

APPENDIX I-1

ERRATUM TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA FLOWER MARKET PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

This Erratum makes minor technical corrections and clarifications to the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Southern California Flower Market Project (Project). These EIR modifications clarify and refine the EIR and provide supplemental information to the City decision-makers and the public. CEQA requires recirculation of a Draft EIR only when "significant new information" is added to a Draft EIR after public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR has occurred (refer to California Public Resources Code Section 21092.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5), but before the EIR is certified. Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines specifically states:

New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. "Significant new information" requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.*
- A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted to reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.*
- A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.*
- The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.*

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 also provides that "[r]ecirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR [...] A decision not to recirculate an EIR must be supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record."

The information added pursuant to this Erratum does not disclose a new significant environmental impact that would result from the Project or from a new mitigation measure or substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact. Nor does it contain significant new information that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect that the Applicant has declined to adopt. Additionally, information provided in this Erratum does not

present a feasible Project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed in the EIR. All of the information added pursuant to this Erratum merely clarifies, corrects, adds to, or makes insignificant modifications to information in the EIR. The City has reviewed the information in this Erratum and has determined that it does not change any of the basic findings or conclusions of the EIR, does not constitute "significant new information" pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, and does not require recirculation of the EIR.

Minor Corrections and Additions

Clarification to Project Description

Following publication of the Final EIR, a discrepancy was found pertaining to the description of the Event Space floor area identified in the Project Description of the Draft EIR, and the actual floor area shown on the Project Plans. The total physical area of Event Space proposed, including both interior and exterior areas, is depicted on Sheets A3.40 and A3.50 of the Project Plans, dated July 25, 2019, as 21,295 square feet. The breakdown of these areas is shown in Table 1 below and should be added to Draft EIR page 2-2, in the "Project Overview" Subsection.

Table 1
Event Space Calculation Summary

Location	Space	Size
Fourth Floor	Event Space (Interior)	5,660 square feet
	Event Space Open Terrace	9,485 square feet
Fifth Floor	Event Space Terrace	6,150 square feet
Total		21,295 square feet

It should be noted that the proposed area of Event Space has not physically changed since the publication of the Final EIR, but was incorrectly described as 10,226 square feet, which per the "Floor Area Breakdown" on the Project Plans, dated July 25, 2019, is comprised of 5,660 square feet interior and 1,040 square feet of exterior covered Event Space, and 3,566 square feet of Lobbies/Other Interior Area. Updating the Event Space area from 10,226 square feet to 21,295 square feet serves to more accurately describe the area of use rather than the area included for the purposes of calculating building floor area, as defined by the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety (LADBS). In addition, the EIR analyzed a maximum of 125 attendees for any event held in the event space. This number of attendees was not based on the square footage of the event space, but rather, was provided by the Project Applicant as the maximum number of attendees that would be permitted for the type of small, more intimate special events that would be held within the Project. Thus, the maximum number of attendees (125) would not change based on the clarification of the event space square footage. Further, the EIR assumed a maximum of 28 employees to service the special events, and that number of employees would not change based on the clarification of the event space square footage. However, as portions of the Draft EIR (such as the Project Description and Section 4.N, Utilities and Service Systems) analyzed the Project as including 10,226 square feet of Event Space, an analysis of this revision is provided below.

Addition of Clarifying Language to Mitigation Measure E-1

In addition to the above clarification, the following additions shall be made to EIR Mitigation Measure E-1, in order to clarify the role of LADBS, Grading Division, in reviewing and approving the Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Geocon West, Inc. Additions are provided in **bold**.

- E-1** The Project shall comply with the recommendations found on pages 10 through 41 of the Geotechnical Investigation, Southern California Flower Mart Proposed Mixed-Use Development, 747 & 755 South Wall Street, Los Angeles, California, prepared by Geocon West, Inc., July 2016 (included as Appendix G to the Draft EIR), **and as may be amended and supplemented** to the satisfaction of the Department of Building and Safety, **Grading Division**.

These clarifications and additions do not alter the conclusions of the EIR, as is presented in the analysis below.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**1. Aesthetics**

No changes are proposed to the Project design or the types of land uses included in the Project, and only minor changes are proposed with respect to the description of the event space square footage included in the Project. Therefore, the impacts with respect to aesthetics would remain unchanged from the EIR.

2. Air Quality

As stated below under Subsection 11, Transportation/Traffic, the Project's estimated trip generation for the proposed event space is based on the maximum number of event attendees (125 attendees), and is not based on the square footage of this use. As stated above, the maximum number of event attendees would remain at 125 people, and would not change based on the clarification of the event space square footage. Therefore, the clarification of the event space square footage would not result in any changes to the number of vehicle trips generated by the Project. As no additional vehicle trips would be generated, the impacts with respect to air quality would remain unchanged from what was analyzed in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

3. Cultural Resources

The conditions that could affect impacts to cultural resources would remain unchanged with the clarification of the event space square footage. There are no historic buildings located on the Project Site, and there are no changes to the proposed construction footprint or amount of excavation. Therefore, the potential to encounter archaeological resources, paleontological resources, or human remains would be the same as disclosed in the EIR, and the impacts with respect to cultural resources would remain unchanged.

4. Geology and Soils

The conditions that could affect impacts to geology and soils would remain unchanged from the analysis provided in the EIR. Neither the clarification of the event space square footage, nor the clarification of Mitigation Measure E-1, change the existing geologic conditions of the Project Site,

or the engineering and excavations plans for the development. Therefore, the geology and soils impacts would remain unchanged.

5. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As stated below under Subsection 11, Transportation/Traffic, the Project's estimated trip generation for the proposed event space is based on the maximum number of event attendees (125 attendees), and is not based on the square footage of this use. As stated above, the maximum number of event attendees would remain at 125 people, and would not change based on the clarification of the event space square footage. Therefore, the description of the event space square footage would not result in any changes to the number of vehicle trips generated by the Project. As no additional vehicle trips would be generated, the impacts with respect to greenhouse gas emissions would remain unchanged from what was analyzed in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

6. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The conditions that could affect impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would remain unchanged from the analysis provided in the EIR. The Project would continue to be constructed on the same site as analyzed in the EIR, and the same type of land uses are proposed. As discussed in the EIR, the Project would only involve the limited use of hazardous materials, such as small quantities of cleaning solvents, paints, and pesticides for landscaping. These substances would be used and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations, and therefore, impacts would be less than significant. As such, impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials would remain unchanged from the EIR.

7. Land Use and Planning

No changes are proposed to the types of land uses included in the Project, and only minor changes are proposed with respect to the description of the event space square footage included in the Project. In addition, no new or different discretionary actions are requested based on the clarification of the event space square footage calculation. As such, the land use and planning impacts would remain unchanged from the EIR.

8. Noise

As stated below under Subsection 11, Transportation/Traffic, the Project's estimated trip generation for the proposed event space is based on the maximum number of event attendees (125 attendees), and is not based on the square footage of this use. As stated above, the maximum number of event attendees would remain at 125 people, and would not change based on the clarification of the event space square footage. Therefore, the change in the description of the event space square footage would not result in any changes to the number of vehicle trips generated by the Project. As no additional vehicle trips would be generated, no additional traffic noise would be generated as a result of the Project.

Noise attributable to special events in the enclosed and outdoor event space could include three sources:

- Kitchen- and dining-related activity. The event facility includes a small kitchen and bar area, where guests could access food and beverages. Any noise associated with dining-related activities would generally be confined to the enclosed event space. Any ventilation from any food preparation would have to comply with LAMC Section 112.02(a) which

governs noise from mechanical equipment. This noise would be inaudible at the nearest sensitive receptors with a line of sight, the closest of which the Santee Court Apartments, located 240 feet north of the Project Site. Any noise from the enclosed facility would be another 60 feet away, given the event facility's setback from the edge of the building. In addition, the only doors and windows proposed for the enclosed space are along the south elevation of this event facility, further limiting any possible transmission of noise beyond the enclosed building.

- **Amplified music.** The event facility could include acoustic or amplified music that would be confined to the enclosed event space. Any entertainment-related noise would have to comply with LAMC Section 112.01 which governs these types of sources. Any interior noise would be inaudible at the nearest sensitive receptors with a line of sight, the closest of which the Santee Court Apartments, located 240 feet north of the Project Site. Any noise from the enclosed facility would be another 60 feet away, given the event facility's setback from the edge of the building. In addition, the only doors and windows proposed for the enclosed space are along the south elevation of this event facility, further limiting any possible transmission of noise beyond the enclosed building.
- **Human conversation.** The event facility includes open terraces on the fourth and fifth floors, where socializing could occur. These outdoor spaces represent gathering places for outdoor activities that are both private and group oriented. These would be intermittent activities that would produce negligible impacts from human speech, based in large part on the Lombard effect. This phenomenon recognizes that voice noise levels in face-to-face conversations generally increase proportionally to background ambient noise levels, but only up to approximately 67 dBA at a reference distance of one meter. Specifically, vocal intensity increases about 0.38 dB for every 1.0 dB increase in noise levels above 55 dB, meaning people talk slightly above ambient noise levels in order to communicate.¹ Even assuming a worst-case scenario, where up to 67 dBA of human noise is generated over an ambient noise level as low as 50.8 dBA L_{eq} at the open terrace (existing ambient noise levels at the Santee Court Apartments), human conversations from rooftop activities could generate about a 0.3 dBA L_{eq} increase at the nearest sensitive receptors at the Santee Court Apartments. Because the threshold of audibility for humans is 3 dBA, this impact would be inaudible and far below the City's thresholds of significance for operational noise impacts. Any attenuation from solid railing, roof edges, and safety barriers around these open terraces would further mitigate any noise transmission.

If activities were to occur during the evening from 7:00 P.M. to 10:00 P.M., any CNEL adjustment of 5 dBA to account for human sensitivities would result in a 1.0 dBA L_{eq} increase in ambient noise levels at the nearest receptor. If any outdoor activities were to occur after 10:00 P.M., a CNEL adjustment of 10 dBA would to 10:00 P.M., any CNEL adjustment of 5 dBA to account for human sensitivities would result in a 2.5 dBA L_{eq} increase in ambient noise levels at the nearest receptor, an impact that is inaudible and below the City's thresholds of significance.

Therefore, the impacts with respect to noise would remain unchanged from what was analyzed in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

¹ *Acoustical Society of America, Volume 134; Evidence that the Lombard effect is frequency-specific in humans, Stowe and Golob, July 2013.*

9. Population and Housing

The clarification of the event space square footage would not result in any changes to the population generated by the Project, or the number of housing units included in the Project. In addition, as stated above, the maximum number of event attendees would remain at 125 people, and would not change based on the clarification of the event space square footage. Therefore, the number of employees needed to serve the event space would also remain unchanged from what was analyzed in the EIR. As no changes are proposed with respect to any other uses contained in the Project, the number of employees for the other uses would also remain unchanged from the analysis contained in the EIR. Therefore, the impacts with respect to population and housing would be less than significant, and no new impacts would occur as a result of the clarification of the event space square footage.

10. Public Services

Fire

As discussed above under Subsection 9, Population and Housing, neither the population nor the number of employees generated by the Project would change based on the clarification of the event space square footage. As such, there would be no additional need for fire protection beyond what was analyzed in the EIR. Therefore, the impacts with respect to fire protection would remain unchanged from the analysis contained in the EIR.

Police

As discussed above under Subsection 9, Population and Housing, neither the population nor the number of employees generated by the Project would change based on the clarification of the event space square footage. As such, there would be no additional need for police protection beyond what was analyzed in the EIR. Therefore, the impacts with respect to police protection would remain unchanged from the analysis contained in the EIR.

Schools

As discussed above under Subsection 9, Population and Housing, neither the population nor the number of employees generated by the Project would change based on the clarification of the event space square footage. As such, there would be no additional students generated by the Project beyond what was analyzed in the EIR. Therefore, the impacts with respect to schools would remain unchanged from the analysis contained in the EIR.

Parks

As discussed above under Subsection 9, Population and Housing, neither the population nor the number of employees generated by the Project would change based on the clarification of the event space square footage. As such, there would be no additional demand for parks and recreational facilities beyond what was analyzed in the EIR. Therefore, the impacts with respect to parks would remain unchanged from the analysis contained in the EIR.

Libraries

As discussed above under Subsection 9, Population and Housing, neither the population nor the number of employees generated by the Project would change based on the clarification of the

event space square footage. As such, there would be no additional demand for library facilities beyond what was analyzed in the EIR. Therefore, the impacts with respect to libraries would remain unchanged from the analysis contained in the EIR.

11. Transportation/Traffic

The analysis of Project traffic impacts contained in the EIR and in the approved traffic study (contained in Draft EIR Appendix K-1) is not based on the event space square footage. Instead, the Project's estimated trip generation for the proposed event space is based on the maximum number of event attendees, or in this case, 125 attendees. As stated above, the maximum number of event attendees would remain at 125 people and the maximum number of employees servicing the special events would remain at 28 people; neither figure would change based on the clarification of the event space square footage. Therefore, the clarification of the event space square footage would not result in any changes to the traffic impacts previously disclosed in the EIR, as confirmed by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) in an email dated July 26, 2019. Therefore, impacts with respect to traffic would be less than significant, and no new impacts would occur as a result of the clarification of the event space square footage.

12. Tribal Cultural Resources

The conditions that could affect impacts to tribal cultural resources would remain unchanged with the clarification of the event space floor area. There are no changes to the proposed construction footprint or amount of excavation. Therefore, the potential to encounter tribal cultural resources would be the same as disclosed in the EIR, and the impacts with respect to tribal cultural resources would remain unchanged.

13. Utilities and Service Systems

Wastewater

As shown in Table 2, below, with the clarification of the event space square footage, the Project would result in an increase of 82,808 gallons of wastewater per day, as compared to existing conditions. This is a nominal increase of 3,321 gallons per day compared to the analysis provided in the EIR. The Hyperion Treatment Plant would have capacity to treat the additional wastewater generated by the Project. Further, as stated in the EIR, detailed gauging and evaluation as part of the City's permit process would identify a specific sewer connection point. If the public sewer has insufficient capacity, then the Applicant would be required to build sewer lines to a point in the sewer system with sufficient capacity. Therefore, the impacts with respect to wastewater would be less than significant, and no new impacts would occur as a result of the clarification of the event space square footage.

Table 2
Estimated Wastewater Generation

Land Use	Size	Wastewater Generation Rates	Total (gpd)
Proposed			
Residential – 2-Bedroom ^a	323 units	190 gallons / unit	61,370
Office	64,363 sf	120 gallons / 1,000 sf	7,724
Retail	4,385 sf	25 gallons / 1,000 sf	110

Table 2
Estimated Wastewater Generation

Land Use	Size	Wastewater Generation Rates	Total (gpd)
Restaurant	13,420 sf	300 gallons/ 1,000 sf	4,026
Wholesale retail/storage/cooler	63,785 sf	50 gallons / 1,000 sf	3,189
Event Space	21,295 sf	300 gallons/ 1,000 sf	6,389
Total			82,808
<i>Note: sf = square feet; gpd = gallons per day</i> <i>^a All 323 residential units are designed as open live/work units with no separate bedrooms. Therefore, in order to present a conservative estimate of impacts, the 2-bedroom rate has been used for all units.</i> <i>Source: Correspondence from Ali Poosti, Division Manager, Wastewater Engineering Services Division, Bureau of Sanitation, June 23, 2017.</i> <i>City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide, 2006, Exhibit M.2-12 Sewage Generation Factors.</i>			

Water

As shown in Table 3, below, with the clarification of the event space square footage, the Project would result in an increased demand of 87,413 gallons of water per day, as compared to existing conditions. This is a nominal increase of 4,250 gallons per day compared to the analysis provided in the EIR. As stated in the EIR, LADWP would be able to supply the water needed for the Project (including the increased amount based on the revised event space square footage), and impacts would therefore be less than significant and no new impacts would occur as a result of the clarification of the event space square footage.

Table 3
Estimated Water Demand

Land Use	Size	Water Demand Rates	Total (gpd)
Proposed			
Residential – 2-Bedroom ^a	323 units	192 gallons / unit	62,016
Office	64,363 sf	153.6 gallons / 1,000 sf	9,886
Retail	4,385 sf	32 gallons / 1,000 sf	140
Restaurant	13,420 sf	384 gallons / 1,000 sf	5,153
Wholesale retail/storage/cooler	63,785 sf	32 gallons / 1,000 sf	2,041
Event Space	21,295 sf	384 gallons / 1,000 sf	8,177
Total			87,413
<i>Note: sf = square feet; gpd = gallons per day</i> <i>Water consumption rates are assumed as 128 percent (nonresidential) and 118 percent (residential) of the wastewater generation rates.</i> <i>Source: Correspondence from Ali Poosti, Division Manager, Wastewater Engineering Services Division, Bureau of Sanitation, June 23, 2017.</i> <i>City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide, 2006, Exhibit M.2-12 Sewage Generation Factors.</i> <i>^a All 323 residential units are designed as open live/work units with no separate bedrooms. Therefore, in order to present a conservative estimate of impacts, the 2-bedroom rate has been used for all units.</i>			

Solid Waste

As shown in Table 4, below, with the clarification of the event space square footage, the Project would result in an increase of 4,850 pounds of solid waste per day, as compared to existing conditions. This is a nominal increase of 55 pounds per day compared to the analysis provided in the EIR. As stated in the EIR, the Sunshine Canyon Landfill would have adequate capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste (including the increased amount based on the revised event space square footage), and impacts would therefore be less than significant and no new impacts would occur as a result of the clarification of the event space square footage.

Table 4
Estimated Solid Waste Generation

Land Use	Size	Solid Waste Generation Rates	Total (pounds)
Proposed			
Residential	323 units	12.23 lbs/day/du	3,950
Office	64,363 sf	6 lbs/day/1,000 sf	386
Retail	4,385 sf	5 lbs/day/1,000 sf	22
Restaurant	13,420 sf	5 lbs/day/1,000 sf	67
Wholesale retail/storage/cooler	63,785 sf	5 lbs/day/1,000 sf	319
Event Space	21,295 sf	5 lbs/day/1,000 sf	106
Total			4,850
Note: sf = square feet Rates: CalRecycle Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates: http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/wastechar/wastegenrates/			

Energy Conservation

As shown in Table 5, below, with the clarification of the event space square footage, the Project would result in an increased demand of 4,083,570 kilowatt hours per year of electricity, as compared to existing conditions. As stated in the EIR, the Project's electricity consumption (including based on the revised square footage calculation) would represent approximately 0.02 percent of the forecasted 2022-2023 electricity demand. Impacts would therefore be less than significant and no new impacts would occur with respect to electricity as a result of the clarification of the event space square footage.

As shown in Table 6, below, with the clarification of the event space square footage, the Project would result in an increased demand of 1,780,734 cubic feet of natural gas per month, as compared to existing conditions. As stated in the EIR, the Project's natural gas consumption (including based on the revised square footage calculation) would represent approximately 0.002 percent of the peak 2022 natural gas demand. Impacts would therefore be less than significant and no new impacts would occur with respect to natural gas as a result of the clarification of event space square footage.

Table 5
Estimated Electricity Demand

Land Use	Size	Electricity Rates	Total (kw-h/yr)
Residential	323 du	5,626.50 kw-h/du/yr	1,817,360
Commercial	167,248 sf	13.55 kw-h/sf/yr	2,266,210
Total			4,083,570
<i>du = dwelling unit sf = square feet kw-h = kilowatt-hour yr = year</i> <i>Source: SCAQMD Air Quality Handbook, 1993, Table A9-11-A Electricity Usage Rate</i> <i>LADWP does not provide or comment on generation rates to provide an estimate of demand.</i>			

Table 6
Estimated Natural Gas Demand

Land Use	Size	Natural Gas Demand Rates	Total (cf/mo)
Proposed			
Residential	323 du	4,011.5 cf / du	1,295,715
Commercial	167,248 sf	2.9 cf / sf	485,019
Total			1,780,734
<i>sf = square feet; cf = cubic feet; mo = month</i> <i>Source: SCAQMD Air Quality Handbook, 1993, Appendix 9, Table A9-12-A, Natural Gas Usage Rate</i> <i>The SCG does not provide or comment on generation rates to provide an estimate of demand. In addition, the Los Angeles City Planning Department has consistently accepted use of the SCAQMD rates in its EIRs.</i>			

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis presented above, the edits and additions to the EIR set forth in this Erratum do not result in any of the conditions set forth in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines requiring recirculation of the Draft EIR. Specifically, the Project would not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in an impact already identified in the Draft EIR, nor does this Erratum disclose a feasible alternative or mitigation measure the Applicant has declined to adopt. The analysis provided above demonstrates that all of the impacts previously examined in the EIR would remain unchanged with the clarification of the event space square footage, and clarification of Mitigation Measure E-1.

ERRATUM NO. 2 TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA FLOWER MARKET PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

This Erratum makes minor technical corrections and clarifications to the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Southern California Flower Market Project (Project). These EIR modifications clarify and refine the EIR and provide supplemental information to the City decision-makers and the public. CEQA requires recirculation of a Draft EIR only when "significant new information" is added to a Draft EIR after public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR has occurred (refer to California Public Resources Code Section 21092.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5), but before the EIR is certified. Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines specifically states:

New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. "Significant new information" requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.*
- A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted to reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.*
- A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.*
- The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.*

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 also provides that "[r]ecirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR [...] A decision not to recirculate an EIR must be supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record."

The information added pursuant to this Erratum does not disclose a new significant environmental impact that would result from the Project or from a new mitigation measure or substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact. Nor does it contain significant new information that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect that the Applicant has declined to adopt. Additionally, information provided in this Erratum does not

present a feasible Project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed in the EIR. All of the information added pursuant to this Erratum merely clarifies, corrects, adds to, or makes insignificant modifications to information in the EIR. The City has reviewed the information in this Erratum and has determined that it does not change any of the basic findings or conclusions of the EIR, does not constitute "significant new information" pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, and does not require recirculation of the EIR.

Minor Corrections and Additions

Addition of Clarifying Language to Project Design Feature L-1

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) sent a comment letter to the Final EIR on May 8, 2019 outlining recommendations germane to Metro's responsibilities regarding regional transportation. These recommendations are addressed through the addition of clarifying language to Project Design Feature L-1, which details the Construction Traffic Management Plan for the Project, requiring coordination with Metro and other public transit agencies. This coordination will ensure that disruptions to the existing transit network are minimized.

The following addition shall be made to EIR Project Design Feature L-1, in order to clarify the role of the Construction Traffic Management Plan in coordinating with public transit agencies. Additions are provided in **bold, underlined**.

L-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan. A detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan, including street closure information, detour plans, haul routes, and staging plans would be prepared and submitted to the City, including its Department of Transportation, for review and approval. The Construction Traffic Management Plan would formalize how construction would be carried out and identify specific actions that would be required to reduce effects on the surrounding community. The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be based on the nature and timing of specific construction activities and other projects in the vicinity, and will include the following elements as appropriate:

- Providing for temporary traffic control during all construction activities within public rights-of-way to improve traffic flow on public roadways (e.g., flagmen);
- Scheduling of construction activities to reduce the effect on traffic flow on surrounding arterial streets;
- **Coordinate with public transit agencies, including LADOT and Metro, to provide advanced notifications of any temporary transit stop relocations, to ensure continued access to the bus stop directly adjacent to the site on 7th Street and Maple Avenue, and to follow all safety-required procedures required by the concerned agency;**
- Rerouting construction trucks to reduce travel on congested streets to the extent feasible;

- Prohibiting construction-related vehicles from parking on surrounding public streets;
- Providing safety precautions for pedestrians and bicyclists through such measures as alternate routing and protection barriers;
- Accommodating all equipment on-site; and
- Obtaining the required permits for truck haul routes from the City prior to issuance of any permit for the Project.
- Providing off-site truck staging in a legal area furnished by the construction truck contractor. Haul trucks would be radioed in from the off-site staging area to minimize queuing along streets in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site.
- Ensuring that access will remain unobstructed for land uses in proximity to the Project Site during Project construction.

Enforcement Agency: City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation; Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Monitoring Agency: City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation; Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Monitoring Phase: Pre-construction; construction

Monitoring Frequency: Once at Project plan check; periodic field inspection

Action Indicating Compliance: Plan approval; field inspection sign-off

These clarifications and additions do not alter the conclusions of the EIR, as is presented in the analysis below.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

1. Aesthetics

No changes are proposed to the Project design or the types of land uses included in the Project, and only a change is proposed with respect to the Construction Traffic Management Plan. Therefore, the impacts with respect to aesthetics would remain unchanged from the EIR.

2. Air Quality

The conditions that could affect impacts to air quality would remain unchanged with the change proposed with respect to the Construction Traffic Management Plan. As no additional vehicle trips would be generated, the impacts with respect to air quality would remain unchanged from what was analyzed in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

3. Cultural Resources

The conditions that could affect impacts to cultural resources would remain unchanged with the change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan. There are no historic buildings located on the Project Site, and there are no changes to the proposed construction footprint or amount of excavation. Therefore, the potential to encounter archaeological resources, paleontological resources, or human remains would be the same as disclosed in the EIR, and the impacts with respect to cultural resources would remain unchanged.

4. Geology and Soils

The conditions that could affect impacts to geology and soils would remain unchanged from the analysis provided in the EIR. The change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan does not change the existing geologic conditions of the Project Site, or the engineering and excavations plans for the development. Therefore, the geology and soils impacts would remain unchanged.

5. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The conditions that could affect impacts to greenhouse gases would remain unchanged from the analysis provided in the EIR. Therefore, the change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan would not result in any changes to the number of vehicle trips generated by the Project. As no additional vehicle trips would be generated, the impacts with respect to greenhouse gas emissions would remain unchanged from what was analyzed in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

6. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The change in the Construction Traffic Management Plan would not change the conditions that could affect impacts to hazards and hazardous materials from the analysis provided in the EIR. The Project would continue to be constructed on the same site as analyzed in the EIR, and the same type of land uses are proposed. As discussed in the EIR, the Project would only involve the limited use of hazardous materials, such as small quantities of cleaning solvents, paints, and pesticides for landscaping. These substances would be used and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations, and therefore, impacts would be less than significant. As such, impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials would remain unchanged from the EIR.

7. Land Use and Planning

No changes are proposed to the types of land uses included in the Project, and only a minor changes is proposed with respect to the Project's Construction Traffic Management Plan. In addition, no new or different discretionary actions are requested based on the changes to the Construction Traffic Management Plan. As such, the land use and planning impacts would remain unchanged from the EIR.

8. Noise

The conditions that could affect impacts to noise would not be changed by the change in the Construction Traffic Management Plan. Therefore, the impacts with respect to noise would remain

unchanged from what was analyzed in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

9. Population and Housing

The change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan would not result in any changes to the population generated by the Project, or the number of housing units included in the Project. Therefore, the impacts with respect to population and housing would be less than significant, and no new impacts would occur as a result of the revised event space square footage description.

10. Public Services

Fire

The population generated by the Project would not change based on the change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan, and, therefore, the Project would not require the need for new or altered fire station facilities, and no new impacts with respect to fire protection would occur. Therefore, the impacts with respect to Fire Services would remain unchanged from what was analyzed in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

Police

The population generated by the Project would not change based on the change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan and, therefore, the Project would not require the need for new or altered police facilities, and no new impacts with respect to police protection would occur. Therefore, the impacts with respect to Police Services would remain unchanged from what was analyzed in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

Schools

The population generated by the Project would not change based on the change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan and, therefore, no new impacts to school facilities would occur. Further, as stated in the EIR, the Project would be required to pay school facilities fees pursuant to SB 50, which would be used to construct facilities. Mandatory compliance with the provisions of SB 50 is deemed to provide full and complete mitigation of school facilities impacts. Therefore, the impacts with respect to schools would be less than significant, and no new impacts would occur as a result of the minor change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Parks

The change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan does not change the number of residential dwelling units or residents at the Project Site, and therefore would not create an additional demand for parks or recreational facilities beyond what was analyzed in the EIR. The Project would comply with applicable LAMC requirements intended to reduce the increased demand for parks and recreational facilities by contributing funds to a City-controlled account to be used to acquire or develop new parkland in the local service area. Project features (public space, recreational facilities, and open space) and required payment of applicable fees would ensure Project impacts are less than significant. Therefore, the impacts with respect to parks

would be less than significant, and no new impacts would occur as a result of the minor change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Libraries

The population generated by the Project would not change based on the change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan. Therefore, the Project would not increase the demand for library services such that a new or physically altered library facility would be required. Therefore, the impacts with respect to libraries would be less than significant, and no new impacts would occur as a result of the minor change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan.

11. Transportation/Traffic

The change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan would ensure that construction-related impacts to transit facilities remain less than significant by clarifying the coordination required between the Project and Metro and other public transit agencies in the event of any temporary relocation of transit stops due to Project construction. No significant impact had been identified from any potential transit disruption, and this clarification is procedural in nature, not requiring any particular physical change to the Project. Thus, the conclusion of the EIR in this regard that impacts are less than significant does not change. Impacts to Congestion Management Program intersections, arterial segments, and freeway monitoring locations were all analyzed in the EIR and found to be less than significant. Conditions that could affect impacts to other aspects of transportation and traffic, such as traffic generated by the Project, would be unchanged from what was analyzed in the EIR. Therefore, impacts related to transportation and traffic would remain less than significant, and no new impacts would occur as a result of the minor change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan.

12. Tribal Cultural Resources

The conditions that could affect impacts to tribal cultural resources would remain unchanged with the change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan. There are no changes to the proposed construction footprint or amount of excavation. Therefore, the potential to encounter tribal cultural resources would be the same as disclosed in the EIR, and the impacts with respect to tribal cultural resources would remain unchanged.

13. Utilities and Service Systems

Wastewater

The conditions that could affect impacts to wastewater Systems would remain unchanged with the change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan. Further, as stated in the EIR, detailed gauging and evaluation as part of the City's permit process would identify a specific sewer connection point. If the public sewer has insufficient capacity, then the Applicant would be required to build sewer lines to a point in the sewer system with sufficient capacity. Therefore, the impacts with respect to wastewater would be less than significant, and no new impacts would occur as a result of the minor change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Water

The conditions that could affect impacts to water systems would remain unchanged with the change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan. As stated in the EIR, LADWP would be able to supply the water needed for the Project, and impacts would therefore be less than significant and no new impacts would occur as a result of the change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Solid Waste

The conditions that could affect impacts to solid waste disposal would remain unchanged with the change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan. As stated in the EIR, the Sunshine Canyon Landfill would have adequate capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste, and impacts would therefore be less than significant and no new impacts would occur as a result of the change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Energy Conservation

Project energy consumption, including both electricity and natural gas, would remain unchanged with the change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan. As stated in the EIR, the Project's electricity consumption would represent approximately 0.02 percent of the forecasted 2022-2023 electricity demand. Impacts would therefore be less than significant and no new impacts would occur with respect to electricity as a result of the change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan. Also as stated in the EIR, the Project's natural gas consumption would represent approximately 0.002 percent of the peak 2022 natural gas demand. Impacts would therefore be less than significant and no new impacts would occur with respect to natural gas as a result of the change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis presented above, the edits and additions to the EIR set forth in this Erratum do not result in any of the conditions set forth in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines requiring recirculation of the Draft EIR. Specifically, the Project would not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in an impact already identified in the Draft EIR, nor does this Erratum disclose a feasible alternative or mitigation measure the Applicant has declined to adopt. The analysis provided above demonstrates that all of the impacts previously examined in the EIR would remain unchanged with the change to the Construction Traffic Management Plan as included in the addition of clarifying language to Project Design Feature L-1.

ERRATUM NO. 3 TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA FLOWER MARKET PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

This Erratum makes minor technical corrections and clarifications to the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Southern California Flower Market Project (Project). These EIR modifications clarify and refine the EIR and provide supplemental information to the City decision-makers and the public. CEQA requires recirculation of a Draft EIR only when “significant new information” is added to a Draft EIR after public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR has occurred (refer to California Public Resources Code Section 21092.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5), but before the EIR is certified. Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines specifically states:

New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement. “Significant new information” requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- *A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.*
- *A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted to reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.*
- *A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.*
- *The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.*

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 also provides that “[r]ecirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR [...] A decision not to recirculate an EIR must be supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record.”

The information added pursuant to this Erratum does not disclose a new significant environmental impact that would result from the Project or from a new mitigation measure or substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact. Nor does it contain significant new information that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a significant impact of the Project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect that the Applicant has declined to adopt. Additionally, information provided in this Erratum does not present a feasible Project

alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed in the EIR. All of the information added pursuant to this Erratum merely clarifies, corrects, adds to, or makes insignificant modifications to information in the EIR. The City has reviewed the information in this Erratum and has determined that it does not change any of the basic findings or conclusions of the EIR, does not constitute “significant new information” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, and does not require recirculation of the EIR.

Minor Corrections and Additions

Additional Summary to Section 2, Project Description

The Draft EIR provides a complete and consistent description of the Project, including a description of the parking that would be part of the Project’s north building renovation and the ground floor and office uses that would be constructed on the northern portion of the Project Site up to 7th Street, between Maple Avenue and Wall Street. For background purposes, this Erratum provides a compiled summary of the uses on the north portion of the Project Site to show how the EIR described and evaluated all of the Project’s proposed uses, including the proposed uses on the northern portion of the Project Site.

As discussed on page 2-3 of the Draft EIR, in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP), a comment letter was received during the scoping process that stated concern about whether the Project would provide adequate parking, and if not, that this would potentially impact the availability of on-street parking in the neighborhood. A parking demand study was prepared for the Project (included as Appendix K of the Draft EIR), which showed that the parking demand generated by the existing Flower Market operations exceeds the amount of parking required by Code. Therefore, as stated on Draft EIR page 2-3, the Project proposes to provide parking consistent with the parking demand study, which resulted in providing parking uses on the northern portion of the Project Site along 7th Street, between Maple Avenue and Wall Street.¹ Accordingly, the Draft EIR provided a description of the Project that included the parking area that would be part of the Project’s north building renovation on the north portion of the Project Site. (Draft EIR, pp. 2-1 to 2-3; Draft EIR Figures 2-3, 2-5, 2-7, 2-9, 2-11, 2-13, 2-14, 2-15.)

As stated on page 2-1 of the Draft EIR, the “Applicant proposes to maintain and renovate the north building and its roof-top parking and demolish the south building in preparation of a new building, with one level of subterranean parking.” (Draft EIR, p. 2-1.) The Draft EIR further states that the Project proposes to provide parking consistent with a parking demand study (included as Appendix K to the Draft EIR) prepared in response to comments received during the scoping process for the EIR. The Project would provide approximately 681 vehicle parking spaces, which would be accommodated in a subterranean level in the new building and above-grade parking in both the new building and the existing north building. The subterranean parking would not be constructed on the north portion of the Project Site. Parking on the north portion of the Project Site would include four levels of parking attached to the north building, as shown on Draft EIR Figures 2-3, 2-5, 2-7, 2-9, and 2-11.

The ground floor restaurant and office uses along 7th Street would total approximately 5,710 square feet (2,000 square feet of restaurant uses and 3,710 square feet of office uses), and were

¹ As shown in the Draft EIR, ground floor office and restaurant uses will also be included on the northern portion of the Project Site in order to comply with the Downtown Design Guidelines. (Draft EIR, pp. 2-1 to 2-3; Draft EIR Figures 2-3, 2-5, 2-7, 2-9, 2-11, 2-13, 2-14, 2-15.)

provided in order to comply with the Downtown Design Guidelines. Additionally, these ground floor restaurant and office uses were accounted for in the total restaurant and office square footage numbers used throughout the Draft EIR, which are 13,420 square feet and 64,363 square feet, respectively.

The Draft EIR also shows that the north building's renovations would extend to the northern portion of the Project Site to 7th Street, between Maple Avenue and Wall Street. (See again Draft EIR Figures 2-3, 2-5, 2-7, 2-9, and 2-11.) Further describing the uses that will be included in the newly renovated portion of the north building, page 2-1 of the Draft EIR states that ground floor restaurant and office uses would also be provided along 7th Street and Wall Street. In addition, the Draft EIR provides more details of the renovations of the north building that would include new parking, restaurant, and office uses along 7th Street through the detailed renderings of the Project included in the Draft EIR. For example, the bottoms of Figures 2-13 and 2-14 in the Draft EIR show the proposed renovations of the north building from the East and West Elevations, showing the existing loading area of the north building with the proposed parking floors above. The bottom of Figure 2-15 in the Draft EIR similarly shows the north building's renovated parking area, with retail space facing 7th Street and floors of parking above.

The Draft EIR further describes the design of the Project, including the renovation of the north building, stating the "existing north building would be renovated and the façade would be covered by a flower-themed mural" and that "storefront glazing would be used for retail (flower market) and the restaurants along the sidewalk to enhance the pedestrian experience." (Draft EIR, p. 2-2.) With respect to access to the Project, the Draft EIR describes that "access to the Project would be provided by two two-way driveways on Maple Avenue (one serving subterranean parking to be provided below the new south building and one serving roof-top parking on the north building) and one two-way driveway on Wall Street (serving above-grade parking to be provided in the new south building)." (Draft EIR, p. 2-3).

The construction schedule contained on pages 2-5 and 2-6 of the Draft EIR also encompasses all proposed construction activities, including the construction of the new south building and renovations of the north building. The Draft EIR further explains that the "Flower Market would continue to operate in the existing north building during and after the redevelopment, with construction carefully phased, to avoid disruption of existing business operations." (Draft EIR, p. 2-1.)

Clarification to Section 4.C, Air Quality

Further analysis was conducted to confirm running emissions from haul trucks would remain less than significant, as concluded in the Draft EIR, should soils be exported to a more distant landfill than the landfill identified in the Draft EIR. The analysis contained in the Draft EIR (Section 4.C, Air Quality) assumed that all hauling would be directed to the closest available facility, the Manning Pit, and that it would be speculative for hauling to be sent to a more distant landfill. Based on that assumption, the EIR concluded that mitigated construction impacts were substantially below the SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds for VOC (38 of 75 lb/day), NO_x (40 of 100 lb/day), CO (171 of 550 lb/day), PM₁₀ (7 of 150 lb/day), and PM_{2.5} (4 of 55 lb/day) and air quality impacts related to hauling would be less than significant. As the Manning Pit is now closed, further analysis was performed assuming that all haul trips would travel to the Chiquita Canyon Landfill (approximately 40 miles one-way). (The further analysis is attached to the Erratum as Attachment 3.) The further analysis confirms that if all soils were transported to the

Chiquita Canyon Landfill, haul emission that occur off-site would not change the level of significance finding for regional emissions, and any increases in haul emissions would remain substantially below the SCAQMD's regional significance threshold, and less than significant. Impacts would remain less than significant, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Clarification to Section 4.E, Geology and Soils

The Project's Geotechnical Investigation (included as Appendix G to the Draft EIR) was prepared by Geocon West, Inc., in July of 2016 (2016 Geotechnical Investigation). As discussed above, the Project proposes to provide parking consistent with the parking demand study, which resulted in providing parking uses on the northern portion of the Project Site along 7th Street, between Maple Avenue and Wall Street.² The parking uses on the northern portion of the Project Site became part of the Project after the 2016 Geotechnical Investigation was prepared, but before the Draft EIR was circulated.

Based on the 2016 Geotechnical Investigation, the Draft EIR concluded that with implementation of Mitigation Measure E-1, the Project would result in either no impact or a less than significant impact with respect to all potential impacts related to geology and soils. (Draft EIR, Chapter 4.E.) Mitigation Measure E-1 as provided in the Draft EIR required the Project to comply with the requirements of the Geotechnical Investigation. Mitigation Measure E-1 was amended in the first Erratum to the Final EIR to require that the Project comply with the Geotechnical Investigation, as that Geotechnical Investigation "may be amended and supplemented to the satisfaction of the Department of Building and Safety, Grading Division." Pursuant to that mitigation measure, Geocon West, Inc., provided an updated geotechnical investigation on September 20, 2019 (2019 Geotechnical Investigation) to provide detailed recommendations related to the parking uses on the north portion of the Project Site along 7th Street that were added during the scoping process and reflected in the Draft EIR Project description. (A full copy of the 2019 Geotechnical Investigation is provided with this Erratum as Attachment 1.) The 2019 Geotechnical Investigation was based on the same site investigation that provided the basis for the 2016 Geotechnical Investigation. Based on the 2019 Geotechnical Investigation, Mitigation Measure E-1 is still the only mitigation measure required (and no new mitigation measures are required) for the Project's impacts to geology and soils to remain less than significant. Further, the Department of Building and Safety issued a Soils Report Approval Letter for the 2019 Geotechnical Investigation on October 17, 2019, as provided in Attachment 2 to this Erratum

The 2016 Geotechnical Investigation included as Appendix G to the Draft EIR included a site reconnaissance, field exploration, laboratory testing, and engineering analysis for the entirety of the Project Site, including the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site along 7th Street. Specifically, the Project Site was explored between June 20 and June 22, 2016, by excavating five 8-inch diameter borings utilizing a truck-mounted hollow-stem auger drilling machine. Two of the borings, Borings 4 and 5, were conducted in the northern portion of the Project Site along 7th Street. The borings were excavated to depths between approximately 30.5 and 50.5 feet below the existing ground surface. Percolation testing for the design of a stormwater infiltration system was performed in one boring, and laboratory tests were performed on selected soil samples obtained during the investigation to determine pertinent physical and chemical properties. The recommendations contained in the 2016 Geotechnical Investigation were based on analysis of

² As shown in the Draft EIR, ground floor office and restaurant uses will also be included on the northern portion of the Project Site in order to comply with the Downtown Design Guidelines. (Draft EIR, pp. 2-1 to 2-3; Draft EIR Figures 2-3, 2-5, 2-7, 2-9, 2-11, 2-13, 2-14, 2-15.)

the data obtained during the Site investigation, which included investigation of the northern portion of the Project Site along 7th Street.

While the 2016 Geotechnical Investigation included as Appendix G to the Draft EIR evaluated boring samples from the entirety of the Project Site, the 2016 Geotechnical Investigation stated that the Project Site includes an existing loading dock and parking area “which may be used for an undetermined future development” and “detailed recommendations for the future development can be provided under separate cover when information on the proposed development is available.” (2016 Geotechnical Investigation, page 2.) The 2016 Geotechnical Investigation also stated that “once the design phase and foundation loading configuration proceeds to a more finalized plan, the recommendations with this report should be reviewed and revised, if necessary.” (2016 Geotechnical Investigation, page 2). As such, the 2019 Geotechnical Investigation provides recommendations related to the uses on the north portion of the Project Site that were added during the scoping process. Because the 2016 Geotechnical Investigation included an investigation of the entire Project Site, the analysis contained in the 2019 Geotechnical Investigation relies on the site reconnaissance, field exploration, laboratory testing, and engineering analysis prepared for the 2016 Geotechnical Investigation. (2019 Geotechnical Investigation, page 1.)

The 2019 Geotechnical Investigation merely clarifies, adds to, and makes insignificant modifications to the 2016 Geotechnical Investigation. Specifically, the 2019 Geotechnical Investigation includes an updated Project description on page 2, which matches the Project description contained in Section 2 of the Draft EIR. The remainder of the description and analyses contained on pages 2 through 9 of the 2019 Geotechnical Investigation remains substantively the same as the 2016 Geotechnical Investigation, but with updated references to the 2016 California Building Code (CBC), in place of the 2013 CBC, and updated references to other sources, such as to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, which was updated by the California Geological Survey in 2019.

The 2019 Geotechnical Investigation also contains updated recommendations for the Project, including updated recommendations for the parking area on the northern portion of the Project Site along 7th Street (such as additional specificity regarding the foundation type for the Project), as well as updated recommendations based on references to the updated 2016 CBC to ensure the Project will comply with the most current building code standards. (2019 Geotechnical Investigation, pages 10 through 42.) For example, the updated recommendations state that it is anticipated that the tower core will be supported on a reinforced concrete mat foundation, and that elsewhere conventional spread footings may be used. (2019 Geotechnical Investigation, Recommendation 7.1.4, p. 10.) The updated recommendations also provide recommendations for the design of a conventional foundation system (2019 Geotechnical Investigation, Recommendations 7.4.8 and 7.4.9, p. 15). However, the majority of the recommendations provided in the 2019 Geotechnical Investigation remain unchanged from the 2016 Geotechnical Investigation.

Further, the conclusions contained on pages 2 through 9 of the 2019 Geotechnical Investigation remain unchanged from the conclusions provided in the 2016 Geotechnical Investigation. In addition, the 2019 Geotechnical Report reaches the same conclusion in the 2016 Geotechnical Report, stating that “It is our opinion that neither soil nor geologic conditions were encountered during the investigation that would preclude the construction of the proposed development

provided the recommendations presented herein are followed and implemented during design and construction.” (2019 Geotechnical Investigation, page 10.)

Pursuant to that amended mitigation measure, the 2019 Geotechnical Investigation merely updates the 2016 Geotechnical Investigation, and provides recommendations in accordance with the existing mitigation measure to reflect the parking area along the north portion of the Project Site along 7th Street and updates in the applicable Code provisions. The Project would continue to comply with Mitigation Measure E-1, and all Project impacts with respect to geology and soils would continue to be less than significant.

Revision to Mitigation Measure E-1

In addition to the above clarification, the following revisions shall be made to Mitigation Measure E-1, to reflect the preparation of the updated Geotechnical Investigation, prepared by Geocon West, Inc. Deletions are shown with ~~strike through~~ and additions are provided in **bolded underline**.

E-1 The Project shall comply with the recommendations found on pages 10 through **421** of the **Geotechnical Investigation, Southern California Flower Mart Proposed Mixed-Use Development, 747 & 755 South Wall Street, Los Angeles, California**, prepared by Geocon West, Inc., **September 2019** ~~July 2016~~ (included as **Attachment 1 to Erratum No. 3** ~~Appendix G to the Draft EIR~~), and as may be amended and supplemented to the satisfaction of the Department of Building and Safety, Grading Division.

Clarification to Section 4.1, Noise

The Draft EIR provided detailed construction noise impact analysis for four noise-sensitive receptors, which were chosen specifically for detailed construction noise analysis given their potential sensitivities to noise and their proximity to the Project Site. Those sensitive receptors included: (i) Santee Court Apartments located at 716 South Los Angeles Street; (ii) Ballington Plaza Apartments, located at 622 Wall street; (iii) Jardin de la Infancia school, located at 307 7th Street; and (iv) Start Apartments, located at 240 East 6th Street. The Draft EIR concluded that with implementation of mitigation measures, impacts of construction noise to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

To provide further confirmation that the Project's impacts related to construction noise would be less than significant to sensitive receptors near the Project Site, additional analysis was conducted to evaluate potential impacts of construction noise at the Textile Building Lofts, located at 315 E. 8th Street. (That additional analysis is provided in Attachment 4 to this Erratum.) The analysis concluded impacts to the Textile Building Lofts would be less than significant, and no new mitigation measures would be required. The Textile Building Lofts is located approximately 55 feet northwest of the Project, closer than the Santee Courts Apartment receptor that was analyzed in the Draft EIR. However, unlike Santee Court Apartments, Textile Building Lofts is located in a high-noise environment at the intersection of Maple Avenue and 8th Street, where Santee Court Apartments is located over 130 feet from any roadway.

Applying the same construction source assumptions that were used in the Draft EIR construction noise analysis, as well as implementation of Mitigation Measures I-1 and I-2, the Textile Building Lofts is projected to experience a construction-related noise increase of 1.3 dBA and would not

exceed the 5 dBA noise increase threshold. That increase also would not exceed any other noise impact that has previously been disclosed in the Draft EIR. As a result, the Project's construction-related noise impact to Textile Building Lofts would be less than significant with implementation of Draft EIR Mitigation Measures I-1 and I-2, and no new mitigation measures would be required. In addition, according to estimated vibration levels provided in Table 4.I-9 of the Draft EIR, as the distance between the Project Site and Textile Building Lofts is greater than 45 feet, the Textile Building Lofts would experience groundborne vibration levels less than 0.04 inches per second. The Textile Building Lofts would not be exposed to groundborne vibration levels in excess of any of the adopted threshold criteria listed in Draft EIR Table 4.I-3, the Project's construction-related groundborne vibration impact to Textile Building Lofts would be less than significant, and no new mitigation measures are required.

These clarifications and additions do not alter the conclusions of the EIR, as is presented in the analysis below.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

For clarity and full disclosure, this Erratum reviews each of the substantive impact areas to confirm there is no significant new information added to the EIR attributable to the additional summary to the project description, haul distance, additional analysis of a noise receptor, and clarifications to the geology and soils section (as summarized above), and all Project impacts as concluded in the Draft EIR will remain less than significant.

1. Aesthetics

As stated on page 4.B-2 of the Draft EIR, based on the Project's location in a transit priority area, the Project's impacts with respect to aesthetics would not be considered significant pursuant to SB 743 and City Zoning Information File No. 2452. Nevertheless, the Draft EIR provided an analysis of aesthetics for informational purposes only.

The subjects of this erratum are the updated geotechnical report, the refinement of the haul distance, additional analysis of a noise receptor, and the additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site, none of which would involve any changes to the Project design or the types of land uses included in the Project. As discussed on page 4.B-8 of the Draft EIR, "the Project's design is intended to reflect the nature of its existing uses. The existing north building would be renovated and the façade would be covered by a flower-themed mural." The paragraph goes on to state that "storefront glazing would be used for the retail (city market) and the restaurants along the sidewalk, to enhance the appearance of the stores, sustain street level interest, and promote pedestrian traffic." (Draft EIR, p. 4.B-8.) In addition, detailed renderings included in the Draft EIR provide more details of the renovations of the north building that would include new parking, restaurant, and office uses along 7th Street. For example, the bottoms of Figures 2-13 and 2-14 in the Draft EIR show the proposed renovations of the north building from the East and West Elevations, showing the existing loading area of the north building with the proposed parking floors above. The bottom of Figure 2-15 in the Draft EIR similarly shows the north building's renovated parking area, with retail space facing 7th Street and floors of parking above. Therefore, the impacts with respect to aesthetics would remain unchanged from the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

2. Air Quality

The conditions that could affect impacts with respect to air quality remain unchanged with the updated geotechnical report, the additional analysis of a noise receptor, and the additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site. The additional summary highlighting the parking area and ground uses on the north portion of the Project Site are consistent with the proposed construction footprint and amount of excavation that was evaluated in the Draft EIR. The clarifications also do not add any additional vehicle trips be generated.

For both regional and local construction emissions, the Draft EIR based its significance findings on the construction phases that would produce the most emissions impacts. For regional emissions, the most intense construction period is any concurrent grading and building construction for the south building due to the substantial amount of construction equipment that could be operating concurrently (Draft EIR, pp. 4.C-16 to 4.C-17). For localized construction emissions, the most intense period will be the grading and site preparation phases for the south building, primarily from vehicle exhaust and fugitive dust emissions from off-road construction vehicles (Draft EIR, pp. 4.C-16 to 4.C-17). With implementation of mitigation measures, regional construction emissions during those most intense periods would be less than significant (Draft EIR, p. 4.C-23). Renovations of the north building, including the parking area and restaurant/office uses along 7th Street, would not involve any construction activities that are more intense (i.e., produce more daily emissions on- or off-site) than the activities evaluated during the most intense construction phases. Therefore, the renovations of the north building (including the parking and restaurant/office uses along 7th Street) would not lead to significant air quality impacts.

Further, as described previously, the refinement of the haul distance to send all trips to the Chiquita Canyon Landfill would not change the significance finding for regional emissions, and any increases in haul emissions would still be substantially below the SCAQMD's regional significance threshold, and less than significant. As such, as concluded in the Draft EIR, the impacts with respect to air quality would be less than significant, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

3. Cultural Resources

The conditions that could affect impacts to cultural resources would remain unchanged with the updated geotechnical report, the refinement of the haul distance, the additional analysis of a noise receptor, and the additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site. There are no historic buildings located on the Project Site, and there are no changes to the proposed construction footprint or amount of excavation from what was contemplated in the Draft EIR. Therefore, the potential to encounter archaeological resources, paleontological resources, or human remains would be the same as disclosed in the EIR, and the impacts with respect to cultural resources would continue to be less than significant.

4. Geology and Soils

The refinement of the haul distance and additional analysis of a noise receptor would not affect impacts with respect to geology and soils. As described above, the 2019 Geotechnical Investigation relies on the site reconnaissance, field exploration, laboratory testing, and engineering analysis prepared for the entirety of the Project Site, contained 2016 Geotechnical Investigation, and merely updates the recommendations in accordance with Mitigation Measure

E-1 to reflect the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site along 7th Street. The Project would continue to comply with Mitigation Measure E-1, and therefore, all Project impacts related to geology and soils would continue to be less than significant.

5. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The conditions that could affect impacts to greenhouse gas emissions would remain unchanged from the analysis provided in the EIR. As stated below under Subsection 11, there would be no additional vehicle trips generated as a result of the updated geotechnical report, the refinement of the haul distance, additional analysis of a noise receptor, and the additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site. The Project's location, land use characteristics and design render it consistent with the statewide and regional climate change mandates, plans, policies, and recommendations, as well as the City's applicable plans, to reduce GHG emissions. Further, as all proposed uses have been accounted for within the Draft EIR, and as no additional vehicle trips would be generated, the impacts with respect to greenhouse gas emissions would remain unchanged from what was analyzed in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

6. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The conditions that could affect impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would remain unchanged from the analysis provided in the EIR. The Project would continue to be constructed on the same site as analyzed in the EIR, and the same type of land uses are proposed. As discussed in the EIR, the Project would only involve the limited use of hazardous materials, such as small quantities of cleaning solvents, paints, and pesticides for landscaping. These substances would be used and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations, and therefore, impacts would be less than significant. As such, impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials would remain unchanged from the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

7. Land Use and Planning

No changes are proposed to the types of land uses included in the Project, and no new or discretionary actions are requested as a result of the updated geotechnical report, the refinement of the haul distance, additional analysis of a noise receptor, and the additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site. As such, the land use and planning impacts would remain unchanged from the EIR.

8. Noise

As described in the Draft EIR, there are four sensitive receptors near the Project Site: (i) Santee Court Apartments located at 716 South Los Angeles Street; (ii) Ballington Plaza Apartments, located at 622 Wall street; (iii) Jardin de la Infancia school, located at 307 7th Street; and (iv) Start Apartments, located at 240 East 6th Street. Those sensitive receptors were selected for detailed construction noise analysis given their potential sensitivities to noise and their proximity to the Project Site. (Draft EIR, p. 4.I-9.) As described in the Draft EIR, the Project-to-receptor distances for the Ballington Plaza Apartments and Jardin de la Infancia School receptors were measured from the Project's north building, measuring 400 feet and 220 feet, respectively. The Draft EIR concluded construction noise impacts to those sensitive receptors would be less than significant without

mitigation. Implementation of Mitigation Measure I-2³ as evaluated in the EIR would reduce those impacts to even lower levels of significance.

Refinements were made to the distances used to model construction noise impacts to Ballington Plaza Apartments and Jardin de la Infancia School to confirm that potential noise impacts during construction would remain less than significant. Further analysis was conducted for those sensitive receptors because those are the sensitive receptors that could be affected by construction on the north portion of the Project Site along 7th Street. (The further analysis is attached to this Erratum as Attachment 5.) The further analysis confirms there is no significant new information related to noise and vibration impacts, and there is no need for new or additional mitigation measures for the Project's impacts related to noise and vibration remain less than significant.

With regard to construction vibration, the Draft EIR concluded that the Project's construction-related vibration levels at Sensation Flowers (709 Wall Street) could be significant without mitigation. To mitigate the potential groundborne vibration impact to Sensation Flowers, Mitigation Measure I-6⁴ was evaluated in the Project's EIR. Mitigation Measure I-6 would require that construction equipment and vehicles capable of generating excessive vibration levels maintain a setback of at least 7.5 feet from Sensation Flowers at all times. The construction distances from the Project Site to Sensation Flowers would not be affected by the construction of the north parking area on the northern portion of the Project Site along 7th Street. In addition, Mitigation Measure I-6 as evaluated in the Draft EIR would continue to apply to the Project's construction activities. As a result, the projected construction-related vibration impact to Sensation Flowers would not change, and this receptor would not experience groundborne vibration levels in excess of the significance threshold. Therefore, analysis of the renovations of the north building (including the parking and restaurant/office uses along 7th Street) will lead to the same conclusions as presented in the Draft EIR. Impacts related to construction vibration will be less than significant, and no new mitigation measures are required.

In addition, the updated noise and vibration analysis that considers the potential construction noise and vibration impacts to the Textile Lofts Building (Attachment 4) confirmed impacts would remain less than significant, and no new mitigation measures are required.

The updated geotechnical report and the refinement of the haul distance would not affect impacts with respect to noise. Therefore, impacts with respect to noise would remain unchanged from what was analyzed in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

³ Mitigation Measure I-2 requires the following: Temporary sound barriers capable of achieving a sound attenuation of at least 15 dBA shall be erected along the Project's boundaries facing Santee Court Apartments. Temporary sound barriers capable of achieving a sound attenuation of at least 6 dBA shall be erected along all other Project construction boundaries.

⁴ Mitigation Measure I-6 requires the following: Construction equipment and vehicles capable of generating excessive vibration levels including, but not limited to, excavators, loaders, backhoes, scrapers, and graders, shall maintain a setback of at least 7.5 feet from Sensation Flowers at all times.

9. Population and Housing

The subjects of this erratum are the updated geotechnical report, the refinement of the haul distance, additional analysis of a noise receptor, and the additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site, none of which would result in any changes to the population or number of employees generated by the Project, or the number of housing units included in the Project, as all proposed uses were accounted for in the EIR. Therefore, the impacts with respect to population and housing would remain unchanged from what was analyzed in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

10. Public Services

Fire

As discussed above under Subsection 9, Population and Housing, neither the population nor the number of employees generated by the Project would change based on the updated geotechnical report, the refinement of the haul distance, additional analysis of a noise receptor, or the additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site. As such, there would be no additional need for fire protection beyond what was analyzed in the EIR. Therefore, the impacts with respect to fire protection would remain unchanged from the analysis contained in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

Police

As discussed above under Subsection 9, Population and Housing, neither the population nor the number of employees generated by the Project would change based on the updated geotechnical report, the refinement of the haul distance, additional analysis of a noise receptor, or the additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site. As such, there would be no additional need for police protection beyond what was analyzed in the EIR. Therefore, the impacts with respect to police protection would remain unchanged from the analysis contained in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

Schools

As discussed above under Subsection 9, Population and Housing, neither the population nor the number of employees generated by the Project would change based on updated geotechnical report, the refinement of the haul distance, additional analysis of a noise receptor, or the additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site. As such, there would be no additional students generated by the Project beyond what was analyzed in the EIR. Further, as stated in the EIR, the Project would be required to pay school facilities fees pursuant to SB 50, which would be used to construct facilities. Mandatory compliance with the provisions of SB 50 is deemed to provide full and complete mitigation of school facilities impacts. Therefore, the impacts with respect to schools would remain unchanged from the analysis contained in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

Parks

As discussed above under Subsection 9, Population and Housing, neither the population nor the number of employees generated by the Project would change based on the updated geotechnical

report, the refinement of the haul distance, additional analysis of a noise receptor, or the additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site. As such, there would be no additional demand for parks and recreational facilities beyond what was analyzed in the EIR. Therefore, the impacts with respect to parks would remain unchanged from the analysis contained in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

Libraries

As discussed above under Subsection 9, Population and Housing, neither the population nor the number of employees generated by the Project would change based on the updated geotechnical report, the refinement of the haul distance, additional analysis of a noise receptor, or the additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site. As such, there would be no additional demand for library facilities beyond what was analyzed in the EIR. Therefore, the impacts with respect to libraries would remain unchanged from the analysis contained in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

11. Transportation/Traffic

The subjects of this erratum are the updated geotechnical report, the refinement of the haul distance, additional analysis of a noise receptor, and the additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site, none of which would result in any additional vehicle trips or any other changes with respect to transportation/traffic, as all proposed uses were accounted for in the EIR. As discussed, on Page 4L-15, two haul route options were analyzed in Section L, Transportation/Traffic. Option 1 assumed loaded truck trips would dispose of all construction demolition debris at the Chiquita Canyon Landfill and Option 2 assumed loaded truck trips would dispose of all construction demolition debris at the Manning Pit. As noted above, while the Manning Pit is no longer in operation, construction demolition debris would be disposed of at the Chiquita Canyon Landfill, which is operational. Therefore, the impacts with respect to transportation/traffic would remain unchanged from the analysis contained in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

12. Tribal Cultural Resources

The conditions that could affect impacts to tribal cultural resources would remain unchanged with the updated geotechnical report, the refinement of the haul distance, additional analysis of a noise receptor, and the additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site. There are no changes to the proposed construction footprint or amount of excavation from what was contemplated in the Draft EIR. Therefore, the potential to encounter tribal cultural resources would be the same as disclosed in the EIR, and the impacts with respect to tribal cultural resources would remain unchanged and would continue to be less than significant.

13. Utilities and Service Systems

Wastewater

The subjects of this erratum are the updated geotechnical report, the refinement of the haul distance, additional analysis of a noise receptor, and the additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site, none of which would affect impacts with respect to wastewater, as all proposed uses were accounted for in the EIR. Therefore, the impacts with

respect to wastewater would remain unchanged from what was analyzed in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

Water

The subjects of this erratum are the updated geotechnical report, the refinement of the haul distance, additional analysis of a noise receptor, and the additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site, none of which would affect impacts with respect to water, as all proposed uses were accounted for in the EIR. Therefore, the impacts with respect to water would remain unchanged from what was analyzed in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

Solid Waste

The subjects of this erratum are the updated geotechnical report, the refinement of the haul distance, additional analysis of a noise receptor, and the additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site, none of which would affect impacts with respect to solid waste, as all proposed uses were accounted for in the EIR. Therefore, the impacts with respect to solid waste would remain unchanged from what was analyzed in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

Energy Conservation

The subjects of this erratum are the updated geotechnical report, the refinement of the haul distance, additional analysis of a noise receptor, and the additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site, none of which would affect impacts with respect to either electricity or natural gas, as all proposed uses were accounted for in the EIR. Therefore, the impacts with respect to electricity and natural gas would remain unchanged from what was analyzed in the EIR, and impacts would continue to be less than significant.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis presented above, the edits and additions to the EIR set forth in this Erratum do not result in any of the conditions set forth in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines requiring recirculation of the Draft EIR. Specifically, the Project would not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in an impact already identified in the Draft EIR, nor does this Erratum disclose a feasible alternative or mitigation measure the Applicant has declined to adopt. Further, the Erratum does not identify any new mitigation measures that will be required to reduce the Project's impacts to less than significant levels. The analysis provided above demonstrates that all of the impacts previously examined in the EIR would remain unchanged with the updated geotechnical report, clarification of Mitigation Measure E-1, refinement of the haul distance, additional analysis of a noise receptor, and additional summary of the parking area on the north portion of the Project Site.