

# Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal

**Form F**

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH #: 2017051068

Project Title: Southern California Flower Market

Lead Agency: City of Los Angeles

Contact Name: Erin Strelch

Email: erin.strelch@lacity.org

Phone Number: 213-847-3626

Project Location: Los Angeles City and County

*City*

*County*

Project Description (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequences).

Project Location: 709-765 S. Wall St., 306-326 E. 7th St., and 750-752 S. Maple Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90014. The Project Site is currently improved with two buildings (the north and south building). The Project will maintain and renovate the Project Site's north building, but will demolish the south building and construct a new building in its place. The Project would include a new mixed-use development consisting of wholesale trade, retail, restaurant, office, and residential uses. The Project would include 323 residential units (including 10% of units set aside as affordable units for moderate income families), approximately 4,385 square feet of retail space, 64,363 square feet of office space, 63,785 square feet of wholesale space and storage, 13,420 square feet of restaurant space, and 21,295 square feet of event space. The existing north building would continue to operate as the Flower Market with offices on the second floor and an event space and terrace on the fourth floor. The new south building would include the new residential uses, as well as restaurants, a public paseo, retail uses, and additional wholesale flower space.

This Project was previously approved following the City's certification of the original EIR in November 2019. A lawsuit followed (discussed in more detail in the "areas of controversy" section below) that upheld the previously certified EIR in every respect, except for two deficiencies related to noise and GHG, outlined below. The court, however, found no deficiencies in the Project description. In connection with this Partially Recirculated DEIR (for noise and GHG only, referred to as the "PR-DEIR"), the Project applicant is not proposing any changes to the Project.

Identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

Based on the analysis included in the Revised EIR Sections, the Project would not result in any significant and unavoidable noise or GHG impacts. The original Draft EIR identified six mitigation measures to reduce impacts attributable to the Project's construction noise and vibration measures. Those mitigation measures were incorporated into a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). In accordance with CEQA Guideline 15126.4(a)(2), the MMRP is enforced by the City through conditions of approval in the Project Entitlements.

During the administrative proceedings leading up to the City Council's approval of the Project Entitlements in November 12, 2019, the City identified a type of construction noise barrier that would better ensure that construction noise is mitigated to a less-than significant level. That noise barrier can be moved around the Project Site in connection with heavy construction equipment during operation. Such a noise barrier further reduces construction noise, particularly to noise-sensitive receptors living in apartments at upper floors.

However, the Trial Court in the Lawsuit ruled that Measure I-2 was written in a manner that it was not clear whether movable sound barriers would be required. Accordingly, Measure I-2 has been revised to make it clear that (1) traditional sound barrier fencing will be erected along the perimeter of the Project Site and (2) movable sound barriers will also be used.

If applicable, describe any of the project's areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

On December 2019, the AIDS Healthcare Foundation (Plaintiff) filed the Lawsuit challenging the sufficiency of the EIR and the Project Entitlements under the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) (CEQA) and other state and local laws. Except for the two deficiencies discussed herein, the trial court denied all other claims alleged by the Plaintiff in its Complaint.

The Trial Court held that the EIR was deficient under CEQA as to the following two items:

1. The conclusion stated in the EIR that the Project will be consistent with the goal of reducing greenhouse gases ( " GHG ¶ ) by a certain amount by the year 2030 as set forth in a State law known as " SB 32 "(codified at California Health and Safety Code sections 38566 et seq.) was not supported by substantial evidence. (April 2021 Court Order, pp. 6-9.)
2. A measure identified in the EIR to mitigate noise impacts attributable to the construction of the Project was insufficiently worded so as to be vague as to the nature of that mitigation measure (MM I-2). (April 2021 Court Order, pp. 19-21.)

The PR-DEIR addresses these two issues.

Provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

none