

CHAPTER 5

ALTERNATIVES

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Under CEQA, the identification and analysis of alternatives to a project is a fundamental part of the environmental review process. CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1(a)) establishes the need to address alternatives in an EIR by stating that in addition to determining a project's significant environmental impacts and indicating potential means of mitigating or avoiding those impacts, "the purpose of an environmental impact report is . . . to identify alternatives to the project."

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), an EIR must describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project or to the project's location that would feasibly avoid or lessen its significant environmental impacts while attaining most of the proposed project's objectives. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b) emphasizes that the selection of project alternatives be based primarily on the ability to reduce impacts relative to the proposed project, "even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly."

This chapter of the EIR describes and evaluates alternatives to the proposed project. Included in the identification and evaluation of project alternatives is identification of the "Environmentally Superior Alternative" as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2).

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), discussion of each alternative presented in this Chapter is intended "to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the Proposed Project." As permitted by CEQA, the significant effects of each alternative are discussed in less detail than those of the proposed project, but in enough detail to provide perspective and allow for a reasoned choice among alternatives to the proposed project.

5.2 RATIONALE FOR THE SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES

The specific reasons for selection of each alternative addressed in this EIR or rejection of an alternative from further analysis is discussed below as part of the summary of alternatives (see Section 5.3). Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, the alternatives addressed in this Chapter for analysis were selected based on the following general factors.

- The extent to which the alternative would avoid or substantially lessen any of the identified significant environmental effects of the proposed TOD Plan (see Section 5.2.1, *Significant Unavoidable Impacts*, for a listing of significant unavoidable impacts);
- The ability of the alternative to meet the overarching project objective and purpose of the TOD Plan, along with the extent to which the alternative would accomplish other project objectives (see Section 5.2.2, *Project Objectives*, for a listing of the project objectives used to evaluate project alternatives). Only alternatives that could achieve the overarching project objective and the majority of other project objectives were selected for further evaluation;

- The potential feasibility¹ of the alternative, taking into account site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, property control (ownership), and consistency with applicable plans and regulatory limitations;
- The extent to which the alternative contributes to a “reasonable range” of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice between the proposed project and alternatives;
- The extent to which the environmental effects of an alternative could be reasonably identified, and whose implementation would not be remote or speculative; and
- The requirement to consider a “no project” alternative, including an alternative that provides for the likely outcome should the proposed project not be approved.

Neither the CEQA statute, the CEQA Guidelines, nor recent court cases specify a specific number of alternatives to be evaluated in an EIR. Rather, “the range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by the rule of reason that sets forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice” (CEQA Guidelines 15126(f)).

5.2.1 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

CEQA requires the alternatives selected for comparison in an EIR to avoid or substantially lessen one or more significant effects of the project being evaluated. In order to identify alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the identified significant environmental effects of development within the TOD Plan areas, the significant impacts must be considered, although it is recognized that alternatives aimed at reducing the significant and unavoidable impacts of development within the TOD Plan areas would also avoid or reduce impacts that were found to already have been reduced to below a level of significance. The analysis in Chapter 4 (Sections 4.A through 4.P) of this EIR determined that development within the TOD Plan areas would result in the following significant unavoidable impacts.

Significant Unavoidable Traffic and Circulation Impacts

- **Impact 4.E-1.1** Implementation of the proposed TOD Plan would result in four intersections not meeting established LOS performance criteria under existing plus project conditions. Even with implementation of project features, compliance with existing regulations, and EIR mitigation measures, this impact would *remain significant and unavoidable*.
- **Impact 4.E-1.2** Implementation of the proposed TOD Plan would result in 11 intersections not meeting established LOS criteria for intersection operations performance under Cumulative with Project conditions. Even with implementation of project features, compliance with existing regulations, and EIR mitigation measures, this impact would *remain significant and unavoidable* at 7 intersections.

¹ CEQA Guidelines Section 15364 defines feasible as “capable of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1) states that “Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability) economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site...”

- **Impact 4.E-2** Implementation of the proposed TOD Plan would exceed Congestion Management Plan thresholds at one CMP intersection. Because no feasible mitigation is available, the resulting impact would be *significant and unavoidable*.

5.2.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The following identifies the Lead Agency’s project objectives pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15124(b), which requires an EIR to include a “statement of objectives sought by the proposed project,” including the underlying purpose of the project. As noted in CEQA Guidelines Section 15124(b), a “clearly written statement of objectives will help the lead agency develop a reasonable range of alternatives to evaluate in the EIR and will aid the decision makers in preparing findings.”

Overarching Objective

The overarching objectives and underlying purpose of the proposed TOD Plan for the Downtown Inglewood and Fairview Heights areas are to:

- Expand economic development opportunities and maximize utilization of the Metro Crenshaw/LAX Line;
- Create a pedestrian-friendly and economically vibrant mixed-use setting for Downtown Inglewood that is comprised of:
 - New centers adjacent to the Metro station and at the south terminus of Market Street;
 - A re-energized Historic Core;
 - Creation of quality employment opportunities for City residents; and
 - Preservation of unique areas such as Beach Avenue and the Hillcrest neighborhood.
- Create a pedestrian-friendly environment along the Redondo Boulevard Promenade and near the Fairview Heights Metro station, while ensuring development that is complementary in scale and character with the historic Fairview Heights neighborhood.

Additional Project Objectives

Additional project objectives include:

- Providing a model for sustainable development and implementing the Inglewood Energy and Climate Action Plan;
- Protecting and enhancing existing historic structures and providing for their continued use into the future;
- Enhancing access between Downtown Inglewood and major entertainment venues in the community (Forum, NFL Stadium) as a means of providing services to visitors at these venues, thereby expanding business opportunities and sales tax generation within Downtown; and
- Expanding opportunities for artists to live and work in Inglewood.

5.3 ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with the general alternatives selection criteria discussed in Section 5.1, *Criteria for Selecting Alternatives*, above, the following alternatives were selected for analysis in this EIR because either they are required under CEQA (e.g., no project alternative), or they would reduce or avoid significant effects of the proposed project, while attaining most of its objectives. The alternatives analyzed below include:

1. **No Project.** The No Project Alternative assumes that the proposed TOD Plan is not adopted. Adaptive reuse of existing buildings would occur, as would a minimal amount of development on existing vacant sites.
2. **Lower Intensity Transit Oriented Development (50 Percent Reduction).** Under this alternative, the proposed TOD Plan would be approved with an approximate 50 percent lower net increase in development.
3. **Lower Intensity Transit Oriented Development (25 Percent Reduction).** Under this alternative, the proposed TOD Plan would be approved with an approximate 25 percent lower net increase in development.

The following discussion evaluates and compares the impacts of each alternative considered by the Lead Agency with the impacts of the proposed TOD Plan for Downtown Inglewood and Fairview Heights, as detailed in Chapter 4, *Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation*.

5.3.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT

The No Project Alternative assumes that the proposed TOD Plan is not adopted, and that existing conditions would largely continue. None of the TOD Plan components described in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, would be approved, and there would be no further development within the TOD Plan areas other than existing development approvals, adaptive reuse of existing buildings, and a minimal amount of development on currently vacant sites pursuant to current General Plan and zoning requirements. This alternative is intended to meet the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) for evaluation of a no project alternative. The net increase in development under this alternative would be:

- Residential: 400 multi-family dwelling units
- Retail: 150,000 square feet
- Office: 25,000 square feet
- Institutional: 100,000 square feet
- Industrial: 200,000 square feet

Impacts of the No Project Alternative

Land Use and Planning

EIR Determination for Population, Housing, and Employment: No Impact

Because of its infill nature, this alternative would not result in impacts related to the division of existing communities or conflicts with habitat conservation plans.

Population, Housing, Housing and Employment

EIR Determination for Population, Housing, and Employment: Less than Significant

Resident population growth under Alternative 1 would be approximately 950, which is about 15 percent of the population growth anticipated for the proposed TOD Plan, while employment growth would be approximately 1,410, which is about 25 percent of the population growth anticipated for the proposed TOD Plan. Because population, housing and employment growth would be far below that of the proposed TOD Plan, which was determined in this EIR to be consistent with regional growth forecasts, population and employment growth associated with this alternative would also be consistent with regional growth forecasts.

As with development of the TOD Plan areas, this alternative also would generate temporary construction-related jobs, albeit far fewer than for the proposed TOD Plan. It is expected that construction workers generally would travel from other parts of the Los Angeles area to work, and that temporary housing within the TOD Plan areas would not be needed.

Aesthetic Resources

EIR Determination for Aesthetic Resources: Less than Significant

Development under Alternative 1 would consist of infill development on remaining vacant parcels and adaptive reuse of existing buildings, and would not involve intensification of existing developed sites within the TOD Plan areas. As a result, there would be no discernable change to the TOD Plan areas' existing visual character. However, development under this alternative would occur in the absence of the design guidelines set forth in the proposed TOD Plan, nor would it include the Green Boulevards, public plazas, or other aesthetic enhancements proposed in the TOD Plan.

Development under this alternative would result in far fewer new sources of light and glare. While the sources of light and glare would be similar, the number of sources would be far fewer than under TOD Plan development, and the resulting degree of light and glare impacts would be less.

Cultural Resources

EIR Determination for Cultural Resources: Less than Significant

Development under Alternative 1 would have the potential for uncovering unknown buried resources as the result of future development on infill sites. The likelihood of uncovering such resources would be far less than for the proposed TOD Plan, since there would be far fewer development sites where

disturbance of the ground surface would occur. Impacts on designated historic resources would be avoided as adaptive reuse of historic structures under this alternative would be required to adhere to Secretary of Interior Standards.

Traffic and Circulation

EIR Determination for Traffic and Circulation: Significant and Unavoidable

The 75-85 percent reduction in development that would occur under Alternative I as compared to the proposed TOD Plan would reduce traffic impacts to less than significant for intersections that would operate at satisfactory levels of service without TOD Plan development. The reduction also would reduce the TOD Plan's contribution to cumulative impacts to less than considerable at intersections that would not otherwise operate at satisfactory levels of service.

Air Quality

EIR Determination for Air Quality: Less than Significant

Impacts related to air quality and GHG emissions under this Alternative would be substantially reduced compared to those that would occur under TOD Plan development due to a 75-85 percent reduction in new development.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

EIR Determination for Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Less than Significant

Because the significance of greenhouse gas emissions is based on a per capita efficiency metric, Alternative I would result in somewhat higher per capita GHG impacts than would the proposed TOD Plan. This is because the infill and adaptive reuse projects that would occur in this Alternative would not have the same degree of transit orientation as would development under the proposed TOD Plan. This alternative would also not provide access to the Downtown Inglewood Metro station from areas to the north of the station. In addition, this alternative would not provide the extent of bicycle or pedestrian mobility enhancements, including access to Metro transit stations, as would the proposed TOD Plan. As a result, the degree of mode shift from automobiles to transit and non-motorized travel that would be achieved under the TOD Plan would not be achieved under the No Project Alternative.

Energy Resources

EIR Determination for Energy Resources: Less than Significant

While the total amount of energy use resulting from Alternative I would be substantially less than for the proposed TOD Plan, energy use on a per capita basis would be greater. This is because the infill and adaptive reuse projects that would occur in this Alternative would not have the same degree of transit orientation as would development under the proposed TOD Plan. This alternative would also not provide access to the Downtown Inglewood Metro station from areas to the north of the station. In addition, this alternative would not provide the extent of bicycle or pedestrian mobility enhancements,

including access to Metro transit stations, as would the proposed TOD Plan. As a result, the degree of mode shift from automobiles to transit and non-motorized travel that would be achieved under the TOD Plan would not be achieved under this Alternative.

Noise and Vibration

EIR Determination for Noise and Vibration: Less than Significant

Noise levels at site-specific development construction sites would be the same as for the proposed TOD Plan. However, the 75-85 percent reduction in development under this Alternative as compared to the proposed TOD Plan would mean a substantial reduction in the number of active construction sites and time it would take to build out the TOD Plan areas. In addition to reduced construction noise, the reduced amount of development under this alternative would generate less construction traffic. Increases in noise levels resulting from this alternative would be far less than for the proposed TOD Plan, but would still result in increased noise along some roadways, even though most of these increases would not be perceptible to the human ear.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

EIR Determination for Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Less than Significant

Alternative I would require site preparation activities, including excavation to a much lesser degree than would the TOD Plan, but would eliminate nearly all demolition activities. Alternative I would also substantially reduce the amount of new commercial and industrial use that could involve the storage and use of hazardous materials. Thus, this Alternative would result in far fewer risks of exposure to hazardous materials, including potential asbestos and lead-based paint that could be released during demolition of existing buildings. Overall, impacts with regard to hazards and hazardous materials under this alternative would be substantially less than those described under the proposed TOD Plan.

Hydrology and Water Quality

EIR Determination for Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Less than Significant

Development on remaining vacant sites within the TOD Plan areas under this alternative would result in a similar increase in impervious surface area as the proposed TOD Plan. In addition, all development under Alternative I would meet the same regulatory requirements to detain stormwater onsite and minimize water quality impacts as development under the proposed TOD Plan. However, because there would be far fewer new development sites, far fewer sites would be required to result in no net increase in stormwater runoff and to provide onsite systems for handling runoff from roofs and parking areas. In addition, this Alternative would not involve daylighting the creek along the historic alignment of Centinela Creek. Although drainage systems would be adequate to handle runoff generated under this Alternative, the overall amount of stormwater runoff and the urban pollutants carried in that runoff would be greater under the No Project Alternative than for the proposed TOD Plan.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

EIR Determination for Geology, Soils, and Seismicity: Less than Significant

Because it would involve far less development than the proposed TOD Plan, the No Project Alternative would place far fewer people in a seismically active region. Development under Alternative 1 would be required to comply with all California Building Code requirements, as would development under the proposed TOD Plan.

Public Services

EIR Determination for Public Services: Less than Significant

Similar to the proposed TOD Plan, population increases resulting from the No Project Alternative would increase the existing demand for fire protection services, police services, public schools, library services, and parks and recreation. However, because the population increase under Alternative 1 would be far less than that of the proposed TOD, this new demand would be substantially reduced from the proposed Plan.

Utilities, Service Systems, and Water Supply

EIR Determination for Utilities, Service Systems, and Water Supply: Less than Significant

Population increases resulting from this Alternative would increase existing water consumption, wastewater generation demand for fire protection services, police services, public schools, library services, and parks and recreation. However, because the population increase under Alternative 1 would be far less than that of the proposed TOD Plan, this new demand would be substantially reduced from the proposed Plan.

Recreational Resources

EIR Determination for Recreational Resources: Less than Significant

Under the No Project Alternative, the increase in demand for parks and recreational facilities would be substantially reduced from the proposed TOD Plan due to the substantially reduced residential population in Alternative 1. However, this Alternative would not provide the public plazas, bicycle lanes, or natural open space (daylighted creek) as would the proposed TOD Plan, and would therefore result in a significant unavoidable impact.

5.3.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: REDUCED NET DEVELOPMENT INCREASE (50 PERCENT REDUCTION)

Development under this alternative would substantially reduce the net increase of development within the Downtown Inglewood and Fairview Heights areas as a means of reducing significant unavoidable traffic impacts of the proposed TOD Plan. Under this alternative, the proposed TOD Plan would be approved, but with approximately half of the net increase in development within the

Downtown Inglewood and Fairview Heights areas compared to the proposed TOD Plan. The net increase in development under Alternative 2 would be:

- Residential: 1,350 multi-family dwelling units
- Retail: 100,000 square feet
- Office: 157,500 square feet
- Hotel: 125 rooms
- Institutional: 170,600 square feet
- Industrial, Industrial & Creative Office: 438,000 square feet

Development would occur on all of the Key Development Sites described in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, and the provisions of the Downtown Inglewood and Fairview Heights Concept Plans would be approved and implemented. The net increase in residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial use that would be developed within the TOD Plan areas would be approximately 50 percent of that which is currently proposed and described in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of this EIR.

Impacts of the Reduced Net Development Increase (50 Percent Reduction) Alternative

Land Use and Planning

EIR Determination for Land Use and Planning: No Impact

The Reduced Net Development Increase Alternative would involve an amendment to the General Plan re-designating the TOD Planning Areas as Downtown Inglewood TOD and Fairview Heights TOD. Because Alternative 2 retains the land use pattern of the proposed TOD Plan at a lower intensity, it would also not result in impacts related to the division of existing communities or conflicts with habitat conservation plans.

Population, Housing, Housing and Employment

EIR Determination for Population, Housing, and Employment: Less than Significant

Resident population growth under Alternative 2 would be approximately 4,800, while employment growth would be approximately 4,230, both of which are about 50 percent of the growth anticipated for the proposed TOD Plan. Because population, housing and employment growth would be well below that of the proposed TOD Plan, which was determined in this EIR to be consistent with regional growth forecasts, population and employment growth associated with this Alternative would also be consistent with regional growth forecasts.

As with development of the TOD Plan, this alternative also would generate temporary construction-related jobs, albeit fewer than for the proposed TOD Plan. It is expected that construction workers generally would travel from other parts of the Los Angeles area to work, and that temporary housing within the TOD Plan areas would not be needed.

Aesthetic Resources

EIR Determination for Aesthetic Resources: Less than Significant

Development under Alternative 2 would consist of infill development on remaining vacant parcels, adaptive reuse of existing buildings, and intensification of existing developed sites within the TOD Plan areas. As a result, there would be a discernable change to the TOD Plan areas' existing visual character, although to a lesser degree than that of the proposed TOD Plan or Alternative 3. Development under this alternative would be required to comply with the design guidelines set forth in the proposed TOD Plan, and would also include the Green Boulevards, daylighted stream, and other aesthetic enhancements proposed in the TOD Plan. While public plazas would be provided under Alternative 2, they would be of a lesser size than under the proposed TOD Plan.

Development under this alternative would result in fewer new sources of light and glare than under the proposed TOD Plan. While the sources of light and glare would be similar, the number of sources would be less than under TOD Plan development, and the resulting degree of light and glare impacts would also be less.

Cultural Resources

EIR Determination for Cultural Resources: Less than Significant

Development under Alternative 2 would have the potential for uncovering unknown buried resources as the result of future development on infill sites. The likelihood of uncovering such resources would be similar to the proposed TOD Plan, since there would be the same number of development sites where disturbance of the ground surface would occur. Impacts on designated historic resources would be avoided as adaptive reuse of historic structures under this alternative would be required to adhere to Secretary of Interior Standards.

Traffic and Circulation

EIR Determination for Traffic and Circulation: Significant and Unavoidable

The 50 percent reduction in net development increase that would occur under Alternative 2 as compared to the proposed TOD Plan would reduce average daily vehicle trip generation from 35,956 for the proposed TOD Plan to approximately 18,000 average daily trips. This would be sufficient to reduce traffic impacts to less-than-significant levels for some, but not all intersections that would operate at satisfactory levels of service without TOD Plan development. It would also reduce the TOD Plan's contribution to cumulative impacts, although they would remain considerable at some intersections that would not otherwise operate at satisfactory levels of service.

Air Quality

EIR Determination for Air Quality: Less than Significant

Impacts related to air quality and GHG emissions would be substantially reduced compared to those that would occur under TOD Plan development due to a 50 percent reduction in new development.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

EIR Determination for Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Less than Significant

Because the significance of greenhouse gas emissions is based on a per capita efficiency metric, Alternative 2 would result in slightly higher per capita GHG impacts than would the proposed TOD Plan. This is because the infill and adaptive reuse projects that would occur in this Alternative adjacent to the Metro Stations would have a reduced intensity as compared to the proposed TOD Plan. This alternative would also provide access to the Downtown Inglewood Metro station from areas to the north of the station. In addition, this alternative would provide the same extent of bicycle or pedestrian mobility enhancements, including access to Metro transit stations, as would the proposed TOD Plan. As a result, the degree of mode shift from automobiles to transit and non-motorized travel that would be achieved under the TOD Plan would be only slightly less under this Alternative than the proposed TOD Plan since proportionately less new development would occur adjacent to Metro stations.

Energy Resources

EIR Determination for Energy Resources: Less than Significant

While the total amount of energy use resulting from this Alternative would be substantially less than for the proposed TOD Plan, energy use on a per capita basis would be slightly greater. This is because the intensity of development adjacent to Metro stations would be lower than for the proposed TOD Plan, and might not achieve the same mode shift to transit as the proposed Plan. This alternative would provide similar access to the Downtown Inglewood Metro station from areas to the north of the station, and would also provide the same extent of bicycle and pedestrian mobility enhancements, including access to Metro transit stations, as would the proposed TOD Plan.

Noise and Vibration

EIR Determination for Noise and Vibration: Less than Significant

Noise levels at site-specific development construction sites would be the same as for the proposed TOD Plan. Alternative 2 would result in the same number of such construction sites as would the proposed TOD Plan. However, the 50 percent reduction in net development increase under this Alternative as compared to the proposed TOD Plan would mean a reduction in the length of time construction activities were undertaken. In addition to reduced construction noise, the reduced amount of development under this alternative would generate less construction traffic. Increases in noise levels resulting from this alternative would be less than for the proposed TOD Plan, but would still result in increased noise along some roadways, although some of these increases would not be perceptible to the human ear.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

EIR Determination for Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Less than Significant

Alternative 2 would require site preparation activities, including excavation to the same degree as would the TOD Plan. Alternative 2 would also reduce the amount of new commercial and industrial

use that could involve the storage and use of hazardous materials. Thus, this Alternative would result in fewer risks of exposure to hazardous materials from ongoing operations. Overall, impacts with regard to hazards and hazardous materials under this alternative would be less than those described under the proposed TOD Plan.

Hydrology and Water Quality

EIR Determination for Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Less than Significant

Development within the TOD Plan areas under this alternative would result in a similar increase in impervious surface area as the proposed TOD Plan. In addition, development under Alternative 2 would meet the same regulatory requirements to detain stormwater onsite and minimize water quality impacts as development under the proposed TOD Plan, resulting in similar amounts of stormwater runoff and urban pollutants.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

EIR Determination for Geology, Soils, and Seismicity: Less than Significant

Because it would involve less development than the proposed project, this Alternative would place fewer people in a seismically active region. Development under Alternative 2 would be required to comply with all California Building Code requirements, as would development under the proposed TOD Plan, resulting in similar impacts.

Public Services

EIR Determination for Public Services: Less than Significant

Population increases resulting from this Alternative would increase the existing demand for fire protection services, police services, public schools, library services, and parks and recreation. However, because the population increase under Alternative 2 would be less than that of the proposed TOD, this new demand would be substantially reduced from the proposed Plan.

Utilities, Service Systems, and Water Supply

EIR Determination for Utilities, Service Systems, and Water Supply: Less than Significant

Population increases resulting from this Alternative would increase existing water consumption, wastewater generation demand for fire protection services, police services, public schools, library services, and parks and recreation. However, because the population increase under Alternative 2 would be less than that of the proposed TOD, this new demand would be substantially reduced from the proposed Plan.

Recreational Resources

EIR Determination for Recreational Resources: Less than Significant

The reduced residential population that would result from Alternative 2 would increase demand for parks and recreational facilities to a lesser degree than the proposed TOD Plan. This Alternative would provide the same bicycle lanes and natural open space (daylighted creek) as would the proposed TOD Plan, but would provide a proportionately lesser amount of plaza area as compared to the TOD Plan.

5.3.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: REDUCED NET DEVELOPMENT INCREASE ALTERNATIVE (25 PERCENT REDUCTION)

Under this alternative, the proposed TOD Plan would be approved, but at a lower intensity than currently proposed. Development under this alternative would result in an approximately 25 percent lower net increase in development within the Downtown Inglewood and Fairview Heights areas compared to the proposed TOD Plan. The net increase in development under Alternative 3 would be:

- Residential: 2,025 multi-family dwelling units
- Retail: 150,000 square feet
- Office: 236,250 square feet
- Hotel: 185 rooms
- Institutional: 256,000 square feet
- Industrial, Industrial & Creative Office: 656,750 square feet

Development would occur on all of the Key Development Sites described in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, and the provisions of the Downtown Inglewood and Fairview Heights Concept Plans would be approved and implemented. The net increase in residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial use that would be developed within the TOD Plan areas would be approximately 75 percent of that which is currently proposed and described in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of this EIR.

Impacts of the Lower Intensity Transit Oriented Development (25 Percent Reduction) Alternative

Land Use and Planning

The Lower Intensity Transit Oriented Development (25 Percent Reduction) Alternative would involve an amendment to the General Plan re-designating the TOD Plan Areas as Downtown Inglewood and Fairview Heights TOD, respectively. Because Alternative 3 retains the land use pattern of the proposed TOD plan at a reduced intensity, it would also not result in impacts related to the division of existing communities or conflicts with habitat conservation plans.

Population, Housing, Housing and Employment

EIR Determination for Population, Housing, and Employment: Less than Significant

Resident population growth under Alternative 3 would be approximately 4,810, while employment growth would be approximately 4,230, both of which are about 25 percent of the net growth anticipated for the proposed TOD Plan. Because population, housing and employment growth would be below that of the proposed TOD Plan, which was determined in this EIR to be consistent with regional growth forecasts, population and employment growth associated with this Alternative would also be consistent with regional growth forecasts.

As with development of the TOD Plan, this alternative also would generate temporary construction-related jobs, albeit fewer than for the proposed TOD Plan. It is expected that construction workers generally would travel from other parts of the Los Angeles area to work, and that temporary housing within the TOD Plan areas would not be needed.

Aesthetic Resources

EIR Determination for Aesthetic Resources: Less than Significant

Development under Alternative 3 would consist of infill development on remaining vacant parcels, adaptive reuse of existing buildings, and intensification of existing developed sites within the TOD Plan areas. As a result, there would be a discernable change to the TOD Plan areas' existing visual character, although to a lesser degree than that of the proposed TOD Plan. Development under this alternative would be required to comply with the design guidelines set forth in the proposed TOD Plan, and would also include the Green Boulevards, daylighted stream, and other aesthetic enhancements proposed in the TOD Plan. While public plazas would be provided under Alternative 3, they would be of a lesser size than under the proposed TOD Plan.

Development under this Alternative would result in reduced amount of new sources of light and glare than under the proposed TOD Plan. While the sources of light and glare would be similar, the number of sources would be less than under TOD Plan development (but more than in Alternatives 1 and 2), and the resulting degree of light and glare impacts would also be less.

Cultural Resources

EIR Determination for Cultural Resources: Less than Significant

Development under Alternative 3 would have the potential for uncovering unknown buried resources as the result of future development on infill sites. The likelihood of uncovering such resources would be similar to the proposed TOD Plan, since there would be the same number of development sites where disturbance of the ground surface would occur. Impacts on designated historic resources would be avoided as adaptive reuse of historic structures under this alternative would be required to adhere to Secretary of Interior Standards.

Traffic and Circulation

EIR Determination for Traffic and Circulation: Significant and Unavoidable

The 25 percent reduction in net development increase that would occur under Alternative 3 as compared to the proposed TOD Plan would reduce average daily vehicle trip generation from 35,956 for the proposed TOD Plan to approximately 27,000 average daily trips. This would be sufficient to reduce traffic impacts to less than significant for a few, but not most intersections that would be impacted by future development within the TOD Plan areas. Thus impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, and the Plan's contribution to cumulative impacts would remain considerable.

Air Quality

EIR Determination for Air Quality: Less than Significant

Impacts related to air quality and GHG emissions under this Alternative would be reduced compared to those that would occur under TOD Plan development due to a 25 percent reduction in net new development.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

EIR Determination for Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Less than Significant

Because the significance of greenhouse gas emissions is based on a per capita efficiency metric, Alternative 3 would result in slightly higher per capita GHG impacts than would the proposed TOD Plan. This is because the infill and adaptive reuse projects that would occur in this Alternative adjacent to the Metro Stations would have a reduced intensity as compared to the proposed TOD Plan. This alternative would also provide access to the Downtown Inglewood Metro station from areas to the north of the station. In addition, this alternative would provide the same extent of bicycle or pedestrian mobility enhancements, including access to Metro transit stations, as would the proposed TOD Plan. As a result, the degree of mode shift from automobiles to transit and non-motorized travel that would be achieved under the TOD Plan would be only slightly less under this Alternative than the proposed TOD Plan since proportionately less development would be adjacent to Metro stations.

Energy Resources

EIR Determination for Energy Resources: Less than Significant

While the total amount of energy use resulting from this Alternative would be less than for the proposed TOD Plan, energy use on a per capita basis would be slightly greater. This is because the intensity of development adjacent to Metro stations would be lower than for the proposed TOD Plan, and might not achieve the same mode shift to transit as the proposed Plan. This alternative would provide similar access to the Downtown Inglewood Metro station from areas to the north of the station as would the proposed TOD Plan, and would also provide the same extent of bicycle and pedestrian mobility enhancements, including access to Metro transit stations, as would the proposed TOD Plan.

Noise and Vibration

EIR Determination for Noise and Vibration: Less than Significant

Noise levels at site-specific development construction sites would be the same as for the proposed TOD Plan. In addition, Alternative 3 would result in the same number of such construction sites as would the proposed TOD Plan. In addition to reduced construction noise, the reduced amount of development under this alternative would generate less construction traffic. Increases in noise levels resulting from this alternative would be less than for the proposed TOD Plan, but would still result in increased noise along some roadways, although some of these increases would not be perceptible to the human ear.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

EIR Determination for Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Less than Significant

Alternative 3 would require site preparation activities, including excavation to the same degree as would the TOD Plan because the number of site being developed would remain the same. Alternative 3 would reduce the amount of new commercial and industrial use that could involve the storage and use of hazardous materials. Thus, this Alternative would result in fewer risks of exposure to hazardous materials from ongoing operations. Overall, impacts with regard to hazards and hazardous materials under this alternative would be less than those described under the proposed TOD Plan, but greater than those of Alternative 2.

Hydrology and Water Quality

EIR Determination for Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Less than Significant

Development within the TOD Plan areas under this alternative would result in a similar increase in impervious surface area as the proposed TOD Plan. In addition, development under Alternative 3 would meet the same regulatory requirements to detain stormwater onsite and minimize water quality impacts as development under the proposed TOD Plan, resulting in similar amounts of stormwater runoff and urban pollutants.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

EIR Determination for Geology, Soils, and Seismicity: Less than Significant

Because it would involve less net new development than the proposed project, this Alternative would place fewer people in a seismically active region. Development under Alternative 3 would be required to comply with all California Building Code requirements, as would development under the proposed TOD Plan, resulting in similar impacts.

Public Services

EIR Determination for Public Services: Less than Significant

Population increases resulting from this Alternative would increase the existing demand for fire protection services, police services, public schools, library services, and parks and recreation. However, because the population increase under Alternative 3 would be less than that of the proposed TOD, this new demand would be reduced from the proposed Plan.

Utilities, Service Systems, and Water Supply

EIR Determination for Utilities, Service Systems, and Water Supply: Less than Significant

Population increases resulting from this Alternative would increase existing water consumption, wastewater generation demand for fire protection services, police services, public schools, library services, and parks and recreation. However, because the population increase under Alternative 3 would be less than that of the proposed TOD, this new demand would be reduced from the proposed Plan.

Recreational Resources

EIR Determination for Recreational Resources: Less than Significant

The reduced residential population that would result from Alternative 3 would increase demand for parks and recreational facilities to a lesser degree than the proposed TOD Plan. This Alternative would provide the same bicycle lanes and natural open space (daylighted creek) as would the proposed TOD Plan, but would provide a proportionately lesser amount of plaza area as compared to the TOD Plan.

5.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires that an EIR identify an environmentally superior alternative. If the No Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2)). In the case of the TOD Plan for Downtown Inglewood and Fairview Heights, Alternative 1, No Project, would be environmentally superior since it reduces or avoids the significant traffic effects of the TOD Plan and reduces nearly all other environmental effects.

Of the other alternatives evaluated in this EIR, Alternative 2 would be the environmentally superior alternative since it involves minimal impacts compared to the proposed TOD Plan and meets most project objectives albeit not to the same degree as does the TOD Plan as it is proposed.

This page intentionally left blank.