

CHAPTER 3

Environmental Impacts, Settings, and Mitigation Measures

3.0 Introduction

This EIR evaluates the physical environmental effects that would potentially occur from implementation of the Proposed Project. The structure of the technical sections included in this chapter is discussed below, and definitions of key terms that are used throughout this EIR are provided. Comments that were received during the scoping period are summarized herein as well. In addition, this section includes a description of certain possible environmental impacts that are typically considered under CEQA, but are not analyzed in detail in this EIR because it was determined the Proposed Project would have no impact. This section also provides a discussion of the Adjusted Baseline Environmental Setting and the identification of other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects that are used in the analysis of cumulative impacts throughout this chapter.

3.0.1 Assembly Bill 987 (AB 987)

AB 987 was signed by Governor Jerry Brown on September 30, 2018. The bill added Section 21168.6.8 to the Public Resources Code (PRC Section 21168.6.8) and provides for expedited judicial review in the event that the certification of this EIR or the granting of project approvals are challenged, so long as certain requirements are met. The provisions of PRC section 21168.6.8 are similar to the provisions of the Jobs and Economic Improvement through Environmental Leadership Act of 2011 (AB 900; PRC sections 21178 through 21189.3), which established expedited judicial review of certified Environmental Leadership Development Projects. In order to qualify for expedited judicial review under AB 987, the Proposed Project must implement a transportation demand management program that will achieve a 15 percent reduction in vehicle trips and would not result in any net additional greenhouse gas emissions. Additionally, as a condition of approval of the Proposed Project, the City must require the project applicant to implement measures that will achieve reductions of specified amounts of certain criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants.¹

Comment [1]: I would consider doing a more summary overview in one place and cross-referencing the other vs. repeating all of this in two places.

Comment [2]: Conform to changes made in Section 1.0, Introduction.

¹ Office of the Governor, 2018. Assembly Bill 987 Signing Message. September 30. A copy of PRC Section 21168.6.8 is contained in Appendix X of this Draft EIR.

The Proposed Project must:

- A. Receive Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) gold certification for new construction within one year of the completion of the first NBA season.
- B. Implement trip reduction measures including the following:
 - i. Implementation of a transportation demand management plan that, upon full implementation, will achieve and maintain a 15-percent reduction in the number of vehicle trips, collectively, by attendees, employees, visitors, and customers as compared to operations absent the transportation demand management program;
 - ii. To accelerate and maximize vehicle trip reduction, each measure in the transportation demand management program shall be implemented as soon as feasible, so that no less than a 7.5-percent reduction in vehicle trips is achieved and maintained by the end of the first NBA season during which an NBA team has played at the arena;
 - iii. A 15-percent reduction in vehicle trips shall be achieved and maintained as soon as possible, but not later than January 1, 2030. The applicant shall verify achievement to the lead agency and the Office of Planning and Research; and
 - iv. If the applicant fails to verify achievement of the reduction require by clause (iii), the lead agency shall impose additional feasible measures to reduce vehicle trips by 17 percent, or, if there is a rail transit line with a stop within one-quarter mile of the arena, 20 percent, by January 1, 2035.
- C. Is located on an infill site.
- D. Is consistent with the general use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in either a sustainable communities strategy or an alternative planning strategy for which the State Air Resources Board, pursuant to subparagraph (H) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (b) of Section 65080 of the Government Code, has accepted a metropolitan planning organization's determination that the sustainable communities strategy or the alternative planning strategy would, if implemented, achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.

AB 987 would also require that the Governor certify that the following conditions are met in order for the Proposed Project to qualify for streamlining of judicial review:

- (1) The Proposed Project will result in a minimum investment of one hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) in California upon completion of construction.
- (2) The Proposed Project creates high-wage, highly skilled jobs that pay prevailing wages and living wages, employs a skilled and trained workforce, as defined in subdivision (d) of Section 2601 of the Public Contract Code, provides construction jobs and permanent jobs for Californians, and helps reduce unemployment.
- (3) Compliance with AB 987 would require the Proposed Project to result in no net additional emission of greenhouse gases, including greenhouse gas emissions from

employee transportation, as determined by the State Air Resources Board pursuant to Division 25.5 (commencing with Section 38500) of the Health and Safety Code.

(4) The project applicant demonstrates compliance with the solid waste and recycling requirements of Chapters 12.8 (commencing with Section 42649) and 12.9 (commencing with Section 42649.8) of Part 3 of Division 30, as applicable.

(5) The project applicant has entered into a binding and enforceable agreement that all mitigation measures required pursuant to CEQA and any other environmental measures required by AB 987 to certify the Proposed Project under AB 987 shall be conditions of approval of the Proposed Project, and those conditions will be fully enforceable by the lead agency or another agency designated by the lead agency.

(6) The project applicant agrees to pay any additional costs incurred by the courts in hearing and deciding any case subject to AB 987.

(7) The project applicant agrees to pay the costs of preparing the record of proceedings for the Proposed Project concurrent with review and consideration of the Proposed Project pursuant to CEQA.

AB 987 also requires that, as a condition of approval of the project, the lead agency shall require the applicant, in consultation with the South Coast Air Quality Management District, to implement measures that will achieve criteria pollutant and toxic air contaminant reductions over and above any emission reductions required by other laws or regulations in communities surrounding the project. At a minimum, these measures must achieve reductions of a minimum of 400 tons of NO_x and 10 tons of PM_{2.5} over the 10 years following the commencement of construction of the Proposed Project. Of these amounts, a minimum of 130 tons of NO_x and 3 tons of PM_{2.5} would be achieved within the first year following commencement of construction of the Proposed Project. If the project applicant can demonstrate and verify to the South Coast Air Quality Management District that it has invested at least thirty million dollars (\$30,000,000) to achieve the requirements of this subdivision, the requirements of this subdivision shall be deemed met, so long as one-half of the reductions described above are met. Greenhouse gas emissions reductions achieved through these NO_x and PM_{2.5} reduction measures shall count toward the applicant's obligations to achieve 50 percent of the greenhouse gas reductions through local, direct greenhouse gas reduction measures.

3.0.2 Definitions of Terms Used in the EIR

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

- **Significance Criteria:** A set of criteria used by the lead agency (City of Inglewood) to determine at what level or threshold an impact would be considered significant. Thresholds of significance are identifiable quantitative, qualitative, or performance levels of a particular

environmental effect that are supported by substantial evidence.² Thresholds of significance used in this EIR include those standards provided by the City of Inglewood unless otherwise specifically defined.

- **No Impact:** No impact means that the Proposed Project would result in no direct or indirect adverse changes (or impacts) to the environment, with respect to the applicable significance criterion. A project impact with a no impact determination would also not contribute to a cumulative impact. Where the Proposed Project would not have an impact, the impact statement states this definitively.
- **Less-than-Significant Impact:** A project impact is considered less than significant when the physical change caused by the Proposed Project would not exceed the applicable significance criterion.
- **Potentially Significant Impact:** A potentially significant impact is identified where the Proposed Project may cause a substantial adverse change in the environment, depending on certain unknown conditions related to the project or the affected environment. For CEQA purposes, a potentially significant impact is treated as if it were a significant impact. A project impact is considered potentially significant if the Proposed Project is anticipated to exceed identified standards of significance thereby result in a substantial adverse change in the physical conditions of the environment. Significant impacts are identified by the evaluation of project-related physical change compared to specified significance criteria. A significant impact is defined as “a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.”³ In instances where potentially significant impacts are identified, the EIR must consider whether mitigation measures (as defined below) or alternatives to the project would reduce those impacts.
- **Significant and Unavoidable Impact:** A project impact is considered significant and unavoidable if it would result in a substantial adverse physical change in the environment that cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
- **Cumulative Impact:** Under CEQA, a cumulative impact refers to “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.”⁴ “A cumulative impact consists of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts.”⁵ A project has “cumulatively considerable” environmental effects (i.e., is significant) when “the incremental effects of [the] project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.”⁶
- **Mitigation Measure:** Where a potentially significant impact or significant and unavoidable impact is identified, feasible mitigation measures that could minimize the identified

² CEQA Guidelines, section 15064.7

³ CEQA Guidelines, section 15382.

⁴ CEQA Guidelines, section 15355.

⁵ CEQA Guidelines section 15130(a)(1).

⁶ CEQA Guidelines, sections 15065(a)(3), 15130(a), 15064(h)(1).

significant adverse impact are required.⁷ A mitigation measure is an action that could be taken that would avoid or reduce the magnitude of a significant impact. Section 15370 of the CEQA Guidelines defines mitigation as:

- a. Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action;
- b. Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree of magnitude of the action and its implementation;
- c. Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment;
- d. Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action; and
- e. Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments, including through permanent protection of such resources in the form of conservation easements.

3.0.3 Section Format

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

The technical environmental sections each begin with a description of the Proposed Project's **environmental setting** and the **regulatory setting** as it pertains to a particular issue. The environmental setting provides a point of reference for assessing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Project and its alternatives. The environmental setting describes existing conditions at the time the NOP was circulated for the Proposed Project (February 2018). An **Adjusted Baseline** is considered in this EIR (see discussion below in Section 3.0.5) to account for nearby development in the Hollywood Park Specific Plan area. The regulatory setting presents relevant information about federal, state, regional, and/or local laws, regulations, plans or policies that pertain to the environmental resources addressed in each section. Each technical environmental section includes a discussion of whether there are any inconsistencies between the Proposed Project and applicable general plans, specific plans, and regional plans.⁸

Next, each section presents **significance criteria**, which identify the standards used by the City of Inglewood to determine the significance of effects of the Proposed Project. Section 15064.7 of the CEQA Guidelines states that "... a lead agency may consider thresholds of significance previously

⁷ CEQA Guidelines, section 15126.4.

⁸ CEQA Guidelines, section 15125(d).

adopted or recommended by other public agencies or recommended by experts, provided the decision of the lead agency to adopt such thresholds is supported by substantial evidence.”

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

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

Under CEQA, economic or social changes of a project are not treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may, however, trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes.⁹ In addition, anticipated economic or social effects of a project may be used in the determination of the significance of physical changes caused by the project.¹⁰ As required by CEQA, the focus of the analysis in this EIR is on the physical changes that would result from the approval and implementation of the Proposed Project. Consistent with the requirements of CEQA, this EIR includes consideration of potential adverse physical environmental effects that could be the result of socioeconomic and/or economic changes that could be triggered by the Proposed Project, and as appropriate considers social and economic factors that may affect the significance of a physical effect. This topic is addressed in Chapter 4, Other CEQA Required Sections.

Mitigation measures pertinent to each individual impact, if necessary, appear after the impact discussion section. The magnitude of reduction of an impact and the potential effect of that

⁹ CEQA Guidelines, sections 15064(e), 15131(a).

¹⁰ CEQA Guidelines, sections 15064(e), 15131(b).

reduction in magnitude on the significance of the impact is also disclosed. An example of the format is shown below.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact 3.X-1: Impact statement (significance conclusion)

In the impact statement, terminology is used to indicate the level of significance of the impact. If an impact is less than significant, then the impact statement would say that the Proposed Project “could” affect a resource. If an impact is significant or significant and unavoidable, then the impact statement would say that the Proposed Project “would” affect a resource.

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

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 3.X-1

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

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

Cumulative Impacts

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

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

The cumulative impacts analyses are formatted the same as the Project-specific impacts, as shown above in Section 3.0.2.

3.0.4 Comments Received During Scoping

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

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

The issues raised in these comments are addressed as appropriate in the EIR under the applicable environmental topic.

3.0.5 Effects Not Found to be Significant

CEQA requires that the EIR contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and therefore not discussed in detail.¹¹ Upon review of the Proposed Project, with consideration given to comments received during the scoping period as summarized in Appendix B, the City of Inglewood determined that due to the physical characteristics of the Project Site and the Proposed Project, there would be no significant impact in certain specific environmental topic areas; therefore these topics need not be further considered in the Draft EIR.¹² The discussions below provide

¹¹ CEQA Guidelines, section 15128.

¹² Public Resources Code section 21003(e) states that "[t]o provide more meaningful public disclosure, reduce the time and cost required to prepare an environmental impact report, and focus on potentially significant effects on the environment of a proposed project, lead agencies shall, in accordance with Section 21100, focus the discussion in the environmental impact report on those potential effects on the environment of a proposed project which the lead agency has determined are or may be significant. Lead agencies may limit discussion on other effects to a brief explanation as to why those effects are not potentially significant."

brief statements of reasons, supported by citations, for the City's determination that these issues do not warrant further consideration in the EIR.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources

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

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

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

The area surrounding the Project Site is characterized by dense urban development, as well as vacant, undeveloped parcels that were previously developed over many years and more recently cleared for redevelopment. The Project Site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (collectively referred to as 'Farmland'), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency.¹³ As such, the Proposed Project would not convert Farmland, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use. There would be **no project-level or cumulative impacts**.

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

¹³ California Department of Conservation Division of Land Resource Protection, 2016. California Important Farmland Finder. Available: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>. Accessed September 24, 2018.

The Project Site is not included in the most recently released map showing Williamson Act contracts within Los Angeles County¹⁴ and no portions of the Project Site are subject to a Williamson Act contract. The Proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and would not conflict with a Williamson Act contract. There would be **no project-level or cumulative impacts**.

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

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

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

The Project Site is characterized by dense, urban development. The Project Site is not located on land that is zoned as forest land, either by the County of Los Angeles or by the City of Inglewood. As discussed above, since the Project Site is not irrigated and is surrounded by urban land, it is classified as Urban Land by the Natural Resources Conservation Service¹⁵. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. There would be **no project-level or cumulative impacts**.

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

As discussed above, the Project Site is located within an urban environment characterized by dense development. The Project Site is not zoned as Farmland, and is classified as Urban Land. The Project Site is not under a Williamson Act contract. The Project Site is not zoned for agricultural use, nor is it designated for timberland, timberland production, or as forest land. Additionally, the Project Site is not currently utilized for agriculture, timberland or timberland production, or forest land. As such, the Proposed Project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of

¹⁴ California Department of Conservation Division of Land Resource Protection, 2016. Los Angeles County Williamson Act FY 2015/2016 Map. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/LA_15_16_WA.pdf. Accessed September 24, 2018.

¹⁵ United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2018. Web Soil Survey, Farmland Classification of Los Angeles County, California, Southeastern Part. Available: <https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>. Accessed May 15, 2018.

Farmland to non-agricultural use and would not result in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. There would be **no project-level or cumulative impacts**.

Mineral Resources

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

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

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

The Project Site is in a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) classified as MRZ-1, which covers those areas where available geologic information indicates that little likelihood exists for the presence of significant mineral resources.^{16,17,18-19} Although the Project Site is located within the San Gabriel Production-Consumption Region, the Project Site is not located within a MRZ-2 zone, which would indicate that significant mineral resources are present.²⁰ Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. There would be **no project-level or cumulative impacts**.

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

-
- ¹⁶ California Department of Conservation, 1982. California Department of Mines and Geology, Mineral Land Classification Map, Aggregate Resources Only, Inglewood Quadrangle, Special Report 143, Plate 4-15. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_143/PartIV/. Accessed September 25, 2018.
- ¹⁷ California Department of Conservation, 1982. California Department of Mines and Geology, California Geological Survey, Mineral Land Classification of the Greater Los Angeles Area, Part IV: Classification of Sand and Gravel Resource Areas, San Gabriel Valley Production-Consumption Region, Special Report 143, Part IV. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_143/PartIV/. Accessed September 25, 2018.
- ¹⁸ California Department of Conservation, 2010. California Department of Mines and Geology, Update of Mineral Land Classification for Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the San Gabriel Valley Production-Consumption Region, Los Angeles County, California, Special Report 209, Plate 1: San Gabriel Valley P-C Region Showing MRZ-2 Areas and Active Mine Operations. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_209/. Accessed September 25, 2018.
- ¹⁹ California Department of Conservation, 2010. California Department of Mines and Geology, California Geological Survey, Update of Mineral Land Classification for Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the San Gabriel Valley Production-Consumption Region, Los Angeles County, California, Special Report 209. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_209/. Accessed September 25, 2018.
- ²⁰ California Department of Conservation, 2010. California Department of Mines and Geology, Update of Mineral Land Classification for Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the San Gabriel Valley Production-Consumption Region, Los Angeles County, California, Special Report 209, Plate 1: San Gabriel Valley P-C Region Showing MRZ-2 Areas and Active Mine Operations. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_209/. Accessed: September 25, 2018.

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

Wildfire

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

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

The Project Site is not located within or near an area designated as a state responsibility area²¹ nor is it classified as very high fire hazard severity zone or located near a very high fire hazard severity zone.²² Therefore, there would be **no project-level or cumulative impact**.

3.0.6 Adjusted Baseline

CEQA Guidelines section 15125 provides that an EIR must include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the project vicinity. It also allows for a lead agency to define existing conditions by conditions expected when the project becomes operational, when supported by substantial evidence. The Proposed Project is not expected to be complete and operational until mid-2024. At this time, the City of Inglewood has issued building permits for, and construction has commenced on, significant portions of the Hollywood Park Specific Plan (HPSP) located immediately north of the Project Site, including the construction of a 70,000-seat open air NFL Stadium, a 6,000-seat performance venue, 518,077 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, 466,000 square feet of office space, 314 residential units, an 11.89-acre park, and approximately

²¹ California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, 2019. State Responsibility Area Viewer. Available: http://bofdata.fire.ca.gov/sra_viewer/. Accessed February 27, 2019.

²² California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, 2019. Wildland Hazard & Building Codes, California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map Update Project. Available: http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fire_prevention_wildland_zones_maps. Accessed: February 27, 2019.

9,900 parking spaces, collectively known as the HPSP Adjusted Baseline projects (see **Table 3.0-1**).²³

Because of current and anticipated construction schedules, the City is reasonably assured that the HPSP Adjusted Baseline projects will be built and operational between ~~May-summer~~ 2020 and September 2021 when construction of the Proposed Project is expected to be initiated, and prior to 2024 when operation of the Proposed Project would start. The NFL Stadium and performance venue will be operational by the summer 2020. Residential units will be operational in May 2021, with retail and office elements operational by September 2021. The open space and civic uses will be operational by DATE.

Construction and operation of the HPSP Adjusted Baseline projects will change the physical conditions that currently exist in the vicinity of the Project Site for most of the environmental topics addressed in this EIR. Due to the certainty that the HPSP Adjusted Baseline projects will be constructed and in operation prior to construction and operation of the Proposed Project, the City has determined that assuming the HPSP Adjusted Baseline projects in the baseline provides the most accurate picture of the Proposed Project’s impacts and that it would be misleading to disregard the HPSP Adjusted Baseline projects in the environmental setting. Accordingly, the changes associated with HPSP Adjusted Baseline projects are considered as part of the Adjusted Baseline Environmental Setting, which is the baseline against which the Proposed Project’s potential impacts are measured. How these changes affect the environmental setting is further described in each topical section under the heading Adjusted Baseline Environmental Setting.

**TABLE 3.0-1
 HPSP ADJUSTED BASELINE PROJECTS**

Land Use	Adjusted Baseline Project ^a	Estimated Operational Date ^b
Retail	518,077 sf	September 2021
Office	466,000 sf	September 2021
Residential	314 units	May 2021
NFL Stadium	70,000 seats	Summer 2020
Perform. Venue	6,000 seats	Summer 2020
Open Space	11.89 ac	CITY CONF.
Civic Use	0 ac	CITY CONF.

NOTES:
^a Square footages for HPSP Adjusted Baseline projects development provided by the HPSP developer on the following dates: XXXX, TBD, ETC.
^b Operational schedules for the HPSP Adjusted Baseline projects provided by the HPSP in a project schedule dated May 8, 2019.

²³ Additional development at the remaining parts of the HPSP area is planned for the future; however, this remaining HPSP development would occur at a later date, following the operational opening year (2024) of the Project. This additional future HPSP development is included as Cumulative Project #67 in Table 3.0-2, below.

3.0.7 Cumulative Assumptions

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

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

This EIR conservatively considers both approaches where appropriate in this EIR, as described further below and evaluated specifically in each environmental resource topic.

Regional Growth Projections

The Project Site is located within the planning area of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the Southern California region's federally designated metropolitan planning organization. SCAG region includes six counties, including the counties of Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura. According to SCAG's 2012 and 2016 RTP/SCS, the region's population grew from 14,641,000 people in 1990 to 18,332,000 people in 2012, a 25 percent increase over approximately 20 years. The RTP/SCS also includes population forecasts for 2020 through 2040, projecting a 20 percent increase in population from 2012 to 2040 in the region.²⁴ According to SCAG's 2016 RTP/SCS growth forecast, the City is expected to see its population grow to 129,000 people in 2040, a 17 percent increase from 2017.²⁵

Cumulative Project List

The City published the NOP in February 2018. Following publication of the NOP in February 2018, and consistent with guidance provided in CEQA Guidelines section 15130(b), the City began identification of reasonably foreseeable projects to include in the cumulative environmental analysis.

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

²⁴ Southern California Association of Governments, 2019. *About SCAG*. Available: <http://www.scag.ca.gov/about/Pages/Home.aspx> [HYPERLINK] Accessed on February 10, 2019.

²⁵ Southern California Association of Governments, 2016. 2016 RTP/SCS Growth Forecast by Jurisdiction

**TABLE 3.0-2
 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

No.	Project Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Size
1	6161 W. Centinela Boulevard	Culver City	Office	281.209 ksf
2	12712-12718 Washington Boulevard	Culver City	Apartments	5 units
			Retail	3,414 ksf
			Commercial	2,340 ksf
3	6002 Centinela Avenue	Culver City	Service Bays	14,668 ksf
			Parts and Service	12,900 ksf
4	6201 Bristol Parkway	Culver City	Commercial	16,000 ksf
			Apartments	775 units
			Hotel	-60,000 ksf
5	888, 892, and 898 N. Sepulveda Boulevard	El Segundo	Hotel	190 rooms
6	El Segundo South Campus Specific Plan – 2000-2100 East El Segundo Boulevard	El Segundo	Office	1,751,921 ksf
			Warehouse	73,577 ksf
			Retail	148,960 ksf
7	199 Continental Boulevard	El Segundo	Hotel	152 rooms
8	2265 E. El Segundo Boulevard	El Segundo	Warehouse	-3,050 ksf
			Office	3,050 ksf
9	400 Duley Road	El Segundo	Office	73,000 ksf
10	2275 Mariposa Avenue	El Segundo	Corporate Office	52,000 ksf
			Athletic Training Facility	68,300 ksf
11	201 N. Douglas	El Segundo	High School	1,200 students
			High School	-90,000 ksf
12	2125 Campus Drive	El Segundo	Hotel	121,450 ksf
			Office	63,550 ksf
13	535 Indian Street	El Segundo	Condominiums	4 units
14	1700 E. Imperial Avenue	El Segundo	Office	96,898 ksf
15	710 N. Nash Street	El Segundo	Office	611,545 ksf
			Retail	13,660 ksf
16	1950 E. Grand Avenue	El Segundo	Office	93,569 ksf
17	445 N. Douglas Street	El Segundo	Office	106,000 ksf
			Warehouse Industrial Data Center	117,000 ksf
18	101 Continental Boulevard	El Segundo	Hotel	167 rooms
19	444 N. Nash Street	El Segundo	Data Center	180,422 ksf
20	SE Aviation Boulevard	El Segundo	Condominiums	525 units
			Office	-835,000 ksf
21	425-429 Indiana Street	El Segundo	Apartments	8 units
22	NE Sepulveda Boulevard	El Segundo	Retail	67,000 ksf

[STYLEREF "Heading 1" \n It [STYLEREF "Heading 1" * MERGEFORMAT]. [STYLEREF "Heading 2" * MERGEFORMAT]
 [STYLEREF "Heading 3" \n] [STYLEREF "Heading 3"]

**TABLE 3.0-2
 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

No.	Project Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Size
23	55 Continental Boulevard and 1955 E. Grand Avenue	El Segundo	Office Tower	300,000 ksf
24	1960 E. Grand Avenue	El Segundo	Hotel	150 rooms
25	525 N. Sepulveda Boulevard	El Segundo	Hotel Expansion	6,952 ksf
26	900, 950 Sepulveda Boulevard	El Segundo	Warehouse	20,819 ksf
			Office	139,558 ksf
			Manufacturing	14,025 ksf
27	600-630 N. Sepulveda Boulevard	El Segundo	Fast Food Restaurant with Drive-Through	3,714 ksf
28	2130 E. Maple Avenue	El Segundo	Office	20,955 ksf
29	555 N. Nash Street	El Segundo	Ice Skating Rink	17,315 ksf
30	14321 Van Ness Avenue	Gardena	Townhomes	40 townhomes
31	1720 West 135 th Street	Gardena	Industrial	100,438 ksf
32	13919 Normandie Avenue	Gardena	Single Room Occupancy	20 units
33	525 E. Rosecrans Avenue	Gardena	Retail	3,140 ksf
34	Aviation Boulevard/El Segundo Boulevard	Hawthorne	Condominiums	610 units
35	4500 West 116 th Street	Hawthorne	Condominiums	116 units
36	13806 Hawthorne Boulevard	Hawthorne	Apartments	171 units
			Office	32,500 ksf
37	Crenshaw Boulevard/Jack Northrop Avenue	Hawthorne	Dwelling Units	230 units
			Restaurant	33,700 ksf
38	14000 Yukon Avenue	Hawthorne	Apartments	6 units
39	4427 El Segundo Boulevard	Hawthorne	Hotel	350 rooms
40	11519 Acacia Avenue	Hawthorne	Hotel	119 rooms
41	14135 Cersie Avenue	Hawthorne	Apartments	241 units
42	664 E. Manchester Terrace	Inglewood	Condominiums	4 units
43	844 N. Centinela Avenue	Inglewood	Apartments	4 units
44	501 E. 99 th Street	Inglewood	Condominiums	12 units
45	921 N. Edgewood Street	Inglewood	Apartments	38 units
46	222 W. Spruce Avenue	Inglewood	Apartments	10 units
47	961 E. 68 th Street	Inglewood	Condominiums	3 units
48	417 N. Market Street	Inglewood	Condominiums	12 units
49	819 E. La Palma Drive	Inglewood	Apartments	5 units
50	814 N. Market Street	Inglewood	Congregate Living Facility	18 beds
51	411 E. Hazel Street	Inglewood	Apartments	18 units
52	329 E. Hazel Street	Inglewood	Condominiums	4 units

**TABLE 3.0-2
 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

No.	Project Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Size
53	11111 S. Prairie Avenue	Inglewood	Hotel	120 rooms
54	3920 W. 108 th Street	Inglewood	Apartments	3 units
55	125 E. Spruce Avenue	Inglewood	Apartments	7 units
56	704 N. Market Street	Inglewood	Apartments	12 units
57	408 E. Warren Lane	Inglewood	Commercial	2,542 ksf
58	508 S. Eucalyptus Avenue	Inglewood	Senior Housing	40 units
59	417-433 Centinela Avenue	Inglewood	Apartments	116 units
60	721 N. La Brea Avenue	Inglewood	Commercial	1,312 ksf
			Commercial	-1,210 ksf
61	101,125,139,140,150 Market Street	Inglewood	Retail	40,000 ksf
62	113-133 Plymouth Street	Inglewood	Townhomes	20 units
63	333 N. Prairie Avenue	Inglewood	Townhomes	310 units
64	705-715 N. Centinela Avenue	Inglewood	Self-Storage	81,613 ksf
65	3660 W. 107 th Street	Inglewood	Dwelling Units	3 units
66	614 E. Hyde Park Boulevard	Inglewood	Congregate Living Facility	18 beds
67	1050 S. Prairie Avenue (HPSP Remaining Development) ²⁶	Inglewood	Residential	2,186 units
			Retail	371,923 ksf
			Office	3,567,314 ksf
			Hotel	300 rooms
			Open Space	13.06 acres
			Civic Site	30,000 ksf
68	D3 SITE (La Brea Avenue/Florence Avenue)	Inglewood	Apartments	243 units
			Retail	40,000 ksf
69	101 S. La Brea	Inglewood	Philharmonic Association	25,500 ksf
70	316 Hardy Street	Inglewood	Condominiums	5 units
71	943-959 W. Hyde Park Boulevard	Inglewood	Self-Storage	159,498 ksf
72	8911 Aviation Boulevard	Inglewood	Car Rental	173,804 ksf
73	3900 W. Century Boulevard	Inglewood	Hotel	4 units
74	5206 W. Thornburn Street	Los Angeles	Elementary to Middle Private School	50 students
75	9800 S. Sepulveda Boulevard	Los Angeles	Hotel	178 rooms
76	10701 S. La Cienega Boulevard	Los Angeles	Bus Facility	1,006,236 ksf

²⁶ This HPSP Remaining Development (Cumulative Project #36) is in addition to HPSP Adjusted Baseline Environmental Setting projects identified in Table 3.0-1. The square footages, units, and hotel rooms presented here are the remaining maximum allowable uses included in the HPSP, after completion of the HPSP Adjusted Baseline development, as shown above in Table 3.0-1.

[STYLEREF "Heading 1" \n lt [STYLEREF "Heading 1" * MERGEFORMAT]. [STYLEREF "Heading 2" * MERGEFORMAT]
 [STYLEREF "Heading 3" \n] [STYLEREF "Heading 3"]

**TABLE 3.0-2
 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

No.	Project Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Size
77	7407 S. La Tijera Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	140 units
			Retail	2,600 ksf
78	8740 S. La Tijera Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	137 units
79	8521 S. Sepulveda Boulevard	Los Angeles	Fast Food Restaurant with Drive-Through	3,399 ksf
80	6801 Center Drive	Los Angeles	Apartments	600 units
81	1 World Way	Los Angeles	Land Access Modernization Program	- -
82	8721 S. Broadway	Los Angeles	Senior Housing	108 units
			Retail	4,000 ksf
83	5975 S. Western Avenue	Los Angeles	Industrial	225,000 ksf
84	1636 W. Manchester Avenue	Los Angeles	Office	68,250 ksf
85	8540 S. La Tijera Boulevard	Los Angeles	Middle School	525 students
86	8705 S. Western Avenue	Los Angeles	Middle School	616 students
87	8400 S. Vermont Avenue	Los Angeles	Shopping Center	740,000 ksf
88	9402 S. Broadway	Los Angeles	Senior Housing	49 units
89	8415 S. Hoover Street	Los Angeles	Condominiums	142 units
			Apartments	57 units
			Recreational Center	11,550 ksf
			Retail	7,500 ksf
			Bank	1,500 ksf
90	5816 S. Western Avenue	Los Angeles	Office	15,400 ksf
			Fueling Positions	4 positions
91	505 W. Century Boulevard	Los Angeles	Convenience Store	1,835 ksf
			Fueling Position	6 positions
92	6733 Sepulveda Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	176 units
93	5208 W. Centinela Avenue	Los Angeles	Fast Food Restaurant with Drive-Through	4,642 ksf
94	6711 S. Sepulveda Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	180 units
95	6855 S. La Cienega Boulevard	Los Angeles	Supermarket	22,590 ksf
96	11604 Aviation Boulevard	Los Angeles	Condominiums	281 units
			Retail/Commercial	26,500 ksf
			Apartments	112 units
97	1248 W. 105 th Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	74 units
98	3816 W. 54 th Street	Los Angeles	Office Expansion	1,196 ksf
99	1252 W. 105 th Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	74 units
100	11814 Aviation Boulevard	Los Angeles	Hotel	128 rooms
101	11034 S. Western Avenue	Los Angeles	Laundromat	4,983 ksf
102	5550 S. La Brea Avenue	Los Angeles	Apartments	32 units

**TABLE 3.0-2
 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

No.	Project Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Size
103	12000 S. Western Avenue	Los Angeles	Hotel	44 rooms
104	1743 Imperial Highway	Los Angeles	Apartments	39 units
105	10601 S. Vermont Street	Los Angeles	Laundromat	4,500 ksf
106	1423 W. 120 th Street	Los Angeles	Condominiums	57 units
107	1509 W. 102 nd Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	12 units
108	1539 102 nd Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	10 units
109	10501 S. Buford Avenue	Los Angeles	Townhomes	11 units
110	11824 Aviation Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	36 units
111	10505 Hawthorne Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	32 units
112	10609 S. Inglewood Avenue	Los Angeles	Apartments	9 units
113	10907 S. Inglewood Avenue	Los Angeles	Apartments	4 units
114	8910 S. Normandie Avenue	Los Angeles	Apartments	6 units
115	10136 Felton Avenue	Los Angeles	Apartments	19 units
116	5053 E. 109 th Street	Los Angeles	Condominiums	17 units
117	9223 S. Vermont Avenue	Los Angeles	Auto Repair	2,858 ksf
118	5301 W. Centinela Avenue	Los Angeles	Restaraunt	1,640 ksf
119	3838 W. Slauson Avenue	Los Angeles	Convenience Store	1,060 ksf
120	5101 Overhill Drive	Los Angeles	Condominiums	88 units
121	1240 W. 105 th Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	42 units
122	6109 Overhill Drive	Los Angeles	Duplex	2 units
123	1034 W. 109 th Place	Los Angeles	Apartments	9 units
124	11408-11412 S. New Hampshire Avenue	Los Angeles	Gas Station with Convenience Store	2,900 ksf
125	10335 S. Vermont Avenue	Los Angeles	Church	1,324 ksf
126	10401 S. Vermont Avenue	Los Angeles	Commercial	0.250 ksf
			Apartments	1 units
127	1023 W. 107 th Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	8 units

[STYLEREF "Heading 1" \n It [STYLEREF "Heading 1" \^ MERGEFORMAT], [STYLEREF "Heading 2" \^ MERGEFORMAT]
 [STYLEREF "Heading 3" \n] [STYLEREF "Heading 3"]

**TABLE 3.0-2
 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

No.	Project Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Size
128	LAX Northside Project Westchester Parkway between Pershing Drive and Sepulveda Boulevard	Los Angeles	Office	612,500 ksf
			Playing Fields	5 fields
			Dog Park	1 field
			Retail	270,000 ksf
			Research and Development	612,500 ksf
			Civic Site	215,000 ksf
			Park	130,680 ksf
129	Bounded by Century Boulevard, La Cienega Boulevard, Arbor Vitae Street, and Vicksburg Avenue	Los Angeles	Office	300,000 ksf
			Hotel	400 rooms
			Retail	200,000 ksf
			Conference Center	100,000 ksf
130	10341 Graham Avenue	Los Angeles	Theater	1,000 seats
			Education Center	12,417 ksf
131	3831 W. Stocker Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	127 units
132	3900 W. Martin Luther King Boulevard	Los Angeles	Office	50.00 ksf
			Condominiums	200 units
			College	3,600 students
133	4018 S. Buckingham Road	Los Angeles	Senior Housing	130 units
134	4115 W. Martin Luther King Boulevard	Los Angeles	Middle School	500 students
135	4252 S. Crenshaw Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	111 units
136	5950 W. Jefferson Boulevard	Los Angeles	Office	64,000 ksf
			Retail	4,000 ksf
			Quality Restaurant	2,000 ksf
			High Turnover Restaurant	2,000 ksf
137	6024 W. Jefferson Boulevard	Los Angeles	Office	123,572 ksf
			Manufacturing	64,206 ksf
			Coffee Shop with Drive- Through	2,200 ksf
138	6100 S. Hoover Street	Los Angeles	Laundromat	6,500 ksf
			Self-Service Car Wash	2,328 ksf
139	2178 Firestone Boulevard	Los Angeles County	Residential Care	16 beds

**TABLE 3.0-2
 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

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

SOURCE: Trifiletti Consulting Inc., 2019. Related Projects List Methodology for the proposed Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center (IBEC). March 18.

[STYLEREF "Heading 1" \n \t [STYLEREF "Heading 1" * MERGEFORMAT], [STYLEREF "Heading 2" * MERGEFORMAT]
[STYLEREF "Heading 3" \n] [STYLEREF "Heading 3"]

Figure 3.0-1 Cumulative Projects Map

[STYLEREF "Heading 1" \n lt][STYLEREF "Heading 1" * MERGEFORMAT] [STYLEREF "Heading 2" * MERGEFORMAT]
[STYLEREF "Heading 3" \n][STYLEREF "Heading 3"]

This page intentionally left blank