities, which would reduce the potential for worker exposures. For this reason, impacts related to on-site contamination would be similar to those described for the Proposed Project.

The City Services Center site is fully developed with impervious surfaces; pervious surfaces on the site are minimal and include ornamental landscaping. Sheet flow stormwater runoff on the City Services Center site is managed by an existing system of storm drains. Further, the site is bisected, east-to-west, by a drainage that is encased in a below-grade culvert and would be required to be relocated as part of development of the site. In addition, as discussed in Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, the Arena Site is partially developed with large portions of previously development but now vacant land.

As a result, it is possible that construction and operation of Alternative 3 could cause water quality discharges that are not consistent with SWRCB objectives and could degrade the quality of the water that is discharged from the City Services Center site (due to arena development) and the Arena Site (due to the relocation of the City Services Center land uses) (Impacts 3.9-1 and 3.9-4). Altered drainage patterns during both construction and operation on both sites, including the realignment of the below-grade drainage culvert bisecting the City Services Center site, have the potential to result in erosion, sedimentation, and/or flooding on or offsite by redirecting or concentrating flows (Impact 3.9-3 and 3.9-6). The existing storm drain system in the area of the City Services Center and Arena sites may not have the capacity to handle post-construction stormwater runoff from the City Services Center site (Impacts 3.15-7 and 3.15-8). In order to lessen the significance of these impacts for Alternative 3, like the Proposed Project, Mitigation Measure 3.9-1(a) would require the project to comply with a number of regulations governing water quality and drainage while Mitigation Measure 3.9-1(b) would require the periodic sweeping parking lots during operation to remove contaminants. As a result, impacts related to water quality, drainage, and stormwater capacity would be similar to the Proposed Project.

Like the Proposed Project, Alternative 3 would not result in the division of an established community, nor would it be inconsistent with plans or policies that have been adopted for the

⁷ State Water Resources Control Board, 2019. Geotracker database. Accessed: May 9, 2019.

purposes of environmental mitigation, and thus Alternative 3 would have less-than significant-impacts related to land use and planning (Impacts 3.10-1 through 3.10-4). Because impacts of the Proposed Project on public services, including fire and police protection, parks and recreation facilities, and public schools would be largely driven by event activity at the proposed arena, these impacts would remain largely unchanged and would continue to be less than significant (see Impacts 3.13-1 through 3.13-12),, and would remain less than significant under Alternative 3.

Impacts Identified as Being Less Severe than the Proposed Project

Because Alternative 3 would be located away from the busy West Century Boulevard and South Prairie Avenue corridors, and because the amount of development in Alternative 3 is less than under the Proposed Project, a number of significant impacts of the Proposed Project would be lessened or avoided.

Although the aesthetic impacts of the Proposed Project to views and visual character would be less than significant, none of the effects described near the Project Site would occur under Alternative 3. There would be development on the Arena Site, but it would be low in scale other than the fire academy tower, and would not be large in scale or lit at night. Because the streets surrounding the City Services Center site are narrower and not straight for extended distances, views are relatively constrained, and as such there would be less potential for disruption of long-range views under Alternative 3.

Air Quality and GHG emissions during construction and operation under Alternative 3 would be similar to the Proposed Project but lessened because this alternative would disturb slightly less soil (i.e., 9.7 acres on the City Services Center site and approximately 10 acres on the Arena Site acre) and would not include additional team facilities (i.e., team practice facility, sports medical clinic, and team offices), the planned hotel on the East Transportation Site, or a new potable water well, and thus, the duration of construction would be shorter and fewer trips would be generated during operation. Therefore, impacts associated with the emission of criteria air pollutants (Impacts 3.2-2 and 3.2-6) and GHG emissions (Impact 3.7-1) would be reduced, but would still require the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.2-1, which would require the implementation of a transportation demand management (TDM) plan, Mitigation Measure 3.7-1a, which would require the implementation of an energy minimization and GHG reduction plan, and Mitigation Measure 3.7-1b, which would require the preparation of an annual GHG verification report to determine the number of GHG offsets required to bring the project below the net neutral threshold of significance. In addition, similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative 3 would conflict with implementation of applicable air quality plans, as operational emissions associated with the alternative, though reduced, would still exceed thresholds established by the SCAQMD for criteria air pollutants (Impact 3.2-1 and 3.2-5).

As described above, there are three residential homes that considered sensitive receptors immediately across W. Beach Avenue. Construction noise levels under Alternative 3 would also be similar to the Proposed Project but lessened in duration as this alternative would not include additional team facilities (i.e., team practice facility, sports medical clinic, and team offices), the

planned hotel on the East Transportation Site, or a new potable water well, and thus the construction period would be shorter and fewer vehicle trips would be generated during operation. Like with the Proposed Project, operational sound from outdoor plaza events from amplification systems would result in significant impacts at sensitive receptors proximate to the City Services Center site, but because compared to the Proposed Project there are fewer sensitive receptors that are in close proximity to the City Services Center site, this impact would be less severe than under the Proposed Project. Therefore, impacts associated with a temporary increase in noise during construction and a permanent increase in noise during operation (Impacts 3.11-1 and 3.11-5) would be reduced.

Vibration levels under Alternative 3 would also be similar to the Proposed Project but lessened as the duration of construction would be shorter. As a result, vibration impacts with respect to structural damage and human annoyance (Impacts 3.11-2 and 3.11-6) would be reduced, but would still require the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.11-2, which requires minimum distances of construction equipment from sensitive receptors and the designation of a construction relations officer to field vibration-related complaints.

Unlike the Proposed Project, Alternative 3 would not construction of the hotel and team medical clinic and the City Services Center site is located entirely outside the 65 dBA contour for aircraft operations from LAX. Thus, Alternative 3 would not expose sensitive receptors within the Project Site to excessive noise levels from aircraft operations. For this reason, noise impacts associated with aircraft operations (Impacts 3.11-3 and 3.11-7) would be avoided and Mitigation Measure 3.11-3 would not be required.

[ADD DISCUSSION OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED GHG AND AIR QUALITY]

Impacts Identified as Being More Severe than the Proposed Project

Although the amount of development included in the City Services Center Site Alternative is less than under the Proposed Project, the specific aspects of the site create the potential for impacts that would be more severe than under the Proposed Project.

Because of the narrowness of the surrounding streets and the presence of residential uses immediately across West Beach Avenue, the potential for spillover lighting effects on residential uses is greater than under the Proposed Project. In addition, the location of the residences to the northeast of the Arena Structure and 8-story Parking Structure B and 7-story Parking Structure C that would be located across the street would create the potential for shadows to be cast on the homes in afternoons in the winter. Due to the over 400-foot length and east-west alignment of the two parking structures, such effects would be longer lasting than shadow effects on homes under the Proposed Project and it is likely that these impacts would be significant. If such shadows were significant, mitigation would involve reducing the height of the West Beach Avenue parking structures, which could also materially reduce the available parking on the City Services Center Alternative Site.

[ADD LIGHTING EFFECTS DISCUSSION, IF WARRANTED]

[NOTE DISCUSS POTENTIAL ACCESS ISSUES GIVEN CONSTRAINTS OF SURROUNDING STREETS]

Relationship to Project Objectives

The City Services Center Alternative would meet some of City's objectives for the project. In particular, the project would meet the City's goals of becoming a regional sports and entertainment center (City Objective 1) and stimulating economic development (City Objective 2). In addition, given the location of the site near the future Crenshaw/LAX light rail line, the project would also meet the City's goal of encouraging public transit opportunities (City Objective 6). However, the elimination of the team practice facility, sports medical clinic, and team offices means that the LA Clippers would continue to generate VMT and associated air pollutants and GHG emissions during commute trips between these uses located around the Los Angeles basin. As such, Alternative 3 would be less responsive to City Objective 8 because it would be less environmentally conscious than the Proposed Project.

The City Services Center Alternative would also meet some, but not all, of the Project Applicant's objectives for the project. The project under this alternative would not meet the Project Applicant's goal of consolidating team facilities on one site (Project Applicant Objective 1b) as the team practice facility, sports medical clinic, and team offices would continue to be located in Downtown Los Angeles and Playa Vista, respectively. In addition, the project would only partially meet the Project Applicant's goal of contributing to the economic and social well-being of the community as the elimination of the hotel under the City Services Center Alternative would result in the loss of revenue from transient occupancy taxes (Project Applicant Objective 1f). Next, as the City Services Center site would be approximately 35 percent of the size of the Project Site, and thus would provide fewer amenities, the project would not be as competitive with other major entertainment venues as it would be on the Project Site, and it would not provide sufficient complementary on-site uses to sustain the project on non-event days (Project Applicant Objectives 2b and 2d). Finally, the project would not be located on a site near other similar uses (i.e. the future stadium) within the HPSP area under the City Services Center Alternative. As a result, the proposed project would not combine with the future stadium to create a dynamic, year-round sports and entertainment district destination in the southwestern portion of the City (Project Applicant Objective 3a).

6.4.4 Alternative 4: Baldwin Hills Alternative Site

Description

Under Alternative 4, the Proposed Project would be developed at the site of the existing Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza shopping mall, located approximately 4.5 miles north of the Project Site in the Baldwin Hills neighborhood of the City of Los Angeles (see **Figure 6-3**). The focus of this alternative is to identify the impacts that would occur if the arena and related development were to be constructed and operated at another site that is located, if not within the City of Inglewood,

then in the same general vicinity within the region, but not as proximate to The Forum and the NFL stadium, as a means of avoiding or lessening the traffic and related impacts of concurrent events at these facilities. Because the vicinity around Inglewood is largely developed, available sites that may meet these criteria and be of sufficient size to accommodate the arena and other project elements are limited. The City determined that there is such a site located in the vicinity of Baldwin Hills neighborhood.

The Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza shopping mall is approximately 43 acres in size and is bounded by West 39th Street on the north, Crenshaw Boulevard on the east, Stocker Street on the southeast, Santa Rosalia Drive on the southwest, and Marlton Avenue on the west. The mall is also bisected into two parcels by Martin Luther King Jr. (MLK) Boulevard: a northern parcel consisting of approximately 11 acres and a southern parcel consisting of 32 acres. The Alternative 4 Baldwin Hills site includes a portion of the 32-acre southern parcel of the mall.

Under existing conditions, the Baldwin Hills site includes approximately 791,650 square feet of commercial retail, restaurant, and entertainment uses. These uses include anchor stores such as Sears; mall stores; restaurants; a theater; a bank; and two parking structures. The existing Cinemark Theaters and mall stores on the site would remain. All other uses, including the Sears store and automotive center would be demolished and cleared for construction of the Alternative 4 uses. None of the uses on the northern parcel would be disrupted, and the viaduct that crosses West Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard would remain.

In general, regional highway facilities are located further from the Baldwin Hills Alternative Site than the regional highway facilities that serve the Project Site. Regional access to the Baldwin Hills site is provided by the Santa Monica Freeway (I-10), located approximately 1.6 miles to the north, the Harbor Freeway (I-110), located about 3.1 miles to the east, and the San Diego Freeway (I-405), located approximately 3.5 miles to the west. Local access to the Baldwin Hills site is provided by Crenshaw Boulevard and West Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. The Baldwin Hills site is also accessible by transit via bus and the future Crenshaw/LAX light rail line. The closest bus stop to the Baldwin Hills site will be located immediately adjacent to the site, at the intersection of Crenshaw Boulevard and MLK Boulevard, while the nearest light rail station is located immediately adjacent to the site along the west side of Crenshaw Boulevard, south of MLK Boulevard.

The Baldwin Hills site is located adjacent to the Crenshaw Commercial Corridor and is mostly surrounded by commercial uses with low and medium density residential uses located to the southwest, south, and east. Land uses to the north consist of retail uses located across MLK Boulevard on the mall's 11-acre northern parcel while land uses to the east include single-story commercial uses and associated parking. To the east, along Crenshaw Boulevard between West MLK Jr. Boulevard and West Stocker Street, land uses are commercial for one parcel deep, and then single family residential further east. Land uses to the southeast across Stocker Street include single-story commercial uses, two-story multifamily uses, and one-story single family residential uses. Land uses to the southwest along Santa Rosalia Drive include various mid-rise residential

and office uses including a four-story medical office building, six-story condominium building, a church and preparatory academy, and a community recreational facility (YMCA). Land uses to the west along Marlton Avenue include a large three-story Kaiser Permanente medical office building surrounded by parking.

The Baldwin Hills Alternative Site is designated Regional Commercial Center, and is located in the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan area. Land uses surrounding the Baldwin Hills site within the City of Los Angeles are designated by the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan as Regional Commercial Center to the north, Community Commercial and Neighborhood Commercial to the east, Community Commercial to the southeast, and Regional Center Commercial to the west. With respect to zoning, the Baldwin Hills site is designated Commercial (C2). Land uses surrounding the Baldwin Hills alternative site within the City of Los Angeles are zoned as Commercial (C2) to the north; Limited Commercial (C1) to the east; Commercial (C2) to the southwest; and Commercial (C2) to the west. Land uses within unincorporated Los Angeles County to the southeast are zoned Multiple Dwelling Unit Residential (R3).

A plan to modernize and redevelop the existing Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza shopping mall was approved by the City of Los Angeles 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 site; the existing mall buildings and theater would remain. The project has yet to be developed.

Alternative 4 would involve the demolition of the Sears store, the east parking structure along Crenshaw Boulevard, and smaller commercial and retail outbuildings along Stocker Street, Santa Rosalia Drive, and Marlton Avenue. The former Walmart store at the corner of Crenshaw Boulevard and West MLK Jr. Boulevard, the main mall structure (including bridge structure), and Cinemark movie theater would remain. In addition, the west parking structure along Marlton Avenue would either be expanded or replaced under this alternative.

Similar to the Proposed Project, the arena under Alternative 4 would have a capacity of 18,000 attendees in an NBA basketball configuration, and up to 18,500 in certain concert configurations. In addition, a team practice facility, sports medical clinic, team offices, and retail uses would be included under this alternative. The square footage of each of these uses would remain the same as under the Proposed Project. This alternative would not include a hotel or a new potable water well because such uses would not be removed in order to accommodate the arena structure. Approximately 4,060 onsite parking spaces would be provided in two parking structures, slightly less than the 4,125 onsite parking spaces that would be provided in the Proposed Project. Onsite parking would be provided in the expanded or new four-level 2,100-space Parking Structure A that would be accessed from Marlton Avenue and a new four-level, 1,960-space Parking Structure B would be constructed along Stocker Street.

Comparative Analysis of Environmental Effects

Table 6-5 at the end of this chapter provides an impact-by-impact comparison of the significant impacts of the Proposed Project and Alternative 4. The comparative analysis of environmental effects provided below was informed by the 2016 Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza Master Plan Project EIR (Master Plan EIR)⁸, that contained information relating to existing conditions in and around the Baldwin Hills Alternative Site, and the environmental impacts of redevelopment of the site.

Impacts Identified as Being the Same or Similar to the Proposed Project

Because the size of the arena and the amount of development would be essentially the same as the development in the Proposed Project, many of the impacts of the Proposed Project that are affected by the intensity of development would remain the same or very similar at the Baldwin Hills Alternative Site.

The aesthetic conditions around the Baldwin Hills site are different in specifics than at the Project Site, but similar in character. The site is adjacent to a major commercial corridor, in this case Crenshaw Boulevard, with other commercial lined streets backed by residential neighborhoods on several sides. Long range views are of urbanized Los Angeles, and while the proposed arena and associated uses at this site would be clearly identifiable, the aesthetic change of the site from a regional shopping mall with major parking resources would to an arena with parking resources would not be material. Most of the immediately adjacent uses that would be potentially affected by shadows created by the larger structures are commercial in nature, and given the 4-story profile of the perimeter parking structures, it is unlikely that significant shadow impacts would affect nearby residential uses.

[ADD LIGHTING EFFECTS DISCUSSION, IF WARRANTED]

A number of trees are located on and/or adjacent to the Baldwin Hills site so it is likely that tree loss or other construction activities that would occur with Alternative 4 could disturb nesting raptors or migratory birds (Impact 3.3-2). Mitigation Measures 3.3-2 and 3.3-3 would reduce these impacts by requiring that steps be taken to protect these resources during construction. As a result, impacts to nesting raptors or migratory birds would be similar to the Proposed Project.

Past soil contamination on the Baldwin Hills site has either been remediated or does not pose a concern to individuals and/or the environment.⁹ However, it is possible that previously contaminated soils may still remain on the Baldwin Hills site, and thus, as with the Proposed Project, construction workers could be exposed to contamination during ground disturbing activities (Impact 3.8-4). Mitigation Measure 3.8-4 would require the preparation and approval of the Soil Management Plan prior to initiating earthwork activities, which would reduce the

⁸ City of Los Angeles, 2016. *Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza Master Plan Project EIR*. November 2016.

⁹ City of Los Angeles, 2016. *Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza Master Plan Project EIR*. November 2016. p. IV.F-10.

potential for worker exposures. For this reason, impacts related to on-site contamination would be similar to the Proposed Project.

The Baldwin Hills site is fully developed with impervious surfaces; pervious surfaces on the site are minimal and include ornamental landscaping. Surface water runoff from the Baldwin Hills site is directed into an extensive storm drain collection system that serves the area. Similar to the Proposed Project, it is possible that construction and operation of Alternative 4 could degrade the quality of the water that is discharged from the Baldwin Hills site (Impacts 3.9-1 and 3.9-4). In addition, as with the Proposed Project, altered drainage patterns on the Baldwin Hills site during both construction and operation have the potential to result in erosion, sedimentation, and/or flooding on or offsite by redirecting or concentrating flows (Impact 3.9-3 and 3.9-6). Finally, like with the Proposed Project, the existing storm drain system in the vicinity of the Baldwin Hills site may have insufficient capacity to accommodate post-construction stormwater runoff from the Alternative 4 development (Impacts 3.15-7 and 3.15-8). Mitigation Measure 3.9-1(a) would require the project at the Baldwin Hills site to comply with a number of regulations governing water quality and drainage while Mitigation Measure 3.9-1(b) would require the periodic sweeping of parking lots during operation to remove contaminants. As a result, impacts related to water quality, drainage, and stormwater capacity would be similar to those described for the Proposed Project.

Construction vibration levels under Alternative 4 would be similar to the Proposed Project due to the use of similar equipment and construction methods. As a result, vibration impacts with respect to structural damage and human annoyance (Impacts 3.11-2 and 3.11-6) would be the same and would still require the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.11-2, which requires minimum distances of construction equipment from sensitive receptors and the designation of a construction relations officer to field vibration-related complaints.

Fire protection services at the Baldwin Hills site is provided by the City of Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) and police protection services are provided by the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD). There are multiple fire stations that provide service to the project site, including Station Nos. 94, 34, and 66, which the LAFD has indicated that the response times and distances to the Project Site from Station 94 and Station 34 currently meet LAFD standards.¹⁰ The Baldwin Hills Alternative Site is located within the LAPD's South Bureau, and is served by the Southwest Community Police Station, located at 1546 West Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.¹¹ With the implementation of a series of Regulatory Compliance Measures and Project Design Features required of new projects in the City of Los Angeles, the Proposed Project built and operated at the Baldwin Hills site would have a less than significant impact on the provision of fire and police protection services (see Impacts 3.13-1 through 3.13-4). This impact would be similar in magnitude to the impact at the Project Site.

¹⁰ City of Los Angeles, 2016. *Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza Master Plan Project EIR*. November 2016. p. IV.K.1-2.

¹¹ City of Los Angeles, 2016. *Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza Master Plan Project EIR*. November 2016. p. IV.K.2-2.

Because the Proposed Project does not include residential uses, it would not adversely affect City of Los Angeles parks and recreation facilities or Los Angeles Unified School District elementary, middle, and high schools. Thus, these impacts would be the same as with the Proposed Project.

[ADD DISCUSSION OF TRANSPORTATION, INCLUDING TRANSIT EFFECTS ON THE CRENSHAW LINE]

Impacts Identified as Being Less Severe than the Proposed Project

Air Quality and GHG emissions during construction and operation under Alternative 4 would be similar to the Proposed Project but slightly lessened as this alternative would not include the planned hotel on the East Transportation Site or a new potable water well. Therefore, impacts associated with the emission of criteria air pollutants (Impacts 3.2-2 and 3.2-6) and GHG emissions (Impact 3.7-1) would be reduced, but would still require the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.2-1, which would require the implementation of a transportation demand management (TDM) plan, Mitigation Measure 3.7-1a, which would require the implementation of an energy minimization and GHG reduction plan, and Mitigation Measure 3.7-1b, which would require the preparation of an annual GHG verification report to determine the number of GHG offsets required to bring the project below the net neutral threshold of significance. In addition, similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative 4 would conflict with implementation of the applicable air quality plans, as operational emissions associated with the alternative, though reduced, would still exceed thresholds established by the SCAQMD for criteria air pollutants (Impact 3.2-1 and 3.2-5).

None of the trees listed in the City of Los Angeles Protective Tree Ordinance occur on the Baldwin Hills site.¹² As a result, Alternative 4 would not result in the loss of protected trees (3.3-3). Mitigation Measure 3.3-3 to reduce this impact would not be required. As a result, impacts to protected trees would be avoided under this alternative.

Alternative 4 would not expose people residing or working within the Baldwin Hills site to excessive noise levels from aircraft as the site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. For this reason, noise impacts associated with aircraft operations (Impacts 3.11-3 and 3.11-7) would be avoided under this alternative and Mitigation Measure 3.11-3 would not be required.

Impacts Identified as Being More Severe than the Proposed Project

Cultural Resources

According to Master Plan EIR, two known archaeological sites are located on the Baldwin Hills site. Archaeological site survey records indicate the presence of archaeological burial remains and artifacts including abalone shells, mollusk shells, chipped stone points, and other unidentified material that were identified and recorded in 1946 during construction of the Broadway Building

¹² City of Los Angeles, 2016. *Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza Master Plan Project EIR*. November 2016. Appendix A, Initial Study, p.5.

on the northern mall parcel and again in 1951 during excavation for the basement store.¹³ In addition, the younger quaternary alluvium deposits underneath the Baldwin Hills site typically do not contain significant fossil vertebrate remains; however, older, deeper deposits underneath the site may contain significant vertebrate fossils.¹⁴

For these reasons, similar to the Project Site, it is possible that the Baldwin Hills site may contain unknown archaeological resources (Impacts 3.4-1, 3.4-2 and 3.4-6), unknown paleontological resources (Impacts 3.6-2 and 3.6-4), and unknown human remains (Impacts 3.4-4 and 3.4-8). As noted above, the Master Plan EIR identified that there are two known archaeological sites within the Project Site, and City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument No. 487 (Sanchez Ranch) is located within 500 feet of the Project Site. Both archaeological resource sites 19-000080 and 19-001336, and City of Los Angeles Cultural Monument No. 487, have recorded the existence of Native American burial remains and other artifacts including abalone shells, mollusk shells, and chipped stone points. Due to the proximate location of the proposed grading areas and these sites, potential to disturb other undiscovered Native American remains that may exist beneath the Project Site is considered moderate to high. Because of the potential for accidental discovery of such resources occur during construction, this impact would be potentially significant and considered more severe than that described for the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measures 3.4-1 and 3.4-2 would reduce these impacts by requiring that work stop if such resources are uncovered, and that the resources be appropriately evaluated and treated. Nevertheless, because of the known presence of Native American archaeological resources, including human remains and burial artifacts on and near the Baldwin Hills Alternative Site, impacts on archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains would be more severe than for the Proposed Project.

Noise

Ambient noise levels at locations around the Baldwin Hills Alternative site are similar, but somewhat lower than those in the vicinity of the Project Site. Noise levels along perimeter streets range from about 61 to 69 dBA Leq at the Baldwin Hills site,¹⁵ compared to a range of approximately 64 to 71 dBA Leq at the Project Site (see Table 3.11-1). While traffic noise generators are similar in character, the Baldwin Hills Alternative site area lacks proximity to aircraft noise as is the case at the Project Site.

Noise levels under generated by construction and operation of Alternative 4 would be similar to the Proposed Project and sensitive receptors along Stocker Street to the south, across Crenshaw Boulevard to the east, across Santa Rosalia Drive to the west-southwest, and across West MLK Jr. Boulevard to the northwest of the Baldwin Hills site would be subjected to the same noise levels as sensitive receptors near the Project Site during construction and operation; these

¹³ City of Los Angeles, 2016. *Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza Master Plan Project EIR*. November 2016. p. IV.D.2-9.

¹⁴ City of Los Angeles, 2016. *Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza Master Plan Project EIR*. November 2016. p. IV.D.2-6.

¹⁵ City of Los Angeles, 2016. *Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza Master Plan Project EIR*. November 2016. Table IV.I-3, p. Page IV.I-7.

receptors would be located similar distances as sensitive receptors near the Project Site from construction activity, nearby roadways, and arena plaza activities. Therefore, while temporary increases in noise during construction and permanent increases in noise during operation (Impacts 3.11-1 and 3.11-5) would be of similar magnitude, the fact that the Baldwin Hills site area is generally quieter than the Project Site vicinity would result in more severe impacts with Alternative 4 than under the Proposed Project.

Utilities-Wastewater

At the Project Site, wastewater flows could be accommodated with several limited off-site improvements to increase capacity in local lines. At the Baldwin Hills Alternative site, the 12-inch sewer line under Marlton Avenue has a remaining flow capacity of 0.28 MGD; the capacity of the sewer under Crenshaw Boulevard is unknown.¹⁶ The estimated peak wastewater flow from the Proposed Project development would be approximately 0.70 MGD, more than double the known capacity of lines serving the site. Thus, infrastructure upgrades would be needed to allow the local wastewater infrastructure adjacent to the Project Site to serve the Proposed Project at the Baldwin Hills site. The construction of these infrastructure improvements could cause noise, traffic disruption, and other environmental effects associated with sewer line upgrades. This impact would be more severe than at the Project Site.

Transportation

[ADD DISCUSSION OF TRAFFIC IMPACTS WHICH MAY BE MORE SEVERE BECAUSE (1) ONE MAIN ROAD IN/OUT (CRENSHAW), AND LONGER DISTANCE TO NEAREST FREEWAYS; ADDRESS DISTANCE FROM FORUM AND NFL STADIUM, AND REDUCED IMPACTS DURING CONCURRENT EVENTS]

Relationship to Project Objectives

The City of Inglewood's basic objectives for the Proposed Project involve economic development, revitalization, and enhancing the welfare of the City and its residents, transforming underutilized property in the City, enhancing the identity of the City, and creating jobs in Inglewood. Because the Baldwin Hills Alternative Site is located in the City of Los Angeles and not in the City of Inglewood, none of the City of Inglewood's objectives for the Project would be met under Alternative 4.

The Baldwin Hills Alternative Site would meet most but not all of the Project Applicant's objectives for the project. While a state-of-the-art multi-purpose basketball and entertainment center (Project Applicant Objective 1a) along with team facilities (Project Applicant Objective 1c) and retail uses (Project Applicant Objective 1e) would be constructed under the Baldwin Hills Alternative, it would not combine with the future NFL Stadium to create a dynamic, year-round

¹⁶ City of Los Angeles, 2016. *Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza Master Plan Project EIR*. November 2016. Table IV.I-3, p. Page IV.M.1-11.

sports and entertainment district destination in the southwestern portion of Inglewood (Project Applicant Objective 3a).

6.4.5 Alternative 5: The District at South Bay Alternative Site Description

Under Alternative 5, the Proposed Project would be developed at a site in the City of Carson approximately 8 miles southeast of the Project Site (see **Figure 6-4**). The focus of this alternative is to identify the impacts that would occur if the arena and related development are located at another site that is, if not proximate to the City, then at a site that has previously been considered for a sports and entertainment facility. The City has determined that there is such a site located in the City of Carson. One key aim of this alternative is to determine whether such a site exists that would locate the arena at a site that is not as proximate to The Forum and the NFL stadium, as a means of avoiding or lessening the traffic and related impacts of concurrent events at these facilities. The City has determined that Alternative 5 may meet these criteria. There is some question regarding whether this site would meet the project applicant's objective to "[l]ocate a basketball and entertainment center on a site that is geographically desirable and accessible to the LA Clippers' current and anticipated fan base." Based on available information, however, this alternative appears to be potentially feasible.

Specifically, the Proposed Project would be located on a portion of a 157-acre site known as The District at South Bay, located west of the San Diego Freeway (I-405) and south of Del Amo Boulevard. The site is a former Class II landfill that is currently undergoing remediation and closure. The site is mostly vacant and is covered with nonnative grasses with the exception of the eastern portion of the site adjacent to the I-405, where a 711,500-square-foot regional commercial center is presently being constructed. Other existing facilities on the site include groundwater and landfill gas treatment facilities, and subsurface facilities to assist with dispersion of landfill gases. Construction trailers and equipment are also located in the northwestern portion of the site; soil and material stockpiles and construction materials are stored in various locations on the site.¹⁷

Regional access to the site would be provided by the San Diego Freeway (I-405), immediately adjacent to the east, Harbor Freeway (I-110 Freeway), approximately 0.5 miles to the west, Artesia Freeway (SR-91 Freeway), about 1.9 miles to the north, and Long Beach Freeway (I-710 Freeway), approximately 3.4 miles to the east. Overall, these regional highway facilities are located closer to the Alternative 5 site than the regional highway facilities that serve the Proposed Project. Local access to the site is provided by Del Amo Boulevard, Avalon Boulevard, and Main Street. Transit at the Alternative 5 site includes bus service provided by the City of Carson's bus system, Carson Circuit, which provides connections to the Metro Blue Line and regional bus services from 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

¹⁷ City of Carson, 2018. The District at South Bay Specific Plan EIR. March 2018, p. II-8.

along Avalon Boulevard. The nearest light rail station is the Metro Blue Line station at Del Amo Boulevard, about 3.5 miles east of the site.

The Alternative 5 site is surrounded by multiple land uses. Uses to the east across the I-405 include residential neighborhoods and regional retail, most notably the South Bay Pavilion at Carson. To the north of the site is the Porsche Experience Center, a 6.5-kilometre test and development auto racetrack, a racing car exhibition, and a restaurant. To the northeast is the Victoria Golf Course. Residential areas, consisting of one- and two-story detached residences and manufactured homes, are located to the south and west. The residences are separated from the Alternative 5 site by the Torrance Lateral Flood Control Channel (Torrance Lateral), a concrete-lined drainage channel which parallels the southern and western border of the site. To the west of the site, extending away from the site on West Torrance Boulevard and Del Amo Boulevard, are low-rise commercial and light industrial uses.

The site is designated Mixed Use – Residential in the City of Carson General Plan and designated Mixed-Use Marketplace (MU-M) and Commercial Marketplace (CM) in The District at Southbay Specific Plan. Land uses surrounding the project site are designated by the City of Carson General Plan as Mixed Use – Residential and Mixed Use – Business Park to the north, Regional Commercial to the east, Low Density Residential and High Density Residential to the south, and Low Density Residential to the west. With respect to zoning, land uses surrounding the project site are zoned regional commercial to the north and east, and single-family and multi-family residential to the south and west.

In 2006, the City of Carson adopted the Carson Marketplace Specific Plan, which proposed constructing a 1,995,125-sf mixed-use commercial project (retail, 300 hotel rooms, and entertainment uses) and 1,550 residential units. In 2011, the specific plan was amended and renamed “The Boulevards at South Bay Specific Plan.” In 2015, the specific plan area was proposed for the development of an NFL Stadium that would have served as the home for the San Diego Chargers and Oakland Raiders franchises. Ultimately this site was not selected, and the Chargers relocated to Los Angeles with the intent to play games at the new NFL Stadium under construction in Inglewood, and the Raiders decided to relocate to a new stadium currently under development in Las Vegas.

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 proposal, the 157-acre site would be developed with a total of 1,250 residential units and 1,834,833 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 rooms total in two hotels. As discussed above, the 711,500-square-foot regional commercial center (Los Angeles Premium Outlets) is under construction on the approximately 30-acre eastern portion of the specific plan area, adjacent to the I-405.

As with the Proposed Project, the Alternative 5 arena would have a capacity of 18,000 attendees in an NBA basketball configuration, and up to 18,500 in certain concert configurations. In addition, this alternative would include a team practice facility, sports medical clinic, team offices, and retail uses. The square footage of each of these uses would remain the same as under the Proposed Project. Approximately 8,000 surface parking spaces would be provided on the site; no parking structures would be constructed. The amount of parking is almost twice as much parking as is provided by the Proposed Project, and would respond to the relative lack of access to transit (3.5 miles to the Metro Blue Line Del Amo Station) and lack of substantial parking resources in the vicinity of the Alternative 5 site.

The design of the arena would change in response to the conditions on the former Carson Alternative Site. Investigation of and planning for remediation of the former landfill started in the late 1970s, and continued for about 40 years. The DTSC Remedial Action Plan for the former landfill requires the creation of an impervious cap underlain by clean fill.¹⁸ Thus, in order to avoid substantial changes to those earlier plans that would be associated with substantial excavation, instead of excavating to a depth of up to 35 feet and removing approximately 376,000 cubic yards of earth and former landfill materials from the site to accommodate the arena bowl, under Alternative 5 the arena would be constructed on a pad that would require the import of a similar amount of soil in order to build up the land area around the arena to avoid disturbing the buried landfill materials on the site.

This alternative would not include a hotel or a new municipal water well because the Roadway Inn would not be demolished and the existing Well #6 would not be removed from the Project Site as called for under the Proposed Project.

Comparative Analysis of Environmental Effects

Table 6-5 at the end of this chapter provides an impact-by-impact comparison of the significant impacts of the Proposed Project and Alternative 5. In addition, the comparative analysis of environmental effects provided below was informed by The District at South Bay Specific Plan EIR¹⁹, which provided information relating to existing conditions in and around the Carson Alternative Site.

Impacts Identified as Being the Same or Similar to the Proposed Project

Like the Project Site, the Carson Alternative Site is located in an urbanized area. The area in the vicinity of the Carson site does not contain notable features that would be considered unique geologic features or scenic resources located near a scenic highway, and does not have any scenic vistas. The site is adjacent to the San Diego Freeway which is not designated as a state scenic highway. As such, like the Proposed Project, the project built and operated at the Carson Alternative Site would not substantially damage any scenic resources within a state scenic highway. Because of the setting and location of adjacent uses, there would be no significant

¹⁸ City of Carson, Carson Marketplace Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report, State Clearinghouse Number 20050510059, July 2009, pp. 15-16.

¹⁹ City of Carson, 2018. The District at South Bay Specific Plan EIR. March 2018.

impacts related to shadowing of residences or other sensitive uses. These impacts would be of the same magnitude as under the Proposed Project.

With respect to the geologic and seismic conditions, the Carson Alternative Site is located in an area that has formerly been used as a landfill. In addition, the Alternative 5 site is largely located within an area designated by the City of Carson General Plan Safety Element and the State of California Seismic Hazard Maps as a CGS Liquefaction Hazard Zone.²⁰ Compliance with the most recent State Building Code and the City of Carson's Building Code seismic design standards and site evaluation requirements would reduce the risk of exposure of the Project's occupants and structures to ground shaking, liquefaction, differential settlement, or other geologic hazards. Thus, although geologic and seismic impacts would be greater at the Alternative 5 site, impacts related to geology and soils would, as mitigated, be less than significant, and similar to those described for the Proposed Project.

Hazardous materials impacts related to the former landfill uses on the site are discussed further below. However, impacts related to exposure of workers or residents to accidental spills or other operational hazards would be the same at the Carson Alternative Site as described for the Proposed Project (Impacts 3.8-1 through 3.8-3).

Fire protection services at the Carson site is provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) and police protection services are provided by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LACSD). There are multiple fire stations that provide service to the project site, including Station No. 36 which is the closest to the site.²¹ The Carson Alternative Site is served by the Carson Sheriff Station located at 21356 South Avalon.²² With the implementation of a series of design-related mitigation measures required of new projects in the City, and including the provision of space for use by the Sheriff's Department in the arena, the Proposed Project built and operated at the Carson site would have a less than significant impact on the provision of fire and police protection services (see Impacts 3.13-1 through 3.13-4). This impact would be similar in magnitude to the impact at the Project Site.

Because the Proposed Project does not include residential uses, it would not adversely affect City of Los Angeles parks and recreation facilities or Los Angeles Unified School District elementary, middle, and high schools. Thus, these impacts would be the same as with the Proposed Project.

Water, wastewater, and storm drainage infrastructure serving the Carson Alternative Site has been sized to accommodate intense development planned under the various versions of the specific plan that regulate development of the site. The planned infrastructure would be sufficient to meet the needs of the project built at this location. These impacts would be similar to those described for the Proposed Project.

²⁰ City of Carson, 2018. The District at South Bay Specific Plan EIR. March 2018. p. IV.E-7

²¹ City of Carson, 2018. The District at South Bay Specific Plan EIR. March 2018. p. VI-17.

²² City of Carson, 2018. The District at South Bay Specific Plan EIR. March 2018. p. VI-20.

Impacts Identified as Being Less Severe than the Proposed Project

The Carson Alternative Site has been completely disturbed and no vegetation, including trees, or habitat is present to support nesting raptors or migratory birds. As a result, Alternative 5 would not disturb nesting raptors or migratory birds (Impact 3.3-2) and would not result in the loss of protected trees (Impact 3.3-3).²³ Mitigation Measures 3.3-2 and 3.3-3 to reduce these impact would not be required. As a result, unlike the Proposed Project, no impacts to nesting raptors or migratory birds and protected trees would occur under this alternative.

The Carson Alternative Site is a former landfill with no existing buildings or other structures. As a result, there is no potential for the development of the Proposed Project at this site to have a significant impact on historical or archaeological resources (Impacts 3.4-1, 3.4-2 3.4-5, and 3.4-6), tribal cultural resources (Impact 3.4-3), paleontological resources (Impacts 3.6-2 and 3.6-4), and/or human remains (Impacts 3.4-4 and 3.4-8).²⁴ Mitigation Measures 3.4-1 and 3.6-2 to reduce these impacts would not be required. Therefore under Alternative 5 impacts on cultural resources, including archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains would be less severe than under the Proposed Project.

Impacts related to proximity to nearby airports would be less severe for the Carson Alternative Site than for the Proposed Project, which is under the flight path of LAX and within 2 miles of Hawthorne Airport (HHR). The closest public airport to the Carson Alternative site is the Compton Airport, which is located approximately 3.25 miles to the north. Therefore, development of the Proposed Project would not occur within 2 miles of a public or public use airport and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of the site.

Development under Alternative 5 would not degrade the quality of the water that is discharged from the Carson Alternative Site (Impacts 3.9-1 and 3.9-4). Construction on the Carson Alternative Site would be required to adhere to best management practices listed the NPDES General Construction Permit to reduce potential adverse effects with regard to water quality. During operation, the proposed arena and other facilities would be subject to the drainage control requirements of the County's 2009 Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) permit and the City's Storm Water Pollution Control Measures for New Development Projects.²⁵ In addition, any alterations to existing drainage patterns as a result of Alternative 5 would not be of a sufficient magnitude so as to result in substantial erosion or siltation or flooding on- or off-site (Impact 3.9-3 and 3.9-6).²⁶ Finally, development under Alternative 5 would be required to implement drainage control features in accordance with the City's drainage control regulations as well as 2009 SUSMP requirements, and thus would not result in the need for new or expanded storm drainage facilities.²⁷ As a result, Mitigation Measures 3.9-1(a) and 3.9-1(b) to reduce

²³ City of Carson, 2018. The District at South Bay Specific Plan EIR. March 2018. p. VI-4.

²⁴ City of Carson, 2018. The District at South Bay Specific Plan EIR. March 2018. p. VI-6.

²⁵ City of Carson, 2018. The District at South Bay Specific Plan EIR. March 2018. p. VI-11.

²⁶ City of Carson, 2018. The District at South Bay Specific Plan EIR. March 2018. p. VI-12.

²⁷ City of Carson, 2018. The District at South Bay Specific Plan EIR. March 2018. p. VI-13.

impacts related to water quality and drainage would not be required. For this reason, impacts related to on-site contamination would be less than those described for the Proposed Project.

Noise levels under Alternative 5 would be similar to the Proposed Project but lessened as sensitive receptors to the west and south of the Carson Alternative Site are located further away from construction activity and roadway than sensitive receptors under the Proposed Project. The nearest sensitive residential receptors that may be affected by the Proposed Project at the Carson Alternative Site are one- and two-story detached residences and mobile homes that are located across the Torrance Lateral Channel to the south and west of the site. Future residential uses have been approved across Del Amo Boulevard from the area of the Alternative 5 site. In addition, the San Diego Freeway is a substantial noise source on to the east of the Alternative Site, and the Porsche Experience, located across Del Amo Boulevard immediately north of the recently approved residences, is an entertainment use that already creates substantial noise in the area. Ambient noise levels measured at the site range from about 50 to 78 dBA across the site, generally in a west-to-east configuration with higher noise levels near the San Diego Freeway, and lower levels near the residential uses south and west of the site.²⁸ This is a much wider range of noise levels than at the Project Site. Because the noise levels produced by the Proposed Project constructed at the Carson Alternative Site would be similar to those predicted for the Proposed Project, it is possible that the impacts would be less severe on the eastern side of the property, near the San Diego Freeway, and potentially more severe on the south and western side of the site, adjacent to current residential uses.

Therefore, impacts associated with a temporary increase in noise during construction and a permanent increase in noise during operation (Impacts 3.11-1 and 3.11-5) would be reduced. In addition, vibration levels under Alternative 5 would also be similar to the Proposed Project but lessened for the same reasons. As a result, vibration impacts with respect to structural damage and human annoyance (Impacts 3.11-2 and 3.11-6) would be reduced, but would still require the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.11-2, which requires minimum distances of construction equipment from sensitive receptors and the designation of a construction relations officer to field vibration-related complaints. Finally, Alternative 5 would not expose people residing or working within the Carson Alternative Site to excessive noise levels from aircraft as the site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. For this reason, noise impacts associated with aircraft operations (Impacts 3.11-3 and 3.11-7) would be avoided and Mitigation Measure 3.11-3 would not be required.

[ADD TRANSPORTATION]

Impacts Identified as Being More Severe than the Proposed Project

Air Quality and GHG Emissions

Air Quality and GHG emissions during construction under Alternative 5 would be similar to the Proposed Project but slightly lessened as this alternative would not include the planned hotel on

²⁸ City of Carson, 2018. The District at South Bay Specific Plan EIR. March 2018. Table IV.H-1, p. IV.H-6.

the East Transportation Site and no parking structures would be constructed. However, operational air pollutant and GHG emissions would be increased compared to the Proposed Project because the project developed at the Carson Alternative Site would have less accessibility to transit and therefore higher automobile trip generation. In addition, because of its increased distance from Staples Center, VMT would be increased due to increased trip lengths. The combination of increased trips and increased trip lengths means that transportation-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and GHGs would be increased compared to the Proposed Project. Thus, impacts associated with the emission of criteria air pollutants (Impacts 3.2-2 and 3.2-6) and GHG emissions (Impact 3.7-1) would be increased, and would still require the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.2-1, which would require the implementation of a transportation demand management (TDM) plan, Mitigation Measure 3.7-1a, which would require the implementation of an energy minimization and GHG reduction plan, and Mitigation Measure 3.7-1b, which would require the preparation of an annual GHG verification report to determine the number of GHG offsets required to bring the project below the net neutral threshold of significance. It is very likely that the required GHG offsets would be materially greater than under the Proposed Project, and much less likely to meet the AB 987 requirement for 50% local offsets. In addition, like the Proposed Project, Alternative 5 would conflict with implementation of the applicable air quality plans, however operational emissions associated with the alternative would exceed thresholds established by the SCAQMD for criteria air pollutants by a greater amount than under the Proposed Project (Impact 3.2-1 and 3.2-5).

Energy Demand and Conservation

Impacts related to Energy Demand and Conservation would be greater than those of the Proposed Project. Like for the Proposed Project, it is assumed that the Alternative 5 project would be built to comply with the requirements of LEED Gold certification. Because the project at the Carson Site would not include construction of either the hotel or the parking structures, energy required for construction would tend to be less than under the Proposed Project. However, due to increased trip making and VMT, operational transportation energy would be increased compared to the Proposed Project. Construction impacts, which may be decreased compared to the Proposed Project, are one-time events and relatively short in duration, compared to operational impacts which occur on a continual basis over a 30-year or more period. Thus, on balance, energy effects of the project at the Carson Alternative Site would be more severe than those of the Proposed Project.

[ADD TRANSPORTATION]

Hazardous Materials

The initial investigations of contamination at the Alternative 5 site go back to the late 1970s. As a result of contamination discovered on and adjacent to the Carson Alternative Site, the site was listed as a hazardous substances site by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) in the 1980s and a remedial action order requiring implementation of remedial activities

was issued for the site in 1988.²⁹ Remediation of the Carson Alternative Site was divided by the DTSC into two operable units (OU). A remedial action plan (RAP) for the Upper OU was approved in 1995, which was modified by an Explanation of Significant Differences (ESD) in 2009. A separate RAP for the Lower OU was prepared in 2005. The purpose of the Upper OU RAP was to make the Carson Alternative Site safe for future development. The purpose of the Lower OU RAP was to protect groundwater resources and was not required to make the Carson Alternative Site safe for future resources.³⁰

The Upper OU RAP requires the installation, operation, and maintenance of (1) a landfill cap designed to encapsulate the waste and create a barrier between future improvements and buried waste, (2) an active gas collection and treatment system designed to remove landfill gases from under the landfill cap, and (3) a groundwater collection and treatment system designed to contain a groundwater plume underneath the site and treat the extracted groundwater prior to discharge.³¹ Development under Alternative 5 would be required to adhere to these requirements. The arena foundation would need to be supported by a pile system, with individual piles driven to the bearing soil beneath the waste. Given the density of the pile system to support a building of the scale of the proposed arena, and the nature of the extensive landfill gas collection system, it is likely that material changes to the landfill gas collection system may be required, and it is possible that construction workers could be exposed to contamination during ground disturbing and foundation construction activities. These impacts would be more severe than those described for the Proposed Project in Impact 3.8-4. Mitigation Measure 3.8-4 would require the preparation and approval of the Soil Management Plan prior to initiating earthwork activities, which would reduce the potential for worker exposures. This measure would be required to be expanded to include coordination with the State Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC), and implementation of any required amendments or updates to the RAP for the site. For this reason, impacts related to on-site contamination would be more severe than those described for the Proposed Project.

Relationship to Project Objectives

The City of Inglewood's basic objectives for the Proposed Project involve economic development, revitalization, and enhancing the welfare of the City and its residents, transforming underutilized property in the City, enhancing the identity of the City, and creating jobs in Inglewood. Because The District at South Bay Alternative is located in the City of Carson and not in the City of Inglewood, none of the City of Inglewood's objectives for the project would be met under Alternative 5.

The District at South Bay Alternative would meet most but not all of the Project Applicant's objectives for the project. While a state-of-the-art multi-purpose basketball and entertainment center (Objective 1a) along with team facilities (Objective 1c) and retail uses (Objective 1e)

²⁹ City of Carson, 2018. The District at South Bay Specific Plan EIR. March 2018. p. II-13.

³⁰ City of Carson, 2018. The District at South Bay Specific Plan EIR. March 2018. p. II-14.

³¹ City of Carson, 2018. The District at South Bay Specific Plan EIR. March 2018. p. II-14.

would be constructed under The District at South Bay Alternative, it would not combine with the future stadium to create a dynamic, year-round sports and entertainment district destination in the southwestern portion of the City of Inglewood (Objective 3a).

Alternative 5 may not meet one of the 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 Alternative 5 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. For this reason, it is unclear whether this location would achieve Applicant Objective 1(b).

6.5 Environmentally Superior Alternative

An EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative from among the range of reasonable alternatives that are evaluated. Section 15126.6 (e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an environmentally superior alternative be designated and states that if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

For each significant impact, Table 6-2 indicates whether the impacts of the project alternatives are more or less severe than those of the Proposed Project.

From the alternatives evaluated in this EIR, the environmentally superior alternative would be Alternative 1 – the No Project Alternative. This alternative would avoid all significant impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

Of the other alternatives considered in this EIR, the environmentally superior alternative would be [TBD].

**TABLE 6-2
PROJECT ALTERNATIVES SIGNIFICANT IMPACT COMPARISON**

Impact PRELIMINARY DRAFT – TO BE COMPLETED AFTER FINAL REVISIONS TO TECHNICAL SECTIONS	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Reduced Project Size	Alternative 3: Different Location – City Yard	Alternative 4: Different Location – Baldwin Hills	Alternative 5: Different Location – Carson
3.1 Aesthetics						
3.2 Air Quality						
3.3 Biological Resources						
3.3-2: Construction of the Proposed Project could have the potential to interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM=	LSM-
3.3-3: Construction of the Proposed Project could have the potential to conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resource, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM-	LSM-
3.4 Cultural and Tribal Resources						
3.4-1: Construction of the Proposed Project could have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM+	LS

Impact PRELIMINARY DRAFT – TO BE COMPLETED AFTER FINAL REVISIONS TO TECHNICAL SECTIONS	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Reduced Project Size	Alternative 3: Different Location – City Yard	Alternative 4: Different Location – Baldwin Hills	Alternative 5: Different Location – Carson
33.4-2: Construction of the Proposed Project could have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM+	LS
3.4-3: Construction of the Proposed Project could have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is: i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k). ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM+	LS
3.4-4: Construction of the Proposed Project could have the potential to disturb human remains including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM+	LS
3.4-6: Construction of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with construction of other cumulative development, could have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts on archaeological resources.	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM+	LS
3.4-7: Construction of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with construction of other cumulative development, could have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts on the significance of a Tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074.	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM+	LS
3.4-8: Construction of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with construction of other cumulative development, could have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts on human remains including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM+	LS
3.5 Energy Demand and Conservation						
3.5-2: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project could have the potential to conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM=	LSM=

Impact PRELIMINARY DRAFT – TO BE COMPLETED AFTER FINAL REVISIONS TO TECHNICAL SECTIONS	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Reduced Project Size	Alternative 3: Different Location – City Yard	Alternative 4: Different Location – Baldwin Hills	Alternative 5: Different Location – Carson
3.5-4: Implementation of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with other cumulative development, could conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM=	LSM=
3.6 Geology and Soils						
3.6-1: Construction of the Proposed Project could have the potential to result in the substantial erosion or the loss of topsoil.	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM=	LSM=
3.6-2: Construction of the Proposed Project could have the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM=	LSM-
3.6-4: Construction of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with construction of other cumulative development, would contribute to cumulative impacts on paleontological resources.	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM=	LSM-
3.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions						
3.7-1: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project could generate "net new" GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that could have a significant impact on the environment.	LSM	NI	LSM-	LSM-	LSM-	LSM+
3.7-2: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project could have the potential to be inconsistent with applicable plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.	LSM	NI	LSM-	LSM-	LSM-	LSM+
3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials						
3.8-4: Construction of the Proposed Project would be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, could have the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM=	LSM+
3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality						
3.9-1: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project could have the potential to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality, or conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan.	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM=	LSM-
3.9-3: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project could have the potential to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM=	LSM-

Impact PRELIMINARY DRAFT – TO BE COMPLETED AFTER FINAL REVISIONS TO TECHNICAL SECTIONS	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Reduced Project Size	Alternative 3: Different Location – City Yard	Alternative 4: Different Location – Baldwin Hills	Alternative 5: Different Location – Carson
surfaces, in a manner which has the potential to: result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or impede or redirect flow.						
3.9-4: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with other cumulative development within the Dominguez Channel Watershed, would have the potential to cumulatively violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM=	LSM-
3.9-6: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with other cumulative development in the Dominquez Channel Watershed, could have the potential to cumulatively alter the drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or impede or redirect flow.	LSM	NI	LSM=	LSM=	LSM=	LSM-
3.10 Land Use and Planning						
There are no significant project or cumulative impacts related to Land Use and Planning.						
3.11 Noise						
3.12 Population, Employment and Housing						
There are no significant project or cumulative impacts related to Population, Employment and Housing.						

Impact PRELIMINARY DRAFT – TO BE COMPLETED AFTER FINAL REVISIONS TO TECHNICAL SECTIONS	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Reduced Project Size	Alternative 3: Different Location – City Yard	Alternative 4: Different Location – Baldwin Hills	Alternative 5: Different Location – Carson
3.15 Utilities and Service Systems						
3.15-7: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project could have the potential to require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction or relocation of which could have the potential to cause significant environmental effects.	LSM	NI	LSM-	LSM=	LSM=	LSM-
3.15-8: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with other cumulative projects, could result in the relocation or construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction or relocation of which could have the potential to cause significant environmental effects.	LSM	NI	LSM-	LSM=	LSM=	LSM-
NI – No Impact LS – Less than significant LSM – Less than significant after application of feasible mitigation measure(s). SU – Significant and unavoidable and no feasible mitigation is identified SUM – Significant and unavoidable after application of available mitigation measure(s). - = Impact is less severe than under the Proposed Project = = Impact is the same as under the Proposed Project + = Impact is more severe than under the Proposed Project						