
8.0 REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR DOCUMENTS

8.1 INTRODUCTION

This section of the Final EIR identifies the revisions to the Draft EIR and the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document that were made in response to comments received on the documents or as initiated by the Lead Agency (City of Rolling Hills Estates). Certain revisions to the original Draft EIR that were documented in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document are not reiterated in this section.

The revisions to the original Draft EIR are shown below in excerpts from the Draft EIR with underlined text for additions and ~~striketrough~~ text for deletions and/or as a narrative description of the revision. The revisions to the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document are shown with double underlined text for additions and ~~double striketrough~~ text for deletions and/or as a narrative description of the revision.

The revisions identified below are shown in the order they appear in the EIR and under their corresponding Chapter heading and page number from the Draft EIR or Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document. These revisions have also been made to the text in the body of the EIR (Executive Summary and Chapters 1-7). The Executive Summary and Chapters 1-7 of the Draft EIR, with the both revisions identified in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document and the revisions shown below, constitute Chapters 1-7 of the Final EIR.

8.2 REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR AND RECIRCULATED PORTIONS OF THE DRAFT EIR DOCUMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Table ES.1, first column, was modified to reflect the revisions to the impact summaries that occurred since the original Draft EIR was published. The revised impact summaries are:

Impact AQ-2: Construction of the proposed project would generate criteria air pollutants, which would affect localized air quality. PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions generated by project construction would exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Screening Thresholds for Localized Significance, both before and after mitigation, and NO_2 emissions generated by project construction would exceed the District's Screening Thresholds before mitigation. Dispersion modeling indicates that the project's construction emissions would exceed the District's significance thresholds for localized concentrations of NO_2 (1-hour standard only), PM_{10} (1-hour and annual standards), and $PM_{2.5}$ (1-hour and annual standards). This is a significant impact that cannot be mitigated.

Impact AQ-3: Construction of the proposed project would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter (DPM), crystalline silica, and earth metals. However, such toxic air contaminants would not cause an exceedence of the applicable chronic health index at any sensitive receptors. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. Before mitigation, construction-induced DPM emission levels exceed the applicable chronic health index. However, after mitigation, DPM emission levels are below the applicable chronic health index. This is a significant but mitigable impact.

Impact AQ-8: Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate greenhouse gases (GHG), which contribute to the cumulative impact of global climate change. Before mitigation, the total GHG emissions attributable to the project would exceed 3,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO₂e) per year, which was identified as the residential and commercial screening threshold for GHG emissions in the preliminary (unadopted) October 2008 iteration of the SCAQMD Draft Guidance document for GHG analysis. This is a potentially significant but mitigable cumulative impact. However, the project would result in a net reduction in GHG emissions and, as such, the project's contribution to the Earth's GHG levels and the related impacts on global climate would not be considerable. Therefore, the project's impact on global climate change is not significant.

Impact BIO-2a: The proposed project would result in the loss of 1.5 acres of remnant coastal sage scrub habitat that exists on the northern cliffs of the Chandler's quarry pit. The project would also marginally impact a patch of non-jurisdictional freshwater emergent vegetation along the site's southeastern boundary. Neither coastal sage scrub nor freshwater emergent vegetation is considered a sensitive natural community. This impact is a potentially significant but mitigable impact.

Impact BIO-2b: The proposed project would impact 0.3444 acres of potentially jurisdictional waters of the State (0.0576 acres of channelized streambed and 0.2868 acres of riparian habitat). This is a potentially significant impact that can be mitigated to a less than significant level.

Impact HYD-2: The proposed project could ~~substantially~~ deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge, because the proposed project would fill the existing sand-and-gravel quarry pit that has functioned as a de facto infiltration basin over several decades. Although the exact volume of water entering one or more subterranean aquifers is unknown, it is reasonable to conclude that, without a replacement infiltration system, the proposed topographic changes would reduce the site's capacity to replenish local groundwater, if groundwater replenishment occurs now. Additionally, the proposed project includes a golf course, which would rely on an existing well for irrigation. These are significant but mitigable impacts.

Impact USS-2: The proposed project is expected to generate ~~34,620~~ 35,781 gallons of wastewater per day. This is a less than significant impact.

Table ES.1, second column, was modified to reflect revisions to mitigation measures and additions of mitigation measures that occurred since the original Draft EIR was published. The revised and added mitigation measures are:

- MM AQ-5 was revised, as detailed in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document;
- MM AQ-11 was revised, as detailed below in this section;
- MM AQ-14 was added, as detailed in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document;
- MM AQ-15 was added, as detailed in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document;
- MM AQ-16 was added, as detailed in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document;
- MM AQ-17 was added, as detailed in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document;
- MM AQ-18 was added, as detailed in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document;
- MM AQ-19 was added, as detailed in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document;
- MM AQ-20 was added, as detailed in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document;
- MM AQ-21 was added, as detailed in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document;
- MM AQ-22 was added, as detailed in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document;
- MM AQ-23 was added, as detailed in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document;
- MM AQ-24 was added, as detailed in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document;
- MM AQ-25 was added, as detailed in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document;
- MM AQ-26 was added in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document and subsequently revised, as detailed below in this section;
- MM AQ-27 was added, as detailed in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document;
- MM CULT-1 was revised, as detailed below in this section;
- MM NOI-7 was revised, as detailed below in this section;
- MM HYD-1 was revised, as detailed below in this section;
- MM HYD-2 was revised, as detailed in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document;
- MM HYD-6 was revised, as detailed in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document;
- MM HYD-7 was revised, as detailed in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document;
and
- MM HYD-9 was deleted, as identified in Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document.

Pg. ES-53, subsection *Environmentally Superior Alternative*, first paragraph, has been revised as follows:

The No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) would avoid the significant construction air quality and noise impacts of the proposed project. However, the No Project Alternative would cause significant long-term air quality impacts from the emission of criteria pollutants and GHGs, which are significant impacts that would not be caused by the proposed project, Alternative 2, or Alternative 3. In addition, the No Project Alternative would cause significant aesthetic and land use compatibility impacts related to maintaining an incompatible and aesthetically unpleasing land use (the Chandler's facility) adjacent to residential neighborhoods. Given the additional significant impacts the No Project Alternative would cause, the No Project Alternative would not be the environmentally superior alternative, even though the No Project Alternative does avoid the project's significant and unmitigable construction impacts.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

No revisions to this chapter were made, other than those depicted in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document.

3.1 AESTHETICS

Pg. 3.1-16, subsection *Rolling Hills Estates Municipal Code Title 17 (Zoning), § 17.18 (RPD District), Development Standards, § 17.18.040* has been revised as follows:

The RPD District's purpose is to provide for cluster housing that is designed with common open space areas, with accessible open space (including active recreational uses) and public viewshed preservation as a result. Accordingly, the Development Standards require that a minimum of 70% of a proposed RPD development be dedicated to common and private open space, in part for aesthetic purposes. Building coverage is restricted to not more than 30% of the gross area of a parcel, except for buildings used for community purposes. While Section 17.18.040 of the Rolling Hills Estates Municipal Code identifies that Residential height limits in the RPD District are set at no more than 35 feet or two stories, this section also indicates that the 27-foot residential height limit required by Section 17.06.080 of the Municipal Code applies. However, the development standards do not set forth specific design themes for RPD development, and in part, state that the RPD density standards are not intended to limit design flexibility. Should the RPD zoning designation be approved, this designation would apply to the residential portions of the project.

Pg. 3.1-29, first full paragraph, has been revised as follows:

Residential Architecture. The proposed two-story, single-family residences range from 2700 to 6500 square feet, on lots ranging from 8,600 to 24,430 square feet, resulting in lot coverage averaging 30%, consistent with RPD coverage limits. Also consistent with RPD standards, ~~all residential units' heights are less than 35 feet,~~ front setbacks range from 20 to 55 feet, ~~and~~ rear setbacks from 30 to 60 feet, with approximate five-foot side setbacks. Second-story elements are distributed so that no second-story abuts another and occupies less than half of the ground-level footprint (see Project Application, Sheet 15, "One and Two-Story Elements for T.T. 61287"). The heights of the proposed homes (to the top of

roofline) would not exceed 27 feet, except for one configuration (out of 27 proposed configurations), which has a roofline height of 27 ft 6 inches. All of the proposed heights comply with the height restrictions in both Sections 17.18.040 and 17.06.080 of the Rolling Hills Estates Municipal Code, except one configuration, which exceeds the 27-ft height limit identified in 17.06.080 by six inches. As with the clubhouse design, the proposed residences incorporate elements of Mediterranean design, with an emphasis on Italian features. There are at least nine different residential models, resulting in architectural variety similar to that present in surrounding neighborhoods. As described previously, the existing architecture vernacular in surrounding neighborhoods exhibits Mediterranean, Spanish, and California Ranch features, including terra cotta S-tile roofing material. Existing building size and setbacks also appear to conform to RPD requirements, thereby likely conforming to NCO requirements for compatibility in scale. Accordingly, the proposed new residential construction's Mediterranean architecture would be reasonably consistent with existing themes; however, as required by Mitigation Measure AES-6, the Planning Commission will ultimately determine if other styles, such as "Ranch", should be mixed into the neighborhood. Additionally, Mitigation Measure AES-6 requires the Planning Commission to consider the residential elevations to ensure the proposed exterior walls are appropriately articulated.

3.2 AIR QUALITY

In addition to the revisions depicted in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document, the following modifications were made to this section:

Pg. 3.2-46, Section 3.7.7 *Mitigation Measures*, Mitigation Measure AQ-11 of the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document has been revised as follows:

- MM AQ-11:** During all phases of construction, NO_x impacts shall be mitigated by one or a combination of the following six (6) methods, each of which is designed to reduce mass daily construction phase NO_x to 200 lbs/day or less by fifteen percent (15%):
- a. Limit vehicle activity to either of the following:
 - i. 20,146 horsepower-hours per day (hp-hr/day) ~~404,822 horsepower-hours per month (hp-hr/mo.);~~ or
 - ii. 1,029-20,684 gallons of diesel fuel consumed per day month (gal/day mo.).
 - b. Install add-on controls and/or turnover older equipment by one of the following methods:
 - i. All equipment shall operate on aqueous diesel fuel; or
 - ii. Using the fleet average approach implemented by CARB for the In-Use Off-road Air Toxic Control Measure, demonstrate that equipment operating on-site has either:
 1. 100% 35% of engine horsepower on-site is Tier 3; or

2. Add-on controls (e.g., diesel oxidation catalysts) sufficient to mitigate NOx emissions by ~~45%~~ 45% on a weighted horsepower basis (i.e., a high level of control on large engines may be preferable to low levels of control on all engines); or
3. Overall NOx emissions characteristics of ~~2.47~~ 3.66 g/hp-hr or better.

This revision to Mitigation Measure AQ-11 has also been made in the *Executive Summary* in Table ES.1.

Pg. 3.2-48, Section 3.7.7 *Mitigation Measures*, Mitigation Measure AQ-26 of the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document has been revised as follows:

MM AQ-26: To the satisfaction of the ~~Director of Planning~~ Director, prior to the issuance of a building permit for the clubhouse or the first residential unit, the project proponent shall identify additional green building techniques, such as cool/green roofs and tankless water heaters, to be utilized for each of the proposed structures. To the satisfaction of the ~~Director of Planning~~ Director, the project proponent shall also quantify the reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) pollutant emissions that would be achieved by the identified green building techniques. Potential green building techniques that shall be considered by the project proponent include but are not limited to:

- Specification/use of ENERGY-STAR qualified building materials and appliances;
- Specification/use of energy efficient lighting, heating and cooling systems, appliances, equipment, and control systems;
- Use of passive solar design to minimize the need for artificial heating and cooling of indoor spaces;
- Use of daylighting architectural practices to take advantage of sunlight;
- Specify/install light colored cool roofs, green roofs, and/or cool pavement materials;
- Use of on-site renewable energy and/or grid-source green power; and
- Include energy storage to optimize on-site renewable energy generation systems and to avoid peak energy use.

This revision to Mitigation Measure AQ-26 has also been made in the *Executive Summary* in Table ES.1.

3.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

No revisions to this section were made, other than those depicted in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document.

3.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

In addition to the revisions depicted in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document, the following modifications were made to this section:

Pg. 3.4-16, Section 3.4.6 *Mitigation Measures*, Mitigation Measure CULT-1 of the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document has been revised as follows:

MM CULT-1: A full-time archaeological monitor(s) and Native American/Gabrieliño-Tongva representative(s) shall be present onsite during the demolition and grading phases of project construction, and during other construction activities that disturb soils, such as trenching for pipes and foundations. The archaeological monitor(s) must be a Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA) or a trained monitor working under the direct supervision of an RPA. The monitor(s) must oversee all excavations and have the ability to recognize, record, and/or recover isolated finds during the monitoring program and have the authority to halt any activities adversely impacting potentially significant cultural resources. The monitor(s) must maintain daily notes on the operations and isolated finds and maintain a detailed photographic record of the ground altering activities.

~~In addition to monitoring during grading, the archaeological monitor(s) shall conduct a focused, pre-grading testing program (minimally trenching), which would ideally occur after golf play has been suspended. The monitor(s) shall review the information contained in this EIR, other available cultural resource information about the site and surrounding area (e.g., archaeological records forms), historic aerial photography, and other historic mapping, and develop the investigation techniques/survey methodology in consideration of such available information. The investigation techniques/survey methodology shall be subject to the review and approval of the City of Rolling Hills Estates and, minimally, the testing program shall include additional trenching. Using a current and standard approach to trenching, the program can provide up to a 3% sample of the area tested thereby protecting up to 97% of any resources that might be present. If resources are identified, they shall be assessed (Phase II) prior to the mass grading program.~~

In addition to the archaeological monitoring, the consulting archaeologist will conduct a focused, pre-grading testing program (i.e., minimally, a trenching program) that would be undertaken, preferably, after the golf course activities are suspended.

The archaeological consultant shall review all information contained in this EIR, other available cultural resource information regarding the project site and general area, historic aerial photographs, historic maps, and the records maintained by the Golf Course pertaining to the development of the course and, specifically, changes made to the natural contours of the property. The trenching program shall be designed to obtain a minimum of a 3% sample of the subsurface in areas identified as sensitive for buried resources. Based on the results of this testing program, any identified resource(s) shall be evaluated to determine if the resource would add significant data to the current understanding of the prehistoric use of the area.

If any discovered resource(s) would add significant data to the current understanding of the prehistoric use of the area, a Phase III (data recovery) program shall be implemented. Said Phase III analysis shall, at a minimum, consist of a sampling no less than 10% of the area identified as the resource (as defined through the Phase II study).

If ~~any~~ the resource(s) discovered during the monitoring or testing program is determined to be of Native American origin, the Native American/Gabrieliño-Tongva representative(s) onsite will be able to assist in the completion of the monitoring program. If any evidence of human remains is uncovered, the archaeological monitor shall have the authority to shut the project down, contact the Principal Investigator, who will contact the County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission. If the remains are declared of Native American descent, the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) will be named by the Native American Heritage Commission and consultation pertaining to the disposition of the remains will be undertaken. Activities will not commence at the site of the remains until clearance is afforded by the Coroner, Commission, Archaeological Consultant, and MLD.

This revision to Mitigation Measure CULT-1 has also been made in the *Executive Summary* in Table ES.1.

3.5 GEOLOGY/SOILS

No revisions to this section were made.

3.6 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

No revisions to this section were made.

3.7 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

In addition to the revisions depicted in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document, the following modifications were made to this section:

Pg. 3.7-30, first, second, and third full paragraphs have been revised as follows:

The State's NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities ~~General Construction Activity permit~~, Municipal Stormwater NPDES permit, ~~including the corresponding~~ SUSMP, the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control ordinance and the City Building Code outline a developer's obligations to file a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Wet Weather Erosion Control Plan (WWECP) ~~Rain Event Action Plan (REAP)~~ ~~SWPPP and WWECP~~ that includes an array of BMPs to reduce pollutants in storm water discharges to the maximum extent practicable. They set forth minimum requirements and do not limit a local agency's ability to apply additional mitigation measures to ensure that runoff water contaminants are minimized. There are seven primary objectives that construction BMPs must address: minimizing disturbed areas, stabilizing disturbed areas, protecting slopes and channels, controlling the site perimeter, retaining sediment, practicing good housekeeping overall for all site activities, and containing materials and waste. Six BMP categories address these objectives: erosion control, sediment control, wind erosion control, tracking control, non-stormwater management, and ~~waste~~ management and materials pollution control.¹

BMP selection is site and project-specific, but must be accomplished to meet the water quality objectives outlined above. The project applicant has not proposed specific BMPs for construction, but would be required in the project's SWPPP and (WWECP) ~~REAP~~ ~~WWECP~~ to apply as many BMPs as necessary to prevent water contaminants from escaping the site. Table 3.7.3 lists construction site BMPs.

Mitigation Measure HYD-1 requires the applicant to prepare a SWPPP and (WWECP) ~~REAP~~ ~~WWECP~~ according to current regulations, and to implement required BMPs. Mitigation Measure HYD-2 requires the applicant to confirm that construction workers will receive appropriate training for BMP Compliance. These mitigation measures would reduce construction-related storm water quality impacts to less than significant levels.

Pg. 3.7-38, Section 3.7.7 *Mitigation Measures*, Mitigation Measure HYD-1 of the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document has been revised as follows:

MM HYD-1: Prior to issuance of grading permit(s) for the project site, the applicant shall submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), ~~and for construction taking place during the rainy season,~~ a Wet Weather Erosion Control Plan for construction taking place during the rainy season, ~~Rain Event Action Plan "REAP"~~ and evidence that the applicant has applied for coverage under the NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities ~~Wet Weather Erosion Control Plan "WWECP"~~, for Public Works and Planning Director review and approval. Each plan shall document and illustrate the proposed Best Management Practices (BMPs) for construction activities that will effectively prevent storm water contaminants from entering the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System

¹ California Stormwater Quality Association, *California Stormwater BMP Handbook – Construction*, January 2003, Section 2, pp. 3-4.

(MS4). BMPs shall be selected from the California Stormwater Quality Association's *California Stormwater BMP Handbook—Construction Activity* or other reliable equivalent BMP source, subject to Public Works and Planning Director approval. The Public Works and Planning Directors may require additional BMPs as necessary to achieve compliance with future NPDES permits that may be adopted subsequent to the approval of this project. Final SWPPP and ~~REAP~~-~~WWECP~~-BMPs shall be incorporated into project plans and related construction punch lists/checklists.

This revision to Mitigation Measure HYD-1 has also been made in the *Executive Summary* in Table ES.1.

3.8 LAND USE AND PLANNING

No revisions to this section were made.

3.9 MINERAL RESOURCES

No revisions to this section were made.

3.10 NOISE

Pg. 3.10-37, Section 3.10.6 *Mitigation Measures*, Mitigation Measure NOI-7 has been revised as follows:

MM NOI-7: Outside public address systems shall have their volumes set at the minimum level necessary for acceptable communications and shall minimally comply with the noise level standards specified in Section 8.32.050 of the City of Rolling Hills Estates Municipal Code.

This revision to Mitigation Measure NOI-7 has also been made in the *Executive Summary* in Table ES.1.

Pg. 3.10.39, first full paragraph, third and fourth bullets have been revised as follows:

- For those existing residences that will be newly exposed to golf course maintenance noise as a result of eliminating the landfill and concrete batch plant, it is noted that the project noise may be of a character that is more acceptable to a residential community (i.e., lawn mowers rather than truck movements and concrete batch plant operations). It should be noted that noise character is subjective and noise that is acceptable to one receptor may not be acceptable to another.
- For those existing residences that will be newly exposed to golf course maintenance noise as a result of eliminating the landfill and concrete batch plant, it is noted that the golf course maintenance noise will start later in the day than the noise at the landfill and batch plant (i.e., 8:00 a.m. in the vicinity of residential uses rather than 6:00 a.m.). This is

expected to significantly reduce the annoyance potential of the noise. However, it should be noted that golf course maintenance noise would be a regular occurrence, whereas landfill and concrete batch plant activity may be sporadic. It should also be noted that non-maintenance activities at the golf course and clubhouse (e.g., golfing, dining, events, etc.) will likely begin at daybreak and extend into evening hours (outdoor activities would cease at 10:00 p.m.).

3.11 POPULATION AND HOUSING

No revisions to this section were made.

3.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

Pg. 3.12-7, subsection *Schools*, first paragraph has been revised as follows:

Cumulative development within the Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District will continue to increase enrollment in local public schools. Since local schools are near capacity, cumulative impacts to schools are considered potentially significant. Payment of statutory school impact fees, as required by ~~MM PS-4~~ MM PS-18, would mitigate the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts on schools to a level that is less than considerable.

Pg. 3.12-7, subsection *Libraries*, first paragraph has been revised as follows:

Cumulative development on the Palos Verdes Peninsula will continue to increase the population served by the PVLDD. The fair-share library fees established in the City of Rolling Hills Estates' Public Facilities Impact Fee Report (City of Rolling Hills Estates, 2008) are based on future growth projections in the PVLDD's service area. These projections account for cumulative growth. As such, payment of library fees, as required by ~~MM PS-2~~ MM PS-19, would mitigate the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts on libraries to a level that is less than considerable.

3.13 RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE

No revisions to this section were made.

3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Pg. 3.14-22, title of Figure 3.14.11 has been revised as follows:

Figure 3.14.11 Proposed Expanded Clubhouse Uses Trip ~~Generation~~ Distribution

This revision has also been made in the *Table of Contents* on pg. iv.

3.15 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Pg. 3.15-2, subsection *Wastewater*, first full paragraph has been revised as follows:

The City of Rolling Hills Estates is located in District #5, ~~the South Bay Cities Sanitation District~~ serviced by the Los Angeles County Sanitation District, which owns and operates the wastewater collection system within the City of Rolling Hills Estates. The City is located in the Joint Outfall System (JOS), a collection of seventeen sanitation districts which provides sanitation sewer and sewage treatment services to 73 cities and unincorporated areas. The Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts' Joint Outfall System currently treats approximately 430 million gallons per day (gpd) ~~operates 10 water reclamation plants, which treat an estimated 510 million gallons per day (gpd)~~. The closest treatment facility is the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) located in Carson, California, approximately seven miles from the project site, which provides primary and secondary treatment for an estimated ~~320~~291 million gpd.

Pg. 3.15-7, subsection *Wastewater*, Impact USS-2, heading and first paragraph have been revised as follows:

Impact USS-2: The proposed project is expected to generate ~~34,620~~35,781 gallons of wastewater per day. This is a less than significant impact.

The City of Rolling Hills Estates is located in District #5, ~~the South Bay Cities Sanitation District~~ serviced by the Los Angeles County Sanitation District, which owns and operates the wastewater collection and treatment system that serves the City of Rolling Hills Estates. The Los Angeles County Sanitation District has submitted a letter stating that there is capacity to serve this project. This letter is contained in Appendix K of this document. Per the District's letter, the proposed project is anticipated to generate ~~34,620~~35,781 gallons of wastewater per day. Wastewater generated from the proposed project would consist of domestic sewage from the proposed homes and wastewater from the clubhouse/golf course, which includes domestic sewage and wastewater from food preparation. The quantity and type of wastewater generated by the proposed project can be collected and treated by the Los Angeles County Sanitation District's existing facilities. No new offsite wastewater facilities would be required to serve the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause any significant impacts related to wastewater or wastewater treatment

4.0 ALTERNATIVES

No revisions to this section were made, other than those depicted in the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR document.

5.0 IMPACT OVERVIEW

Pg. 5.0-1, Section 5.1 *Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Effects*, second paragraph, second bullet has been revised as follows:

- **Impact AQ-2:** Construction of the proposed project would generate criteria air pollutants, which would affect localized air quality. PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions generated by project construction would exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Screening Thresholds for Localized Significance, both before and after mitigation, and NO₂ emissions generated by project construction would exceed the District's Screening Thresholds before mitigation. Dispersion modeling indicates that the project's construction emissions would exceed the District's significance thresholds for localized concentrations of NO₂ (1-hour standard only), PM₁₀ (1-hour and annual standards), and PM_{2.5} (1-hour and annual standards). This is a significant impact that cannot be mitigated.

6.0 REPORT AUTHORS AND CONSULTANTS; ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONSULTED

No revisions to this section were made.

7.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY

No revisions to this section were made.

This page intentionally blank