

**CITY OF ROLLING HILLS ESTATES**

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

**RESOLUTION NO. 2496**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS ESTATES, CALIFORNIA, CERTIFYING THE ROLLING HILLS ESTATES 2040 GENERAL PLAN FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (SCH# 2021050450), ADOPTING THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, AND A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

The City Council of the City of Rolling Hills Estates resolves as follows:

SECTION 1. General Findings. The City Council finds as follows:

A. The City of Rolling Hills Estates, California ("City") is a municipal corporation, duly organized under the constitution and laws of the State of California.

B. California Government Code section 65300 and following requires each city to prepare and adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the city.

C. In March, 2017, the City initiated a multi-year process to comprehensively update the 1992 General Plan by approving a work plan and schedule, hiring consultants, and conducting public workshops, collectively known as the General Plan Update ("Project" or "2040 General Plan").

D. The Project consists of long-term planning policies and standards that will guide future development in the City and does not approve any specific developments, and is therefore appropriately covered by a program-level Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") pursuant to Section 15168 of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") Guidelines (as set forth in Title 14, California Code of Regulations).

E. In accordance with Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City released a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") for the Project to the Office of Planning and Research ("OPR") State Clearinghouse and interested agencies and persons on May 21, 2021 for a 30-day review period, during which interested agencies and the public could submit comments about the Project. On June 3, 2021, the City held a scoping meeting via teleconference, serving as a public forum to discuss the environmental issues identified for the EIR and any other issues identified by the public that should be included for further analysis within the EIR for the proposed Project. The public comment period for the NOP and Initial Study began on May 21, 2021 and ended on June 21, 2021. Comments on the NOP were received and considered during preparation of the Draft EIR.

F. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15087(a), a Notice of Availability ("NOA") was issued on October 22, 2021, and the Draft EIR for the Project was available for public review for a 45-day period, through December 6, 2021.

G. On November 9, 2021, the City Council and Planning Commission held a duly noticed joint special meeting to review the Draft EIR, take public comment and testimony, and provide input on the Draft EIR.

H. The City sent the Draft 2040 General Plan to affected public entities and agencies in compliance with state law (Government Code sections 65302(g)(7), 65302.5, 65302.7, 65352, 65352(a)(9) and Public Utilities Code section 21676, and in accordance with Government Code sections 65352.2 contacted California Native American tribes that are on the contact list maintained by the Native America Heritage Commission to invite those tribes to consult on the proposed Draft 2040 General Plan.

I. The City released the Public Review Draft 2021-2029 Housing Element in July 2021 and released the Public Review Draft 2040 General Plan, in its entirety in October 2021 and invited comments by the public from October 22, 2021 through January 10, 2022.

J. On December 6, 2021 the City's Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing by teleconference on the Draft EIR and the Draft 2040 General Plan, considered all written and oral reports of staff and public testimony on the matter, and such other matters are reflected in the record of this matter and continued the public hearing to January 10, 2022.

K. The comments on the Draft EIR have been considered and analyzed, the comments and responses to comments on the Draft EIR have been incorporated in the Final EIR ("FEIR") in

accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

L. On January 7, 2022, the City published the FEIR.

M. The comments on the Draft 2040 General Plan received from the public were presented and revisions proposed, for the Planning Commission's consideration as described in the January 10, 2022 Planning Commission staff report and recommended for incorporation into the document presented.

N. All required public notices and public hearings were duly given and held according to law. After notice having been lawfully given, a duly noticed public hearing was held before the Planning Commission on January 10, 2022, by teleconference, at which all persons interested had the opportunity to appear and comment and at which the Planning Commission considered and made recommendations to the City Council regarding the FEIR and the merits of the Project.

O. On January 10, 2022, after closing the public hearing, the Planning Commission, acting on its independent judgement and analysis, voted affirmatively to recommend certification of the FEIR (SCH # 2021050450) by the City Council pursuant to CEQA, and adopt the 2040 General Plan, by adopting Resolution No. PA-210363.

P. On January 25, 2022, the City Council held a duly noticed public hearing by teleconference on the FEIR, the proposed Findings of Facts, and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Project, and considered all written and oral staff reports and public testimony on the matter, and such other matters as are reflected in the record.

Q. On March 8, 2022, and March 15, 2022, the City Council held duly noticed public workshops to discuss in detail the Draft 2040 General Plan and directed staff to make minor changes in several chapters of the document. The changes did not constitute significant new information or otherwise affect the analysis in the FEIR, and thus did not trigger the need to recirculate the document under Public Resources Code section 21092.1 and CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5.

R. On April 26, 2022, the City Council held a duly noticed public hearing in person and by teleconference on the FEIR, the proposed Findings of Facts, and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Project, and considered all written and oral staff reports and public testimony on the matter, and such other matters as are reflected in the record.

SECTION 2. CEQA Findings. The City Council finds as follows:

A. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15132, the FEIR includes the Draft EIR (SCH No. 2021050450) dated October 2021, the Draft EIR Appendices, and the document entitled "Final EIR" dated April 2022, including all related appendices and attachments.

B. The environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIR that the Council finds are of no impact or constitute a less than significant impact and do not require mitigation are described in the Findings of Fact attached as Exhibit A.

C. The environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIR as potentially significant but which the City finds cannot be mitigated to a level of less than significant, despite the imposition of feasible mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR are described in the Findings of Fact.

D. The significant and irreversible environmental changes that would result from the proposed Project, but would be largely mitigated, are described in the Findings of Fact.

E. The environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIR as potentially significant but which the City finds cannot be mitigated to a level of less than significant, despite the imposition of feasible mitigation measures identified in the FEIR are also described in the Findings of Fact.

F. The existence of any growth-inducing impacts resulting from the proposed Project identified in the EIR are described in the Findings of Fact.

G. Alternatives to the proposed Project that might eliminate or reduce significant environmental impacts are described in the Findings of Fact.

H. Certain potential significant impacts identified in the FEIR cannot be lessened to a level of less than significant; therefore, approval of the Project must include a Statement of Overriding Considerations as set forth in the attached Exhibit A.

I. The City Council specifically finds that where more than one reason for approving the Project and rejecting alternatives is given in its findings or in the record, and where more than

one reason is given for adopting the Statement of Overriding Considerations it would have made its decision on the basis of any one of those reasons.

J. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") set forth in Exhibit B to this Resolution, has been prepared to ensure that all mitigation measures described in the MMRP are fully implemented. The City Council finds all of the mitigation measures proposed in the MMRP are feasible.

K. Prior to taking action, the City Council has heard, been presented with, reviewed and considered all of the information and data in the administrative record, including the FEIR, and all oral and written evidence presented to it during all meetings and hearings.

L. All the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines have all been satisfied by the City in the Draft EIR and FEIR, which is sufficiently detailed so that all of the potentially significant environmental effects of the proposed Project have been adequately evaluated.

M. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.1(c)(3), the City Council finds that the FEIR reflects the City's independent judgment as the lead agency for the Project and is supported by substantial evidence.

N. The City has not received any comments or additional information that would constitute substantial new information requiring recirculation of the FEIR under Public Resources Code section 21092.1 and CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5.

SECTION 3. Adoption of the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

A. The City Council, in its independent judgment, based on the whole of the administrative record, adopts all of the findings in the Findings of Fact set forth in Exhibit A to this Resolution. In adopting the Findings of Fact, the City Council ratifies, adopts, and incorporates the analysis and explanation in the FEIR, and ratifies, adopts, and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions in the FEIR relating to the environmental impacts and mitigation measures.

B. The City Council adopts the Statement of Overriding Considerations attached as Exhibit A to this Resolution. The City Council finds that each Project benefit identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations provides a separate and independent ground for its approval of the Project and overrides all of the identified significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project.

C. The City Council adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") attached as Exhibit B to this Resolution. The City Council finds all of the mitigation measures in the MMRP are feasible and that adoption of the MMRP will ensure that all mitigation measures described in the MMRP are fully implemented.

SECTION 4. EIR Certification. The City Council has independently reviewed and analyzed the facts and findings set forth in this Resolution, the FEIR, and the entirety of the record of the proceedings. Based upon the foregoing, the City Council exercises its independent judgment and finds that this FEIR complies with CEQA and hereby certifies the FEIR.

SECTION 5. Notice of Determination. The Director of Community Development is directed to cause to be filed a Notice of Determination as required by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

SECTION 6. Severability. If any section, subsection, subdivision, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this resolution is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision will not affect the validity of the remainder of this resolution. The City Council hereby declares that it would have adopted this resolution, and each and every section, subsection, subdivision, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, sentences, clauses, phrases, or portions thereof is declared invalid or unconstitutional.

SECTION 7. Record of Proceedings. The City Clerk is directed to certify to the adoption of this Resolution and to keep a copy of same along with such other documents and records of proceedings as may be designated by the Director of Community Development.

PASSED, APPROVED, CERTIFIED, AND ADOPTED on April 26, 2022.

  
FRANK V. ZERUNYAN, MAYOR

ATTEST:



---

LAUREN PETTIT, CITY CLERK

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution No. 2496 was duly and regularly passed by the City Council of the City of Rolling Hills Estates at a regular meeting thereof held on April 26, 2022 by the following vote:

AYES: HUFF, SCHMITZ, STEGURA, ZERUNYAN, ZUCKERMAN

NOES: NONE

ABSENT: NONE

ABSTAIN: NONE



---

LAUREN PETTIT, CITY CLERK

# CITY OF ROLLING HILLS ESTATES

## GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
SCH No. 2021050450

FINDINGS OF FACT/STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

---

**CITY OF ROLLING HILLS ESTATES**  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
4045 PALOS VERDES DRIVE NORTH  
ROLLING HILLS ESTATES, CA 90274

*Prepared by:*

**Michael Baker**  
**INTERNATIONAL**

3760 KILROY AIRPORT WAY, SUITE 270  
LONG BEACH, CA 90806

**APRIL 2022**



<b>CONTENT</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1.0-1</b>
1.1 Organization of CEQA Findings of Fact .....	1.0-1
1.2 Statutory Requirements .....	1.0-2
1.3 Location and Custodian of Record of Proceedings .....	1.0-3
<b>2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....</b>	<b>2.0-1</b>
2.1 Environmental Setting.....	2.0-1
2.1.1 Location .....	2.0-1
2.1.2 Existing General Plan .....	2.0-1
2.2 Project Overview.....	2.0-2
2.2.1 Land Use Element.....	2.0-2
2.2.2 Mobility Element .....	2.0-3
2.2.3 Housing Element.....	2.0-3
2.2.4 Conservation Element .....	2.0-3
2.2.5 Open Space and Recreation Element .....	2.0-3
2.2.6 Noise Element .....	2.0-4
2.2.7 Safety Element.....	2.0-4
2.2.8 Safety Element.....	2.0-4
2.2.9 Commercial District Area Vision Plan .....	2.0-4
2.3 Project Objectives.....	2.0-4
2.4 List of Discretionary Actions .....	2.0-5
<b>3.0 CEQA REVIEW AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION .....</b>	<b>3.0-1</b>
<b>4.0 NO ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITHOUT MITIGATION MEASURES.....</b>	<b>4.0-1</b>
4.1 Aesthetics.....	4.0-1
4.2 Agricultural Resources .....	4.0-1
4.3 Air Quality.....	4.0-2
4.4 Biological Resources .....	4.0-2

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

4.5	Energy .....	4.0-3
4.6	Geology and Soils .....	4.0-3
4.7	Greenhouse Gases .....	4.0-4
4.8	Hazards and Hazardous Materials .....	4.0-4
4.9	Hydrology and Water Quality.....	4.0-5
4.10	Land Use and Planning .....	4.0-6
4.11	Mineral Resources .....	4.0-6
4.12	Noise .....	4.0-7
4.13	Population and Housing.....	4.0-7
4.14	Public Services .....	4.0-7
4.15	Recreation .....	4.0-8
4.16	Transportation.....	4.0-8
4.17	Utilities and Service Systems.....	4.0-9
4.18	Wildfire .....	4.0-10
<b>5.0</b>	<b>LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED .....</b>	<b>5.0-1</b>
5.1	Biological Resources.....	5.0-1
5.2	Geology and Soils .....	5.0-4
5.3	Noise .....	5.0-5
<b>6.0</b>	<b>SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS.....</b>	<b>6.0-1</b>
6.1	Air Quality.....	6.0-1
6.2	Cultural Resources .....	6.0-5
6.3	Transportation.....	6.0-10
6.4	Tribal Cultural Resources .....	6.0-13
<b>7.0</b>	<b>FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES.....</b>	<b>7.0-1</b>
7.1	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative .....	7.0-1
	7.1.1 Environmental Effects .....	7.0-1
	7.1.2 Findings.....	7.0-1



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

7.2	Alternative 2: Project without Local Density Bonus Alternative .....	7.0-2
7.2.1	Environmental Effects .....	7.0-2
7.2.2	Findings.....	7.0-2
7.3	Alternative 3: Project without Mixed-Use Overlay on Commercial Office Alternative.....	7.0-2
7.3.1	Environmental Effects .....	7.0-3
7.3.2	Findings.....	7.0-3
<b>8.0</b>	<b>FINDINGS REGARDING CHANGES TO THE DRAFT PEIR AND RECIRCULATION.....</b>	<b>8.0-1</b>
8.1	Changes to the Draft PEIR .....	8.0-1
8.2	Refinement of the Proposed Project .....	8.0-1
8.3	Findings.....	8.0-2
<b>9.0</b>	<b>FINDINGS REGARDING CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL PEIR.....</b>	<b>9.0-1</b>
<b>10.0</b>	<b>STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS.....</b>	<b>10.0-1</b>
10.1	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts.....	10.0-1
10.1.1	Air Quality (Air Quality Management Plan).....	10.0-1
10.1.2	Air Quality (Exceedance of Regional Thresholds During Construction and Operation) .....	10.0-1
10.1.3	Air Quality (Sensitive Receptors) .....	10.0-1
10.1.4	Cultural Resources (Historical and Archaeological Resources) .....	10.0-2
10.1.5	Transportation (VMT Impacts) .....	10.0-2
10.1.6	Tribal Cultural Resources .....	10.0-2
10.2	Project Benefits.....	10.0-3
10.3	Conclusions.....	10.0-5

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

This page intentionally left blank.

**1.1 ORGANIZATION OF CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Final Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the proposed Rolling Hills Estates General Plan Update (proposed GPU) identified potential significant environmental impacts that would result from the implementation of the proposed GPU. However, the City of Rolling Hills Estates (City) finds that the inclusion of certain mitigation measures, as part of project approval, would reduce most potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level. Those impacts that are not reduced to a less-than-significant level are identified and overridden due to specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other feasibility considerations. As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City, in adopting these Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (findings), also adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the proposed GPU. The City finds that the MMRP, which is incorporated by reference and made a part of these findings, meets the requirements of Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21081.6 by providing for the implementation and monitoring of measures intended to mitigate potentially significant effects of the proposed GPU. In accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the City adopts these findings as part of the certification of the Final PEIR for the proposed GPU. Pursuant to PRC Section 21082.1(c)(3), the City Council also finds that the Final PEIR reflects the City's independent judgment as the Lead Agency for the proposed GPU.

The content and format of these Findings of Fact are designed to meet the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.<sup>1,2</sup> The Findings of Fact is organized into the following chapters:

- **Chapter 1: Introduction**—This chapter outlines the organization of this document and identifies the location and custodian of the record of proceedings.
- **Chapter 2: Environmental Setting and Project Description**—This chapter describes the location and characteristics of the Planning Area, proposed GPU overview, proposed objectives, vision, and guiding principles of the proposed GPU, and the required discretionary approvals related to the proposed GPU.
- **Chapter 3: CEQA Review and Public Participation**—This chapter describes the steps the City has undertaken to comply with the CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines as they relate to public input, review, and participation during the preparation of the Draft and Final PEIRs.
- **Chapter 4: No Environmental Effects and Less-Than-Significant Environmental Effects without Mitigation Measures**—This chapter presents a summary of those environmental issue areas where no impacts or less-than-significant impacts would occur and a corresponding finding adopting the Initial Study and PEIR's conclusions of no impact or less-than-significant impacts.
- **Chapter 5: Less-Than-Significant Environmental Effects with Mitigation Incorporated**—This chapter presents a summary of potentially significant environmental effects for which implementation of identified feasible mitigation measures would avoid or substantially reduce the environmental effects to less-than-significant levels and provides a corresponding finding for each effect.
- **Chapter 6: Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Effects**—This chapter presents a summary of significant and unavoidable effects for which there are no known feasible

<sup>1</sup> Public Resources Code (PRC), §§ 21000 et seq., 2019.

<sup>2</sup> CEQA Guidelines, CCR, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, §§ 15000 et seq., 2019.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

---

mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially reduce the environmental effects to less-than-significant levels and provides a corresponding finding for each effect.

- **Chapter 7: Findings Regarding Project Alternatives**—This chapter presents a summary of the alternatives considered for the proposed GPU.
- **Chapter 8: Findings Regarding Changes to the Draft PEIR and Recirculation**—This chapter presents a summary of the changes to the Draft PEIR in response to public comments received and finding that changes to the Draft PEIR did not require recirculation for public review.
- **Chapter 9: Findings Regarding Certification of the Final PEIR**—This chapter presents the City Council's findings and independent judgment of the City to adequately assess the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed GPU for certification of the PEIR.
- **Chapter 10: Statement of Overriding Considerations**—This chapter presents a summary of all of the significant unavoidable adverse impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed GPU. In addition, this chapter identifies the proposed GPU's substantial benefits that outweigh and override the proposed GPU's significant unavoidable impacts, such that the impacts are considered acceptable.

## 1.2 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

CEQA (PRC Sections 21081 *et seq.*), and particularly the CEQA Guidelines (Sections 15091 *et seq.*), require that:

- (a) *No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which a [PEIR] has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:*
1. *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final [PEIR].*
  2. *Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.*
  3. *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final [PEIR].*

In short, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091(a) and (b), CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to avoid or mitigate significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur with implementation of a proposed project. Project mitigation or alternatives are not required, however, where they are infeasible or where the responsibility for modifying a proposed project lies with another agency.

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

---

Pursuant to PRC Section 21081(b), when a lead agency approves a project with significant effects that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the public agency is required to find that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the Proposed Project outweigh the significant effects on the environment. CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a) states that:

*If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits... of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."*

**1.3 LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City's project approval is based are located at the City's Community Development Department (custodian's) offices at 4045 Palos Verdes Drive North, Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274. The record of proceedings is provided in compliance with PRC Section 21081.6(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e).

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

---

This page intentionally left blank.

---

**2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

---

**2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING****2.1.1 LOCATION**

The City of Rolling Hills Estates is located in the center of the Palos Verdes Peninsula in the southwestern portion of the County of Los Angeles. The General Plan Planning Area (Planning Area) is the land area addressed by the proposed GPU, which encompasses approximately 2,378 acres, including all of the land within City limits (84 percent) and the unincorporated Sphere of Influence (SOI) (16 percent). The boundaries of the Planning Area generally follow the borders of the City. The City is bounded by the City of Rancho Palos Verdes on the west and south, the City of Rolling Hills on the south, the City of Palos Verdes Estates on the north, the City of Torrance on the north and northeast, the City of Lomita on the north and east, and unincorporated Los Angeles County on the south and southeast.

**2.1.2 EXISTING GENERAL PLAN**

State law (California Government Code Section 65300) requires that each city and county adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for its physical development. Seven elements are required for every general plan: land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety. The City of Rolling Hills Estates adopted its current General Plan in 1992, with amendments having occurred as needed. Consistent with State requirements, the current (1992) General Plan includes the following elements: Land Use, Transportation, Housing (comprehensively updated in 2014), Conservation, Open Space and Recreation, Noise, and Public Safety, as described in the following paragraphs:

The Land Use Element establishes a land use plan for the City that identifies land use designations for all parcels in the Planning Area, along with goals and policies for the types and forms of land uses in the City. The land use plan both regulates land uses and provides guidance for the City's land use related decisions. The City's current (1992) General Plan land use designations include Very Low Density Residential and Estate Density, Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Commercial General, Commercial Office, Neighborhood Commercial, Commercial Recreation, Open Space, and Institutional. Additionally, the City's current (1992) General Plan includes Overlay Designations, which identify additional development standards that must be considered in future planning and development.

The Transportation Element establishes the City's master plan of roads, which is intended to create a roadway system that is able to accommodate existing and future traffic in the City. The Transportation Element contains goals and policies that emphasize the need for providing an efficient circulation system to handle traffic increases due to both regional and local growth. The Transportation Element designates each roadway in the City as a Major Arterial, Secondary Arterial, Collector, or Local Street.

The Housing Element consists of an identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing. It also identifies

## **2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

---

adequate sites for housing and makes adequate provision for the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.

The Conservation Element considers natural and cultural resources within the City's jurisdiction. This element serves as a management guide for the use of water, land, and earth resources; protection of native plant and animal life; preservation of cultural resources; maintenance of healthy air quality; and preservation of aesthetic and scenic resources within the jurisdictional area.

The Open Space and Recreation Element considers open space and recreational facilities within the City's jurisdiction, both of which help exemplify the unique Rolling Hills Estates rural character and way of life. This element also includes a plan for the City's Equestrian Trails. This element serves as a management guide for preserving, maintaining, and expanding both open space and recreational facilities.

The Noise Element considers existing and potential noise sources and identifies noise exposure associated with major transportation systems within the City's jurisdiction. This information serves as a guide for establishing land use patterns, site design, and development standards and addressing existing or potential noise problems within the jurisdictional area.

The Public Safety Element focuses on the safety and security of Rolling Hills Estates residents and businesses. The City strives to provide a safe and enjoyable environment for citizens, and properly addressing and reducing risks associated with natural and human-induced hazards further this goal. The information in the Public Safety Element serves as a guide for hazard mitigation, emergency planning, and preparedness throughout the City's jurisdiction.

### **2.2 PROJECT OVERVIEW**

The proposed GPU involves updates to the City's seven General Plan Elements and the addition of an eighth element (Sustainability Element). The subsections below describe the proposed changes to Land Use, Mobility (formerly Transportation), Housing, Conservation, Open Space and Recreation, Noise, and Safety (formerly Public Safety) Elements and the proposed new Sustainability Element.

#### **2.2.1 LAND USE ELEMENT**

The proposed GPU includes a revised General Plan Land Use Map. Since land use patterns in the City are well-established and the City's developable parcels are largely built out, proposed changes in the Land Use Plan are targeted to the Commercial District and select parcels. The intentions of such changes include (1) guiding and spurring redevelopment in the Commercial District to aid the City in fostering a walkable mixed-use district, (2) providing additional housing opportunities to aid the City in meeting its housing obligations, (3) guiding redevelopment of select parcels that have garnered development interest, and (4) changing land use designations to reflect existing uses that are not expected or desired to change. No new land use designations are proposed, although one new overlay, CD Mixed-Use Overlay, is proposed.



## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

In addition to the proposed changes to the General Plan Land Use Map described above, the proposed GPU includes modifying the Overlay Zones included in the current (1992) General Plan.

There are eight overlays identified in the 1992 General Plan Land Use Element. Six of the eight overlays are included in principle in the General Plan Update, while two are excluded since they are now obsolete. The General Plan Update also clarifies the remaining overlays. Generally, the term “overlay” is used for Zoning districts (rather than in a General Plan) and can create confusion when both the City’s General Plan and Zoning code/map contain disparate overlays.

### 2.2.2 MOBILITY ELEMENT

Previously known as the Transportation Element, the Mobility Element defines the City’s transportation network, including streets, transit routes, equestrian trails, bikeways, and sidewalks and describes how people move throughout the City. Pursuant to Senate Bill 743, this element considers approaches to improve the performance of the local transportation system to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT). No changes to the City’s master plan of roads are proposed except (1) a change of Silver Spur Road through the Commercial District from a four-lane street to a two-lane street, narrowing it to a “main street” scale street, and with the Commercial District Area Vision Plan reimagining Silver Spur Road as a two-sided commercial street with streetscape design elements, such as banners, landscaping, benches, bike parking, outdoor dining spaces, and other amenities; (2) the removal of Bart Earle Way to allow for full realization of the two-sided commercial street vision of Silver Spur Road; and (3) the reconnection of Deep Valley Drive if and when redevelopment of the Promenade Mall site occurs.

### 2.2.3 HOUSING ELEMENT

As required, the proposed Housing Element update includes identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing. It is also required to identify adequate sites for housing and to make adequate provision for the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community. A new requirement in the current (6<sup>th</sup>) cycle<sup>3</sup> is the inclusion of an analysis of how existing and future policies, plans, programs, rules, practices, and related activities affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH) in the City. The City’s Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation that the proposed Housing Element update satisfies includes 82 Very Low Income units, 42 Low Income units, 38 Moderate Income units, and 29 Above Moderate Income units for a total allocation of 191 units for the City.

### 2.2.4 CONSERVATION ELEMENT

The proposed Conservation Element update would continue to serve as a management guide for the use of water, land, and earth resources; protection of native plant and animal life; preservation of cultural resources; maintenance of healthy air quality; and preservation of aesthetic and scenic resources within the jurisdictional area.

---

<sup>3</sup> To date, there have been five previous housing element update “cycles.” California is now in its sixth “housing element update cycle.” (California Department of Housing and Community Development, Housing Elements, <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/index.shtml>, accessed June 25, 2021.)

## **2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

---

### **2.2.5 OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION ELEMENT**

The proposed updated Open Space and Recreation Element describes how open spaces and parks in the City would continue to be defined, managed, used, and preserved. This element designates open spaces in the City by purpose and establishes standards related to the availability of public parks and open space.

Generally, the City Planning Area is well served by parks and recreation facilities. However, the proposed updated Open Space and Recreation Element identifies three planned mini-parks, including Butcher Park at the northeastern corner of Palos Verdes Drive North and Palos Verdes Drive East, Tabor Grove on the west side of Palos Verdes Drive East just north of Harbor Sight Drive, and unnamed park on the south side of Palos Verdes Drive North just east of Ranchview Road, to expand the percent of residences within the Planning Area that are within a 10-minute walkshed. In addition, the Commercial District Vision Plan, as described in the Land Use Element, envisions plaza spaces/gathering areas and green spaces in various locations in the Commercial District, including plazas on the Promenade Mall and Peninsula Center sites, a green space on the Brick Walk Property, and a potential interim greenway/park space along the Bart Earle Way right-of-way.

### **2.2.6 NOISE ELEMENT**

The proposed updated Noise Element describes the existing noise environment in the City; identifies noise sources and issues affecting community health and safety; and establishes standards, goals, and policy objectives that limit community exposure to excessive noise levels. This element would continue to establish guidance for acceptable noise levels for various land uses and provides guidance on how to balance the noise created by an active and economically healthy community with residents' desire for peace and quiet.

### **2.2.7 SAFETY ELEMENT**

Previously referred to as the Public Safety Element, the proposed Safety Element would continue to set forth long-range City policies and programs to protect people and property from harm resulting from natural and human-caused hazards and criminal activity. Priority issues in this element include fire hazards, geologic and seismic hazards, human-caused and other hazards, emergency readiness, and crime prevention. The element fully integrates the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan.

### **2.2.8 SUSTAINABILITY ELEMENT**

The proposed GPU includes a Sustainability Element, which would be a new element of the Rolling Hills Estates General Plan. The purpose of the Sustainability Element is to identify potential opportunities for the City to engage the community in establishing a blueprint for steady, responsible action in addressing the effects of climate change, so we leave a cleaner, more resilient environment for future generations in terms of air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, energy use, water resources, quality of life, land use, mobility, and waste management and recycling. The Sustainability Element would also integrate the City's 2017 Climate Action Plan and the South Bay City Council of Governments' 2019 Sub-Regional Climate Adaptation Plan.

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

### 2.2.9 COMMERCIAL DISTRICT AREA VISION PLAN

In addition to the elements described above, the proposed GPU includes a Vision Plan for the Commercial District Area. The Vision Plan is not a blueprint for the development of the area but rather provides direction and inspiration for future development based on community aspirations and needs, with the intent of realizing the following GPU's Guiding Principle for the Commercial District. The primary elements of the proposed Commercial District Area Vision Plan include (1) Desired Urban Form; (2) Circulation and Connectivity; and Opportunity Areas, consisting of the following five areas: Promenade Mall, Roxcove and Town and Country, Bart Earle Way, Brick Walk Property, and Peninsula Center.

### 2.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15124(b), a clear statement of objectives and the underlying purpose of the project are to be discussed. The proposed GPU is intended to reflect the City's Vision of tomorrow, while complying with changes in State law and improving the usefulness of the plan. The proposed GPU is organized around Guiding Principles that are intended to preserve the unique character and identity of Rolling Hills Estates and the neighborhoods that make up the community. The Vision and Guiding Principles of the proposed GPU, along with the City's required housing goals, together constitute the Project objectives, and are as follows:

#### VISION

Rolling Hills Estates in 2040 has maintained a rural feel and equestrian identity, while becoming a more vibrant and connected community. The commercial district is an attractive and thriving destination for residents and visitors from the Palos Verdes Peninsula, providing ample opportunities for shopping, outdoor dining, entertainment, and living. Rolling Hills Estates is a model for sustainable practices and is admired for its quality local environment, natural semi-rural setting, and recreational amenities, including trails, parks, and open spaces. Residents and visitors can conveniently walk, ride horses, bike, and take transit to and within the community. Rolling Hills Estates is a family-, youth-, and senior-friendly City, with safe places for people of all ages to gather, play, and learn.

#### GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. Preserve the community's distinctive rural character and high quality of life.
2. Improve mobility and emphasize a spectrum of transportation choices.
3. Promote a vibrant commercial district.
4. Maintain equestrian character.
5. Provide quality parks, trails, open spaces, and community facilities.
6. Enhance the public realm and promote quality design.
7. Become a more sustainable city.

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

### HOUSING

The proposed Housing Element states:

*Meeting the housing needs established by the State of California is an important goal for the City of Rolling Hills Estates. As the population of the State continues to grow and scarce resources decline, it becomes more difficult for local agencies to create adequate housing opportunities while maintaining a high standard of living for all citizens in the community. State law recognizes that housing needs may exceed available resources and, therefore, does not require that the City's quantified objectives be identical to the identified housing needs. This recognition of limitations is critical, especially during this period of financial uncertainties in both the public and private sectors.*

### 2.4 LIST OF DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS

The City, as lead agency pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15367, has the principal responsibility for approving the proposed GPU. There are no responsible or trustee agencies with any approval authority for the Proposed Project. In order to adopt the proposed GPU, the City would have to take the following actions:

- Certification of the Final PEIR
- Amend the General Plan and adopt the GPU

Additionally, while not required for approval of the proposed GPU, but associated with the actions to be taken as part of this Project, the City's Zoning Code would need to be updated for consistency with the proposed GPU and to implement certain components of the proposed GPU.

### 3.0 CEQA REVIEW AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

---

#### 3.0 CEQA REVIEW AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The City has complied with the CEQA Guidelines during the preparation of the Draft PEIR for the GPU. The Draft PEIR, dated October 2021, was prepared following input from the public and affected agencies through the Draft PEIR scoping process. The “scoping” of the PEIR was conducted utilizing several of the tools available under CEQA. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study were prepared and distributed to the State Clearinghouse, affected agencies, and other interested parties from May 21, 2021 to June 21, 2021. A scoping meeting was held on June 3, 2021. The NOP was posted in the Los Angeles County Clerk's office for 30 days. Information requested and input provided during the 30-day NOP comment period regarding the scope of the PEIR are included in the Draft PEIR as Appendix A.

On October 22, 2021, the City issued a Notice of Availability for the proposed GPU's Draft PEIR for a 45-day public review and comment period. On November 9, 2021, the City held a Special Joint City Council and Planning Commission meeting to share information regarding the proposed GPU and the impact determination presented in the Draft PEIR and to receive public comments on the Draft PEIR. The Notice of Availability was also published on the City's website, in a local newspaper, and directly mailed to each commenter on the Initial Study and affected public agencies. In all, 39 notices were distributed.

The Draft PEIR was distributed directly to numerous agencies, organizations, and interested groups and persons for comment for a 45-day review period from October 22, 2021 to December 6, 2021. During the review period, copies of the Draft PEIR were made available to the public on the City's website (<https://www.ci.rolling-hills-estates.ca.us/departments/administration/city-clerk/public-notices>) and electronically at the Peninsula Center Library, located at 701 Silver Spur Road, Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274.

A Final PEIR has been completed and includes written comments received by mail and electronic-mail on the Draft PEIR, written responses to the written comments, and changes to the Draft PEIR.

### **3.0 CEQA REVIEW AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

---

This page intentionally left blank.

## **4.0 NO ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITHOUT MITIGATION MEASURES**

---

### **4.0 NO ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITHOUT MITIGATIONS**

Based on the Initial Study, Draft PEIR, and Final PEIR (collectively the "PEIR") and the referenced documents, the proposed GPU would have no or less-than-significant environmental effects for the specific areas associated with the topics identified below.

#### **4.1 AESTHETICS**

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

Threshold (c): The proposed GPU would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings and would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

Threshold (d): The proposed GPU would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU's contribution to aesthetic impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and, as such, cumulative aesthetic impacts would be less than significant.

#### **FINDINGS**

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, the referenced documents, and the whole of the record, that the proposed GPU would result in no impact to aesthetics related to scenic resources within a State scenic highway and a less-than-significant impact related to scenic vistas, visual character and quality, the creation of new sources of substantial light or glare, and cumulative impacts.

#### **4.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural uses.

Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

Threshold (c): The proposed GPU would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

Threshold (d): The proposed GPU would not result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

## **4.0 NO ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITHOUT MITIGATION MEASURES**

---

Threshold (e): The proposed GPU would not involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use.

### **FINDINGS**

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, all referenced documents, and the whole of the record, that the proposed GPU would result in no impacts to agricultural and forestry resources.

### **4.3 AIR QUALITY**

Threshold (d): The proposed GPU would not result in other emissions, such as those leading to odors, adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU would not result in cumulative impacts due to carbon monoxide hotspots or localized air quality impacts.

### **FINDINGS**

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, all referenced documents, and the whole of the record, that the proposed GPU would result in no impact related to other emissions, such as odors, and less-than-significant cumulative impacts related to carbon monoxide hotspots or localized air emissions.

### **4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Threshold (e): The proposed GPU would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Threshold (f): The proposed GPU would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU would not result in cumulative impacts concerning biological resources.

### **FINDINGS**

The City finds, based on the PEIR, all referenced documents, and the whole of the record, that the proposed GPU would result in less-than-significant impacts to biological resources related to conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or State habitat conservation plan ,and cumulative biological resources impacts.



## **4.0 NO ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITHOUT MITIGATION MEASURES**

---

### **4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Threshold (c): The proposed GPU would not disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

#### **FINDINGS**

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, all referenced documents, and the whole of the record, that the proposed GPU would result in a less-than-significant impact to cultural resources related to the disturbance of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

### **4.6 ENERGY**

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.

Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU would not result in cumulative impacts related to energy consumption and energy plans.

#### **FINDINGS**

The City finds, based on the PEIR, all referenced documents, and the whole of the record, that the proposed GPU would result in less-than-significant impacts to energy related to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, and cumulative energy impacts.

### **4.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map.
- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking.
- iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, as discussed on page.
- iv. Landslides.

Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

## 4.0 NO ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITHOUT MITIGATION MEASURES

---

Threshold (c): The Planning Area is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslides.

Threshold (d): The Planning Area is not located on expansive.

Threshold (e): The Planning Area is connected to a public sewer system and would not require the use of septic tanks on soils incapable of adequately supporting them.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU would not result in cumulative impacts related to geology and soils.

### FINDINGS

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, all referenced documents, and the whole of the record, that the proposed GPU would result in no impacts to geology and soils related to rupture of a known earthquake fault and seismic-related ground failure. The proposed GPU would have less-than-significant impacts to geology and soils related to strong seismic ground shaking, landslides, unstable soils erosion, loss of top soil, expansive soils, septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems, and cumulative geology and soils impacts.

### 4.8 GREENHOUSE GASES

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not generate greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU would not cause cumulative impacts related to greenhouse gases.

### FINDINGS

The City finds, based on the PEIR, all referenced documents, and the whole of the record, that the proposed GPU would result in less-than-significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions.

### 4.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport.

Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable, foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

Threshold (c): The proposed GPU would not cause hazardous emissions or induce the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

## **4.0 NO ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITHOUT MITIGATION MEASURES**

---

- Threshold (d): The proposed GPU would not designate for potential future development sites which are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.
- Threshold (e): Implementation of the proposed GPU would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Planning Area.
- Threshold (f): The proposed GPU would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- Threshold (g): The proposed GPU would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

### **FINDINGS**

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, all referenced documents, response to comments regarding wildfire, and the whole of the record, that the proposed GPU would result in no impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials regarding risks associated with close proximity to airports. Further, the proposed GPU would result in less-than-significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials regarding the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; release of hazardous materials into the environment through reasonable, foreseeable upset and accident conditions; hazardous material emissions within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; proximity to listed hazardous materials sites; impairment of or physical interference with adopted emergency response and evacuations plans; and the exposure of people or structures to risks involving wildland fires.

### **4.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

- Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality.
- Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would not cause a substantial decrease in groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
- Threshold (c): The proposed GPU would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation, substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff, create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems; or impede or redirect flood flows.
- Threshold (d): The proposed GPU would no result in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, which would risk release of pollutants due to project inundation.
- Threshold (e): The proposed GPU would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

## 4.0 NO ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITHOUT MITIGATION MEASURES

---

### FINDINGS

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, all referenced documents, and the whole of the record, that the proposed GPU would result in no impacts to hydrology and water quality related to impeding or redirecting flood flows, and the release of pollutants in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones. Further, the proposed GPU would result in less-than-significant impacts to hydrology and water quality related to water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; groundwater; alteration of drainage patterns resulting in erosion or siltation, increased rate or amount of runoff, or creation of runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems; and conflict with or obstruction of implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

#### 4.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not physically divide an established community.

Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would not cause a significant impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU would not result in cumulative impacts related to land use and planning.

### FINDINGS

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, all referenced documents, and the whole of the record, that the proposed GPU would result in no impact to land use related to the physical division of an established community and a less-than-significant impact related to conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of mitigating an environmental effect and cumulative land use impacts.

#### 4.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state.

Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

### FINDINGS

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, all referenced documents, and the whole of the record, that the proposed GPU would result in no impact to mineral resources.

#### 4.13 NOISE

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not result in the generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise level in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the General Plan or Noise Ordinance.

## **4.0 NO ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITHOUT MITIGATION MEASURES**

---

Threshold (c): The proposed GPU would not result in the exposure of people residing or working in the Planning Area to excessive noise levels due to the proximity of a private airstrip or airport.

### **FINDINGS**

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, all referenced documents, and the whole of the record that the proposed GPU would result in a less-than-significant impact to temporary or permanent increases in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Planning Area in excess of applicable standards and no impact related to exposure of people residing or working in the Planning Area to excessive noise levels caused by proximity to a private airport.

### **4.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING**

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly.

Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU would not result in cumulative impacts related to population and housing.

### **FINDINGS**

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, all referenced documents, and the whole of the record, that the proposed GPU would result in less-than-significant impacts to population and housing.

### **4.15 PUBLIC SERVICES**

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for:

- i. Fire protection services
- ii. Police protection
- iii. Schools
- iv. Parks
- v. Libraries, as discussed on page 4.15-3 of the Draft PEIR.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU would not result in cumulative impacts related to public services (i.e., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, and libraries).

### **FINDINGS**

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, all referenced documents, responses to the Los Angeles County Fire Department's comments, and the whole of the record, that the proposed

## 4.0 NO ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITHOUT MITIGATION MEASURES

---

GPU would result in less-than-significant impacts to public services (i.e., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, and libraries).

### 4.16 RECREATION

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities.

Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU would have a less-than-significant cumulative impact related to recreation.

### FINDINGS

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, all referenced documents, and the whole of the record, that the proposed GPU would result in less-than-significant impacts to recreation.

### 4.17 TRANSPORTATION

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

Threshold (c): The proposed GPU would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses.

Threshold (d): The proposed GPU would not result in inadequate emergency access.

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative impacts related to transportation and conflict with plans, inadequate emergency access, and geometric designs would be less than significant.

### Findings

The City finds, based on the PEIR, all referenced documents, and the whole of the record, that the proposed GPU would result in less-than-significant impacts related to conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system; hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use, and emergency access.

### 4.18 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

#### 4.18.1 WATER SUPPLY

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities.

Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would not have insufficient water supplies.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU would have less-than-significant impacts on water supply and water infrastructure.

## **4.0 NO ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITHOUT MITIGATION MEASURES**

---

### **Findings**

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, all referenced documents, responses to comments, and the whole of the record that the proposed GPU would result in less-than-significant impacts to water supply and water infrastructure.

#### **4.18.2 WASTEWATER**

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities.

Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves the Planning Area that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the proposed GPU's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU would have less-than-significant impacts to wastewater and wastewater infrastructure.

### **FINDINGS**

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, all referenced documents, responses to comments, and the whole of the record that the proposed GPU would result in less than significant impacts to wastewater and wastewater infrastructure.

#### **4.18.3 SOLID WASTE**

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards.

Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would comply with federal, state, local management, and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU would not have any cumulative impacts related to solid waste.

### **FINDINGS**

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, all referenced documents, and the whole of the record that the proposed GPU would result in less-than-significant impacts to solid waste.

#### **4.18.4 ENERGY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE**

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded electrical power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU would have less-than-significant cumulative impacts related to energy and telecommunications.

### **FINDINGS**

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, all referenced documents, and the whole of the record that the proposed GPU would result in less-than-significant impacts to energy and telecommunications infrastructure.

## **4.0 NO ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITHOUT MITIGATION MEASURES**

---

### **4.19 WILDFIRE**

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would not exacerbate wildfire risks due to slope, prevailing winds, and/or other factors.

Threshold (c): The proposed GPU would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk.

Threshold (d): The proposed GPU would not expose people or structures to significant risks as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU would have less-than-significant cumulative impacts related to Wildfire.

### **FINDINGS**

The City finds, based on the Initial Study, PEIR, all referenced documents, and the whole of the record that the proposed GPU would result in less-than-significant impacts to wildfire.



## 5.0 LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

---

### 5.0 LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

#### 5.1 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Threshold (a):           The proposed GPU would have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

#### FINDINGS

The City finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed GPU, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. Specifically, the City finds that the following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce potentially significant biological resource impacts, particularly to special status species and habitats resulting from the buildout of the proposed GPU:

**MM-BIO-1:**     The City of Rolling Hills Estates shall require applicants of future development projects that require discretionary grading approval by the Planning Commission within portions of the City that are included within USFWS-designated critical habitat for coastal California Gnatcatcher, or are within close proximity to known occurrences of protected species, such as those identified in Figure 4.3-1 on page 4.3-6 of the Draft PEIR, to prepare a biological resources survey. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and shall minimally include a reconnaissance level field survey of the project site for the presence and quality of biological resources potentially affected by project development. These resources include, but are not limited to, protected/special-status species or their habitat, sensitive habitats, such as wetlands or riparian areas, and jurisdictional waters. If sensitive or protected biological resources are absent from the project site and adjacent lands potentially affected by the project, the biologist shall submit a written report substantiating such to the City of Rolling Hills Estates before issuance of a grading permit by the City, and the project may proceed without any further biological investigation.

If sensitive or protected biological resources are present on the project site or may be potentially affected by the project, then a qualified biologist shall evaluate impacts to sensitive or protected biological resources from development and produce a biological resources impact assessment. The impact assessment may include focused plant and animal surveys or jurisdictional delineations to determine a future development project's impact to biological resources, along with corresponding project-specific mitigation measures, as necessary. To minimize impacts, the City of Rolling Hills Estates shall require applicants to design projects to avoid impacts to sensitive or protected biological resources to the greatest extent feasible. Further, if sensitive or protected species are present on the project site, then the applicant shall consult with the appropriate oversight agency, such as CDFW or USFWS, as necessary.

**MM-BIO-2:**     If future development projects that involve vegetation removal, and are not otherwise categorically exempt from CEQA or subject to the emergency project statutory exemption from CEQA, are unable to avoid construction activities within nesting bird season (January 1st through July 31st for raptors and February 1st

## 5.0 LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

---

through August 31st for other avian species), a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey for avian species to determine the presence/absence, location, and status of any active nests on or adjacent to the area proposed development area. The survey shall be conducted for active nests, eggs, and young of any bird species protected by the state or federal Endangered Species Acts, Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), and/or the California Fish and Game Code (CFGC) Sections 3503, 3503.5, or 3511, within 200 feet of the disturbance zone for songbirds, or within 500 feet of the disturbance zone for raptors and special-status bird species. To avoid the destruction of active nests and to protect the reproductive success of birds protected by the MBTA and the CFGC, a nesting bird survey shall be conducted no more than three (3) days prior to the commencement of project construction if construction occurs between January 1st and August 31st. In the event that active nests are discovered, a suitable buffer (distance to be determined by the biologist) shall be established around such active nests, and no construction activities within the buffer shall be allowed, until the biologist has determined that the nest(s) is no longer active (i.e., the nestlings have fledged and are no longer dependent on the nest).

**MM-BIO-3:** The City of Rolling Hills Estates shall require applicants of future development projects that require discretionary grading approval by the Planning Commission and are not categorically exempt from CEQA or subject to the emergency project statutory exemption from CEQA to retain a qualified bat biologist to conduct a clearance survey for bats within suitable structures and trees within a project's impact area within 30 days of construction. If bats roosts are found within the project impact area, the qualified bat biologist shall identify the bats to the species level and evaluate the colony to determine its size and significance. If any structures house an active maternity colony of bats, construction activities shall not occur during the recognized bat breeding season (March 1 to October 1). Any proposed work in areas with no suitable roosting or foraging habitat shall not require a bat survey. If a bat roost is present within the vicinity of a proposed project impact area that does not need to be removed, a qualified bat biologist shall establish a species-specific no-disturbance buffer that must be maintained throughout the duration of the project's construction. If a maternity roost is identified, a no disturbance buffer shall be established and maintained until a qualified bat biologist determines that the roost is no longer active.

If project activities must occur during non-daylight hours or during the bat breeding season (March 1 to October 1), a qualified bat biologist shall establish monitoring measures, including frequency and duration, based on species, individual behavior, and type of construction activities. Night lighting shall be used only within the portion of the project actively being worked on and focused directly on the work area. This measure would minimize visual disturbance and allow bats to continue to utilize the remainder of the area for foraging and night roosting. If bats are showing signs of distress, work activities shall be modified to prevent bats from abandoning their roost or altering their feeding behavior. At any time, the qualified biologist shall have the authority to halt work if there are any signs of distress or disturbance that may lead to roost abandonment. Work shall not resume until corrective measures have been taken or it is determined that continued activity would not adversely affect roost success.

## 5.0 LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

---

Any roosting habitat loss shall be sequenced, and roosting habitat shall be restored or replaced in-kind and on-site to prevent temporal or permanent loss based on the bat species roosting requirements.

### Explanation of the Rationale

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.3, Biological Resources, pages 4.3-14 through 4.3-18 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

With implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-3 (i.e., preparation of a biological resources assessment and nesting bird and bat surveys conducted on a project-by-project basis), buildout of the proposed GPU would not result in a significant impact to special status species or habitats, as designated by the CDFW or USFWS. As such, impacts would be less than significant after mitigation.

Thresholds (b)-(c):       The proposed GPU would have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

### Findings

The City finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed GPU, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. Specifically, the City finds that the following mitigation measure shall be implemented to reduce potentially significant biological resource impacts, particularly to riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, and federally protected wetlands:

**MM-BIO-4:**       The City of Rolling Hills Estates shall require applicants of future development projects that that require discretionary grading approval by the Planning Commission within portions of the Planning Area that are located within 100-feet of a riverine or wetland feature, as identified in Figure 4.3-4 on page 4.3-11 of the Draft PEIR, to prepare a biological resources survey. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and shall minimally include a site survey for the presence and quality of riverine or wetland features potentially affected by project development, as well as a stream delineation of the potentially impacted riparian or wetland feature. If such features are present and may be impacted by the future development, then the City shall require appropriate vegetative buffers and/or setbacks adjoining the stream or wetland feature to reduce impacts of future development on these riparian or wetland features. If avoidance of riparian habitat, wetlands, or other drainage features within the jurisdiction of the CDFW or Army Corps is not possible, permits/approvals from the jurisdictional agency/agencies shall be necessary and impacted acreage shall be replaced at a ratio acceptable to the jurisdictional agency/agencies. In no case shall the replacement ratio be less than 1:1.

## 5.0 LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

---

### Explanation of the Rationale

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.3, Biological Resources, pages 4.3-18 through 4.3-20 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

Because the proposed GPU would not concentrate development in close proximity to existing wetland or riparian habitats, and because any direct or indirect impacts to riparian and wetland habitat would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis and would be required to comply with existing local, State, and federal regulations, the proposed GPU would not likely have a substantial effect on federally protected wetlands, riparian habitat, or other sensitive natural community. With implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-4, impacts on riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, and federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act would be less than significant. As such, impacts would be less than significant after mitigation.

Threshold (d):                   The proposed GPU would interfere substantially with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

### Findings

The City finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed GPU, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. Specifically, the City finds that Mitigation Measures MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-3 shall be implemented to reduce potentially significant biological resource impacts, particularly to the movement of native resident migratory wildlife species.

### Explanation of the Rationale

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.3, Biological Resources, pages 4.3-20 through 4.3-21 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

Development associated with the buildout of the proposed GPU could result in limited vegetation removal, intrusion by humans and pets, or increases in nuisance noise, affecting wildlife movement and nesting sites in areas with known occurrences of wildlife species and habitats. As such, impacts related to interference with the movement of native resident migratory wildlife species would be potentially significant. With implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-3, impacts on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and native wildlife nursery sites from adoption of the proposed GPU, would be less than significant. As such, impacts to sensitive biological resources are less than significant after mitigation.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU would have less-than-significant cumulative impacts related to Wildfire.

### Findings

The City finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed GPU, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as

## 5.0 LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

---

identified in the Draft PEIR. Specifically, the City finds that Mitigation Measures MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-3 shall be implemented to reduce potentially significant cumulative biological resource impacts, particularly to special status species and habitats; riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, and federally protected wetlands; and the movement of native resident migratory wildlife species resulting from the buildout of the proposed GPU.

### Explanation of the Rationale

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.3, Biological Resources, pages 4.3-23 through 4.3-24 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

Biologically sensitive areas are located within the Planning Area, as well as within adjacent cities on the Palos Verdes Peninsula, including the cities of Rolling Hills, Palos Verdes Estates, Rancho Palos Verdes, and Los Angeles [San Pedro community]]. These areas support coastal California gnatcatcher critical habitat and the Palos Verdes blue butterfly in the cities of Rancho Palos Verdes and Palos Verdes Estates. In general, impacts on biological resources are typically limited to an individual future development site and possibly the immediate surroundings and would not be substantially compounded by the construction or operation impacts of other, more distant projects. An important exception to this is when a future development project eliminates a significant portion of a regional wildlife corridor or eliminates one of the few remaining pockets of habitat supporting a sensitive species in the same region, which may potentially result in significant cumulative impacts. With implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-4, consistency with the goals and policies to protect open spaces and the existing biological resources within Planning Area, and ongoing enforcement of existing General Plan goals and policies protecting sensitive biological resources by the other jurisdictions on the peninsula and preservation activities conducted by the Palos Verdes Land Conservancy, which has preserved approximately 1,600 acres of open space on the peninsula, the proposed GPU's contribution to impacts on biological resources within the Planning Area would not be cumulatively considerable, and, as such, cumulative impacts would be less than significant after mitigation.

### 5.2 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Threshold (f):                   The proposed GPU would have the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Cumulative Impacts:

#### Findings

The City finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed GPU, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. Specifically, the City finds that Mitigation Measures MM-GEO-1 and MM-GEO-2 shall be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources:

**MM-GEO-1:** To ensure identification and preservation of significant paleontological resources and avoid significant impacts to those resources, prior to the issuance of a grading approval by the City of Rolling Hills Estates Planning Commission, each project

## 5.0 LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

---

requiring such approval shall be screened to determine whether a full paleontological resources assessment is required. Screening shall consider whether the proposed grading activity will extend into known undisturbed fossil-bearing strata (i.e., those of the Monterey Formation, including Lomita Marl Member, Valmonte Diatomite Member, and Altamira Shale Member). If so, the City shall require a paleontological resources assessment be conducted by a paleontologist that meets Bureau of Land Management or Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards (i.e., a qualified paleontologist) prior to the issuance of a grading approval. If the paleontological resources assessment identifies the potential for destruction of significant paleontological resources, an avoidance and/or recovery plan shall be developed and implemented under the supervision of a qualified paleontologist to the satisfaction of the City of Rolling Hills Estates.

**MM-GEO-2:** In the event that any prehistoric subsurface paleontological resources are encountered during future construction or the course of any ground disturbance activities, all such activities shall halt immediately, at which time the applicant shall notify the City and consult with a qualified paleontologist to assess the significance of the find. In the case of discovery of paleontological resources, the assessment shall be done in accordance with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. If any find is determined to be significant, appropriate avoidance measures recommended by the consultant and approved by the City must be followed unless avoidance is determined to be unnecessary or infeasible by the City. If avoidance is unnecessary or infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery, excavation) shall be instituted.

### Explanation of the Rationale

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, pages 4.6-13 through 4.6-14 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

The Planning Area encompasses areas that may contain fossil-bearing units and are, therefore, considered sensitive for paleontological resources. Ground-disturbing activities associated with future development and redevelopment projects allowed under the proposed GPU would have the potential to unearth, damage, and/or destroy known or unknown paleontological resources and have the potential to result in adverse impacts. Impacts related to paleontological resources, however, would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-GEO-1 and MM-GEO-2.

### 5.3 NOISE

Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

### Findings

The City finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the GPU, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. Specifically, the City finds that Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-1 and MM-NOI-2 shall be

## 5.0 LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

---

implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts cause by excessive groundborne vibrations:

**MM-NOI-1:** Projects with construction activities that use equipment with high vibration levels, including, but not limited to, pile drivers, vibratory rollers, large bulldozers, and loaded trucks, within 25 feet of an occupied sensitive use (i.e., historical buildings, residential, senior care facilities, hospitals, and schools/day care centers) shall be required to prepare a project-specific vibration impact analysis to identify the potential project-specific construction vibration impacts associated with the project, and to determine any specific vibration control mechanisms that shall be incorporated into the project's construction bid documents to reduce such impacts. Contract specifications shall be included in construction documents, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer prior to issuance of a grading permit.

**MM-NOI-2:** Projects within 100 feet of a historic structure(s) shall implement the following measures to reduce the potential for architectural/structural damage resulting from elevated groundborne noise and vibration levels:

- Pile driving within 50 feet of any historic structure(s) shall utilize alternative installation methods, such as pile cushioning, jetting, predrilling, cast-in-place systems, and resonance-free vibratory pile drivers.
- As accessible, a preconstruction survey of all eligible for listing or listed historic buildings under the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historic Resources, and/or local historic database(s) within 50 feet of proposed construction activities shall be conducted. Fixtures and finishes within 50 feet of construction activities susceptible to damage shall be documented photographically and in writing. The preconstruction survey shall determine conditions that exist before construction begins for use in evaluating any damage caused by construction activities. Construction vibration monitoring shall be conducted at the edges of these historic properties and construction activities shall be reduced, as needed, to ensure no damage occurs.
- Vibration monitoring shall be conducted prior to and during pile driving operations occurring within 100 feet of the historic structure(s). Contractors shall limit construction vibration levels during pile driving and impact activities in the vicinity of the historic structure(s) in accordance with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual, dated April 2020, or subsequent updates of this Manual.

### Explanation of the Rationale

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.9, Noise, pages 4.9-30 through 4.9-32 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

For sensitive uses that are located at or within 25 feet of potential project construction sites, sensitive receptors at these locations may experience vibration levels during construction activities

## **5.0 LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

---

that exceed the FTA vibration impact threshold of 80 VdB for human annoyance. However, pursuant to Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1, should certain construction activities take place within 25 feet of an occupied structure, a project-specific vibration impact analysis shall be conducted. In addition, Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2 would prohibit pile driving within 50 feet of historic structures and instead utilize alternative installation methods; require a preconstruction survey of all designated historic buildings within 50 feet of proposed construction activities; and require vibration monitoring prior to and during pile driving operations occurring within 100 feet of historic structures. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-1 and MM-NOI-2 would reduce short-term vibration impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU would not result in cumulative impacts due to groundborne vibrations.

### **Findings**

The City finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed GPU, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. Specifically, the City finds that Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-1 and MM-NOI-2, described above, shall be implemented to reduce potentially significant cumulative impacts cause by excessive groundborne vibrations to less-than-significant levels.

### **Explanation of the Rationale**

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.9, Noise, pages 4.9-33 through 4.9-34 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

Potential cumulative impacts of short-term and long-term noise would be less than significant. Operational activities under the implementation of proposed GPU would not generate substantial groundborne vibration and construction activities associated with developments under the proposed GPU would cause less-than-significant vibration impacts with implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-1 and MM-NOI-2. Groundborne vibration generated from cumulative development projects would be required to implement any required mitigation measures on a project-by-project basis, as applicable, pursuant to CEQA provisions. Moreover, vibration generation is limited to areas within the immediate vicinity of the source (e.g., primarily within 25 feet of most construction activities); thus, vibration impacts are almost exclusively project-level impacts rather than cumulative. Therefore, implementation of the proposed GPU would result in a less-than-significant cumulative vibration impact.



## 6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

### 6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The Final EIR determined that the proposed GPU has potentially significant environmental effects that cannot be feasibly mitigated to less-than-significant levels, and such impacts would be significant and unavoidable. These impacts and the corresponding findings are identified in the sections below.

#### 6.1 AIR QUALITY

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would have the potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

#### Findings

The City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR. While changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed GPU to address this significant effect on the environment, no feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce emissions below the thresholds of significance. The following Mitigation Measures MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2 would be required to reduce emissions but would not be sufficient to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level:

**MM-AQ-1:** The City of Rolling Hills Estates shall require applicants of future development projects that require discretionary grading approval by the Planning Commission to control ozone precursor emissions from construction equipment vehicles by maintaining equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer's specifications. The equipment maintenance records and equipment design specifications data sheets shall be kept on site by the project contractor during construction activities.

**MM-AQ-2:** To identify potential long-term operational-related air quality impacts from future development projects that are larger than the representative projects considered in this analysis, project-specific air emissions impacts shall be determined in compliance with the latest version of the SCAQMD CEQA Guidelines. To address potential localized impacts, the air quality analysis shall be completed pursuant to the latest version of SCAQMD's *Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology* document or other appropriate methodology as determined in conjunction with SCAQMD. The results of the operational-related and localized air quality impacts analyses shall be included in the future development project's CEQA documentation. If such analyses identify potentially significant regional or localized air quality impacts, the City shall require the incorporation of appropriate mitigation to reduce such impacts as required by CEQA. In such cases, appropriate mitigation could include, but would not be limited to:

- Use of Tier 4 equipment during project construction;
- Incorporation of energy-efficient design features beyond those required by Title 24 and the CALGreen Code; and

## 6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

---

- Application of transportation demand measures (TDM) beyond those required by code.

The City finds that there are no other feasible mitigation measures that would further lessen the impact; thus, the impact is unavoidable. The City finds that specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation. However, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable based on specific overriding considerations found in Chapter 10 below.

### Explanation of the Rationale

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.2, Air Quality, pages 4.2-15 through 4.2-18 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

The proposed GPU would be inconsistent with the SCAQMD AQMP as buildout of the proposed GPU could exceed current SCAG population and employment estimates and would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the South Coast Air Basin. Incorporation of Mitigation Measures MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2 into future development projects during construction and operation would contribute to reduced criteria air pollutant emissions associated with buildout of the proposed GPU. In addition, goals and policies included in the proposed GPU would promote increased capacity for alternative transportation modes and implementation of transportation demand management strategies. However, since implementation of the proposed GPU would introduce land use intensification in certain portions of the Planning Area, no mitigation measures are available that would reduce total air quality emissions from buildout of the proposed GPU to a less-than-significant level. In addition, the population and employment assumptions of the AQMP would still be exceeded until such time the AQMP is revised and incorporates updated projections that consider the proposed GPU. Therefore, air quality impacts related to the implementation of the AQMP would remain significant and unavoidable.

Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would have the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the project region is non-attainment.

### Findings

The City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR. While changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed GPU to address this significant effect on the environment, no feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce emissions below the threshold of significance. Mitigation Measures MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2 would be required to reduce emissions but would not be sufficient to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

The City finds that there are no other feasible mitigation measures that would further lessen the impact; thus, the impact is unavoidable. The City finds that specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation. However, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined

## 6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

---

that this impact is acceptable based on specific overriding considerations found in Chapter 10 below.

### Explanation of the Rationale

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.2, Air Quality, pages 4.2-21 through 4.2-27 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

Construction activities associated with future development under the proposed GPU could generate short-term emissions that could lead to the violation of an applicable air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation or exceed the SCAQMD's significance thresholds and would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the Basin. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2 would reduce criteria air pollutant emissions from construction-related activities. However, since implementation of the proposed GPU would introduce land use intensification and possibly large future development projects in certain portions of the Planning Area, it cannot be determined with certainty that Mitigation Measures MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2 would reduce impacts below SCAQMD's thresholds in all cases. Therefore, construction impacts related to the increase of criteria pollutants for which the Basin is non-attainment are conservatively considered significant and unavoidable.

Threshold (c): The proposed GPU would have the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

### Findings

The City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR. While changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed GPU to address this significant effect on the environment, no feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce emissions below the threshold of significance. Mitigation Measures MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2 would be required to reduce emissions but would not be sufficient to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

The City finds that there are no other feasible mitigation measures that would further lessen the impact; thus, the impact is unavoidable. The City finds that specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation. However, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable based on specific overriding considerations found in Chapter 10 below.

### Explanation of the Rationale

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.2, Air Quality, pages 4.2-27 through 4.2-31 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

Construction activities associated with future development under the proposed GPU could generate short-term emissions that may cause localized air quality impacts. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-AQ-1 through MM-AQ-3 would reduce criteria air pollutant emissions from construction-related activities and the associated localized impacts. However, since construction activities could occur close to existing sensitive receptors, construction emissions generated by future development projects that are larger than the representative projects considered in this

## 6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

---

analysis have the potential to exceed SCAQMD LSTs and it cannot be determined with certainty that Mitigation Measures MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2 would reduce impacts below SCAQMD's thresholds in all cases. Therefore, the impacts are conservatively considered significant and unavoidable.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU's cumulative air quality impacts are significant and cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

### Findings

The City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR. While changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed GPU to address this significant effect on the environment, no feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce emissions below the threshold of significance. Mitigation Measures MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2 would be required to reduce emissions but would not be sufficient to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

The City finds that there are no other feasible mitigation measures that would further lessen the impact; thus, the impact is unavoidable. The City finds that specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation. However, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable based on specific overriding considerations found in Chapter 10 below.

### Explanation of the Rationale

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.2, Air Quality, pages 4.2-31 through 4.2-32 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

Air emissions generated during construction of future potential development projects in the Planning Area and surrounding cities may be cumulatively considerable. Emissions from operations of future development associated with implementation of the proposed GPU would potentially exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thresholds for criteria pollutants, resulting in a significant impact. In accordance with SCAQMD methodology, any project emissions that cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant levels are also significant on a cumulative basis. Therefore, air quality impacts associated with the buildout of the proposed GPU could be cumulatively considerable, and, thus, are considered to be significant and unavoidable.

## 6.2 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Threshold (a): The proposed GPU would have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5

### Findings

The City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR. While changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed GPU to address this significant effect on the environment, impacts are considered significant and unavoidable since demolition or other material impairment of a historical resource over the course of the buildout of

## 6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

---

the proposed GPU cannot be precluded. The following Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-1 through MM-CUL-3 would be required to reduce impacts of the buildout of the proposed GPU on historical resources to the maximum extent feasible but would not be sufficient to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels:

- MM-CUL-1:** Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit for projects that propose to relocate, demolish, or alter a building or structure that is over 45 years old, possesses a distinctive architectural style, and was built during and representative of the period of significance for that architectural style (e.g., California Ranch of the 1940s and 1950s, Midcentury Modern of the 1940s-1960s, etc.), the City of Rolling Hills Estates shall require the applicant to submit a historical resources assessment report, if the building or structure has not been previously evaluated for potential historical significance. For single-family residential properties, a historical resources assessment report shall only be required if the involved building/structure is characteristic of the surrounding neighborhood and the demolition/alteration involves a façade or building volume that is/would be visible from the street or other publicly accessible vantage point. If the building or structure is determined to be a historical resource, the report shall include an assessment of the project's impacts to the resource. The report shall be prepared by a qualified Architectural Historian or Historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards, and shall satisfy federal and State guidelines for the identification, evaluation, and recordation of historical resources. Should the City conduct and/or approve a citywide or neighborhood/district historic resources inventory, within the bounds of that survey this mitigation measure shall only apply to potentially significant historic resources identified by the inventory. Similarly, should a historic context statement be prepared for any historical themes in Rolling Hills Estates, the guidance and recommendations of the historic context statement shall supersede the requirements of this mitigation measure for potentially significant historic resources within that theme.
- MM-CUL-2:** The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties shall be used to the maximum extent possible to ensure that projects involving the relocation, conversion, rehabilitation, or alteration of a historical resource and its setting, or related new construction, will not impair the significance of the historical resource. Use of the Secretary's Standards shall be overseen by an architectural historian or historic architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards. Evidence of compliance with the Secretary's Standards shall be provided to the City in the form of a report identifying and photographing character-defining features and spaces and specifying how the proposed treatment of character-defining features and spaces and related construction activities will conform to the Secretary's Standards.
- MM-CUL-3:** If the City determines that significant impacts to historical resources cannot be avoided, the City shall require, at a minimum, that the affected historical resources be thoroughly documented before issuance of any permits, and may also require additional public education efforts and/or memorialization of the historical resource. Such recordation shall be prepared under the supervision of an architectural historian, historian, or historic architect meeting the Secretary of

## 6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

---

the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, and should take the form of Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), or Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) documentation. At a minimum, this recordation shall include an architectural and historical narrative; archival photographic documentation; and any supplementary information available, such as building plans and elevations and/or historic photographs. The documentation package shall be produced on archival paper and made available to researchers and the public through accession by appropriate institutions, such as the Local History Center at the Peninsula Center Library, the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton, and/or the HABS/HAER/HALS collection housed in the Library of Congress. Depending on the significance of the historical resource, the City, at its discretion, may also require public education about the historical resource in the form of an exhibit, web page, brochure, or other format and/or memorialization of the historical resource on or near the proposed project site. If memorialized, such memorialization shall be a permanent installation, such as a mural, display, or other vehicle that recalls the location, appearance, and historical significance of the affected historical resource, and shall be designed in conjunction with a qualified architectural historian, historian, or historic architect.

The City finds that there are no other feasible mitigation measures that would further lessen the impact; thus, the impact is unavoidable. The City finds that specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation. However, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable based on specific overriding considerations found in Chapter 10 below.

### **Explanation of the Rationale**

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, pages 4.4-15 through 4.4-18 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

Generally, compliance with City General Plan policies, provisions of the RHEMC, and State and federal regulations pertaining to the alteration, demolition, and relocation of historical resources, in addition to Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-1 and MM-CUL-2, would reduce impacts to historical resources to a less-than-significant level. However, in the event that one or more future projects cannot avoid demolition of a historical resource or alteration of a historical resource in a manner that would materially impair the resource, a significant impact would occur even with the implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-3. While implementation of the mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with City General Plan policies, provisions of the RHEMC, and State and federal regulations pertaining to historical resources, would reduce impacts of the buildout of the proposed GPU on historical resources to the maximum extent feasible, since demolition or other material impairment of a historical resource over the course of buildout of the proposed GPU cannot be precluded, impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.

Threshold (b): The proposed GPU would have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5

## 6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

### Findings

The City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR. While changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed GPU to address this significant effect on the environment, impacts are considered significant and unavoidable since destruction of an archaeological resource over the course of the buildout of the proposed GPU cannot be precluded. The following Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-4 through MM-CUL-7 would be required to reduce impacts of the buildout of the proposed GPU on archaeological resources to the maximum extent feasible but would not be sufficient to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels:

**MM-CUL-4:** To ensure identification and preservation of archaeological resources and avoid significant impacts to those resources, prior to grading approval by the Rolling Hills Estates Planning Commission, each project requiring such approval shall be screened to determine whether an Archaeological Resources Assessment report is required. Screening shall consider the type of project and whether ground disturbance will occur in native soils (i.e., previously undisturbed soils). If so, prior to grading approval by the Rolling Hills Estates Planning Commission, the City shall require an Archaeological Resources Assessment be conducted under the supervision of an archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards.

Archaeological Resources Assessments shall include a California Historical Resources Information System records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center and a Sacred Lands File search through the Native American Heritage Commission. The records searches will determine if the proposed development area has been previously surveyed for archaeological resources, identify and characterize the results of previous cultural resource surveys, and disclose any cultural resources that have been recorded and/or evaluated. If unpaved surfaces are present within the development area, and the entire development area has not been previously surveyed within the past 10 years, a Phase I pedestrian survey shall be undertaken in proposed development areas to locate any surface cultural materials that may be present.

**MM-CUL-5:** If the Archaeological Resources Assessment identifies potentially significant archaeological resources and impacts cannot be avoided, a Phase II Testing and Evaluation investigation shall be performed by an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to determine significance prior to any ground-disturbing activities. If resources are determined significant or unique through Phase II testing and site avoidance is not possible, appropriate site-specific mitigation measures shall be undertaken. These may include a Phase III data recovery program implemented by a qualified archaeologist and performed in accordance with the California Office of Historic Preservation's "Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format" (1990) and "Guidelines for Archaeological Research Designs" (1991).

**MM-CUL-6:** If the Archaeological Resources Assessment did not identify archaeological resources but found the area to be highly sensitive for archaeological resources, a qualified archaeologist shall monitor all ground-disturbing construction and pre-construction activities in areas with previously undisturbed soil. The archaeologist shall inform all construction personnel prior to construction activities of the proper

## 6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

---

procedures in the event of an archaeological discovery. The training shall be held in conjunction with the project's initial on-site safety meeting and shall explain the importance and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall be halted while the resources are evaluated for significance by an archaeologist who meets the Secretary's Standards, and tribal consultation shall be conducted in the case of a tribal resource. If the discovery proves to be significant, the long-term disposition of any collected materials shall be determined in consultation with the affiliated tribe(s), where relevant; this could include curation with a recognized scientific or educational repository, transfer to the tribe, or respectful reinternment in an area designated by the tribe.

**MM-CUL-7:** If an Archaeological Resources Assessment does not identify potentially significant archaeological resources but the site has moderate sensitivity for archaeological resources, an archaeologist who meets the Secretary's Standards shall be retained on call. The archaeologist shall inform all construction personnel prior to construction activities about the proper procedures in the event of an archaeological discovery. The pre-construction training shall be held in conjunction with a future development project's initial on-site safety meeting and shall explain the importance and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall be halted while the on-call archaeologist is contacted. The resource shall be evaluated for significance and tribal consultation shall be conducted, in the case of a tribal resource. If the discovery proves to be significant, the long-term disposition of any collected materials should be determined in consultation with the affiliated tribe(s), where relevant.

The City finds that there are no other feasible mitigation measures that would further lessen the impact; thus, the impact is unavoidable. The City finds that specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation. However, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable based on specific overriding considerations found in Chapter 10 below.

### Explanation of the Rationale

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, pages 4.4-19 through 4.4-21 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-4 through MM-CUL-7 were developed to reduce potential impacts associated with future development and redevelopment under the proposed GPU. Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-4 requires an archaeological resources assessment be conducted for future development projects to identify any known archaeological resources and the sensitivity of the site. Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-5 through MM-CUL-7 detail the next steps required should the archaeological resources assessment identify known resources or determine the site to have high or moderate resource sensitivity. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-4 through MM-CUL-7, in addition to compliance with the City's General Plan policies and State and federal



## 6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

---

regulations pertaining to archaeological resources, would reduce impacts of the buildout of the proposed GPU on archaeological resources to the maximum extent feasible; however, since destruction of an archaeological resource over the course of buildout of the proposed GPU cannot be precluded, impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU's cumulative impacts on cultural resources, specifically historical and archaeological resources, are significant and cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

### Findings

The City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR. While changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed GPU to address this significant effect on the environment, no feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce impacts to cultural resources to less-than-significant levels. Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-1 through MM-CUL-7 would be required to reduce impacts to cultural resources but would not be sufficient to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

The City finds that there are no other feasible mitigation measures that would further lessen the impact; thus, the impact is unavoidable. The City finds that specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation. However, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable based on specific overriding considerations found in Chapter 10 below.

### Explanation of the Rationale

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, pages 4.2-21 through 4.2-22 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

Future development and redevelopment projects in the Palos Verdes Peninsula have the potential to result in cumulative impacts related to the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of historical resources or their immediate surroundings. Significant cultural resources, including archaeological resources, are non-renewable components of finite classes of resources. Therefore, all adverse effects contribute to the erosion of a shrinking base of resources. As a result, the potential for cumulative impacts to cultural resources is cumulatively significant.

Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-1 through MM-CUL-3 would require a historical resources assessment be prepared to evaluate potential historical resources for significance, require conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to reduce a project's impact on historical resources to less than significant, or if impacts cannot be avoided, require the recordation and memorialization of the affected historical resource. Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-4 through MM-CUL-7 require an archaeological resources assessment and detail the next steps required should the assessment identify archaeological resources or determine the site to have high or moderate archaeological resource sensitivity. Implementation of these measures would reduce the potential for adverse impacts on cultural resources both individually and cumulatively; however, there is the potential for significant impacts because documentation, memorialization, and data recovery do not mitigate impacts to a less-than-

## 6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

---

significant level. Therefore, cumulative impacts to cultural resources, including built environment and archaeological resources, are considered significant and unavoidable.

### 6.3 TRANSPORTATION

Threshold (b): Buildout of the proposed GPU would conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)

#### Findings

The City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR. While changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed GPU, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. Specifically, the City finds that the following Mitigation Measures MM-TRAN-1 through MM-TRAN-3 shall be implemented to reduce significant impacts related to vehicle miles traveled (VMT) but would not be sufficient to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels:

**MM-TRAN-1:** The City shall work with future developers of multi-family housing, commercial projects, and mixed-use projects to ensure they provide the following as TDM measures for mitigating VMT:

- **Provision of Pedestrian Network Improvements:** Create a connected pedestrian network within the development and connect to nearby destinations.
- **Construction or Improvements to Bike Facility or Expand Bikeway Network:** Enhance bicycle network Citywide (or at similar scale), such that a building entrance or bicycle parking is within 200 yards walking or bicycling distance from a bicycle network that connects to at least one of the following: at least 10 diverse uses; a school or employment center, if the project total floor area is 50 percent or more residential; or a bus rapid transit stop, light or heavy rail station, commuter rail station, or ferry terminal.

**MM-TRAN-2:** For future projects that exceed the VMT significance thresholds shown in Table 4.16-2, or the VMT significance thresholds in place at the time of the application, the City shall require conditions of approval to reduce the project's VMT. In developing such conditions of approval, the City shall minimally consider the following:

- **Expansion of Car Share Program:** Implement a car-sharing program to (1) lower vehicle ownership rates to encourage a general shift to non-driving modes and (2) allow people to have on-demand access to a shared fleet of vehicles on an as-needed basis as a supplement to trips made by non-single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) modes.
- **Provision of Ridesharing Program:** Provide ride-sharing programs through a multi-faceted approach, such as designating a certain percentage of parking spaces for ride-sharing vehicles or designating adequate passenger loading and unloading and waiting areas for ride-sharing vehicles.

## 6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

- **Implementation of Commute Trip Reduction Program:** Implement a commute trip reduction (CTR) program, which shall include all of the following to be effective:
  - Carpooling encouragement
  - Ride-matching assistance
  - Preferential carpool parking
  - Flexible work schedules for carpools
  - Half-time transportation coordinator
  - Vanpool assistance
  - Bicycle end-trip facilities (e.g., parking, showers, and lockers)

**MM-TRAN-3:** The City of Rolling Hills Estates shall coordinate with neighboring cities and LA Metro to seek additional transit opportunities and resources in the Planning Area and on the Palos Verdes Peninsula. Should a transit station or similar facility be sought on the Peninsula, the Peninsula Center Commercial District shall be a target location for such a facility to align the City's highest density development with transit opportunities.

The City finds that there are no other feasible mitigation measures that would further lessen the impact; thus, the impact is unavoidable. The City finds that specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation. However, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable based on specific overriding considerations found in Chapter 10 below.

### Explanation of the Rationale

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.16, Transportation, pages 4.16-15 through 4.16-18 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

The proposed GPU was analyzed considering both a low-range buildout scenario and a high-range buildout scenario. Neither scenario meets the City's significance threshold for the residential VMT per capita metric, and the low-range buildout scenario does not meet the City's significance threshold for the work VMT per employee metric. As such, the proposed GPU would be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b).

The combination of the strategies identified in Mitigation Measure MM-TRAN-1 would yield approximately a 1-2 percent VMT reduction for the buildout scenarios. The TDM measures identified in Mitigation Measure MM-TRAN-2 are primarily targeted at reducing the work VMT per employee metric (or home-based work attraction trips), whereas the VMT impact for both buildout scenarios is for the residential VMT per capita efficiency metric.

The location of the proposed housing and commercial uses would be mainly concentrated in the Commercial District, which is the most efficient location in the City with respect to VMT. To enhance this efficiency, Mitigation Measure MM-TRAN-3 aims to target transit investments in the

## 6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

---

Commercial District to align the highest density development in the City with transit opportunities. However, requiring a substantial level of TDM measures for future projects would create a financial impediment for developers to build the number housing units outlined in the buildout scenarios, including the City's required Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers. After considering all viable TDM strategies to reduce the VMT impact of the proposed GPU under both buildout scenarios, the proposed GPU would still result in a significant and unavoidable VMT impact.

Cumulative Impacts: A significant cumulative impact related to transportation, specifically on VMT, would result from implementation of the proposed GPU.

### Findings

The City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR. While changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed GPU, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. Specifically, the City finds that Mitigation Measures MM-TRAN-1 through MM-TRAN-3 shall be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts related to VMT but would not be sufficient to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

The City finds that there are no other feasible mitigation measures that would further lessen the impact; thus, the impact is unavoidable. The City finds that specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation. However, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable based on specific overriding considerations found in Chapter 10 below.

### Explanation of the Rationale

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.16, Transportation, pages 4.16-20 through 4.16-21 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

Although both the low-range and high-range buildout scenarios would reduce daily VMT in 2040 compared to existing conditions, both buildout scenarios do not meet the City's significance threshold for the residential VMT per capita metric, and the low-range buildout scenario does not meet the City's significance threshold for the work VMT per employee metric. Accordingly, the proposed GPU has been determined to be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), and impacts related to VMT would be significant. Although the proposed GPU includes numerous goals and policies related to (1) integrating transportation and land use planning to provide mobility options and comfort for pedestrians, bicyclists, equestrians, transit users, and personal vehicles, and (2) providing a balance of high-quality active and passive public open spaces, a regional trail system, and recreation facilities based on community needs, VMT reductions at buildout conditions for the residential VMT per capita metric are substantially lower than the 15-percent minimum threshold. As such, the proposed GPU's contribution to VMT generation in the region would be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts would be considered significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-TRAN-1 would yield approximately a 1-2 percent VMT reduction for the buildout scenarios, which would not be sufficient to reduce the residential VMT per capita by 15 percent. Therefore, the residual VMT impacts associated with the

## 6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

---

buildout of the proposed GPU would remain cumulatively considerable and, thus, are considered to be significant and unavoidable.

### 6.4 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Threshold (a) The proposed GPU would have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or a resource determined by the lead agency to be significant pursuant to criteria from Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(c).

#### Findings

The City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR. While changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed GPU, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. Specifically, the City finds that Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-4 through MM-CUL-7, described above, shall be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to tribal cultural resources but would not be sufficient to reduce such impacts to less-than-significant levels.

The City finds that there are no other feasible mitigation measures that would further lessen the impact; thus, the impact is unavoidable. The City finds that specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation. However, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City has determined that this impact is acceptable based on specific overriding considerations found in Chapter 10 below.

#### Explanation of the Rationale

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.17, Tribal Cultural Resources, pages 4.17-7 through 4.17-9 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

The proposed GPU does not propose any development in and of itself but is a regulatory document that sets the framework for future development and redevelopment in the Planning Area. Because various prehistoric archaeological sites have been identified in the Planning Area, the area is considered potentially sensitive for tribal cultural resources, which could be identified during analysis and CEQA review of future projects. Future development and redevelopment projects must be analyzed on a project-specific basis for conformance with the proposed GPU and other local, State, and federal requirements. Ground-disturbing activities would have the potential to unearth, damage, and/or destroy known or unknown tribal cultural resources and have the potential to result in adverse impacts. Therefore, impacts to tribal cultural resources would potentially be significant.

Future projects proposed in accordance with the proposed GPU would be required to conduct an archaeological resources assessment and archaeological survey to determine whether the development site has high, moderate, or low sensitivity for archaeological resources, including tribal cultural resources (Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-4). If archaeological resources are discovered, Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-5 details additional archaeological testing that shall be

## 6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

---

conducted to determine significance, and Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-6 and MM-CUL-7 require pre-construction training and monitoring if the development site is determined to have high and moderate sensitivity, respectively. Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures and adherence to applicable federal, State, and local regulations would reduce potential impacts of the buildout of the proposed GPU on tribal cultural resources; however, the potential loss of tribal cultural resources may not be adequately mitigated through data recovery and collection methods, as the value of a tribal cultural resource lies in cultural values and religious beliefs of associated tribes. Since significant impacts to tribal cultural resources from future projects building out the Planning Area under the proposed GPU cannot be precluded, impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.

Cumulative Impacts: The proposed GPU would have potentially cumulative impacts on tribal cultural resources.

### Findings

The City finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the GPU, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft PEIR. Specifically, the City finds that Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-4 through MM-CUL-7, described above, shall be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts, but would not be sufficient to reduce impacts to less-than-significant.

The City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the EIR. While changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project to address this significant effect on the environment, no feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce impacts to tribal cultural resources to a less-than-significant level due such resources being unique and non-renewable. The City finds that specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation. However, pursuant to PRC § 21081(a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Board has determined that this impact is acceptable based on specific overriding considerations found herein in Chapter 10 below.

### Explanation of the Rationale

The rationale and facts supporting the above finding are fully developed in Section 4.17, Tribal Cultural Resources, page 4.17-9 of the Draft PEIR. The following presents a summary of that rationale:

While there are no known tribal cultural resources within the Planning Area, it is possible that unknown tribal cultural resources could exist within the Planning Area. Future development and redevelopment projects allowed by the proposed GPU would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact associated with the loss of unknown tribal cultural resources through ground-disturbing activities that could cause substantial adverse change in the significance of tribal cultural resources.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-4 through MM-CUL-7 would reduce the potential for adverse impacts on tribal cultural resources both individually and cumulatively; however, there is the potential for significant impacts because data recovery and collection methods specified as mitigation may not reduce the impact to resources to a less-than-significant level. Potential

## **6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

---

impacts and mitigation would need to be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. Future development projects allowed under the proposed GPU, in combination with cumulative development projects in the surrounding cities in the Palos Verdes Peninsula, would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact to tribal cultural resources. Therefore, cumulative impacts to tribal cultural resources are considered significant and unavoidable.

## **6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

---

This page intentionally left blank.



## 7.0 FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

### 7.0 FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

An EIR must briefly describe the rationale for selection and rejection of alternatives. The lead agency may make an initial determination as to which alternatives are potentially feasible and, therefore, merit in-depth consideration, and which are infeasible. To identify reasonable alternatives to the proposed GPU, the City considered the objectives of the proposed GPU, those alternatives that are feasible to accomplish, and those alternatives that could reduce one or more of the significant impacts of the proposed GPU. The PEIR discussed several alternatives to the proposed GPU in order to present a reasonable range of alternatives. Alternatives analyzed in the Chapter 5 of the Draft PEIR include the following:

- No Project/No Development (Alternative 1)
- Project without Local Density Bonus Alternative (Alternative 2)
- Project without Mixed-Use Overlay on Commercial Office Alternative (Alternative 3)

#### 7.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE (ALTERNATIVE 1)

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires that an EIR evaluate and analyze the impacts of a No Project Alternative. When the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy, or ongoing operation, the No Project Alternative is the continuation of the existing plan, policy, or operation into the future. Accordingly, under Alternative 1, no changes to the current General Plan would occur, including no changes to the land use designations or circulation plan. Alternative 1 would continue to allow future development within the Planning Area of what would be reasonably expected under the current (1992) General Plan based on existing land use designations and their corresponding allowable uses and densities.

##### 7.1.1 ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Alternative 1 would result in the continuation of existing conditions in the Planning Area. While Alternative 1 would reduce the proposed GPU's significant operational air quality impact to a less-than-significant level, it would cause new significant impacts related to biological impacts and vibrations.

##### 7.1.2 FINDINGS

While Alternative 1 would reduce the proposed GPU's significant operational air quality impact to a less-than-significant level, impacts to special status species or habitats, riparian habitat, sensitive communities, federally protected wetlands, and vibration under Alternative 1 may be potentially significant and unavoidable and greater than the proposed GPU without the benefit of implementing Mitigation Measures MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-4 to reduce impacts related to biological resources and MM-NOI-1 and MM-NOI-2 to reduce impacts related to construction vibration. As such these impacts may be potentially significant and unavoidable and would be greater than the proposed GPU. Therefore, the City finds this alternative infeasible and less desirable than the proposed GPU and rejected it because it would fail to meet any of the basic Project objectives, including the City's Vision and Guiding Principles of (1) preserving the City's distinctive rural character and high quality of life; (2) improving mobility and emphasizing a spectrum of transportation choices; (3) promoting a vibrant commercial district that provides ample opportunities for shopping, outdoor dining, entertainment, and living; (4) maintaining

## **7.0 FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

---

equestrian character; (5) providing quality parks, trails, open spaces, and community facilities, where residents and visitors can conveniently walk, ride horses, bike, and take transit to and within the community and where people of all ages can gather, play, and learn safely; (6) enhancing the public realm and promoting quality design; (7) becoming a more sustainable city that is a model for sustainable practices and admired for its quality local environment, natural semi-rural setting, and recreational amenities; and (8) meeting the housing needs established by the State of California.

### **7.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: PROJECT WITHOUT LOCAL DENSITY BONUS ALTERNATIVE**

Under Alternative 2, no local density bonus would be included for the Commercial General land use designation. As a result, the base residential density in the Commercial District would be 30 dwelling units per acre, which with the State's affordable housing density bonus opportunity would provide for a maximum density of 45 dwelling units per acre. Because no local density bonus would be allowed, certain community benefits would not be incentivized.

Alternative 2 would not include the proposed GPU's local density bonus program and, as such, would not allow the same maximum level of buildout as the proposed GPU. Since the Planning Area is predominantly built out, as with the proposed GPU, future new development under Alternative 2 is likely to occur as infill or redevelopment. Accordingly, the majority of future development associated with buildout of Alternative 2 would be located within the Commercial District.

#### **7.2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

Compared to the proposed GPU, Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts to the proposed GPU. Alternative 2 would not reduce the significant and unavoidable project-level impacts and would not reduce the proposed GPU's contribution to the significant cumulative impacts related to air quality, cultural resources, transportation, and tribal cultural resources identified in the Draft PEIR.

#### **7.2.2 FINDINGS**

The City finds this alternative infeasible and less desirable than the proposed GPU and rejected it because it would have similar impacts to the proposed GPU and would not avoid or reduce any of the proposed GPU's impacts to a less-than-significant level. In addition, Alternative 2 would not promote ample housing opportunities for housing to the same extent as the proposed GPU.

### **7.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: PROJECT WITHOUT MIXED-USE OVERLAY ON COMMERCIAL OFFICE ALTERNATIVE**

Under Alternative 3, the Mixed-Use Overlay would not be applied to parcels that are designated as Commercial Office. As a result, 52 dwelling units (under the low range scenario) and 78 dwelling units (under the high range scenario) would not be allowed to be developed on the parcel designated Commercial Office (Academy Center development at the southwest corner of Palos Verdes Drive North and Crenshaw Boulevard).

Alternative 3 would not allow the same maximum level of buildout as the proposed GPU on the parcels that are designated as Commercial Office but would be the same as the proposed GPU on the level of development expected in the Commercial District.

## 7.0 FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

---

### 7.3.1 ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Compared to the Proposed Project, Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts to the proposed GPU. Alternative 3 would not reduce the significant and unavoidable project-level impacts and would not reduce the proposed GPU's contribution to the significant cumulative impacts related to air quality, cultural resources, transportation, and tribal cultural resources identified in the Draft PEIR.

### 7.3.2 Findings

The City finds this alternative infeasible and less desirable than the proposed GPU. Alternative 3 was rejected because it would have similar impacts to the proposed GPU and would not avoid or reduce any of the proposed GPU's impacts to a less-than-significant level. In addition, Alternative 3 would not promote a vibrant commercial district or meet the City's Vision of providing ample opportunities for shopping, outdoor dining, entertainment, and living to the same extent as the proposed GPU.

## **7.0 FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

---

This page intentionally left blank.

## **8.0 FINDINGS REGARDING CHANGES TO THE DRAFT PEIR AND RECIRCULATION**

---

### **8.1 CHANGES TO THE DRAFT PEIR**

In response to comments from the public and other public agencies, the Final PEIR has incorporated changes subsequent to publication of the Draft PEIR, as set forth in Section 3 of the Final PEIR. In addition, mitigation measures proposed in the Draft PEIR were incorporated into a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

### **8.2 REFINEMENT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

Through the public hearing and public workshop process, the City Council made refinements to the proposed GPU, which, in addition to correcting typographical errors and formatting changes, generally consist of the following:

- Chapter 1: Vision and Guiding Principles
  - Added City's Mission Statement to previously blank page.
  - Re-ordered and removed numbering of Guiding Principles.
- Chapter 2: Land Use
  - Existing Mixed-Use Overlay District: currently allows 22 dwelling units/acre; would remain in place for properties with Neighborhood Commercial land use designation and be extended to properties with the Commercial Office designation. Academy Hill (southwest corner of Crenshaw Blvd. and Palos Verdes Drive North) was removed from the Mixed-Use Overlay District.
  - Allowance for workforce housing (affordable staff housing) at 2 dwelling units/acre on properties with Institutional land use designation. All properties with the Institutional land use designation were removed from this overlay, except Dapplegray School, Rolling Hills Covenant Church, and Peninsula High School.
  - All discussion of the reconfiguration and redevelopment of Bart Earle Way was removed.
  - New language was added regarding the future development of a linear park/promenade between Silver Spur Road and Bart Earle Way.
  - Seahorse Riding Club parcel redesignation from Commercial Recreation to Neighborhood Commercial with Mixed-Use Overlay District was removed.
  - Noted calculation error on Existing Residential Development Pro Forma in Appendix A.
  - No changes to Appendix B.
- Chapter 3: Mobility: No modifications were made.
- Chapter 4: Housing: No modifications were made.
- Chapter 5: Conservation
  - Added Hawthorne Boulevard as "Scenic Corridor".
  - Modified language in Goal 5-2 from "local" to "native" regarding the preservation of plant and animal life and their habitats.
- Chapter 6: Open Space and Recreation
  - Noted that Taber Grove is now completed and modified all references to it being a proposed park.
  - Updated status of Butcher Park
- Chapter 7: Safety

## 8.0 FINDINGS REGARDING CHANGES TO THE DRAFT PEIR AND RECIRCULATION

---

- Added language that the policies that ensure both natural and human-made hazards are considered while making land use decisions, particularly given State-mandated requirements to provide additional housing.
- Added language regarding collaboration with Peninsula Cities, on the Peninsula Public Safety Committee and Regional Law Contract Committee.
- Minor clarification language in implementation measures related to the Palos Verdes Landfill
- Chapter 8: Noise
  - Minor language additions to implementation measure regarding excessive motorcycle and altered exhaust vehicles.
- Chapter 9: Sustainability
  - Removed all references to the Home Energy Renovation Opportunity (HERO) and Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) programs.
  - Minor language clarification in implementation measures related to organics collection and used oil and filter recycling.

These refinements to the proposed GPU do not affect the evaluation of environmental impacts in the EIR; no new significant environmental impacts would result from these refinements, nor would there be a substantial increase in the severity of any environmental impact. Given the limited scope and nature of the refinements to the proposed GPU that occurred through the public hearing and public workshop process, buildout of the proposed GPU would remain within the range identified and evaluated within the EIR. In addition, the refinements to the Conservation, Safety, Noise, and Sustainability Elements would serve to further reduce potential environmental impacts.

### 8.3 FINDINGS

Pursuant to CEQA, on the basis of the review and consideration of the Final PEIR, the City finds:

1. None of the comments raise any significant new information that would have to be added to the Draft PEIR.
2. Minor clarifications and updates set forth as revisions to the Draft PEIR have been made that merely make insignificant modifications to the information provided in the Draft PEIR.
3. Neither the minor revisions to the Draft PEIR nor the refinements to the proposed GPU that occurred through the public hearing and public workshop process are substantial changes that would deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on a substantial adverse environmental effect of the proposed GPU, a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect, or a feasible project alternative.
4. Neither the minor revisions to the Draft PEIR nor the refinements to the proposed GPU that occurred through the public hearing and public workshop process result in new significant environmental effects or substantially increase the severity of the previously identified significant effects disclosed in the Draft PEIR.
5. Neither the minor revisions to the Draft PEIR nor the refinements to the proposed GPU that occurred through the public hearing and public workshop process involve mitigation

## 7.0 FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

---

measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the Draft PEIR that would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment.

6. Neither the minor revisions to the Draft PEIR nor the refinements to the proposed GPU that occurred through the public hearing and public workshop process render the Draft PEIR so fundamentally inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment would be precluded.

Thus, none of the conditions set forth in CEQA requiring recirculation of a Draft EIR have been met. Neither incorporation of the revisions to the Draft PEIR into the Final PEIR nor the refinements to the proposed GPU that occurred through the public hearing and public workshop process require the Final PEIR to be circulated for public comments.

## **8.0 FINDINGS REGARDING CHANGES TO THE DRAFT PEIR AND RECIRCULATION**

---

This page intentionally left blank.



---

## 9.0 FINDINGS REGARDING CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL PEIR

---

The City of Rolling Hills Estates (City), the CEQA Lead Agency, finds and declares that the General Plan Update Final PEIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The City Council finds and certifies that the PEIR was reviewed, and information contained in the PEIR was considered prior to approving the proposed GPU.

Based upon its review of the PEIR, the City Council finds that the PEIR is an adequate assessment of the potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed GPU, represents the independent judgment of the City, and sets forth an adequate range of alternatives to this project.

The Final PEIR (April 2022) is comprised of the following elements:

- General Plan Update Initial Study (May 2021)
- General Plan Update Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (October 2021)
- Final PEIR (April 2022)
- Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (January 2022)

Prior to taking action, the City Council reviewed and considered the Final PEIR, all of the information and data in the administrative record, and all oral and written testimony presented to it during meetings and hearings. The City Council finds that the Final PEIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA; the Final PEIR was presented to the City Council, and the City Council reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final PEIR prior to its certification; and the Final PEIR reflects the City's independent judgment and analysis. No changes to the proposed GPU, changes to the environment, comments on the proposed GPU, or any additional information submitted to the City have produced any substantial new information requiring additional environmental review or documentation of the proposed GPU under CEQA.

The City of Rolling Hills Estates City Council hereby declares that no new significant information as defined by the CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 has been received by the City Council after circulation of the PEIR that would require recirculation.

## **9.0 FINDINGS REGARDING CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL PEIR**

---

This page intentionally left blank.

---

**10.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

---

**10.1 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS**

Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines requires lead agencies to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if they elect to approve a project that has significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. As described above in Chapter 6 and based on the information and analysis set forth in the Initial Study, EIR, and the record of proceedings, implementation of the proposed GPU would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality, cultural resources, transportation, and tribal cultural resources, as detailed in the following sections.

**10.1.1 AIR QUALITY (CONSISTENCY WITH THE AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN)**

The proposed GPU would be inconsistent with the SCAQMD AQMP as buildout of the proposed GPU could exceed current SCAG population and employment estimates and would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the Basin. Incorporation of Mitigation Measures MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2 identified in Section 4.2, Air Quality, of the Draft PEIR, into future development projects during construction and operation would contribute to reduced criteria air pollutant emissions associated with buildout of the proposed GPU. In addition, goals and policies included in the proposed GPU would promote increased capacity for alternative transportation modes and implementation of transportation demand management strategies, thereby reducing mobile source emissions. However, since implementation of the proposed GPU would introduce land use intensification in certain portions of the Planning Area, no mitigation measures are available that would reduce total air quality emissions from buildout of the proposed GPU to a less-than-significant level. Furthermore, the population and employment assumptions of the AQMP would still be exceeded until such time the AQMP is revised and incorporates updated projections that consider the proposed GPU. Therefore, air quality impacts, both individually and cumulatively, related to the implementation of the AQMP are considered significant and unavoidable.

**10.1.2 AIR QUALITY (EXCEEDANCE OF REGIONAL THRESHOLDS DURING CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION)**

Construction activities and long-term emissions associated with future development under the proposed GPU could generate air pollutant emissions that exceed the SCAQMD's significance thresholds and would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the Basin. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2 identified in Section 4.2, Air Quality, of the Draft PEIR, would reduce criteria air pollutant emissions from construction-related activities and future development project operations. However, since implementation of the proposed GPU would introduce land use intensification in certain portions of the Planning Area, it cannot be determined with certainty that Mitigation Measures MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2 would reduce impacts below SCAQMD's thresholds in all cases. Therefore, construction and operational impacts, both individually and cumulatively, related to the increase of criteria pollutants for which the Basin is non-attainment are conservatively considered significant and unavoidable.

**10.1.3 AIR QUALITY (SENSITIVE RECEPTORS)**

Construction activities associated with future development under the proposed GPU could generate short-term emissions that may cause localized air quality impacts. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2 identified in Section 4.2, Air Quality, of the Draft PEIR, would reduce criteria air pollutant emissions from construction-related activities and the associated localized impacts. However, since construction activities could occur close to existing sensitive receptors, construction emissions generated by future development projects have the

## 10.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

---

potential to exceed SCAQMD LSTs and it cannot be determined with certainty that Mitigation Measures MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2 would reduce impacts below SCAQMD's thresholds in all cases. Therefore, localized impacts to sensitive receptors are conservatively considered significant and unavoidable.

### 10.1.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES (HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES)

Generally, compliance with City General Plan policies, provisions of the Rolling Hills Estates Municipal Code (RHEMC), and State and federal regulations pertaining to the alteration, demolition, and relocation of historical resources, in addition to Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-1 through MM-CUL-3 identified in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, of the Draft PEIR, would reduce impacts to historical resources to a less-than-significant level. However, in the event that one or more future projects cannot avoid demolition of a historical resource or alteration of a historical resource in a manner that would materially impair the resource and because documentation, memorialization, and data recovery do not mitigate impacts to a less-than-significant level, a significant impact would occur even with the implementation of mitigation measures. While implementation of the mitigation measures, as well as compliance with all applicable regulations pertaining to historical resources, would reduce impacts of the buildout of the proposed GPU on historical resources to the maximum extent feasible, since demolition or other material impairment of a historical resource over the course of buildout of the proposed GPU cannot be precluded, impacts, both individually and cumulatively, are considered significant and unavoidable.

Similarly, implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-4 through MM-CUL-7 identified in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, of the Draft PEIR, as well as compliance with all applicable regulations pertaining to archaeological resources, would reduce impacts of the buildout of the proposed GPU on archaeological resources to the maximum extent feasible; however, since destruction of an archaeological resource over the course of buildout of the proposed GPU cannot be precluded and because documentation, memorialization, and data recovery do not mitigate impacts to a less-than-significant level, impacts, both individually and cumulatively, are considered significant and unavoidable.

### 10.1.5 TRANSPORTATION (VMT IMPACTS)

Both the low-range and high-range buildout scenarios do not meet the City's significance threshold for the residential VMT per capita metric, and the low-range buildout scenario does not meet the City's significance threshold for the work VMT per employee metric. As a result, the proposed GPU would be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), and impacts related to VMT would be significant. After considering all viable TDM strategies (Mitigation Measures MM-TRAN-1 through MM-TRAN-3 identified in Section 4.16, Transportation, of the Draft PEIR, to reduce the VMT impact of the proposed GPU under both buildout scenarios, the proposed GPU would still result in a significant and unavoidable VMT impact.

### 10.1.6 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-CUL-4 through MM-CUL-7 identified in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, of the Draft PEIR, and adherence to all applicable regulations pertaining to tribal cultural resources would reduce potential impacts of the buildout of the proposed GPU on tribal cultural resources; however, the potential loss of tribal cultural resources may not be adequately mitigated through data recovery and collection methods, as the value of a tribal cultural resource lies in cultural values and religious beliefs of associated tribes. Since significant

## 10.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

---

impacts to tribal cultural resources from future projects building out the Planning Area under the proposed GPU cannot be precluded, impacts, both individually and cumulatively, are considered significant and unavoidable.

### 10.2 PROJECT BENEFITS

For projects that would result in significant unavoidable impacts, CEQA requires that the lead agency balance the benefits of these projects against the unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the projects. If the benefits of these projects outweigh the unavoidable impacts, those impacts may be considered acceptable (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093[a]). CEQA requires that, before adopting such projects, the lead agency adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations setting forth the reasons why the lead agency finds that the benefits of the project outweigh the significant environmental effects caused by the project. The City has balanced the proposed GPU's economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits against the proposed GPU's significant and unavoidable air quality, cultural resources, transportation, and tribal cultural resources impacts. The City Council finds that the proposed GPU's benefits outweigh those significant unavoidable impacts, and those impacts, therefore, are considered acceptable in light of the proposed GPU's benefits. The City Council finds that each of the following benefits is an overriding consideration, independent of the other benefits, that warrants approval of the proposed GPU notwithstanding the proposed GPU's significant unavoidable impacts. The proposed GPU would provide the following public benefits:

- The proposed GPU recognizes economic trends and includes programs to proactively address them, including a specific vision and guiding principles to address retail and office vacancies, while envisioning a more vibrant Commercial District to make Rolling Hills Estates a more attractive place to live, work, gather, dine, shop, and play.
- The proposed GPU would provide for greater zoning flexibility in the Commercial District to create greater opportunities for mixed-use development, thereby providing for more housing than the current (1992) General Plan, particularly higher density housing that has a greater likelihood of being affordable, in response to State housing requirements.
- The proposed GPU would allow certain affordable workforce housing to be built on Institutional parcels to provide more housing choices for those who work in Rolling Hills Estates.
- The proposed GPU incentivizes private development projects that provide community benefits and affordable housing to create a thriving Commercial District that is the cultural, entertainment, and economic hub of Rolling Hills Estates.
- The proposed GPU supports economically productive use of land, including revitalization of underutilized and vacant properties.
- The proposed GPU includes a Sustainability Element that establishes a blueprint for steady, responsible action in addressing the effects of climate change for a cleaner, more resilient environment for future generations. The proposed GPU's Sustainability Element includes new policies and programs to (1) reduce greenhouse gas emissions, (2) reduce air pollutant emissions, (3) prepare the City for long-term adaptability to climate change, (4) reduce energy consumption, (5) protect fresh water availability and reduce potable water consumption, (6) manage and harvest stormwater, (7) stimulate sustainable growth, (8)

## 10.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

---

expand dark skies standards in the City's Zoning to minimize light pollution, and (9) reduce solid waste disposal, promote composting and recycling, and encourage more sustainable living.

- The proposed GPU would primarily concentrate growth in the Commercial District, thereby (1) resulting in fewer impacts from the expansion of infrastructure into undeveloped open space areas, (2) minimizing the expansion of impervious surfaces, and (3) encouraging low impact development and on-site retention of stormwater.
- The proposed GPU's Conservation Element Update includes updated policies and programs to protect hillsides; preserve the natural environment and resources of the City; prioritize restoration of habitats for sensitive and/or endangered species; maintain wetlands and surface water functions; ensure the protection of sites of paleontological, archaeological, historical, and culturally valuable significance; and establish an Urban Forestry program to maintain a resilient and healthy tree canopy in the City.
- Given that approximately 26 percent of the City's population is 65 years old or older, the proposed GPU's Sustainability Element acknowledges and addresses the unique needs of this vulnerable group through goals, policies, and implementation measures in all seven pillars of sustainability (i.e., Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Energy, Water Resources, Quality of Life, Land Use, Mobility, and Waste Management and Recycling), such as ensuring that home-bound populations receive the resources they need during extreme heat events and identifying potential partnerships with health care providers and local nonprofit organizations, such as the Palos Verdes Peninsula Village and Palos Verdes Peninsula Seniors, as established in the proposed GPU's Safety Element Update.
- Given that there are no high quality transit areas existing within the City or any planned in SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS for the Palos Verdes Peninsula, the proposed GPU's Sustainability Element developed innovative goals, policies, and implementation measures for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in this context, including the implementation of "carbon sinks," such as urban forests and soil amendments, and the pursuit of lobbying strategies to encourage transit agencies to provide increased high-quality transit opportunities to the Palos Verdes Peninsula. The Sustainability Element also identifies ways to increase the use of alternate modes of transit within the City by improving pedestrian, bike, and equestrian connectivity to reduce jurisdictional vehicle miles traveled (VMT).
- The proposed GPU promotes a stronger sense of community through additional public spaces, particularly in the Commercial District, that foster placemaking.
- The proposed GPU's Open Space and Recreation Element includes updated policies and programs to (1) preserve natural open space areas to protect the local natural environment for present and future generations; (2) strive to create contiguous open space and multi-trail networks; (3) preserve and promote the use of and access to equestrian trails in the City; (4) promote a cooperative, neighborly, and cultural community by encouraging recreational programs that stimulate, educate, and enrich the lives of residents.
- The proposed GPU's Safety Element Update includes updated policies and programs supporting emergency preparedness and resiliency to climate change impacts, including programs engaging lower income residents.

---

**10.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

---

**10.3 CONCLUSION**

The City Council, after balancing the specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed GPU, has determined that the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts identified may be considered "acceptable" due to the specific considerations listed above, which outweigh the unavoidable, adverse environmental impacts of the proposed GPU.

Accordingly, City Council adopts this Statement of Overriding Considerations, recognizing that unavoidable significant air quality, cultural resources, transportation, and tribal cultural resources impacts would result from implementation of the proposed GPU. Having (1) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, (2) rejected alternatives to the proposed GPU as discussed in Chapter 7 above, and (3) recognized all unavoidable significant impacts, the City Council hereby finds that each of the separate benefits of the proposed GPU, as stated herein, is determined to be unto itself an overriding consideration, independent of other benefits, that warrants approval of the proposed GPU and outweighs and overrides the proposed GPU's unavoidable significant adverse environmental effects, and thereby justifies the approval of the City's proposed GPU.

**10.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

---

This page intentionally left blank.



# CITY OF ROLLING HILLS ESTATES

## GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
SCH No. 2021050450

### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

---

**CITY OF ROLLING HILLS ESTATES**  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
4045 PALOS VERDES DRIVE NORTH  
ROLLING HILLS ESTATES, CA 90274

*Prepared by:*

**Michael Baker**  
**INTERNATIONAL**

3760 KILROY AIRPORT WAY, SUITE 270  
LONG BEACH, CA 90806

**APRIL 2022**



City of Rolling Hill Estates Rolling Hills Estates General Plan Update Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring			Reporting		
	Period of Implementation	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Procedure	Comments	Date	Initials
<b>Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-1:</b> The City of Rolling Hills Estates shall require applicants of future development projects that require discretionary grading approval by the Planning Commission to control ozone precursor emissions from construction equipment vehicles by maintaining equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer's specifications. The equipment maintenance records and equipment design specifications data sheets shall be kept on site by the project contractor during construction activities.	During construction	City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department	The Community Development Department shall ensure equipment maintenance records and equipment design specifications data sheets are maintained on-site and verify that engines of construction equipment vehicles are maintained in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer's specifications.			
<b>Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-2:</b> To identify potential long-term operational-related air quality impacts from future development projects that are larger than the representative projects considered in the Draft PEIR, project-specific air emissions impacts shall be determined in compliance with the latest version of the SCAQMD CEQA Guidelines. To address potential localized impacts, the air quality analysis shall be completed pursuant to the latest version of SCAQMD's Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology document or other appropriate methodology as determined in conjunction with SCAQMD. The results of the operational-related and localized air quality impacts analyses shall be included in the future development project's CEQA documentation. If such analyses identify potentially significant regional or localized air quality impacts, the City shall require the incorporation of appropriate mitigation to reduce such impacts as required by CEQA. In such cases, appropriate mitigation could include, but would not be limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of Tier 4 equipment during project construction;</li> <li>• Incorporation of energy-efficient design features beyond those required by Title 24 and the CALGreen Code; and</li> <li>• Application of transportation demand measures (TDM) beyond those required by code.</li> </ul>	During development of project-specific CEQA documentation	City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department	The Community Development Department shall ensure project-specific CEQA documentation contains project-specific air emissions impacts analysis and a determination if the project is in compliance with the latest version of the SCAQMD CEQA Guidelines.			

City of Rolling Hill Estates Rolling Hills Estates General Plan Update Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring			Reporting		
	Period of Implementation	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Procedure	Comments	Date	Initials
<p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-1:</b> The City of Rolling Hills Estates shall require applicants of future development projects that require discretionary grading approval by the Planning Commission within portions of the City that are included within USFWS-designated critical habitat for coastal California Gnatcatcher, or are within close proximity to known occurrences of protected species, such as those identified on Figure 4.3-1, found in Section 4.3, Biological Resources, of the Draft PEIR, to prepare a biological resources survey. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and shall minimally include a reconnaissance level field survey of the project site for the presence and quality of biological resources potentially affected by project development. These resources include, but are not limited to, protected/special-status species or their habitat, sensitive habitats such as wetlands or riparian areas, and jurisdictional waters. If sensitive or protected biological resources are absent from the project site and adjacent lands potentially affected by the project, the biologist shall submit a written report substantiating such to the City of Rolling Hills Estates before issuance of a grading permit by the City, and the project may proceed without any further biological investigation.</p> <p>If sensitive or protected biological resources are present on the project site or may be potentially affected by the project, then a qualified biologist shall evaluate impacts to sensitive or protected biological resources from development and produce a biological resources impact assessment. The impact assessment may include focused plant and animal surveys or jurisdictional delineations to determine a future development project's impact to biological resources, along with corresponding project-specific mitigation measures, as necessary. To minimize impacts, the City of Rolling Hills Estates will require applicants to design projects to avoid impacts to sensitive or protected biological resources to the greatest extent feasible. Further, if sensitive or protected species are present on the project site, then the applicant shall consult with the appropriate oversight agency, such as CDFW or USFWS, as necessary.</p>	Prior to issuance of a grading permit	City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department	The Community Development Department shall ensure that future development projects that require discretionary grading approval that are within USFWS-designated critical habitat for coastal California Gnatcatcher, or other protected species, have a qualified biologist prepare a biological resources survey. The Community Development Department shall review the survey and ensure compliance with the any suggested measures.			

City of Rolling Hill Estates Rolling Hills Estates General Plan Update Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring			Reporting		
	Period of Implementation	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Procedure	Comments	Date	Initials
<p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-2:</b> If future development projects that involve vegetation removal, and are not otherwise categorically exempt from CEQA or subject to the emergency project statutory exemption from CEQA, are unable to avoid construction activities within nesting bird season (January 1st through July 31st for raptors and February 1st through August 31<sup>st</sup> for other avian species), a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey for avian species to determine the presence/absence, location, and status of any active nests on or adjacent to the area proposed development area. The survey shall be conducted for active nests, eggs, and young of any bird species protected by the state or federal Endangered Species Acts, Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), and/or the California Fish and Game Code (CFGF) Sections 3503, 3503.5, or 3511, within 200 feet of the disturbance zone for songbirds, or within 500 feet of the disturbance zone for raptors and special-status bird species. To avoid the destruction of active nests and to protect the reproductive success of birds protected by the MBTA and the CFGF, a nesting bird survey should be conducted no more than three (3) days prior to the commencement of project construction if construction occurs between January 1st and August 31st. In the event that active nests are discovered, a suitable buffer (distance to be determined by the biologist) shall be established around such active nests, and no construction activities within the buffer will be allowed, until the biologist has determined that the nest(s) is no longer active (i.e., the nestlings have fledged and are no longer dependent on the nest).</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of a grading permit and during construction</p>	<p>City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department</p>	<p>The Community Development Department shall ensure that future development projects that involve vegetation removal, are not categorically exempt from CEQA or subject to the emergency project statutory exemption from CEQA, and are unable to avoid construction activities within nesting bird season, have a qualified biologist prepare a pre-construction nesting bird survey. The Community Development Department shall review the survey and ensure compliance with any suggested measures, which may include establishing suitable buffer distances around active nests.</p>			
<p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-3:</b> The City of Rolling Hills Estates shall require applicants of future development projects that require discretionary grading approval by the Planning Commission and are not categorically exempt from CEQA or subject to the emergency project statutory exemption from CEQA to retain a qualified bat biologist to conduct a clearance survey for bats within suitable structures and trees within a project's impact area within 30 days of construction. If bats roosts are found within the project impact area, the qualified bat biologist shall identify the bats to the species level and evaluate the colony to determine its size and significance. If any structures house an active maternity colony of bats, construction activities shall not occur during the recognized bat breeding season (March 1 to October 1). Any proposed work in areas with no suitable roosting or</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of a grading permit and during construction</p>	<p>City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department</p>	<p>The Community Development Department shall ensure that future development projects that require discretionary grading approval and are not categorically exempt from CEQA or subject to the emergency project statutory exemption retain a qualified bat biologist to conduct a clearance survey for bats. The Community Development Department shall review the survey and ensure compliance with any suggested measures,</p>			

City of Rolling Hill Estates Rolling Hills Estates General Plan Update Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring			Reporting		
	Period of Implementation	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Procedure	Comments	Date	Initials
<p>foraging habitat shall not require a bat survey. If a bat roost is present within the vicinity of a proposed project impact area that does not need to be removed, a qualified bat biologist shall establish a species-specific no-disturbance buffer that must be maintained throughout the duration of the project's construction. If a maternity roost is identified, a no disturbance buffer shall be established and maintained until a qualified bat biologist determines that the roost is no longer active.</p> <p>If project activities must occur during non-daylight hours or during the bat breeding season (March 1 to October 1), a qualified bat biologist shall establish monitoring measures, including frequency and duration, based on species, individual behavior, and type of construction activities. Night lighting shall be used only within the portion of the project actively being worked on and focused directly on the work area. This measure would minimize visual disturbance and allow bats to continue to utilize the remainder of the area for foraging and night roosting. If bats are showing signs of distress, work activities shall be modified to prevent bats from abandoning their roost or altering their feeding behavior. At any time, the qualified biologist shall have the authority to halt work if there are any signs of distress or disturbance that may lead to roost abandonment. Work shall not resume until corrective measures have been taken or it is determined that continued activity would not adversely affect roost success. Any roosting habitat loss shall be sequenced, and roosting habitat shall be restored or replaced in-kind and on-site to prevent temporal or permanent loss based on the bat species roosting requirements.</p>			which may include a species-specific no-disturbance buffer, limiting night lighting, and other techniques as suggested by the biologist.			
<p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-4:</b> The City of Rolling Hills Estates shall require applicants of future development projects that that require discretionary grading approval by the Planning Commission within portions of the Planning Area that are located within 100-feet of a riverine or wetland feature, as identified in Figure 4.3-4, found in Section 4.3, Biological Resources, of the Draft PEIR, to prepare a biological resources survey. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and shall minimally include a site survey for the presence and quality of riverine or wetland features potentially affected by project development, as well as a stream delineation of the potentially impacted riparian or wetland feature. If such features are present and may be impacted by the future development, then the City shall require appropriate vegetative buffers and/or setbacks</p>	Prior to issuance of a grading permit	City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department	The Community Development Department shall ensure that future development projects that require discretionary grading approval have a qualified biologist prepare a biological resources survey that includes a site survey for the presence and quality of riverine or wetland features potentially affected by project development, as well as a stream delineation. The Community Development Department shall review the			

City of Rolling Hill Estates Rolling Hills Estates General Plan Update Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring			Reporting		
	Period of Implementation	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Procedure	Comments	Date	Initials
adjoining the stream or wetland feature to reduce impacts of future development on these riparian or wetland features. If avoidance of riparian habitat, wetlands, or other drainage features within the jurisdiction of the CDFW or Army Corps is not possible, permits/approvals from the jurisdictional agency/agencies will be necessary and impacted acreage shall be replaced at a ratio acceptable to the jurisdictional agency/agencies. In no case shall the replacement ratio be less than 1:1.			assessment and ensure compliance with any suggested measures, which may include vegetative buffers and/or setbacks.			
<b>Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-1:</b> Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit for projects that propose to relocate, demolish, or alter a building or structure that is over 45 years old, possesses a distinctive architectural style, and was built during and representative of the period of significance for that architectural style (e.g., California Ranch of the 1940s and 1950s, Midcentury Modern of the 1940s-1960s, etc.), the City of Rolling Hills Estates shall require the applicant to submit a historical resources assessment report, if the building or structure has not been previously evaluated for potential historical significance. For single-family residential properties, a historical resources assessment report shall only be required if the involved building/structure is characteristic of the surrounding neighborhood and the demolition/alteration involves a façade or building volume that is/would be visible from the street or other publicly accessible vantage point. If the building or structure is determined to be a historical resource, the report shall include an assessment of the project's impacts to the resource. The report shall be prepared by a qualified Architectural Historian or Historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards, and shall satisfy federal and State guidelines for the identification, evaluation, and recordation of historical resources. Should the City conduct and/or approve a citywide or neighborhood/district historic resources inventory, within the bounds of that survey this mitigation measure shall only apply to potentially significant historic resources identified by the inventory. Similarly, should a historic context statement be prepared for any historical themes in Rolling Hills Estates, the guidance and recommendations of the historic context statement shall supersede the requirements of this mitigation measure for potentially significant historic resources within that theme.	Prior to issuance of a demolition permit	City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department	Upon submission of a historical resources assessment regarding a building or structure that is of possible historical significance, the Community Development Department shall review the assessment and ensure compliance with the suggested techniques, which may include periodic site inspections or further study.			

City of Rolling Hill Estates Rolling Hills Estates General Plan Update Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring			Reporting		
	Period of Implementation	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Procedure	Comments	Date	Initials
<b>Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-2:</b> The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties shall be used to the maximum extent possible to ensure that projects involving the relocation, conversion, rehabilitation, or alteration of a historical resource and its setting, or related new construction, will not impair the significance of the historical resource. Use of the Secretary's Standards shall be overseen by an architectural historian or historic architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards. Evidence of compliance with the Secretary's Standards shall be provided to the City in the form of a report identifying and photographing character-defining features and spaces and specifying how the proposed treatment of character-defining features and spaces and related construction activities will conform to the Secretary's Standards.	Prior to construction	City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department	Upon submission by a qualified architectural historian or historic architect of compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, the Community Development Department shall review the documentation and ensure compliance with the Secretary's Standards, which may require periodic site inspections.			
<b>Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-3:</b> If the City determines that significant impacts to historical resources cannot be avoided, the City shall require, at a minimum, that the affected historical resources be thoroughly documented before issuance of any permits, and may also require additional public education efforts and/or memorialization of the historical resource. Such recordation shall be prepared under the supervision of an architectural historian, historian, or historic architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, and should take the form of Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), or Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) documentation. At a minimum, this recordation shall include an architectural and historical narrative; archival photographic documentation; and any supplementary information available, such as building plans and elevations and/or historic photographs. The documentation package shall be produced on archival paper and made available to researchers and the public through accession by appropriate institutions, such as the Local History Center at the Peninsula Center Library, the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton, and/or the HABS/HAER/HALS collection housed in the Library of Congress. Depending on the significance of the historical resource, the City, at its discretion, may also require public education about the historical resource in the form of an exhibit, web page, brochure, or other format and/or memorialization of the historical resource on or near the proposed project site. If	Prior to issuance of any permits	City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department	Upon determination that significant impacts to historical resources cannot be avoided, the Community Development Department shall ensure that the affected historical resources are thoroughly documented and recorded by a qualified architectural historian, historian, or historic architect. The documentation may include narrative, archival photographic documentation, and any supplementary information.			



City of Rolling Hill Estates Rolling Hills Estates General Plan Update Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring			Reporting		
	Period of Implementation	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Procedure	Comments	Date	Initials
memorialized, such memorialization shall be a permanent installation, such as a mural, display, or other vehicle that recalls the location, appearance, and historical significance of the affected historical resource, and shall be designed in conjunction with a qualified architectural historian, historian, or historic architect.						
<p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-4:</b> To ensure identification and preservation of archaeological resources and avoid significant impacts to those resources, prior to grading approval by the Rolling Hills Estates Planning Commission, each project requiring such approval shall be screened to determine whether an Archaeological Resources Assessment report is required. Screening shall consider the type of project and whether ground disturbance will occur in native soils (i.e., previously undisturbed soils). If so, prior to grading approval by the Rolling Hills Estates Planning Commission, the City shall require an Archaeological Resources Assessment be conducted under the supervision of an archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards.</p> <p>Archaeological Resources Assessments shall include a California Historical Resources Information System records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center and a Sacred Lands File search through the Native American Heritage Commission. The records searches will determine if the proposed development area has been previously surveyed for archaeological resources, identify and characterize the results of previous cultural resource surveys, and disclose any cultural resources that have been recorded and/or evaluated. If unpaved surfaces are present within the development area, and the entire development area has not been previously surveyed within the past 10 years, a Phase I pedestrian survey shall be undertaken in proposed development areas to locate any surface cultural materials that may be present.</p>	Prior to issuance of grading permit	City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department	The Community Development Department shall determine if an Archaeological Resources Assessment report is required based on criteria including the type of project and whether any ground disturbance will occur in native soils. If an Archaeological Resources Assessment is deemed necessary, the Community Development Department will ensure the report is prepared under the supervision of a qualified archaeologist and contains sufficient information including a CHRIS records search, SCCIC search, and a Sacred Lands File search. The Community Development Department will ensure that the report and ensure compliance with any suggested measures.			

City of Rolling Hill Estates Rolling Hills Estates General Plan Update Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring			Reporting		
	Period of Implementation	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Procedure	Comments	Date	Initials
<b>Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-5:</b> If the Archaeological Resources Assessment identifies potentially significant archaeological resources and impacts cannot be avoided, a Phase II Testing and Evaluation investigation shall be performed by an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards to determine significance prior to any ground-disturbing activities. If resources are determined significant or unique through Phase II testing and site avoidance is not possible, appropriate site-specific mitigation measures shall be undertaken. These may include a Phase III data recovery program implemented by a qualified archaeologist and performed in accordance with the California Office of Historic Preservation’s “Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format” (1990) and “Guidelines for Archaeological Research Designs” (1991).	Prior to issuance of grading permit	City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department	If potentially significant impacts to archaeological resources cannot be avoided, the Community Development Department shall ensure completion of a Phase II Testing and Evaluation investigation by a qualified archaeologist to determine significance of the impacted resources. If resources are determined significant, or unique and avoidance is not possible, the Community Development Department shall ensure compliance with site-specific mitigation measures which may include a Phase III data recovery program.			
<b>Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-6:</b> If the Archaeological Resources Assessment did not identify archaeological resources but found the area to be highly sensitive for archaeological resources, a qualified archaeologist shall monitor all ground-disturbing construction and pre-construction activities in areas with previously undisturbed soil. The archaeologist shall inform all construction personnel prior to construction activities of the proper procedures in the event of an archaeological discovery. The training shall be held in conjunction with the project’s initial on-site safety meeting and shall explain the importance and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall be halted while the resources are evaluated for significance by an archaeologist who meets the Secretary’s Standards, and tribal consultation shall be conducted in the case of a tribal resource. If the discovery proves to be significant, the long-term disposition of any collected materials shall be determined in consultation with the affiliated tribe(s), where relevant; this could include curation with a recognized scientific or educational repository, transfer to the tribe, or respectful reinterment in an area designated by the tribe.	During construction	City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department	The Community Development Department shall conduct periodic site inspections during ground-disturbing activities to ensure monitoring is occurring in accordance with this measure. The Community Development Department shall ensure training has been conducted by a qualified archaeologist.			

City of Rolling Hill Estates Rolling Hills Estates General Plan Update Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring			Reporting		
	Period of Implementation	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Procedure	Comments	Date	Initials
<p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-7:</b> If an Archaeological Resources Assessment does not identify potentially significant archaeological resources but the site has moderate sensitivity for archaeological resources, an archaeologist who meets the Secretary's Standards shall be retained on call. The archaeologist shall inform all construction personnel prior to construction activities about the proper procedures in the event of an archaeological discovery. The pre-construction training shall be held in conjunction with a future development project's initial on-site safety meeting and shall explain the importance and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall be halted while the on-call archaeologist is contacted. The resource shall be evaluated for significance and tribal consultation shall be conducted, in the case of a tribal resource. If the discovery proves to be significant, the long-term disposition of any collected materials should be determined in consultation with the affiliated tribe(s), where relevant.</p>	During construction	City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department	The Community Development Department shall conduct periodic site inspections during ground-disturbing activities to ensure monitoring is occurring in accordance with this measure. The Community Development Department shall ensure training has been conducted by a qualified archaeologist.			
<p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-GEO-1:</b> To ensure identification and preservation of significant paleontological resources and avoid significant impacts to those resources, prior to the issuance of a grading approval by the City of Rolling Hills Estates Planning Commission, each project requiring such approval shall be screened to determine whether a full paleontological resources assessment is required. Screening shall consider whether the proposed grading activity will extend into known undisturbed fossil-bearing strata (i.e., those of the Monterey Formation, including Lomita Marl Member, Valmonte Diatomite Member, and Altamira Shale Member). If so, the City shall require a paleontological resources assessment be conducted by a paleontologist that meets Bureau of Land Management or Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards (i.e., a qualified paleontologist) prior to the issuance of a grading approval. If the paleontological resources assessment identifies the potential for destruction of significant paleontological resources, an avoidance and/or recovery plan shall be developed and implemented under the supervision of a qualified paleontologist to the satisfaction of the City of Rolling Hills Estates.</p>	Prior to issuance of grading permit	City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department	The Community Development Department shall determine if a paleontological resources assessment is required. If required, the Community Development Department shall ensure the assessment is conducted by a qualified paleontologist. If the assessment identifies the potential for destruction of significant paleontological resources, the Community Development Department shall review and ensure compliance with an avoidance and/or recovery plan.			

City of Rolling Hill Estates Rolling Hills Estates General Plan Update Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring			Reporting		
	Period of Implementation	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Procedure	Comments	Date	Initials
<b>Mitigation Measure MM-GEO-2:</b> In the event that any prehistoric subsurface paleontological resources are encountered during future construction or the course of any ground disturbance activities, all such activities shall halt immediately, at which time the applicant shall notify the City and consult with a qualified paleontologist to assess the significance of the find. In the case of discovery of paleontological resources, the assessment shall be done in accordance with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. If any find is determined to be significant, appropriate avoidance measures recommended by the consultant and approved by the City must be followed unless avoidance is determined to be unnecessary or infeasible by the City. If avoidance is unnecessary or infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery, excavation) shall be instituted.	During construction	City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department	Upon finding of paleontological resources, the Community Development Department shall conduct periodic site inspections to ensure project development is occurring in accordance with this measure. The Community Development Department shall also review the techniques proposed by the qualified paleontologist and ensure compliance with the recommendations.			
<b>Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1:</b> Projects with construction activities that use equipment with high vibration levels, including, but not limited to, pile drivers, vibratory rollers, large bulldozers, and loaded trucks, within 25 feet of an occupied sensitive use (i.e., historical buildings, residential, senior care facilities, hospitals, and schools/day care centers) shall be required to prepare a project-specific vibration impact analysis to identify the potential project-specific construction vibration impacts associated with the project, and to determine any specific vibration control mechanisms that shall be incorporated into the project's construction bid documents to reduce such impacts. Contract specifications shall be included in construction documents, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer prior to issuance of a grading permit.	Prior to issuance of grading permit	City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department	The Community Development Department shall ensure a project-specific vibration impact analysis will be prepared in accordance with this measure.			
<b>Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2:</b> Projects within 100 feet of a historic structure(s) shall implement the following measures to reduce the potential for architectural/structural damage resulting from elevated groundborne noise and vibration levels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pile driving within 50 feet of any historic structure(s) shall utilize alternative installation methods, such as pile cushioning, jetting, predrilling, cast-in-place systems, and resonance-free vibratory pile drivers.</li> <li>• As accessible, a preconstruction survey of all eligible for listing or listed historic buildings under the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historic Resources, and/or local historic database(s)</li> </ul>	Prior to issuance of grading permit	City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department	The Community Development Department shall ensure projects within 100 feet of a historic structure(s) implement measures to reduce the potential for architectural/structural damage. Potential measures may include utilizing alternative installation methods, documenting fixtures and finishes as described in			

City of Rolling Hill Estates Rolling Hills Estates General Plan Update Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring			Reporting		
	Period of Implementation	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Procedure	Comments	Date	Initials
<p>within 50 feet of proposed construction activities shall be conducted. Fixtures and finishes within 50 feet of construction activities susceptible to damage shall be documented photographically and in writing. The preconstruction survey shall determine conditions that exist before construction begins for use in evaluating any damage caused by construction activities. Construction vibration monitoring shall be conducted at the edges of these historic properties and construction activities shall be reduced, as needed, to ensure no damage occurs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vibration monitoring shall be conducted prior to and during pile driving operations occurring within 100 feet of the historic structure(s). Contractors shall limit construction vibration levels during pile driving and impact activities in the vicinity of the historic structure(s) in accordance with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual, dated April 2020, or subsequent updates of this Manual.</li> </ul>			<p>this measure, and vibration monitoring.</p>			
<p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-TRAN-1:</b> The City shall work with future developers of multi-family housing, commercial projects, and mixed-use projects to ensure they provide the following as TDM measures for mitigating VMT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Provision of Pedestrian Network Improvements:</b> Create a connected pedestrian network within the development and connect to nearby destinations.</li> <li><b>Construction or Improvements to Bike Facility or Expand Bikeway Network:</b> Enhance bicycle network Citywide (or at similar scale), such that a building entrance or bicycle parking is within 200 yards walking or bicycling distance from a bicycle network that connects to at least one of the following: at least 10 diverse uses; a school or employment center, if the project total floor area is 50 percent or more residential; or a bus rapid transit stop, light or heavy rail station, commuter rail station, or ferry terminal.</li> </ul>	<p>Prior to construction activities</p>	<p>City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department</p>	<p>The Community Development Department shall ensure future projects provide the mitigation established in this measure for mitigation of VMT.</p>			

City of Rolling Hill Estates Rolling Hills Estates General Plan Update Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring			Reporting		
	Period of Implementation	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Procedure	Comments	Date	Initials
<p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-TRAN-2:</b> For future projects that exceed the VMT significance thresholds shown in Table 4.16-2, of Section 4.16, Transportation, of the Draft PEIR, or the VMT significance thresholds in place at the time of the application, the City shall require conditions of approval to reduce the project's VMT. In developing such conditions of approval, the City shall minimally consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Expansion of Car Share Program:</b> Implement a car-sharing program to (1) lower vehicle ownership rates to encourage a general shift to non-driving modes and (2) allow people to have on-demand access to a shared fleet of vehicles on an as- needed basis as a supplement to trips made by non-single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) modes.</li> <li>• <b>Provision of Ridesharing Program:</b> Provide ride-sharing programs through a multi-faceted approach, such as designating a certain percentage of parking spaces for ride-sharing vehicles or designating adequate passenger loading and unloading and waiting areas for ride-sharing vehicles.</li> <li>• <b>Implementation of Commute Trip Reduction Program:</b> Implement a commute trip reduction (CTR) program, which shall include all of the following to be effective:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Carpooling encouragement</li> <li>○ Ride-matching assistance</li> <li>○ Preferential carpool parking</li> <li>○ Flexible work schedules for carpools</li> <li>○ Half-time transportation coordinator</li> <li>○ Vanpool assistance</li> <li>○ Bicycle end-trip facilities (e.g., parking, showers, and lockers).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Prior to construction activities	City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department	The Community Development Department shall ensure projects that exceed established VMT significance thresholds incorporate conditions of approval to reduce the project's VMT. These conditions of approval may include the VMT strategy in this measure.			
<p><b>Mitigation Measure MM-TRAN-3:</b> The City of Rolling Hills Estates shall coordinate with neighboring cities and LA Metro to seek additional transit opportunities and resources in the Planning Area and on the Palos Verdes Peninsula. Should a transit station or similar facility be sought on the Peninsula, the Peninsula Center Commercial District shall be a target location for such a facility to align the City's highest density development with transit opportunities.</p>	Ongoing basis	City of Rolling Hills Estates Community Development Department	The Community Development Department shall ensure the City's ongoing compliance with this measure.			

End of Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.