

## 2.0 INTRODUCTION

---

This document is a Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the Inglewood Transit Connector Project (proposed Project). This Draft EIR has been prepared by the City of Inglewood (City), acting as the Lead Agency in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

### 2.1 PURPOSE AND TYPE OF EIR

#### 2.1.1 Statutory Authority

Under CEQA, public agencies are required to evaluate proposed development projects for their effect on the physical environment and identify any feasible measures that would avoid or lessen significant environmental effects. The EIR is an information document used in the planning and decision-making process and is intended to provide disclosure of the environmental consequences of a project to the public and agency decision makers before action is taken to approve project permits.

All projects within the State of California are required to undergo environmental review to analyze the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the project in accordance with CEQA.<sup>1</sup> The preparation of an EIR provides information to assist a lead agency in making decisions on the project but does not control the lead agency's exercise of discretion. Specifically, as noted in the State CEQA Guidelines:<sup>2</sup>

- (a) An EIR is an informational document which will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project. The public agency shall consider the information in the EIR along with other information which may be presented to the agency.*
- (b) While the information in the EIR does not control the agency's ultimate discretion on the project, the agency must respond to each significant effect identified in the EIR by making findings under Section 15091 and if necessary, by making a statement of overriding consideration under Section 15093.*
- (c) The information in an EIR may constitute substantial evidence in the record to support the agency's action on the project if its decision is later challenged in court.*

---

1 California Public Resources Code (PRC), sec. 21000 et seq., California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

2 California Code of Regulations, tit. 14, div. 6, ch. 3, State CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15121.

This EIR was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970<sup>3</sup> and the *Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act* (State CEQA Guidelines), published by the Natural Resources Agency of the State of California.<sup>4</sup>

The City of Inglewood is the Lead Agency for the proposed Project under CEQA<sup>5</sup> and is responsible for the preparation of this EIR.

## 2.1.2 Type of Environmental Document

As provided for in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15161, this EIR for is a project EIR.<sup>6</sup> A project EIR examines the environmental impacts of a specific development project. This type of EIR should focus primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from the development project. The EIR shall examine all phases of the proposed Project including planning, construction, and operation.

## 2.1.3 Purpose and Scope of the EIR

As described in the CEQA Guidelines,<sup>7</sup> an EIR is a public information document that assesses potential environmental effects of a proposed project, as well as identifies mitigation measures and alternatives to a proposed project that could reduce or avoid adverse environmental impacts. CEQA requires that State and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority.

The proposed Project, as defined in **Section 3: Project Description**, would require a discretionary action under CEQA and is the subject of this EIR. The EIR is used in the planning and decision-making process. The purpose of an EIR is not to advocate or recommend either approval or denial of a proposed project.

An EIR, under the provisions of CEQA, identifies “the significant effects on the environment of a project, to identify alternatives to the project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided.”<sup>8</sup> This EIR assesses the potential environmental effects of the proposed Project and related implementing approvals and documents.

---

3 CEQA, Section 21000 et seq.

4 State CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15000 et seq.

5 PRC, sec. 21067 as amended, CEQA.

6 State CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15161.

7 CEQA Guidelines Section 15121(a).

8 PRC, sec/ 21002.1[a].

This EIR was prepared to provide information to public agencies, the general public, and decision makers regarding potential environmental impacts related to the components of the construction and operation of the proposed Project.

The intentions of CEQA are to (1) inform governmental decision makers and the public about the potentially significant environmental effects of proposed activities; (2) identify the ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced; (3) prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible; and (4) disclose to the public the reasons why a governmental agency approved the project in the manner the agency chose if significant environmental effects are involved.<sup>9</sup>

Because the Initial Study determined that the proposed Project may have a significant environmental effect on the environment, the State CEQA Guidelines require the preparation of this Draft EIR. The City has undertaken this Draft EIR for the following purposes:

- To evaluate the potentially significant environmental effects associated with the implementation of the proposed Project, as required by CEQA;
- To indicate the manner in which those significant impacts can be avoided or significantly lessened;
- To identify any significant and unavoidable adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated;
- To identify reasonable and potentially feasible alternatives to the proposed Project that would eliminate any significant adverse environmental impacts or reduce the impacts to less than significant levels;
- To inform the general public, the local community, and responsible trustee, State, and federal agencies of the nature of the proposed Project, its potentially significant environmental effects, feasible mitigation measures to mitigate those effects, and reasonable and feasible alternatives;
- To enable City decision makers to consider the environmental consequences of the proposed Project and make findings regarding each significant effect that is identified;
- To provide a basis for preparation of any future environmental documents; and
- To facilitate responsible agencies in issuing permits and approvals for the proposed Project.

According to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, public agencies must avoid or lessen significant environmental impacts where feasible. Where impacts cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels,

---

<sup>9</sup> State CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15002; PRC, sec. 21002.1.

public agencies have an obligation to balance a project's significant impacts on the environment against other factors, including economic, social, technological, legal, and other benefits.

The City must certify the EIR before approving the proposed Project. Upon certification, the EIR will serve as the base environmental document for the City and will be used as a basis for decisions on implementation of the proposed Project. Other agencies may also use this EIR in their review and approval processes.

This EIR was prepared in accordance with Section 15151 of the State CEQA Guidelines, which defines the standards for EIR adequacy as follows:

*An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection; but for adequacy, completeness, and good faith effort at full disclosure.*

## **2.2 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC OUTREACH**

### **2.2.1 Scoping**

The City of Inglewood (City or Inglewood) as the Lead Agency prepared a Notice of Preparation (Original NOP) and an Initial Study (Original IS) which was published on July 16, 2018 (SCH 2018071034) identifying the resource areas that could have potential significant impacts from the construction and operation of the proposed Project. The Original IS determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would be prepared in compliance with CEQA to assess for potentially significant impacts that may result from the proposed Project. A Notice of Preparation (Original NOP) was circulated and comments were received from the public and agencies following a 30-day comment period that ended on August 15, 2018.

As a result of the comments received and refinements and modifications to the proposed Project identified in the Original NOP and Original IS, a Revised NOP and IS were re-circulated for public review and comment from September 10, 2020 to October 12, 2020. Subsequent to the circulation of the Original IS, the State of California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) updated and revised the thresholds contained in the State CEQA Guidelines Appendix G. The Revised IS was updated to address the updated Appendix G checklist that became effective on December 28, 2018.

The Revised NOP and Revised IS reflect the following refinements and modifications made to the proposed Project:

- Changes to proposed Project from an approximately 1.8-mile long alignment with 5 stations to an approximately 1.6-mile long alignment with 3 stations. The revised alignment follows the same route as the original alignment from Market Street and Florence Avenue to Manchester Boulevard to Prairie Avenue terminating at the intersection of Prairie Avenue and Hardy Street.
- Refinements and modifications to the proposed stations as follows:
  - Modify the proposed Project to reduce the total number of stations from the five stations previously considered to the three stations. The original five station locations were at the following:
    - Market Street Station: at the intersection of Market Street and Regent Street on Market Street;
    - Manchester Boulevard Station: between Hillcrest Boulevard and Spruce Avenue on Manchester Avenue adjacent to the proposed Projects maintenance and storage facility (MSF);
    - Forum Station: north of the intersection of Prairie Avenue and Pincay Drive on Prairie Avenue;
    - Hollywood Park Station: between Arbor Vitae Street and Hardy Street on Prairie Avenue adjacent to the City’s proposed intermodal transit facility (ITF) located on the southeast corner of Prairie Avenue and E. Arbor Vitae Street; and
    - Century Boulevard Station: at the intersection of Prairie Avenue and Century Boulevard on Prairie Avenue.
  - The new locations for the three stations are located at:
    - Market Street/Florence Avenue Station: at an existing commercial plaza on the southeast corner of the intersection of Market Street and Florence Avenue between Market Street and Locust Street;
    - Prairie Avenue/Arbor Vitae Street Station: at the intersection of Prairie Avenue and Pincay Drive; and
    - Prairie Avenue/Hardy Street Station: at the intersection of Prairie Avenue and Hardy Street.
  - A pedestrian bridge linkage has been added to connect the Market Street/Florence Avenue Station with the Metro Crenshaw line on the northside of Florence Avenue.
- Removal of the Intermodal Transit Facility (ITF) as part of the proposed Project; the City is proceeding with the ITF project separately.

- Reduce the potential number of traction power substations from three to two. One will be co-located with the proposed Project’s maintenance and storage facility (MSF facility) and the other will be located on the City’s ITF site on Prairie Avenue.

(For copies, see **Appendix 2.0.1a: Revised Notice of Preparation (Revised NOP) and 2.0.1b Original NOP; Appendix 2.0.2a Revised Initial Study (IS) and 2.0.2b Original IS; and Appendix 2.0.3 Summary of Comments Received on the NOP and IS Memorandum**).

The City submitted both the Original and Revised NOPs and Initial Studies to the Governor’s OPR; applicable trustee or responsible federal, State, regional, and local agencies identified for the proposed Project, including adjacent cities and counties; the County of Los Angeles; relevant Native American tribes; and all interested parties requesting such notice to allow for comment on the IS during the 30-day comment period. The Original and Revised NOP distribution lists indicating the agencies, departments, tribes, and parties that were mailed certified copies of the Original and Revised NOPs is provided as **Appendix 2.0.1: Notice of Preparation**. In addition, copies of the Original and Revised ISs were made available for review at Inglewood City Hall and the Inglewood Public library, as well as on the City’s website, to give the public the opportunity to comment on the both the Original and Revised ISs during the respective 30-day comment periods.

The purpose of the Original and Revised NOPs were to provide information describing the proposed Project and its potential environmental effects to those who might wish to comment regarding the scope and content of the information to be included in the EIR. The City encouraged all notified agencies, adjacent cities and counties, and interested members of the public to provide comments on the Original and Revised NOPs and respective ISs to the City so the City could ensure the Draft EIR addresses the appropriate topics and considers all potential environmental impacts that may result from the construction and operation of the proposed Project.

As part of the Original NOP/IS process, a scoping meeting was held on July 26, 2018, from 6 PM to 8 PM at the Inglewood Senior Citizens Center, 111 N. Locust Street, Inglewood, CA 90301. The City also provided the opportunity for comments to be submitted at the scoping meeting.

Three State agencies, five regional agencies, and one local agency submitted comment letters during the public circulation period for the Original IS prepared for this EIR. In addition, comments were received from 17 individuals at the public scoping meeting held on July 26, 2018. A list of agencies and individuals is provided in **Table 2.0-1: Comments Received on the Original Notice of Preparation and Original Initial Study**.

**Table 2.0-1**  
**Comments Received on the Original Notice of Preparation and Original Initial Study**

<b>Agency/Entity</b>	<b>Name of Commenter</b>
State of California, Native American Heritage Commission	Gayle Totton, MA, PhD, Associate Governmental Program Analyst
State of California, Public Utilities Commission	Daren Gilbert, Manager, Rail Transit Safety Branch, Safety and Enforcement Division
State of California, Department of Transportation	Miya Edmonson, IGR/CEQA Branch Chief
Southern California Association of Governments	Ping Chang, Acting Manager, Compliance and Performance Monitoring
West Basin Municipal Water District	Run Chen, Engineering Supervisor
South Coast Air Quality Management District	Daniel Garcia, Program Supervisor Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources
County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County	Adriana Raza, Customer Service Specialist, Facilities Planning Department
Los Angeles County Fire Department	Michael Y. Takeshita, Acting Chief, Forestry Division, Prevention Services Bureau
Inglewood Unified School District	Jennifer S. Recine, Esq.

The following members of the public also provided comments:

Kathy Alston	Harriet Keyes
Joan Beck	Gary Kynard
T. Bunn	Erica Nelson
Gerald Chernick	Diana Patterson
Daniel J. Coles	Richard Purdy
Randal Curtis	Alma Quijas/Steven Aquino
William Harris	Owen Smith
Wilma Kaufman	Holly Tempo

A total of two State agencies, four regional agencies, three local agencies, two interested parties, and one individual submitted comment letters during the public circulation period for the Revised IS prepared for this EIR. A list of agencies and individuals is provided in **Table 2.0-2: Comments Received on the Revised Notice of Preparation and Revised Initial Study**.

The following members of the public also provided comments:

William Harris

Based on a preliminary review of the proposed Project as part of the Revised IS, the City determined that potentially significant effects could occur with respect to aesthetics; air quality; biological resources; cultural resources; energy resources; geology and soils; greenhouse gas emissions; hazards and hazardous materials; land use and planning; noise and vibration; transportation and traffic; tribal cultural resources;

and utilities and service systems. These issues have been incorporated into the environmental analysis of the proposed Project contained within **Section 4.0: Environmental Impact Analysis** of this Draft EIR.

**Table 2.0-2**  
**Comments Received on the Revised Notice of Preparation and Revised Initial Study**

Agency/Entity	Name of Commenter
State of California, Native American Heritage Commission	Andrew Green, Cultural Resources Analyst
State of California, Department of Transportation	Miya Edmonson, IGR/CEQA Branch Chief
Los Angeles County Transportation Agency	Shine Ling, Manager
Los Angeles County Public Works	Toan Duong, Civil Engineer
Los Angeles County Fire Department	Ronald M. Durbin, Chief
South Coast Air Quality Management District	Lijin Sun, Program Supervisor CEQA IGR Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources
City of Culver City (Culver CityBus)	Kaitlyn Zhang, Management Analyst/ Transportation Planner
Inglewood Unified School District	Erika F. Torrex, Ed. D., MSW, County Administrator
Thomas Safran & Associates	Jordan Pynes, President
Build Your Dreams Transit Solutions	Patrick Duan
Los Angeles Conservancy	Adrian Scott Fine, Director of Advocacy

## 2.2.2 Concerns and Issues Raised During Scoping

The State CEQA Guidelines<sup>10</sup> require that a Draft EIR summary identify areas of issues raised by other agencies and the public. In addition to those areas identified in the NOP as potentially significant, some issues of concern were expressed at the public scoping meeting for the Draft EIR and through responses to the NOP.

The following are the concerns noted in the comments received.

### ***Alignment and Operation***

The Original NOP identified a potential option for the Maintenance and Storage Facility at Kelso School. Representatives of the Inglewood Unified School District (Inglewood USD) raised issues regarding the proposed Project's support facilities, and stated that any acquisition or demolition of the Kelso Elementary School property to implement the proposed Project would have an impact on district facilities. In response to the Revised NOP, which identified a different proposed site for the Maintenance and Storage Facility, Inglewood USD indicated support for the Project and requested analysis of the potential effects of the proposed Project on school facilities.

<sup>10</sup> PRC, tit. 14, div. 6, ch. 3, State CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15123.

In regard to public comments, several commenters voiced concerns, suggestions, and inquiries regarding the final alignment and operation of the proposed Project. Commenters suggested a number of modifications to alignment and support facility alternatives. Suggestions included adding connection to the I-105 freeway; creating an alignment along Locust Street; utilizing a portion of Edward Vincent Junior Park for the MSF; and incorporating the MSF into the Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center (IBEC) due to less interference with traffic, available open space, and optimal access. Further, one commenter noted that more alternatives should be considered to provide more economic development to all of the City, including Market Street.

In terms of operation of the proposed Project, one commenter noted that a station at Market Street and Florence Avenue would be a major benefit to people connecting to other locations and shopping. Another commenter stated that displacing businesses and/or residences should be avoided, and that by removing the Vons shopping center, a source of healthy and organic produce would be eliminated. Other commenters expressed concerns about operation of the proposed Project, including where users would park and whether there would be fares on event and nonevent days. Another commenter would like the proposed Project to be free for seniors and lower income people. One commenter expressed concern regarding financing the proposed Project and questioned whether funding would come from property taxes, sales taxes, or parcel taxes.

### ***Construction Phasing and Impacts***

The physical impacts of construction activity were a concern voiced by several public commenters. Comments included concerns that heavy machinery and construction operations would damage or crack adjacent properties; potentially cause loss of rental income due to undesirability of rental properties near an active construction zone; and disturb current tenants.

Inglewood USD representatives stated that any acquisition or demolition of the Kelso Elementary School property to implement the proposed Project would have an impact on district facilities by shutting down the school and requiring the construction of a new school for 523 displaced students. In response to the Revised NOP, which identified a different proposed site for the Maintenance and Storage Facility, Inglewood USD indicated support for the Project and requested analysis of the potential for aesthetics, air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, traffic, vibration, safety, and utility impacts on school facilities.

Thomas Safran & Associates (TSA) representatives commented on behalf of TSA owned properties designated for mixed-use and residential developments near the proposed Project. TSA requested analysis of the potential aesthetics, air quality, GHG, and noise effects of the Project, especially as related to

development planned at 139 North Market Street and 158 North Market Street. The City has not received plans for these projects. TSA requested these two locations be considered sensitive receptors.

### ***Historic Resources***

Los Angeles Conservancy (LA Conservancy) expressed concern regarding historic resources within and adjacent to the Project area, identifying nine historic resources along the route. LA Conservancy recommends that alternative routes be explored and reviewed to avoid impacts along Market Street and reduce impacts to nearby historic resources.

### ***Mobility Issues***

Caltrans recommend the incorporation of multimodal and complete street transportation elements that will actively promote alternatives to car use and better manage existing parking assets. The recommendation aligns with Caltrans' support for transportation and land use that reduces vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by shortening trip lengths and achieving a high level of nonmotorized travel and transit use. Caltrans also supports the implementation of pedestrian safety measures such as road diets and other traffic calming measures.

Culver CityBus recommends the proposed Project to locate stations near existing transit services in the area in order to allow smooth transit connections.

In addition, one public commenter concerned with mobility issues recommended that the proposed Project be free for seniors and low-income people. In addition, one commenter suggested that a zone limited to pedestrians be extended from the proposed Metro Crenshaw/LAX Line station in downtown Inglewood to other locations along the alignment.

### ***Policy, Plan, and Program Consistency***

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) recommends the incorporation of the proposed Project into the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) project list in order to enable access to State or federal funding. SCAG also recommends the proposed Project to recognize and consider RTP/SCS goals.

### ***Public Services***

The County of Los Angeles Fire Department (County Fire) is concerned for sufficient ingress/egress access points for the circulation of traffic and emergency response issues. County fire requests alternative route (detour) plans with a tentative schedule of planned closures prior to the beginning of construction.

Disruptions to water service shall also be coordinated with County Fire to ensure alternative water sources would be provided.

### ***Transportation Impacts***

A number of comment letters were related to the proposed Project's impacts on transportation local surface transportation in the area. Public comments praised the potential ability of the proposed Project to provide easy access from the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) system to LAX and provide intermodal services for both residents and customers near the area. A primary concern was the potential for increased traffic throughout the City due to construction and any roadway modifications.

Public Utilities Commission stated that the proposed Project would disrupt the heavily used roadway network in the surrounding community and that potential impacts should be identified, discussed, and evaluated for necessary safety improvements and mitigations at each proposed construction stage. This includes considering traffic circulation and queuing, level of service, emergency service response, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance. Further, Public Utilities Commission stated that the automated people mover (APM) trains must comply with California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) rules and regulations, CPUC General Orders, and American Society of Civil Engineers Automated People Mover Standards.

Additionally, one public commenter expressed concern regarding lost pedestrian access along Market Street. Caltrans also touched on this point by stating that the proposed Project should incorporate multimodal and complete streets transportation elements that will actively promote alternatives to car use and better manage existing parking assets, requesting that the City evaluate the proposed Project for access problems, vehicle miles traveled, and service needs that may need to be addressed.

### ***Tribal Resources Impacts***

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) recommends lead agencies consult with all California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed Project in order to avoid inadvertent discoveries of Native American human remains and best protect tribal cultural resources. NAHC pointed out that the proposed Project will be required to comply with AB 52 and SB 18.

### ***Utility Impacts***

The West Basin Municipal Water District (West Basin) notified the proposed Project that most West Basin recycled water distribution pipelines are located at least 3.5 feet below ground and within the public right-

of-way. If a relocation of the pipelines would be needed, a request should be submitted at least 6 months in advance of the required relocation. Additionally, the Kenneth Hahn Lateral project by West Basin is investigating opportunities to provide recycled water from the existing 36-inch pipeline that ends at the intersection of Prairie Avenue and Florence Avenue, in the City of Inglewood, to Kenneth Hahn State Park, Baldwin Hills area, and into Culver City. The complete Kenneth Hahn Lateral Feasibility Study is available upon request.

The Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (Sanitation District) and the Los Angeles Department of Public Works (LADWP) identified that the proposed Project may impact existing and/or proposed facilities (e.g., trunk sewers, waterlines, drainage pipes, etc.) over which it will be constructed. Both agencies indicated utility facilities are directly under and/or cross directly beneath the proposed Project footprint. Both agencies requested the submittal of plans and specifications for the Project address any affected facilities and be submitted for review for review. Once the plans and specifications are submitted, both agencies indicated responses would be provided, followed by permits for construction.

Consultation with the Southern California Edison Company (SCE) was conducted regarding the Project. Based on a distribution study completed by SCE, upgrades to the existing distribution system were identified. These improvements are addressed in this EIR.

### ***Cumulative Impacts***

The Centinela/Florence Avenues Grade Separation Project by Metro will have construction activities concurrent with the schedule of the proposed Project. Metro would like the EIR to take into consideration the construction impacts and activities of the Centinela/Florence Avenues Grade Separation Project as it relates to the proposed Project.

#### **2.2.3 Tribal Consultation**

A part of the AB 52 process, the City has been notified by tribes that may have interest in tribal cultural resources in the region. Four tribes had previously notified the City and requested future notification of, with the possibility of providing consultation on, any projects that proceed under CEQA. These tribes include the Gabrielino–Tongva Tribe, Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council, Gabrielino/Tongva Nation, and the Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians. Additionally, the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation was identified as a relevant party.

In accordance with AB 52, the City sent notification letters on July 31, 2018 notifying the four tribes identified above that the City was planning the proposed Project. Additionally, the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation was mailed a Notice of Preparation of this Draft EIR. Each tribe notified has 30 days from receipt of the letter to notify the City that they wish to engage in the AB 52 consultation

process on the proposed Project. As of December 6, 2018, the City had received only one response requesting consultation via email from Brandy Salas, Administrative Specialist, for the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation (Tribe).<sup>11</sup> The Tribe indicated that if there would be any ground disturbance activity associated with the proposed Project, they would like to consult.

Consultation between the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation Tribe and the City, and the City’s consultant team was initiated via conference call on February 6, 2019. As part of the consultation, the City noted that it completed record searches to date to identify existing archaeological records, and that that information would be made available to the Tribe if requested.

Members of the Tribe provided an overview of the Tribes experience with other projects in the Los Angeles Basin including work that the Tribe has completed with LA Metro and other transit efforts. As part of the other projects, the Tribe noted that artifacts had been unearthed as part of ground disturbing activities. The Tribe also noted that many of these discoveries were located along historic roads and routes in the LA Basin that followed Native American tribal routes.

As a result of consultation, the Tribe shared information including maps of the area that depict the historic and prehistoric trading routes, and suggested mitigation measures that may be considered to assist in reducing potential impacts to any cultural resources that could be unearthed during ground disturbing activities.

The tribal notification and outreach process for the proposed Project is included in the appendices of this Draft EIR and listed as follows:

- *AB 52 Tribal Notification and Outreach Summary Memorandum*, Meridian Consultants LLC, December 6, 2018 (included as **Appendix 4.13.1**); and
- *AB 52 Consultation Summary*, Meridian Consultants LLC, February 6, 2019 (included as **Appendix 4.13.2**).

Please see **Section 8.0** for a glossary of terms, definitions, and acronyms used in this Draft EIR.

This information as well as the recommendations of the tribe have been included in the Draft EIR.

## 2.2.4 Public Outreach and Community Engagement

The City initiated a comprehensive outreach program for the proposed Project in 2018, at the outset of the environmental clearance phase. As the Draft EIR was prepared, the City continued to keep elected

---

<sup>11</sup> See **Appendix 4.13.1** and its attachments therein of this Draft EIR.

officials, community leaders and the general public informed of the status of the technical analysis and schedule for completion of the environmental documents throughout the preparation of this Draft EIR. The outreach program is focused on increasing project awareness and education, disseminating project information, garnering public input, and supporting the technical and legal environmental processes. To learn more about the local community's needs for the proposed Project, the City held over 35 community and stakeholder outreach meetings over the past 2 years during the planning, environmental and design process.

Stakeholders have included local Inglewood block clubs, neighborhood watch groups and homeownership associations (HOA) such as the Renaissance HOA, Carlton Square HOA, Briarwood HOA, Regent Street HOA, and the Hyde Park Village HOA. The City also engaged the NCAAP Inglewood Chapter, Inglewood Airport Area Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Club of Inglewood, Inglewood Unified School District, local churches, and community-based nonprofits including the Social Justice Learning Center Institute, Move LA, The Enrichment Center, and the Coalition for Clean Air.

A complete listing of stakeholders and meetings is included in **Appendix 2.0.1a: Revised Notice of Preparation (Revised NOP) and 2.0.1b Original NOP; Appendix 2.0.2a Revised Initial Study (IS) and 2.0.2b Original IS;** and **Appendix 2.0.3 Summary of Comments Received on the Revised and Original NOP and IS Memorandum** of this Draft EIR.

Through the use of focus groups, workshops, tours, participation in community events, social media outlets, and webinars, project stakeholders have been involved in each of the major technical milestones of the project development process that has occurred to date.

### ***Public Engagement Process***

The public engagement process included compilation of a stakeholder database, development of project related meeting materials and collateral materials, proactive outreach, public meetings, participation in community events and coordination meetings with public agencies.

### **Stakeholder Database**

To properly inform the public, the City compiled a list of key individuals located throughout and adjacent to the proposed Project and public agencies that have jurisdiction in the area. In addition to key individuals and/or groups identified as part of the initial due diligence, the database includes a listing of all stakeholders who have attended public meetings, participated in a key stakeholder meeting, community events or who have otherwise asked to be added to the database. It is used to notify stakeholders of public meetings, to send out the electronic Newsletter, or other updates as needed.

The stakeholder database includes the following groups:

**City Council**

- Mayor James T. Butts, Jr.
- Councilman George W. Dotson, District No. 1
- Councilman Alex Padilla, District No. 2
- Councilman Eloy Morales, Jr., District No. 3
- Councilman Ralph Franklin, District No. 4

**City Commissions**

- Parking & Traffic Commission
- Parking Authority
- Park & Recreation Commission
- Planning Commission
- Senior Center Advisory Committee
- South Bay Cities Service Council
- Citizen Advisory Committee
- Community Development Committee
- Inglewood Housing Authority – RAB Committee

**Community Based Organizations and Religious Community Institutions**

- Inglewood Teen Center
- Lockhaven Community Center
- Social Justice Learning Center Institute
- The Enrichment Center
- Amassi Center
- Briarwood Community Center
- Inglewood Cultural Arts Center
- Uplift Inglewood Coalition
- Inglewood Forward
- We Can Help Foundation Inc.
- Great Beginnings for Black Babies, Inc.
- American Legion
- Women Infant Children (WIC) Inglewood Chapter
- South Bay Workforce Investment Board
- Faithful Central Bible Church
- Inglewood Ministerial Alliance
- Brotherhood Crusade
- Inglewood Community Church
- Christ Centered Ministries
- Coalition for Clean Air
- Champions for Progress
- St. John Chrysostom Church

### **Transit Advocacy Groups**

- LA County Bicycle Coalition
- Alliance for Community Transit LA
- Southern California Transit Advocates
- Cherrywood-Leimert Block Club
- Empowerment Congress West
- Move LA

### **Local and Regional Agencies**

- Inglewood Unified School District
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Agency
- Southern California Association of Governments
- South Bay Cities Council of Government
- Los Angeles World Airport
- University of California, Los Angeles
- Los Angeles/Orange Counties Building and Construction Trades Council

### **Regional Stakeholders**

- A.G. Spanos, Los Angeles Chargers, President of Los Angeles Chargers
- Kevin Demoff, Los Angeles Rams, Chief Operating Officer and Executive Vice President
- Steve Ballmer, Chairman, Los Angeles Clippers
- Stadco LA, LLC, SoFi Stadium Owner
- University of California, Los Angeles
- Los Angeles/Orange Counties Building and Construction Trades Council
- Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters
- Los Angeles Cleantech (LACI)
- The Inglewood Airport Area Chamber of Commerce
- LAX Coastal Chamber of Commerce
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
- Ironworkers Local 433 – International Association of Bridge, Structural & Ornamental Iron Workers  
A.F.L – C.I.O

### **Other Public Officials**<sup>12</sup>

- U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein
- U.S Representative Maxine Waters
- California Assemblywoman Autumn Burke
- California Senator Steven C. Bradford
- Los Angeles County Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
- Los Angeles County Supervisor Janice Hahn

---

12 Note: It is envisioned that these public officials would be contacted and briefed by the City and/or the outreach team in connection with the Inglewood Transit Connector project. At those meetings, information can also be provided on shorter-range planning efforts, which would include the TMOP.

- Los Angeles County Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
- Los Angeles City Councilmember Herb J. Wesson, Jr.
- Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti
- City of El Segundo Mayor Drew Boyles
- City of Carson Mayor Cedric L. Hicks
- Casey Wasserman (Los Angeles Olympics 2028 Committee Chairperson)
- *California Senator Holly Mitchell*
- California Senator Maria Elena Durazo

### ***Project Materials and Resources***

To inform and update stakeholders about the proposed Project's progress, the outreach team developed collateral materials for distribution through various channels and means of communication. These included project related fact sheets, frequently asked questions, meeting notices, electronic newsletters/e-bulletins, and other collateral materials. In addition, a complete set of collateral pieces was developed and distributed at community meetings, stakeholder briefings, and public events, as well as electronically when requested. These collateral materials were updated throughout the proposed Project's development process and were produced in English and Spanish.

The City's project website served as the central point where stakeholders went to obtain a variety of information about the proposed Project. The website is located at:

<http://envisioninglewood.org/transportation-solutions/inglewood-transit-connector/>

The website contains maps of the proposed Project, and other collateral materials and key documentation such as the NOP, Initial Study Report, the Draft Environmental Impact Report, planning workshops and working group presentations. The website also contains a "Contact Us" sections where people can provide their input to the study, ask questions, and add themselves to the proposed Project database to be notified of future meetings and project related updates.

## **2.2.5 Post Scoping Outreach**

### ***General Public***

After the initial scoping period and during the preparation of the technical reports and Draft EIR, the City held over 35 community and stakeholder outreach meetings over the past 2 years during the planning, environmental and design process. Stakeholders have included property and landowners adjacent to the proposed Project including but not limited to business and property owners along Market Street, Stadco LA, LLC (SoFi Stadium Owner), Steve Ballmer (owner of the Forum and proposed Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center), the Rams and the Chargers. The City also engaged with local Inglewood block

clubs, neighborhood watch groups and HOAs such as the Renaissance HOA, Carlton Square HOA, Briarwood HOA, Regent Street HOA, and the Hyde Park Village HOA. The City also presented at local community groups and organizations including but not limited to the NCAAP Inglewood Chapter, Inglewood Airport Area Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Club of Inglewood, Inglewood Unified School District, local churches, and community-based nonprofits including the Social Justice Learning Center Institute, Move LA, The Enrichment Center, and the Coalition for Clean Air.

At the meetings, residents expressed significant interest in and support for the proposed Project. The overarching themes summarized below emerged as priority interests and needs the community would like to see addressed by the proposed Project, including but not limited to creating economic development opportunities along the corridor, specifically Downtown Inglewood; increasing transit options for local residents and visitors; connecting communities and residents to jobs and educational opportunities, services and destinations locally and regionally; reducing traffic congestion and the growing demand on the existing roadway networks on both event and nonevent days; providing a transit system that preserves existing traffic lanes along Prairie Avenue and Manchester Avenue for vehicular traffic; reducing potential impacts to local businesses during construction; ensuring stations are designed to promote safety, and be easy to access for multiple modes including pedestrians, bicyclists, and park-and-ride users. The City has embraced the stakeholder input received to date and addressed various community needs identified into the design of the proposed Project, including supporting TOD development in Downtown Inglewood, a direct transit connection to the Metro Crenshaw/LAX Line, a fully elevated transit system that does not remove any existing vehicular travel lanes, a phased construction approach focused on helping local businesses, and designed state-of-the-art stations integrated into its surrounding environment. The City will continue to host public workshops, design charrettes and stakeholder meetings throughout the CEQA, design, procurement, construction and project implementation process.

### ***Public Agency***

In addition to the scoping meeting, the City also participated in various meetings with public agencies to allow concerns to be identified and addressed early in the development process of the proposed Project. This effort was designed to present information on the proposed Project's concept design, to discuss relevant issues related to each agency's jurisdiction and proactively consult with these agencies prior to formal agency consultation. Agency involved in these meetings are list in **Table 2.0-3: Post Scoping Public Agency Outreach**.

**Table 2.0-3  
Post Scoping Public Agency Outreach**

<b>Agency/Entity/Individual</b>	<b>Summer 2018</b>	<b>Spring 2019</b>	<b>Winter 2019</b>	<b>Summer 2020</b>
Los Angeles Department of Transportation	X	X	X	X
City of Hawthorne		X	X	
City of Lawndale	X	X	X	
South Bay Council of Governments	X	X	X	X
Los Angeles County, Public Works Department	X	X	X	
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority	X	X	X	X
Santa Monica Big Blue Bus	X	X	X	X
City of Gardena – GTrans	X	X	X	X
City of Santa Monica – Big Blue Bus	X	X	X	X
City of Culver City – Culver City Bus	X	X	X	X
City of Redondo Beach – Beach Cities Transit	X	X	X	X
City of Long Beach Transit		X	X	
Inglewood Unified School District			X	
Los Angeles County Fire Department				X
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	X	X	X	X
South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)	X	X	X	X

## 2.3 ORGANIZATION OF THIS DRAFT EIR

This EIR is organized as follows:

**Section 1.0: Executive Summary** provides a summary of the proposed Project. This chapter includes an overview of the proposed Project description and areas of controversy, a discussion of key environmental effects, a discussion of significant and unavoidable impacts, a discussion of cumulative effects, an overview of alternatives, and a summary table that includes each environmental impact, level of impact, and all applicable mitigation measures.

**Section 2.0: Introduction and Environmental Setting** provides information on the background of the proposed Project, the environmental review process, and organization of the Draft EIR, and describes the existing physical setting of the proposed Project and the surrounding area.

**Section 3.0: Description of the Proposed Project** presents a description of the proposed Project that addresses its location, the objectives, and the approvals being requested from the City.

**Section 4.0: Environmental Impact Analysis** contains information and analysis of the potential for the proposed Project to result in significant environmental effects for each of the following topics evaluated in this Draft EIR:

- **Section 4.1: Aesthetics**
- **Section 4.2: Air Quality**
- **Section 4.3: Biological Resources**
- **Section 4.4: Cultural Resources**
- **Section 4.5: Energy Resources**
- **Section 4.6: Geology and Soils**
- **Section 4.7: Greenhouse Gas Emissions**
- **Section 4.8: Hazards and Hazardous Materials**
- **Section 4.9: Land Use and Planning**
- **Section 4.10: Noise and Vibration**
- **Section 4.11: Population, Employment, and Housing**
- **Section 4.12: Transportation**
- **Section 4.13: Tribal Cultural Resources**
- **Section 4.14: Utilities and Service Systems**

**Section 5.0: Alternatives** discusses alternatives to the proposed Project that have been developed and analyzed to provide additional information on ways to avoid or lessen the impacts of the proposed Project. The alternatives include the “No Project Alternative” as required by the CEQA Guidelines along with other alternatives.

**Section 6.0: Other Environmental Considerations** is divided into five subsections.

- **Section 6.1: Introduction;**
- **Section 6.2: Significant Unavoidable Impacts;**
- **Section 6.3: Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes** discusses the significant irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources associated with the implementation of the proposed Project;
- **Section 6.4: Effects Not Found to Be Significant** discusses the potential impacts of the proposed Project that were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in this Draft EIR; and
- **6.5: Growth Inducing Effects.**

**Section 7.0: List of Preparers, Organizations and Persons Consulted, and Parties to Whom Sent** lists persons involved in the preparation of this Draft EIR or who contributed information incorporated into this Draft EIR and parties to whom this Draft EIR was sent.

**Section 8.0: List of Terms, Definitions, and Acronyms** includes specifically defined term, definitions, and acronyms used throughout this Draft EIR.

**Section 9.0: List of References** includes the principal documents, reports, maps, and other information sources referenced in this Draft EIR.

**Appendices** to this Draft EIR include technical information and other materials prepared for this EIR and the City's environmental review of the proposed Project.

## **2.4 PUBLIC REVIEW OF THE DRAFT EIR**

The Draft EIR is available for public review and comment beginning December 18, 2020 and concluding at 5 PM on February 1, 2020. The Draft EIR can be accessed at the following locations:

- City of Inglewood website at:

<https://www.cityofinglewood.org/1016/Environmental-Documents>

During the review and comment period, written comments (including email) regarding the Draft EIR may be submitted to Ms. Mindy Wilcox, AICP, Planning Manager, at the following:

By mail:

City of Inglewood  
Planning Division  
One W. Manchester Boulevard, 4th Floor  
Inglewood, CA 90301

By email: [inglewoodtransitconnector@cityofinglewood.org](mailto:inglewoodtransitconnector@cityofinglewood.org)