

CHAPTER 3

Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

3.0 Introduction to the Analysis

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 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.¹ 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.

¹ CEQA Guidelines section 15064.7.

- **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 Proposed 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.”² In instances where potentially significant impacts are identified, the EIR must consider whether mitigation measures (as defined below) or alternatives to the Proposed 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 mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
- **Cumulative Impact:** Under CEQA, a cumulative impact refers to “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.”³ “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.”⁴ 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.”⁵
- **Mitigation Measure:** Where a potentially significant impact or significant and unavoidable impact is identified, feasible mitigation measures that could minimize the identified significant adverse impact are required.⁶ A mitigation measure is an action that could be taken that would avoid or reduce the magnitude of a significant impact. CEQA Guidelines section 15370 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.

² CEQA Guidelines section 15382.

³ CEQA Guidelines section 15355.

⁴ CEQA Guidelines section 15130(a)(1).

⁵ CEQA Guidelines sections 15065(a)(3), 15130(a), 15064(h)(1).

⁶ CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4.

3.0.2 Section Format

Chapter 3 is divided into technical sections (e.g., Section 3.1, Aesthetics) that present for each environmental resource issue area the physical environmental setting, the regulatory setting, standards of significance from which impacts are measured, analytical methods, an evaluation of potential impacts to the environment, and, where required, potentially 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.⁷

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. CEQA Guidelines section 15064.7 states that “... a lead agency may consider thresholds of significance previously adopted or recommended by other public agencies or recommended by experts, provided the decision of the lead agency to adopt such thresholds is supported by substantial evidence.”

A **methodology and assumptions** description in each section presents the analytical methods and key assumptions used in the evaluation of effects of the Proposed Project, and is followed by an **impacts and mitigation measures** discussion. The impact and mitigation portion of each section includes one or more impact statements, prefaced by an impact number in bold-faced type. An explanation of each impact is followed by an analysis of its significance. The impact discussion ends with a concluding statement regarding the significance of the impact and any related need for mitigation measures (either none are required, or all potentially 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 potentially 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 CEQA Guidelines

⁷ CEQA Guidelines section 15125(d).

section 15126.2(a), 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.

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

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact 3.X-1: Impact statement (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 potentially 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 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

CEQA Guidelines section 15130 requires that an EIR discuss cumulative impacts of a project when a 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.

3.0.3 Comments Received During Scoping

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

3.0.4 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.⁸ 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

⁸ CEQA Guidelines section 15128.

topics need not be further considered in the Draft EIR.⁹ The discussions below provide brief statements of reasons, supported by citations, for the City's determination that these issues do not warrant further consideration in the EIR.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Project Site is not included in the most recently released map showing Williamson Act contracts within Los Angeles County¹¹ 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 Service.¹² 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

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

¹² 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.^{13,14,15,16} 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.¹⁷ 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)

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

-
- ¹³ 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.
 - ¹⁴ 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.
 - ¹⁵ 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.
 - ¹⁶ 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.
 - ¹⁷ 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.

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 area¹⁸ nor is it classified as very high fire hazard severity zone or located near a very high fire hazard severity zone.¹⁹ Therefore, there would be **no project-level or cumulative impact**.

3.0.5 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 (sf) of retail and restaurant uses, 466,000 sf of office space, 314 residential units, an 11.89-acre park, a 4-acre civic use, and approximately 9,900 parking spaces, collectively known as the HPSP Adjusted Baseline projects (see **Table 3.0-1**).²⁰

¹⁸ California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, 2019. State Responsibility Area Viewer. Available: <https://bofdata.fire.ca.gov/projects-and-programs/state-responsibility-area-viewer/>. Accessed February 27, 2019.

¹⁹ California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, 2019. Wildland Hazard & Building Codes, California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map Update Project. Available: <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/wildfire-prevention-planning-engineering/wildland-hazards-building-codes/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps/>. Accessed: February 27, 2019.

²⁰ Additional development at the remaining parts of the HPSP area is planned for the future. This additional future HPSP development is included as Cumulative Project #67 in Table 3.0-2, below.

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

Land Use	Adjusted Baseline Projects ^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 (2,772,304 sf)	Summer 2020
Perform. Venue	6,000 seats	Summer 2020
Open Space	11.89 ac	Summer 2020
Civic Use	4 ac	Summer 2020

NOTES:
^a Trifiletti Consulting, Inc., Related Project List Methodology for the Proposed Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center (IBEC), July 12, 2019.
^b Operational schedules for the HPSP Adjusted Baseline projects provided by the HPSP in a project schedule dated May 8, 2019.

Because of current and anticipated construction schedules, the City is reasonably certain that the HPSP Adjusted Baseline projects will be built and operational between summer 2020 and September 2021 when construction of the Proposed Project is expected to be underway, 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 summer 2020.

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 reasonable 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.

Adjusted Baseline Transportation Assumptions

In addition to the development projects described above, improvements in the local transportation system are reasonably certain to be undertaken and operational prior to the commencement of operations for the Proposed Project, as described further below and in Section 3.14, Transportation and Circulation.

Roadways

A number of physical improvements are required as mitigations and/or conditions of approval of the Hollywood Park Specific Plan, are related to the City's ongoing Century Boulevard Improvement Plan, or are associated with the Crenshaw/LAX LRT project. These improvements either are under construction, or are approved and funded and scheduled; the improvements will be in place under all adjusted baseline condition scenarios. The full list of improvements is described further in Section 3.14, Transportation and Circulation, and presented in Table 3.14-13.

Transit

The adjusted baseline conditions transit network will differ considerably from existing conditions due to completion of the Crenshaw/LAX LRT prior to 2024. With this completion and the potential for a future Green Line South Bay extension, Metro is evaluating multiple operating scenarios, which would affect the routing of the trains, number of train cars, and potential peak and off-peak headways. The Metro board has currently approved Alternative C-3 for a 2-year pilot program; therefore, ridership forecasts for Alternative C-3 for a 2025 condition were used to represent the Adjusted Baseline condition. Alternative C-3 recommends an interline train between existing Norwalk Station (Green Line) and Expo/Crenshaw, and a short line train between Willowbrook/Rosa Parks Station and Redondo Beach Station (Green Line).

Metro is also studying changes to its bus system through the NextGen Bus study, but future changes to bus service are not yet defined and so would be speculative to assume. Therefore, the adjusted baseline conditions analysis assumes the existing bus routes that serve the Project Site will remain in operation at opening year of the Proposed Project.

3.0.6 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. Region wide, the population grew from 14.64 million people in 1990 to 16.52 million in 2000, a growth rate of nearly 1.28 percent per year. From 2000 to 2010, while the population of Inglewood dropped at an average rate of

0.3 percent per year, the region grew at an average rate of 1.03 percent per year. From 2010 to 2019, regionwide population growth slowed to an average of 0.61 percent per year, reaching a total of 19.16 million people in 2019.²¹

The 2016 RTP/SCS forecasts regionwide population growth to nearly 22.14 million as of 2040, which would represent an average growth rate of 0.73 percent per year from 2019, similar to potential citywide growth.²² 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 2017.²³

Cumulative Project List

The City published the NOP in February 2018. Following publication of the NOP, identification of cumulative projects focused on those projects that were proposed as of May 2018. This time frame coincides with the commencement of the City's environmental review process for the Proposed Project.

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 that have a pending development application, are approved, or are under construction, and transit and related infrastructure improvement projects that have been approved or proposed and under review.

As shown in **Table 3.0-3**, in total the Cumulative Projects List documents 145 projects with anticipated development of 1,903,815 sf of retail/commercial space, 8,675,487 sf of office space, 2,070,210 sf of industrial/warehouse/data center space, 9,315 residential units or beds, approximately 2,430 hotel rooms, and new or expanded schools to accommodate 6,401 students.

²¹ State of California, Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State—January 1, 2011–2019. Sacramento, California, May 2019. Available: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/e-5>.

²² As shown in SCAG's 2016-2040 RTP/SCS Demographics & Growth Forecast Appendix, Table 8, the population forecasts indicate an average annual growth for the entire SCAG region between 2000 and 2040 of 0.73%. The highest growth rates are projected to be in counties that are peripheral in the region, including Imperial, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties. Los Angeles County, by contrast, is projected to have the lowest growth rate projected over that period of the six counties in the region, at only 0.45% per year. Further, SCAG projects population growth to be slower in the 2015 to 2040 period, 0.57% regional per year instead of 0.73% for the full 2000–2040 period.

In addition, growth within Los Angeles County also varies depending on location. The traffic growth rate of 0.23% per year used in the Transportation analysis presented in Section 3.14 is from the Los Angeles Metro Congestion Management Plan specifically for the South Bay/LAX Regional Statistical Area (RSA) in which Inglewood is located. The South Bay/LAX RSA is projected to be one of the slower growing areas in LA County. In general, the inland areas of the region (Palmdale/Lancaster/Santa Clarita, Pomona) are projected to be the fastest growing areas in Los Angeles County, resulting in an overall regional average growth rate of 0.73%.

²³ 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

**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 W. 135th 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 W. 116th 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	3.700 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. 99th 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. 68th 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. 108th 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. 107th Street	Inglewood	Dwelling Units	3 units
66	614 E. Hyde Park Boulevard	Inglewood	Congregate Living Facility	18 beds
67 ^a	1050 S. Prairie Avenue (HPSP Remaining Development)	Inglewood	Residential	2,186 units
			Retail	371,923 ksf
			Office	3,567,314 ksf
			Hotel	300 rooms
			Open Space	13.06 acres
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 ^b	3900 W. Century Boulevard	Inglewood	Hotel	4 rooms
74	Market Street/Manchester Blvd/ S. Prairie Ave	Inglewood	Inglewood Transit Connector Project	
75	5206 W. Thornburn Street	Los Angeles	Elementary to Middle Private School	50 students
76	9800 S. Sepulveda Boulevard	Los Angeles	Hotel	178 rooms
77	10701 S. La Cienega Boulevard	Los Angeles	Bus Facility	1,006,236 ksf
78	7407 S. La Tijera Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	140 units
			Retail	2,600 ksf
79	8740 S. La Tijera Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	137 units

**TABLE 3.0-2
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

No.	Project Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Size
80	8521 S. Sepulveda Boulevard	Los Angeles	Fast Food Restaurant with Drive-Through	3,399 ksf
81	6801 Center Drive	Los Angeles	Apartments	600 units
82	1 World Way	Los Angeles	Land Access Modernization Program	- -
83	8721 S. Broadway	Los Angeles	Senior Housing	108 units
			Retail	4,000 ksf
84	5975 S. Western Avenue	Los Angeles	Industrial	225,000 ksf
85	1636 W. Manchester Avenue	Los Angeles	Office	68,250 ksf
86	8540 S. La Tijera Boulevard	Los Angeles	Middle School	525 students
87	8705 S. Western Avenue	Los Angeles	Middle School	616 students
88	8400 S. Vermont Avenue	Los Angeles	Shopping Center	740,000 ksf
89	9402 S. Broadway	Los Angeles	Senior Housing	49 units
90	8415 S. Hoover Street	Los Angeles	Condominiums	142 units
			Apartments	57 units
			Recreational Center	11,550 ksf
			Retail	7,500 ksf
			Bank	1,500 ksf
			Office	15,400 ksf
91	5816 S. Western Avenue	Los Angeles	Fueling Positions	4 positions
			Convenience Store	1,835 ksf
92	505 W. Century Boulevard	Los Angeles	Fueling Position	6 positions
93	6733 Sepulveda Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	176 units
94	5208 W. Centinela Avenue	Los Angeles	Fast Food Restaurant with Drive-Through	4,642 ksf
95	6711 S. Sepulveda Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	180 units
96	6855 S. La Cienega Boulevard	Los Angeles	Supermarket	22,590 ksf
97	11604 Aviation Boulevard	Los Angeles	Condominiums	281 units
			Retail/Commercial	26,500 ksf
			Apartments	112 units
98	1248 W. 105th Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	74 units
99	3816 W. 54th Street	Los Angeles	Office Expansion	1,196 ksf
100	1252 W. 105th Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	74 units
101	11814 Aviation Boulevard	Los Angeles	Hotel	128 rooms
102	11034 S. Western Avenue	Los Angeles	Laundromat	4,983 ksf
103	5550 S. La Brea Avenue	Los Angeles	Apartments	32 units
104	12000 S. Western Avenue	Los Angeles	Hotel	44 rooms
105	1743 Imperial Highway	Los Angeles	Apartments	39 units
106	10601 S. Vermont Street	Los Angeles	Laundromat	4,500 ksf

**TABLE 3.0-2
 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

No.	Project Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Size
107	1423 W. 120th Street	Los Angeles	Condominiums	57 units
108	1509 W. 102nd Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	12 units
109	1539 W. 102nd Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	10 units
110	10501 S. Buford Avenue	Los Angeles	Townhomes	11 units
111	11824 Aviation Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	36 units
112	10505 Hawthorne Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	32 units
113	10609 S. Inglewood Avenue	Los Angeles	Apartments	9 units
114	10907 S. Inglewood Avenue	Los Angeles	Apartments	4 units
115	8910 S. Normandie Avenue	Los Angeles	Apartments	6 units
116	10136 Felton Avenue	Los Angeles	Apartments	19 units
117	5053 E. 109th Street	Los Angeles	Condominiums	17 units
118	9223 S. Vermont Avenue	Los Angeles	Auto Repair	2,858 ksf
119	5301 W. Centinela Avenue	Los Angeles	Restaurant	1,640 ksf
120	3838 W. Slauson Avenue	Los Angeles	Convenience Store	1,060 ksf
121	5101 Overhill Drive	Los Angeles	Condominiums	88 units
122	1240 W. 105th Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	42 units
123	6109 Overhill Drive	Los Angeles	Duplex	2 units
124	1034 W. 109th Place	Los Angeles	Apartments	9 units
125	11408-11412 S. New Hampshire Avenue	Los Angeles	Gas Station with Convenience Store	2,900 ksf
126	10335 S. Vermont Avenue	Los Angeles	Church	1,324 ksf
127	10401 S. Vermont Avenue	Los Angeles	Commercial	0.250 ksf
			Apartments	1 units
128	1023 W. 107th Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	8 units
129	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
130	Bounded by W. 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
131	10341 Graham Avenue	Los Angeles	Theater	1,000 seats
			Education Center	12,417 ksf
132	3831 W. Stocker Street	Los Angeles	Apartments	127 units

**TABLE 3.0-2
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

No.	Project Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Size
133	3900 W. Martin Luther King Boulevard	Los Angeles	Office	50.00 ksf
			Condominiums	200 units
			College	3,600 students
134	4018 S. Buckingham Road	Los Angeles	Senior Housing	130 units
135	4115 W. Martin Luther King Boulevard	Los Angeles	Middle School	500 students
136	4252 S. Crenshaw Boulevard	Los Angeles	Apartments	111 units
137	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
138	6024 W. Jefferson Boulevard	Los Angeles	Office	123,572 ksf
			Manufacturing	64,206 ksf
			Coffee Shop with Drive-Through	2,200 ksf
139	6100 S. Hoover Street	Los Angeles	Laundromat	6,500 ksf
			Self-Service Car Wash	2,328 ksf
140	2178 Firestone Boulevard	Los Angeles County	Residential Care	16 beds
141	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			
142	1854 E. 118th Street	Los Angeles County	Apartments	100 units
143	13200 S. Avalon Boulevard	Los Angeles County	Homeless Shelter	79 rooms
144	11735 Holmes Avenue	Los Angeles County	Apartments	61 units
145	14733 S. Stanford Avenue	Los Angeles County	Apartments	85 units

NOTES:

^a This HPSP Remaining Development (Cumulative Project #67) 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 include the remaining uses in the HPSP, after completion of the HPSP Adjusted Baseline development, as shown above in Table 3.0-1.

^b Cumulative Project #73 involves the renovation of an existing 178-room hotel, and would add 4 rooms to a new total of 182.

SOURCE: Trifiletti Consulting, Inc., Related Project List Methodology for the Proposed Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center (IBEC), July 12, 2019.



SOURCE: Open Streetmap, 2018; ESA, 2019.

Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center

Figure 3.0-1
Approximate Locations of Cumulative Projects



TABLE 3.0-3
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY

Land Use	Cumulative Projects^a
Retail/Commercial	1,903,815 sf
Office	8,675,487 sf
Industrial/Warehouse/Data Center	2,070,210 sf
Residential	9,315 units/beds
Hotel	2,430 rooms
Schools	6,401 students

NOTES:

^a Hotel square footage, where provided, was translated into rooms at 1 room per 1,000 sf.