

1 hazards, and wildland fire hazards to less than significant levels.

2 J. Hydrology and Water Quality

3 *Impact 4.9-1: Water Quality Standards*

4 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not violate any water*
5 *quality standards or waste discharge requirements with the implementation of mitigation,*
6 *nor would the Project otherwise substantially degrade water quality (refer to Project*
7 *Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

8 1. Impacts:

9 The potential for water quality impacts would be significant during the earthwork
10 and construction phase of future implementing projects, when the potential for
11 erosion, siltation, and sedimentation would be the greatest and following
12 construction, but prior to the establishment of any ground cover, when erosion
13 potential may remain relatively high.

14 The Project will support new and existing rural residential, winery, and equestrian
15 uses, as well as other commercial activities that encourage tourism. The goal of the
16 Project is to expand development opportunities and attract tourists to the area. The
17 operation of wineries, equestrian uses, and an increase in residential development
18 would generate additional wastewater which would require treatment. Table 4.9-1
19 of EIR No. 524, *Agricultural and Equestrian Impacts on Water Quality*, lists a
20 number of potential surface and groundwater impacts which could result from
21 agricultural and equestrian uses. For example, it is possible that some implementing
22 projects may propose uses that, in the aggregate, exceed the wastewater flow
23 standards established by the Regional Water Quality Control Boards.

24 Collectively, these impacts require mitigation in order to assure that any impacts to
25 water quality standards are reduced to below a level of significance.

26 2. Mitigation:

27 Agricultural and equestrian operations are regulated by County, State and federal
28 programs requiring Best Management Practices for pesticide spraying, fertilizer and

1 related applications. Adherence to the existing federal and state regulations in
2 addition to the project design features and mitigations measures HYD-1 through
3 HYD-5 would ensure that any impacts to water quality would remain less than
4 significant. HYD-1 specifies conditions under which a Water Quality Management
5 Plan (WQMP) would be required for an implementing project, and further requires
6 the application of Best Management Practices (BMP's) to maintain conformance to
7 the County's active MS4 permit. HYD-2 requires connection to sewer services
8 when San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board discharge standards are
9 exceeded and when such service is made available by the Eastern Municipal Water
10 District. Specifically, a Phase I wastewater collection system is currently being
11 implemented under a joint partnership by Eastern Municipal Water District,
12 Rancho California Water District and the County of Riverside which – when
13 completed – will accommodate existing and future winery waste discharges
14 associated with the viticulture process. HYD-3 requires the preparation of a
15 SWPPP and compliance with the NPDES to assure that state and federal
16 construction run-off requirements are met. HYD-4 contains provisions that address
17 stormwater runoff infiltration, and, if infiltration is not feasible, onsite detention to
18 control runoff. HYD-5 contains additional requirements for implementing projects
19 to include measures designed to increase infiltration and reduce impacts to water
20 quality with the upper aquifer. Combined, this suite of mitigation measures assures
21 compliance with water quality standards and waste discharge requirement and,
22 therefore impacts would be less than significant.

23
24 *Impact 4.9-2: Groundwater*

25 **Threshold:** *Project implementation would not substantially deplete groundwater*
26 *supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge with the implementation of*
27 *mitigation (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and*
28 *Reporting Program).*

3. Impacts:

1 The Project will support new and existing rural residential, winery, and equestrian
2 uses, as well as other commercial activities that encourage tourism. Implementing
3 projects would cause an increase in impervious surfaces, but by minimizing the
4 amount of grading and utilizing existing drainage patterns projects should be able
5 to minimize their effect on runoff, as well as their impacts on local groundwater
6 recharge.

7 Nonetheless, the operation and maintenance of the equestrian and agricultural uses
8 in addition to an increase in residential development could have the potential to
9 deplete groundwater supplies. In order to ensure a reliable water supply in a water
10 shortage situation, Rancho California Water District ("RCWD") has developed a
11 five stage water shortage contingency plan for agricultural, commercial, and
12 domestic customers that would take effect and provide adequate water supply to the
13 area. RCWD has determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project
14 (refer to Section 4.13 of EIR No. 524, *Public Services & Utilities*).

15 4. Mitigation:

16 Compliance with existing regulatory programs, including General Plan policies,
17 project design features, and mitigation measure HYD-6 would assure that potential
18 impacts would be less than significant. Mitigation Measure HYD-6 requires
19 implementing projects to provide a plan of service analysis in determining the
20 needs for water distribution, fire protection, service pressures and connection into
21 the Rancho California Water District's (RCWD) master planned system. These
22 plans must show requirements of offsite transmission mains to be constructed to
23 serve certain areas of the project. It will be the responsibility of each implementing
24 project proponent to ensure water system reliability/redundancy for domestic,
25 irrigation, and emergency needs, as determined appropriate through the County's
26 discretionary review process, and RCWD staff review.

27 *Impact 4.9-3: Erosion or Siltation*
28

1 **Threshold:** *Project implementation would not substantially alter the existing drainage*
2 *pattern of the site or area with the implementation of mitigation (refer to Project*
3 *Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

4 5. Impacts:

6 Temporary construction-related impacts associated with implementing projects are
7 anticipated to involve grading to construct buildings, access roads, signage,
8 lighting, landscaping, onsite utilities, trails and necessary infrastructure
9 improvements to support implementing projects. Due to the rural nature of the
10 area, the pre-existing drainage patterns will generally be maintained. Specifically,
11 future implementing projects within the Winery, Equestrian, and Residential
12 Districts will be required to avoid the alteration of existing drainages, whenever
13 possible. Drainage modifications, if necessary, will be subject to County and
14 RCFCWCD discretionary review relative to flood control and water quality, and
15 review by RWQCB, ACOE, CDFG and USFWS relative to effects upon drainage
16 courses and associated wildlife and water quality.

17 The construction of new infrastructure will avoid the alteration of existing
18 drainages whenever possible. Any drainage modifications, if required, would be
19 designed in accordance with County of Riverside (e.g., EPD, Planning Department,
20 and RCFCWCD) and outside resource agency (e.g., ACOE, CDFG, RWQCB,
21 USFWS) criteria, as appropriate.

22 Nonetheless, potential erosion and siltation impacts caused during construction are
23 a potentially significant impact requiring mitigation.

24 6. Mitigation:

25 Adherence to the existing General Plan policies, project design features and
26 mitigation measures HYD-7 through HYD-8 would ensure that impacts associated
27 with the Project remain less than significant. HYD-7 would require all
28 implementing projects within the Murrieta Creek Area Drainage Plan to pay
applicable fees to support the construction of drainage facilities. HYD-8 requires all

1 implementing projects to consider and apply various flood control measures
2 including: minimizing encroachment into floodplains and watercourses; require
3 interim flood protection measures to ensure that all phases of an implementing
4 project is protect from 100-year flood events; elevate building pads above the 100-
5 year level of flood protection, and detaining any incremental increase in drainage
6 within an implementing project's boundaries. With these mitigation measures,
7 potential impacts will be reduced to a level of less than significant.

8 It should be noted that the provided analysis is consistent with the requirements of
9 a program EIR and future site-specific implementing projects proposed within the
10 Project area will require individual site-specific CEQA analysis at a later date.

11 *Impact 4.9-4: Surface Runoff and Stormwater*

12 **Threshold:** *Project implementation would not substantially increase the rate or amount*
13 *of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite; or create or*
14 *contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned*
15 *stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff*
16 *with the implementation of mitigation (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B",*
17 *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

18 7. Impacts:

19 Implementing projects would cause an increase in impervious surfaces; however,
20 by minimizing the amount of grading and utilizing existing drainage patterns
21 projects should be able to minimize their effect on runoff, as well as their impacts
22 on local groundwater recharge. Implementing projects that could be constructed
23 pursuant to the implementation of the Project could increase the amount of urban
24 runoff due to an increase in impervious area (i.e. roof tops and paving). Mitigation
25 of increased runoff can typically be handled onsite through the use of detention
26 facilities, stormwater improvements, infiltration, and maximizing pervious area.
27 Project specific requirements would be evaluated on a project level during the
28 County's entitlement and permitting process and would beyond the scope of this
programmatic evaluation; however, it is reasonable to assume that projects would

1 be required to adhere to County standards for detention of incremental flows and
2 management of stormwater flows. Since the majority of the implementing projects
3 proposed pursuant to the Plan would be rural in nature, pre-existing drainage
4 patterns will be maintained wherever possible. Potential impacts to natural
5 drainage courses would be regulated by State, federal, regional, and County
6 agencies to reduce or eliminate adverse impacts. With appropriate drainage,
7 stormwater, and surface runoff design features integrated into implementing
8 projects and the implementation of mitigation measures, described below, impacts
9 to downstream drainage facilities would not be anticipated. Existing regulations
10 would require implementing projects to provide their own flood protection for
11 structures and access and conformance to those regulations would protect
12 downstream properties from adverse impacts. With implementation of on-site
13 drainage control and appropriate mitigation measures, and given the
14 overwhelmingly agricultural nature of anticipated implementing projects within the
15 Project Area, implementation of the Project would not be expected to result in
16 significant impacts related to surface runoff provided that site-specific studies are
17 completed, the Area Drainage Plan is supported, and implementing projects use
18 appropriate flood control measures.

19 Accordingly, to ensure that any such surface runoff impacts are reduced to a level
20 of less than significant, mitigation imposing these requirements is necessary.

21 8. Mitigation:

22 Adherence to the existing General Plan policies, project design features, and
23 mitigation measures HYD-1 through HYD-5, HYD-7 through HYD-8, and LU-1
24 would ensure that impacts associated with the Project remain less than significant.
25 As discuss above, under Impact 4.9-1, Mitigation Measures HYD-1 through HYD-
26 5 would similarly reduce stormwater volume and quality impacts by utilizing
27 percolation, where feasible, and implementing SWPPPs and other best management
28 practices. HYD-7 would require all implementing projects within the Murrieta

1 Creek Area Drainage Plan to pay applicable fees to support the construction of
2 drainage facilities. HYD-8 requires the consideration and application of various
3 flood control measure including: minimizing encroachment into floodplains and
4 watercourses; require interim flood protection measures to ensure that all phases of
5 an implementing project is protect from 100-year flood events; elevate building
6 pads above the 100-year level of flood protection, and detaining any incremental
7 increase in drainage within an implementing project's boundaries. Finally, LU-1
8 requires the completion of site specific environmental studies as part of the review
9 and approval process for future implementing projects. With the implementation of
10 these measures, any drainage impacts will be less than significant.

11 *Impact 4.9-7: Flooding and Housing*

12 **Threshold:** *Project implementation would not place housing or structures within a 100-*
13 *year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood*
14 *Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, nor would the Project impede*
15 *or redirect flows, nor would the Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of*
16 *loss, injury, or death involving flooding (including flood as a result of failure of a levee or*
dam) with the implementation of mitigation (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B",
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).

17 9. Impacts:

18 The limits of each floodplain type is shown on Exhibit 4.9-3 of EIR No. 524,
19 *FEMA Floodplain Areas*. Any project that requires fill to be placed within this
20 area, which alters the limits of the floodplain will be required to process a Letter of
21 Map Revision based on Fill (LOMR-F) with FEMA. Future implementing projects
22 in this area would be subject to County and RCFCWCD review for drainage and
23 flood control improvements necessary to accommodate the specific implementing
24 project. Nonetheless, to ensure that all future implementing projects are subject to
25 specific performance standards regarding flooding, mitigation is required.

26 10. Mitigation:

27 Adherence to the existing General Plan policies, project design features, and
28 mitigation measures HYD-8 and LU-1 would ensure that impacts associated with

1 the Project remain less than significant. HYD-7 would require all implementing
2 projects within the Murrieta Creek Area Drainage Plan to pay applicable fees to
3 support the construction of drainage facilities. LU-1 requires that site-specific
4 surveys and studies be completed as part of the review and approval process for
5 future implementing projects. With the implementation of these mitigation
6 measures, impacts would be less than significant.

7 K. Land Use and Relevant Planning

8 *Impact 4.10-2: Plan Consistency*

9
10 *Threshold: Project implementation would not conflict with any applicable land use*
11 *plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project with the*
12 *implementation of mitigation (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation*
13 *Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

14 1. Impacts:

15 The Project is designed to guide future development within the Project area. For
16 that reason, the Project includes a General Plan Amendment and Change of Zone
17 that will govern future land uses and implementing projects within the Project area.
18 All implementing projects would be required to adhere to the policies and goals of
19 the General Plan, as well as Ordinance No. 348 as amended by the Project. These
20 plans, policies, and regulations are intended to negate the adverse effects related to
21 land use. Therefore, the Project is itself "self-mitigating" meaning that it provides
22 the necessary policies, land use control and design guidelines that are anticipated to
23 result in substantial improvements in the physical connectivity and avoidance of
24 physical division of land uses within the Project area.

25 The Project does not change the zoning classifications on individual parcels. The
26 Project only establishes land use development policies that implement the County's
27 goals of preserving and enhancing the viticulture potential, rural lifestyle and
28 equestrian activities within this unique area of the County. The Project's policies
will help coordinate growth in a manner that avoids land use conflicts and ensures

1 the timely provision of public infrastructure to keep up with growth in the Project
2 area.

3 The Project, as approved, does not apply to the two parcels owned by the Calvary
4 Church Bible Fellowship (Calvary). There was much testimony during the public
5 hearings regarding Calvary's parcels. Concerns were voiced by existing residents,
6 surrounding property owners and Calvary. Calvary intends to continue using its
7 properties for religious exercise and such use falls within the Religious Land Use
8 and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA). Not applying the Project to
9 Calvary's parcels allows the County to ensure there is no violation of RLUIPA by
10 maintaining existing land use policies and regulations to accommodate this
11 religious exercise.

12 After considering all the competing interests presented during the public hearings,
13 the Board made the reasonable accommodation to approve the Project, but not
14 apply it to Calvary's parcels. The two parcels owned by Calvary total
15 approximately twenty (20) acres, while the Project's policy area covers
16 approximately 17,000 acres. Not applying the Project to Calvary's 20 acres allows
17 Calvary to continue its legal uses on the parcels that supports the community, while
18 also allowing the County to achieve a balanced land use pattern that reduces land
19 use inconsistencies and ensures appropriate infrastructure for traffic, water and
20 sewer for the anticipated growth in the area. This furthers the County's vision to
21 promote development and preservation of unique communities in which each
22 community exhibits a special sense of place and quality of design.

23 Furthermore, removing 20 acres from the total 17,000 acres will not hinder the
24 Project's purpose because there is still ample opportunity in the remaining acres for
25 development that will preserve and expand winery and equestrian operations.
26 Further, as Calvary's parcels will remain citrus/vineyard zoning, any future
27 development on said parcels will require compliance with the 75% planting
28 requirement. Therefore, future development on Calvary's parcels will be similar to

1 development allowed pursuant to the Project and will further the County's goals of
2 preserving the viticulture and rural lifestyle of the Project area.

3 Additionally, based on information and testimony provided in the public hearings,
4 the Board agreed to remove approximately 200 other parcels from the Project as
5 requested by the various property owners. These requests were unrelated to
6 religious uses. Removing these parcels from the Project was based on their
7 existing and designated land uses, topography, location within the Project's
8 boundary and being located ideally for a Tourist Information Center or Park and
9 Ride facility. Removing these parcels allows the County to balance land uses in
10 the area while also fulfilling the Project's purpose which is to provide a blueprint
11 for future growth in the area to ensure development enhances the quality of life for
12 existing and future residents, while providing opportunities for continued
13 preservation and expansion of winery and equestrian operations within the area.

14 Although future implementing projects are anticipated to be consistent with the
15 County's General Plan, zoning, and other applicable land use policies, there is
16 always the possibility that future projects may propose particular uses that may be
17 incompatible with existing uses in the surrounding area. Accordingly, mitigation
18 will be required.

19 2. Mitigation:

20 Each implementing project would be required to prepare site-specific, construction-
21 level CEQA documentation. Mitigation Measure LU-1 requires future
22 implementing projects to comply with the Wine Country Community Plan policies
23 and regulations and to complete all appropriate environmental analysis prior to any
24 approval. Such analysis would identify any specific land use incompatibilities
25 associated with the particular proposed uses and require the implementation of
26 measures to reduce or avoid them. Accordingly, with the implementation of
27 mitigation measures LU-1, impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

28 L. Mineral Resources

1 *Impact 4.11-1: Loss of Availability of Known Mineral Resources*

2 **Threshold:** *Project implementation would not result in the loss of availability of a*
3 *known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state*
4 *with the implementation of mitigation (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B",*
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).

5 1. Impacts:

6 Mineral deposits are likely to exist within Project area (Exhibit 4.11-1, *Mineral*
7 *Resource Areas*); however, the significance of these deposits is undetermined, and
8 in response has been classified as MRZ-3 and Unstudied. Therefore, although
9 areas classified as MRZ-3 and Unstudied are not considered to be areas of known
10 mineral resources, there is the potential for presently unidentified, significant
11 aggregate mineral resources to occur within the Project area. The Project's
12 development could impact those resources, such that mitigation is required.

13 2. Mitigation:

14 Implementation of the General Plan policies related to mineral resources, standard
15 conditions of approval, and Mitigation Measure MIN-1 would ensure that future
16 implementing projects within the Project area would not have a significant effect
17 on area mineral resources or result in the loss of availability of unknown mineral
18 resources of value to the region or the State. Specifically, the County Geologist is
19 required to make a site-specific determination with regard to future implementing
20 projects within the MRZ-3 as to the site's potential to contain or yield mineral
21 resources. To the extent such resources are likely to exist; avoidance of those
22 resources is the preferred means of mitigation. Though the implementation of
23 Mitigation Measure MIN-1, Project impacts would be reduced to less than
24 significant.

25 3. Cumulative Impacts:

26 Availability of mineral resources, on a regional level, is a serious issue facing
27 Southern California. Although much of Southern California has lands capable or
28 designated for mineral resource production, the region has insufficient permitted

1 mineral resource areas to meet the region's projected demand. The Project does
2 not have a "cumulatively considerable" significant incremental effect on this
3 regional impact, relative to the potential impacts on the limited MRZ-3 and
4 Unstudied lands within the Project area. There are no known mineral resources in
5 the Project area, the Project does not include any designated mineral extraction
6 sites, and the County offers extensive availability of potential aggregate resources.
7 Cumulative impacts to mineral resources are most effectively addressed at the
8 State and County level through the State programs and General Plan policies, and
9 implementation of Mitigation Measure MIN-1. Accordingly, compliance with
10 existing regulatory requirements and General Plan policies, along with Project
11 Design Features and recommended mitigation measures, will reduce the Project's
12 share of cumulative impacts to less than significant levels.

13 4. Mitigation:

14 Compliance with existing regulatory requirements and General Plan policies,
15 along with Project Design Features and recommended mitigation measures, will
16 reduce the Project's share of cumulative impacts to less than significant levels.
17 Cumulative impacts to mineral resources are most effectively addressed at the
18 State and County level through the State programs and General Plan policies, and
19 implementation of Mitigation Measure MIN-1. Therefore, Project
20 implementation would not result in cumulative impacts to known mineral resource
21 that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state with the
22 implementation of Mitigation Measure MIN-1.

23 The Mineral Resources mitigation measure addressed above will ensure impacts to
24 potential mineral resources are less than significant because proposed
25 implementing projects shall be required to comply with existing regulations,
26 ordinances and the mitigation measure stated in the Mitigation Monitoring and
27 Reporting Program (MMRP) MIN-1. Mitigation measure MIN-1 requires that
28 implementing projects comply with the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act. For

1 lands that are classified as MRZ-3, a County Geologist shall review and determine
2 the potential for significant mineral resources located on an implementing project
3 site. Implementing projects shall avoid identified mineral resources or incorporate
4 appropriate findings subject to a site-specific discretionary review and CEQA
5 process if a significant mineral resource is identified on the site.

6 M. Noise and Vibration

7 *Impact 4.12-1: Temporary Noise Increases*

8 **Threshold:** *Project construction would not result in temporary ambient noise impacts*
9 *that may exceed County noise standards with the implementation of mitigation measures*
10 *(refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting*
11 *Program).*

12 1. Impacts:

13 During the future construction of implementing projects within the Project area,
14 sensitive receptors may be exposed to periodically high noise levels associated with
15 construction activities, such as jack-hammering and large equipment.
16 Implementing projects would be subject to compliance with Ordinance No. 847,
17 Section 2, which exempts construction noise provided that construction of projects
18 located within one-quarter mile from an inhabited dwelling does not occur between
19 the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. from June through September, and between
20 the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. from October through May. Additionally,
21 Project compliance with General Plan Policies N 12.1 through N 12.4 would
22 minimize construction noise impacts by requiring the preparation of a construction
23 noise mitigation plan and requiring construction equipment to utilize noise-
24 reduction features. Nonetheless, noise impacts from construction could be
25 significant from time to time throughout the Project area, such that mitigation is
26 required.

27 2. Mitigation:

28 Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would reduce construction noise
associated with future implementing projects through the use of site-specific, noise-

1 reduction features. Specifically, NOI-1 would require the use of the best available
2 noise control techniques as well as requiring alternatives to pneumatic power tools.
3 Mitigation Measure NOI-2 includes a list of measures to respond to and track
4 complaints related to construction noise. With implementation of Mitigation
5 Measure NOI-1 and NOI-2, as well as compliance with Ordinance No. 847 and
6 General Plan Policies, short-term construction noise impacts would be reduced to
7 less than significant levels.

8
9 *Impact 4.12-4: Groundborne Noise and Vibration*

10 *Threshold: Would the project result in the exposure of persons to or generation*
11 *excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?*

12 3. Impacts:

13 Vibration from grading and earthwork activities would occur during the allowable
14 daytime construction hours and would not interfere with daily activities occurring
15 within Category 1 or 2 land uses described in Table 4.12-9 of EIR No. 524,
16 Groundborne Vibration and Noise Impact Criteria. However, the Project may
17 result in potentially significant groundborne vibrations resulting from proximity
18 between earthmoving equipment and sensitive receptors. Accordingly, mitigation
19 is required.

20 4. Mitigation:

21 Furthermore, Mitigation Measure NOI-7 would require alternatives or control
22 techniques to reduce vibration. Mitigation Measure NOI-7 also requires that
23 alternative methods be utilized should future pile driving activities take place
24 within 50 feet of an occupied or historic structure. Compliance with Mitigation
25 Measure NOI-7, which requires implementing projects to demonstrate that
26 construction activities are controlled and minimized in order to reduce vibration
27 impacts, would reduce the generation and/or exposure of persons or structures to
28 excessive groundborne vibration to less than significant levels. Blasting, if

1 required, would be subject to the County's standard practices and applicable
2 conditions of approval related to site-specific geotechnical and noise studies.
3 Accordingly, impacts associated with groundborne vibration will be less than
4 significant with mitigation.

5 N. Public Services, Recreation & Utilities

6 *Impact 4.13-5 Parks and Recreation*

7 **Threshold:** *Operation of the proposed Project would not result in impacts to parks and*
8 *recreation facilities including deterioration of existing facilities or requiring the*
9 *construction or expansion of recreational facilities in a manner resulting in adverse*
10 *physical environmental effects with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to*
11 *Project Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

12 1. Impacts:

13 The County of Riverside has established a standard of five (5) acres of parkland for
14 each 1000 residents of the County. At the present time that standard has not been
15 met and a countywide deficiency exists. In the immediate vicinity of the Project
16 site, the County operates the Lake Skinner Park and recreational facilities. The
17 addition of nearly 44,000 tourists annually to the Project area would significantly
18 impact the surrounding region and place new burdens of use on existing and future
19 regional and local recreational and park facilities in addition to those that can be
20 anticipated through the build-out of the Temecula and Murrieta General Plans and
21 the balance of the County General Plan and Southwest Area Plan.

22 2. Mitigation:

23 All implementing projects within the Project area shall participate in any future
24 trails phasing and financing plan being developed by the County (Mitigation
25 Measure PSU REC-1).

26 Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the Project area, a park
27 and recreational facilities dedication plan or fee-in-lieu shall be submitted to the
28 County Regional Recreation and Parks District for review and approval (Mitigation
Measure PSU REC-2). This measure includes the requirement that, at minimum,

1 implementing projects include a "half-width" dedication of trail right-of-way
2 (ROW) for any trails bordering a proposed implementing project, and full
3 dedication and/or construction of trails traversing a proposed implementing project.
4 Additionally, PSU REC-2 requires that, where private recreational facilities are
5 proposed, provision shall be made as part of the development entitlement process
6 for a HOA or other appropriate management entity to be responsible for
7 maintaining the elements of the plan, including the power to assess HOA fees or
8 other fees required to fund the maintenance activity. Furthermore, Mitigation
9 Measure PSU REC-3 requires the County Regional Recreation and Park District to
10 negotiate, where feasible, joint use agreements with the Temecula Valley Unified
11 School District for the joint use of school recreational facilities including playing
12 fields, to contribute to the supply of public parks located within reach of residents
13 of the Project area.

14 *Impact 4.13-6 Water and Water Supply*

15 **Threshold:** *Operation of the proposed Project would not result in impacts to water
16 supply or result in the need for new or expanded water treatment facilities and
17 infrastructure with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution
18 Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

19 3. Impacts:

20 As a result of the planned changes in both the number of acres of active use
21 included within the Project area and the amount of agricultural activity and number
22 of residential units anticipated within the Project area, the RCWD projects a total
23 net increase of approximately 38% of additional water demand based on the
24 proposed uses of the Project. DEIR Table 4.13-11, *Existing/Proposed Land Use
25 Designation Changes Impact on Water Demand*, and Table 4.13-12, *Summarized
26 Water Demands Comparing Existing/ Proposed Land Use Changes* summarizes the
27 net increase in water demand between the existing condition and proposed build-
28 out of the Project area. These tables indicate a potential water demand increase of

1 10,336 acre-feet/year as compared to the demand projection for the area used in the
2 2010 UWMP. Accordingly, mitigation is required to reduce potential impacts to
3 water supply.

4 4. Mitigation:

5 All implementing projects shall be required to use graywater as a water conserving
6 system (Riverside County Policy OS 2.1), subject to review and approval by the
7 SDRWQCB and incorporation of applicable Best Management Practices pursuant
8 to Mitigation Measure PSU WATER-1. This will reduce Project-associated
9 demands for potable water supply.

10 Further, Mitigation Measure PSU WATER-2 requires that all implementing
11 projects use California-friendly, drought-resistant landscaping and landscape
12 irrigation in order to reduce the Project-wide demand for water. Additionally,
13 Mitigation Measure PSU WATER-3 requires that all implementing projects shall
14 be required to use graywater advanced water conservation pursuant to the intent of
15 Riverside County Policy OS 2.5, through implementation of at least the following
16 best management practices:
17

- 18 • Irrigation systems shall be designed, maintained, and managed to meet or
19 exceed an irrigation system efficiency of 80%.
- 20 • The capacity of the irrigation system shall not exceed peak system capacity
21 to meet crop-specific water requirements, water meter capacity, and
22 backflow preventer device capacity.
- 23 • Irrigation systems shall be designed to prevent runoff, overspray, and low-
24 head drainage.
- 25 • Irrigation systems shall be designed to ensure the dynamic pressure at each
26 emission device is within the manufacturers recommended pressure range
27 for optimum performance.
- 28 • Irrigation systems shall be designed to include a device(s), which provides
site-specific soil moisture and/or evapotranspiration data that can be used to
schedule irrigation events effectively.
- Care shall be taken to design irrigation systems so that irrigation blocks are
contained within areas of uniform soil texture and solar orientation.

- Irrigation shall be scheduled to apply water at or below crop-specific water requirements.
- Crops with different water needs shall be irrigated separately.

With the implementation of these mitigation measures, potential impacts to water and water supply will be less than significant.

Impact 4.13-7 Wastewater

Threshold: *Operation of the proposed Project would not result in impacts to wastewater treatment capacity or requirements; or result in the need for new or expanded wastewater treatment or storm sewer facilities and infrastructure with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

5. Impacts:

The Project area currently relies on on-site wastewater treatment systems (OWTS) to handle wastewater and is not currently served by a public sewer provider. However, the Project area lies within the service area of the Eastern Municipal Water District, which has the ability to provide treatment for wastewater generated by implementing projects facilitated by the Project at its Temecula Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility (TVRWRF). The facility has capacity to receive and treat up to 18 mgd of wastewater inflow while currently receiving approximately 12 mgd of inflow. The TVRWRF has approximately 4 mgd of excess capacity available with its existing facilities based on current inflow. Accordingly, the facility does not have the capacity to receive and treat the projected 4.21 mgd of new inflow from the Project area at full build-out, and implementation of the Project would require the provision of additional capacity in the existing wastewater treatment facility. Nonetheless, to ensure that all impacts to wastewater and storm sewers are less than significant, mitigation is required.

6. Mitigation:

As required by Mitigation Measure PSU SEWER-1, and interim to sewer services in this region, all implementing projects proposed for construction in the Project

1 area shall provide onsite wastewater treatment to meet compliance with the Basin
2 Plan Groundwater Quality Objectives, as well as, additional conditions for salinity
3 management to the satisfaction of the County Department of Environmental Health
4 and the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB).

5 Further, Mitigation Measure PSU SEWER-2 requires that all implementing
6 projects make a fair share contribution toward proposed sewer improvements, as
7 set forth in the phasing and financing plan being developed by EMWD. In addition,
8 all implementing projects shall be responsible for extending sewer lines from
9 available trunk lines as a condition of approval for the project, and/or otherwise
10 ensuring adequate wastewater service consistent with County, Rancho California
11 Water District and Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements, as deemed
12 appropriate by the County during application review. This will ensure that all
13 implementing projects meet water quality standards and comply with applicable
14 policies and regulations adopted by the County, Rancho California Water District
15 and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Every future project in the Project
16 area shall have special sewer conditions as established by the County pursuant to
17 the "Temecula Valley Wine Country (TVWC) Draft Conditions of Approval"
18 adopted by the Board on April 24, 2012.

19 With the implementation of these mitigation measures, potential impacts to
20 wastewater and related infrastructure will be less than significant

21 *Impact: 4.13-8 Solid Waste*

22 *Threshold: Operation of the proposed Project would not result in impacts to landfill*
23 *capacity or violate federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste*
24 *with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment*
25 *"B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

26 7. Impacts:

27 The Southern California Association of Governments projects that Riverside
28 County buildout would occur by the year 2040. While some of the currently active

1 landfills have estimated closure dates that predate the build-out year of 2040,
2 expansions of the Badlands and Lamb Canyon landfills are planned that may
3 extend the life of these landfills. In addition, the County of Riverside has
4 guaranteed disposal capacity of 2,000 tons of solid waste per day at the Eagle
5 Mountain Landfill. The Eagle Mountain Landfill has an estimated closure date of
6 2085, with expansion capability that adds approximately 38 more years of life. As
7 discussed in the Riverside County General Plan EIR No. 441, by the build-out of
8 Riverside County, the County will need to dispose of 4,148,156 tons of solid waste
9 in landfills each year (includes waste generated from the Project). The amount of
10 landfill capacity needed to accommodate this solid waste is directly in line with the
11 County's projected increased landfill need (4 percent per year). Hence, the build-
12 out of the County, which includes waste generated from the Project area, would not
13 create demands for waste management services that exceed the capabilities of the
14 County's waste management system. Nonetheless, to ensure that all impacts to
15 solid waste are less than significant, mitigation is required.

16 8. Mitigation:

17 As required by Mitigation Measure PSU WASTE-1, all implementing project
18 proponents shall make every effort feasible to recycle, reuse, and/or reduce the
19 amount of construction and demolition materials (i.e., concrete, asphalt, wood, etc.)
20 generated by implementing projects of the Project that would otherwise be taken to
21 a landfill. This diversion of waste must exceed a 50 percent reduction by weight.
22 The project shall complete the Riverside County Waste Management Department
23 Construction and Demolition Waste Diversion Program Form B or and Form C
24 process as evidence to ensure compliance. Form B (Recycling Plan) must be
25 submitted and approved by the Riverside County Waste Management Department
26 and provided to the Department of Building and Safety prior to the issuance of
27 building permits. Form C (Reporting Form) must be approved by the Riverside
28 County Waste Management Department and submitted to the Department of

1 Building and Safety prior to the issuance of certificate of occupancy/final
2 inspection. This mitigation measure will substantially reduce the potential waste
3 stream that might otherwise result from the Project's implementation, thus reducing
4 potential impacts to solid waste facilities.

5 Further, Mitigation Measure PSU WASTE-2 requires that all implementing project
6 proponents shall dispose of any hazardous wastes, including paint, used during
7 construction and grading at a licensed facility in accordance with local, state, and
8 federal guidelines. This measure will help protect against any secondary effects
9 that might otherwise occur from the improper disposal of hazardous wastes.

10 Mitigation Measure PSU WASTE-3 requires that all implementing projects with a
11 residential Homeowners Association (HOA) establish green waste recycling
12 through its yard maintenance or waste hauling contracts. Green waste recycling
13 includes such things as grass recycling (where lawn clippings from a mulching-type
14 mower are left on the lawn) and on- or off-site composting. This measure shall be
15 implemented to reduce green waste going to landfills. If such services are not
16 available through the yard maintenance or waste haulers in the area, the
17 implementing project's HOA shall provide individual homeowners with
18 information about ways to recycle green waste individually and collectively and
19 provisions shall be included in the CC&R's. This measure will also help to divert a
20 portion of the waste stream that might otherwise result from the Project, by
21 ensuring that green wastes area recycled and reused.

22 Mitigation Measure PSU WASTE-4 requires that prior to issuance of Building
23 Permits for any commercial or agricultural facilities, clearance from the Riverside
24 County Waste Management Department is needed to verify compliance with
25 California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Act of 1991 (AB 1327), which
26 requires the local jurisdiction to require adequate areas for collecting and loading
27 recyclable materials. This measure provides an enforcement mechanism to ensure
28

1 that individual implementing projects are complying with waste reduction and
2 diversion requirements imposed by the Project.

3 Finally, Mitigation Measure PSU WASTE-5 requires that prior to implementing
4 project approval, applicant(s) shall submit for review and approval landscape plans
5 that provide for the use of xeriscape landscaping to the extent feasible and
6 consistent with the Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan Design
7 Guidelines and provide for the use of drought tolerant low maintenance vegetation
8 in all landscaped areas of the Project. This measure will ensure that landscaping is
9 designed in such a manner as to reduce the amount of generated green waste that
10 results from Project implementation.

11 With the implementation of these mitigation measures, potential impacts to solid
12 waste will be less than significant

13 O. Traffic and Circulation

14 *Impact 4.14-4: Design Features*

15 **Threshold:** *Construction of the Project would not substantially increase hazards due to*
16 *a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g.*
17 *farm equipment) with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project*
18 *Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

19 1. Impacts:

20 The Project does not authorize the construction of specific roadway projects.
21 Rather, it presents a process and basic framework within which priorities are
22 established, and specific projects and action will be undertaken in the future within
23 the Project area. Nonetheless, to assure that any future traffic improvements do not
24 introduce hazardous design features, mitigation will be required.

25 2. Mitigation:

26 All such future roadway projects would be required to comply with design
27 standards set forth by the County and the Project, and adherence to these standards
28 would not permit any hazardous design features or incompatible uses on roadways

1 in the Project area. Mitigation Measure TRF-4 requires all transportation related
2 improvements in the Project area be consistent with the County ordinances (i.e.
3 Ordinance No. 348, 460, 461, 499, 512, 585 etc.) and the Project; therefore, this
4 impact is considered to be less than significant with implementation of mitigation
5 measure TRF-4.

6
7 *Impact 4.14-5: Emergency Access*

8 **Threshold:** *Construction of the Project would not result in inadequate emergency*
9 *access with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution*
10 *Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

11 3. **Impacts:**

12 The Project includes a series of connectivity that will provide for servicing
13 emergency personnel, the Project is not anticipated to result in inadequate
14 emergency access. Detailed emergency response time information is provided in
15 DEIR Section 4.13, Public Services, Recreation and Utilities. Nonetheless, to
16 assure that future implementing projects do not result in unanticipated significant
17 impacts to emergency services, mitigation will be required.

18 4. **Mitigation:**

19 All implementing projects in the Project area shall be reviewed by appropriate
20 emergency services personnel to ensure adequate emergency access is provided, as
21 part of the County's discretionary application review process.

22 The Project is not anticipated to result in inadequate emergency access or impacts
23 to public transit because Mitigation Measure TR-2 requires site-specific traffic
24 management plans (TMPs) for each individual implementing project at the time of
25 project design to reduce traffic and circulation impacts resulting from construction.
26 Additionally, mitigation measure TRF-5 would reduce programmatic impacts
27 related to emergency service access by requiring that emergency services personal
28 review each implementing project to ensure that proper emergency access is
provided. Furthermore, operation of implementing projects requires review by

1 appropriate emergency services personnel to ensure adequate emergency access is
2 provided. Therefore, the Project is not anticipated to result in inadequate
3 emergency access with implementation of the above mitigation measures.

4 *Impact 4.14-6: Public Transit*

5 **Threshold:** *Construction of the Project would conflict with adopted policies, plans, or*
6 *programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease*
7 *the performance of safety of such facilities with the implementation of mitigation measures*
8 *(refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting*
9 *Program).*

10 5. Impacts:

11 The Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding
12 public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, and would comply with existing
13 public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facility plans. Nonetheless, to assure that
14 future implementing projects do not result in unanticipated significant impacts to
15 traffic planning or public transit, mitigation will be required.

16 6. Mitigation:

17 The Project would also include measures and policies that support use of
18 alternative modes of travel, including provision for transit along key circulation
19 corridors. SWAP Policy 1.7 reinforces the County's commitment to develop an
20 integrated regional trails network. The County will also require special events,
21 where appropriate, to utilize shuttle services and/or coordinated use of the City's
22 old town parking structure.

23 Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

24 The Traffic and Circulation mitigation measures addressed above reduce traffic
25 impacts to less than significant levels because proposed implementing projects
26 shall be required to comply with existing regulations, ordinances and the mitigation
27 measures stated in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
28 TRF-1 through TRF-5. These measures require implementing projects to provide
traffic impact studies and traffic management plans that will ensure compliance

1 with existing regulations, ordinances, and will require County approval and
2 approval by appropriate emergency services personnel, which will ensure adequate
3 improvements are provided. These measures also require implementing projects to
4 contribute to the payment of Traffic Impact Fees that will fund improvements to
5 freeways, roadways and intersections that will ease traffic congestion potentially
6 created by implementing projects.

7 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following impacts
8 potentially resulting from the adoption of the Wine Country Community Plan cannot be fully mitigated
9 and will be only partially avoided or lessened in consideration of existing regulations, Project Design
10 Features and the mitigation measures hereinafter specified in **Attachment B (Mitigation Monitoring
11 and Reporting Program)**. Accordingly, and as further explained below, the County makes the following
12 findings as to each of the following impacts as allowed by State CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a): "Changes
13 or alterations [that might further reduce Project impacts] are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of
14 another public agency and not the [County]. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or
15 can and should be adopted by such other agency"; or "Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or
16 other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make
17 infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR." Therefore, a
18 statement of overriding considerations consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, 15126(b), and
19 15126.2(b) and discussed in the Final EIR Section 1.6 is required and included herein:

20 A. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

21 *Impact 4.2-1: Conversion of Designated Farmland*

22 **Threshold:** *Project implementation would convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland,
23 or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses.*

24 1. Impacts:

25 Assuming all land anticipated to be designated for agricultural use is actively
26 utilized as such at the time of buildout of the Project, implementation of the
27 proposed zoning and policies and other options proposed under this Project would
28

1 result in an increase of designated Agriculture land uses compared to existing
2 agricultural uses presently existing in in the Project area. In addition, compliance
3 with County regulations would prevent or reduce significant impacts due to, or
4 resulting in, the limited conversion of Farmlands to non-agricultural uses. The
5 existing regulations and policies include Riverside County Ordinance No. 509
6 (Establishing Agricultural Preserve), Ordinance No. 625 ("Right to Farm"), and
7 applicable General Plan policies. Refer to Section 4.5.3, "Regulatory Framework",
8 for an explanation of the use of these regulations. While the proposed zoning and
9 policies would increase the acreage of designated Agricultural land uses and may in
10 turn increase the acreage of agricultural uses, it is possible that implementing
11 project sites could be located on Prime Farmland (or another designation indicating
12 agricultural suitability). Under the Project, such development would allow
13 development of only up to 25 percent of the total project area based on proposed
14 Policy SWAP 1.4, which allows up to 25 percent of a subject site to be developed
15 with winery and associated facilities (e.g., delicatessens, tasting rooms, special
16 event facilities, etc.). Therefore, the Project could convert agriculturally suitable
17 farmland and active agricultural land to non-agricultural operational uses. Despite
18 the potential for the Project to result in an overall increase of land within
19 agricultural production, land uses that do not involve agricultural production could,
20 on a project-specific basis result in Prime or Unique Farmland, or Farmland of
21 Statewide Importance (Farmland) being taken out of agricultural production. This
22 is a potentially significant impact for which mitigation is required.

23 2. Mitigation:

24 The County has applied all feasible measures to reduce potentially significant
25 agricultural impacts to the fullest extent feasible. Agricultural land impacts were
26 previously found as "unavoidable" in the County's current General Plan EIR. The
27 County has endeavored to more effectively preserve and protect agricultural
28 resources through the proposed Project, which includes a requirement for 75%

1 vineyard coverage on all winery projects, as well as 75% open space for clustered
2 subdivisions and commercial equestrian uses.

3 As shown in Table 6.0-1 of Section 7 (Alternatives, Page 6.0-10) of the Draft EIR,
4 project implementation would result in an increase of more than 3,600 acres of land
5 that would be designated for Agricultural uses, as compared to existing conditions
6 in the Project area. Despite the potential increase in agricultural production for the
7 Project area as whole, project-specific incidences of Farmland conversion from
8 development would be inevitable. If a given site is within designated Farmland it
9 would not be possible to provide for any type of development on the site, including
10 structures directly associated with agricultural production (i.e. barns, produce
11 storage and processing buildings, farmhouses, etc.) without converting farmland.
12 Moreover, "farmland" consists of those lands identified and defined by the
13 California Department of Conservation, as shown on the maps maintained by the
14 Farmlands Mapping and Monitoring Program. Thus, once Farmland is lost to
15 conversion it cannot be replaced since there is a finite amount of such Farmland.
16 Possible mitigation designed to provide for securing Farmlands at other locations,
17 either through the establishment of mitigation fees, easements or other in-lieu land
18 contributions would be duplicative of what is already being done as part of the
19 Project, since implementation of the Wine County Community Plan (WCCP)
20 already results in an increase of more than 3,600 acres of land specifically
21 designated for agricultural use. Accordingly, any such mitigation measures would
22 not further reduce or avoid the Project's potentially significant impact to farmlands.
23 Thus, because there are no further feasible mitigation measures to reduce this
24 impact, this impact will remain significant and avoidable.

25 B. Air Quality

26 *Impact 4.3-2: Air Quality Standards*

27 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would violate air quality standard*
28 *or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.*

1 1. Construction Impacts:

2 Construction of the Project's implementing projects has the potential to create air
3 quality impacts through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and through
4 vehicle trips generated from construction workers traveling to and from the Project
5 site. In addition, fugitive dust emissions would result from demolition and
6 construction activities. Additionally, it should be noted that the development
7 allowable under the Project is less intense than that which is allowed under current
8 General Plan designations and zoning classifications. Nonetheless, as shown on
9 Table 4.3-2 of the Draft EIR (See page 4.3-30), the Project would exceed the South
10 Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Regional Construction
11 Thresholds for: Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC); Nitrogen Oxides (NOx);
12 Carbon Monoxide (CO); PM10 and PM2.5.

13 2. Construction Mitigation:

14 Mitigation measures include applying SCAQMD dust control measures (AQ-8 and
15 AQ-9), and construction equipment control measures (AQ-10). AQ-12 requires
16 future implementing projects to prepare site-specific air quality studies in order to
17 document and avoid potential air quality impacts. AQ-13 was added in response to
18 DEIR comments to identify availability of SCAQMD "SOON" funds for NOx
19 construction emission reduction and requires construction contractors to consider
20 and apply for such funding as part of construction plans. As shown in Table 4.3-2,
21 *Regional Unmitigated Construction Emissions*, of the Final Program EIR No. 524,
22 construction-related regional emissions would exceed SCAQMD significance
23 thresholds for VOC, NOx, CO, PM10 and PM2.5. Therefore, construction impacts
24 resulting from the Project would be potentially significant even with incorporation
25 of the above Mitigation Measures. Methods to further reduce emissions were
26 examined and determined to be infeasible, including the measures recommended by
27 the SCAQMD (see Response to Comments, SCAQMD Comment 11.6 and
28 corresponding response). The lack of available construction equipment with the

1 technological advances capable of reducing emissions, combined with the large
2 size, number and timing of the implementing Projects makes achieving the
3 emissions reductions necessary to meet SCAQMD Regional Construction
4 thresholds infeasible.

5 3. Operation Impacts:

6 Air pollutant emissions associated with Project's implementing projects' operations
7 would be generated by the consumption of natural gas, electricity, water
8 conveyance and agricultural operations and by the consumption of fossil fuels in
9 vehicles. As shown in Table 4.3-3, *Project Operation Stationary and Mobile*
10 *Source Emissions*, of the Final Program EIR No. 524, regional emissions associated
11 with the Project would exceed the SCAQMD daily significance thresholds for:
12 Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC); Nitrogen Oxides (NOx); Carbon Monoxide
13 (CO); PM10 and PM2.5. Also, shown on Table 4.3-4, *Net Increase in San Diego*
14 *County Regional Mobile Source Emissions*, of the Final Program EIR No. 524,
15 mobile source emissions from vehicles traveling within San Diego County to and
16 from the Project area will exceed SDAPCD daily significance thresholds for CO.
17 Additionally, as noted in Chapter 4.3 of the Final Program EIR No. 524, the growth
18 allowed under the Project is less intensive than allowed under current zoning, and
19 is therefore considered consistent with the assumptions of the current AQMP and
20 with applicable air quality plans and policies. Thus, the Project will not jeopardize
21 attainment of clean air standards, although it will result in potentially significant
22 operational emissions. Accordingly, mitigation is required.

23 4. Operation Mitigation:

24 The Project proposes a variety of Design Features (noted in DEIR Section 3) and
25 Mitigation Measures (listed in Attachment "B"). EIR Mitigation Measures include
26 a Trip Reduction Program (AQ-1), compliance with trails and bikeways policies
27 (AQ-2), bicycle parking and horse hitching posts (AQ-3), comprehensive Parking
28 Program to promote trip reduction and low to zero emission vehicle usage (AQ-4),

1 a GHG Mitigation Workbook to promote low/zero emission vehicles (AQ-5),
2 commercial vehicle idling limitations (AQ-6), transit measures (AQ-7),
3 Conservation Management Practices for Confined Animal Facilities that will
4 reduce emissions from such facilities (AQ-11), and localized emissions analysis for
5 future site-specific implementing projects (AQ-12). The greenhouse gas measures
6 listed below will also serve to reduce overall air emissions. In addition, the CARB
7 and SCAQMD are each empowered to regulate air emissions, with CARB playing
8 a major role due to regulating motor vehicle emissions (which account for over
9 70% of Project GHG emissions), and SCAQMD regulating the region's major
10 stationary sources such as electricity generating stations. Utilities, such as
11 Southern California Edison, are also regulated by CARB to achieve AB32 targets,
12 including a 33% renewable energy portfolio for all electricity generation by 2020,
13 which reduces Project-related indirect emissions associated with electricity
14 consumption. Nonetheless, operational impacts in the South Coast Air Basin and
15 San Diego Air Basin resulting from the Project would be potentially significant
16 even with incorporation of the above Mitigation Measures, and would fail to meet
17 SCAQMD Regional thresholds.

18 Methods to further reduce emissions were examined and determined to be
19 infeasible, including additional transportation measures recommended by the
20 SCAQMD (see Response to Comments, SCAQMD Comment 11.7 and
21 corresponding response). As described above, even with the imposition of
22 numerous project design features and mitigation measures the Project would
23 exceed the SCAQMD thresholds. A substantial proportion of the Projects
24 operational emissions are generated by mobile sources. Regulation of mobile
25 source tailpipe emissions is not within the authority of the County and is governed
26 by state and federal regulations consistent with the interstate commerce clause.
27 Therefore, providing additional emission reduction, including the amount of
28

1 reductions needed to meet SCAQMD Regional Operational thresholds is not
2 feasible.

3 5. Sensitive Receptors Impacts:

4 *Impact 4.3-3: Sensitive Receptors*

5 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would potentially expose sensitive*
6 *receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.*

7 As analyzed in Chapter 4.3 of the Final Program EIR No. 524, the South Coast Air Basin,
8 which includes the Project area, already exceeds the ambient air quality standards for
9 ozone, PM10, and PM2.5 (see page 4.3-6). Table 4.3-1 indicates that monitoring in the
10 Project area has registered values above the ambient air quality standards for ozone, PM10,
11 and PM2.5. VOCs and NOX are ozone precursors and are thus relevant to the ozone
12 standards. An exceedance of the SCAQMD threshold levels means that a project could
13 potentially cause or substantially contribute to an exceedance of the ambient air quality
14 standards. Therefore, the Project could potentially contribute to the adverse health effects
15 of these pollutants (ozone, PM10, PM2.5, NOx, and VOCs), as described in the Final
16 Program EIR No. 524 (Chapter 4.3 pages 4.3-4 through 4.3-6 under "Health Effects of Air
17 Pollutants"), which are presumed to already occur in the Project area from existing Basin-
18 wide emissions. Accordingly, mitigation is required.

19 6. Sensitive Receptors Mitigation:

20 As described above, Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-11 will reduce Project
21 emissions, thus lessening the potential impacts to sensitive receptors. Additionally,
22 Mitigation Measure AQ-12 requires non-residential implementing projects to
23 conduct site-specific localized emissions analyses, so that any site-specific impacts
24 can be reduced or avoided. Similarly, air quality and greenhouse gas emission
25 measures noted in Impact 4.3-2 reduce Project emissions and therefore reduce the
26 potential for the Project to adversely affect sensitive receptors. In addition, the
27 nature of land uses proposed under the Project are less intense than allowed under
28

1 current General Plan and zoning. CARB and SCAQMD also regulate mobile and
2 stationary emissions, respectively, and emissions standards for mobile sources are
3 expected to become even more stringent in the future – thus further reduce the
4 impact. However, even with compliance with existing regulations and policies, and
5 the implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-13, the Project may
6 result in potentially significant and unavoidable impacts. As set forth above,
7 methods to further reduce or avoid emissions were examined and determined to be
8 infeasible. Accordingly, this impact will remain significant and unavoidable.

9 **7. Cumulative Impacts:**

10 *Cumulative Impact*

11 **Threshold:** *Project implementation would potentially result in a cumulatively*
12 *considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-*
13 *attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.*

14 The Project would result in the emission of criteria pollutants for which the Project area is
15 in non-attainment during both construction and operation of the new development. A
16 significant impact may occur if a project would add a cumulatively considerable
17 contribution of a federal or state nonattainment pollutant. Both the South Coast Air Basin
18 and San Diego Air Basin are currently in nonattainment for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5. As
19 stated above, the emissions from the implementing projects exceed thresholds for these
20 pollutants, and may contribute to an existing or projected air quality exceedance. This
21 would result in a potentially significant and unavoidable impact.

22 **8. Cumulative Mitigation:**

23 The County has implemented all reasonable and feasible measures to reduce air
24 quality impacts to the extent feasible. As noted above, CARB and SCAQMD also
25 have the authority and responsibility to regulate mobile and stationary emissions,
26 respectively, and emissions standards for mobile sources are expected to become
27 even more stringent in the future – thus further reduce the impact. The Project
28 actually reduces the overall air quality emissions that would occur under current

1 General Plan and zoning, which therefore serves to reduce Project and cumulative
2 air quality impacts in the region. The County has proposed a GHG Mitigation
3 Workbook that will further reduce air quality impacts and GHG emissions. Even
4 with compliance with existing regulations and policies, and implementation of
5 Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-13, the Project would result in potentially
6 significant and unavoidable cumulative air quality impacts. For the reasons
7 described above with respect to Project-specific emissions, there are no further
8 feasible mitigation measures to reduce or avoid this impact.

9 C. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

10 Impact 4.7-1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions

11 *Threshold: Project implementation would result in an increase in greenhouse gas*
12 *emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the*
13 *environment.*

14 1. Construction Impacts:

15 Emissions of GHGs were calculated for the worst-case year of Project construction
16 in CalEEMod. Construction emissions were calculated in five-year increments to
17 correspond with the expected rate of build-out. Emissions for each 5-year period
18 take into account projected policies regarding construction waste diversion and
19 anticipated advancement in equipment technology. Results of this analysis are
20 presented in, *Year 2035 Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. As shown on
21 Table 4.7-2 of the Final Program EIR No. 524, the average annual emissions would
22 not likely exceed the GHG interim threshold of 3,000 metric tons, if an equal
23 number of implementing projects are assumed to be constructed in each of the five-
24 year spans. However, as the actual rate of construction cannot be accurately
25 estimated, a plausible scenario of three times the average construction activity
26 occurring in a single year was considered for determining potential worst-case mass
27 emissions from construction under the Project. The GHG emissions resulting from
28

1 this worst-case construction activity would exceed the SCAQMD's threshold, and
2 result in a potentially significant impact. Accordingly, mitigation is required.

3 2. Construction Mitigation:

4 The U.S. EPA, CARB and SCAQMD have the authority to regulate construction
5 equipment emissions. Mitigation Measure GHG-1 requires future implementing
6 projects to implement a suite of GHG reducing measures through various
7 construction-related control measures such as reducing vehicle idling, use of
8 appropriate EPA-rated construction equipment, and use of electricity from the grid
9 rather than temporary diesel generators where feasible. Additionally, Mitigation
10 Measure GHG-2 allows implementing projects to use the County's GHG Option
11 Table to ensure that Project's reduce GHG emissions at least 28.5% below
12 Business As usual emissions. However, even with the implementation of
13 Mitigation Measure GHG-1 and GHG-2 and the expected improvements in
14 construction waste diversion and anticipated advancement in equipment technology
15 over the long term, the Project would fail to meet the SCAQMD interim threshold,
16 largely due to level of development anticipate with the Project's planning area.
17 Therefore, the construction of the implementing projects would result in a
18 potentially significant, adverse and unavoidable impact with regard to construction
19 GHG emissions.

20 There are no feasible mitigation measures to further reduce or avoid this significant
21 GHG impact, because emissions primarily come from construction equipment. As
22 discussed above, the County has already imposed all feasible mitigation to reduce
23 construction-related emissions and require the use of low-emission equipment
24 wherever feasible. Accordingly, this impact will remain significant and
25 unavoidable.

26 3. Operations Impacts:

27 Project operations would result in a change in land use from relatively vacant land
28 to residential, commercial or agricultural use. As a result, the Project would

1 generate an increase in long-term GHG emissions from a number of sources as a
2 result of development, including: mobile sources, residential and commercial
3 building energy consumption, water consumption, waste generation, area sources,
4 and wine production. The individual implementing projects built in accordance
5 with the Project would achieve reductions in GHG emissions consistent with the
6 State's overall reduction goal of 28.5 percent compared to "Business as Usual"
7 (BAU) through the implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 which
8 provide a suite of measures that will reduce implementing projects' emissions.
9 However, the construction and long-term operation of these new residences,
10 wineries, and agricultural developments will result in an increase in total GHG
11 emissions as compared to the existing condition, and will result in emissions, when
12 averaged over the new residents and employees, which exceed the per capita
13 threshold of 4.1 MT/yr (adopted from the SCAQMD efficient-based standard for
14 Year 2035).

15 4. Operations Mitigation:

16 Mitigation Measure GHG-2 includes the County's adoption of the Temecula Valley
17 Wine Country Greenhouse Gas Reduction Workbook (DEIR Appendix E).
18 Measure GHG-2 and the GHG Workbook require future implementing projects to
19 demonstrate compliance with minimum performance standards or achievement of a
20 28.5% or better reduction in GHG emissions compared to Business as Usual
21 (BAU). Existing General Plan policies, federal and state regulations, SCAQMD
22 climate change policies, County regulations and Mitigation Measures GHG-1 and
23 GHG-2 are intended to reduce GHG emissions and represent feasible mitigation.
24 However, even with implementation of the feasible policies, regulations and
25 mitigation measures, the Project would still result in GHG emissions in excess of
26 mass emission and per capita thresholds. There are no further feasible mitigation
27 measures to reduce or avoid this impact. As discussed above, reducing mobile-
28 source emissions from transportation is outside of the County's legal authority, and

1 large proportion of GHG emissions arise from the transportation sector. Moreover,
2 the Project already includes a number of energy efficiency measures that will
3 reduce the Project's GHG emissions, and Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2
4 require further measures to reduce overall emissions. Accordingly, even with all
5 feasible mitigation, this impact will remain significant and unavoidable.

6 5. Cumulative Impacts:

7 With implementation of Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures GHG-1
8 and GHG-2, along with all applicable and feasible federal, state and local policies
9 and regulations, the Project would be consistent with and not conflict with the
10 statewide goals of AB 32 and regional targets under SB375.

11 6. Cumulative Mitigation:

12 However, because measures implementing AB 32 and the SB 375 require further
13 action by other state and federal agencies and implementation and effectiveness is
14 not assured, as well as the continuing effects of past human-induced GHG
15 emissions, in an abundance of caution the County has determined that the Project's
16 incremental contribution to climate change would remain potentially significant
17 and unavoidable. As discussed above, the County has already included as Project
18 features or imposed as mitigation all feasible measures to reduce the GHG impact.
19 However, even with those measures, the impact will remain significant and
20 unavoidable.

21 D. Noise

22 *Impact 4.12-2: Permanent Noise Increases*

23 **Threshold:** *Project implementation would result a substantial permanent increase in*
24 *ambient noise levels in the project vicinity and would expose persons to (or result in) noise*
25 *levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or*
26 *applicable standards of other agencies.*

27 1. Impacts:

1 Long-term development facilitated by the Project would result in additional traffic
2 on adjacent roadways, thereby increasing the vehicular noise in the vicinity of the
3 existing and proposed land uses. Stationary noise sources within the Project area
4 would include special occasion facilities which are used for events such as parties,
5 weddings, and other social gatherings.

6 Riverside County Ordinance No. 847 Section (c), *Audio Equipment*, prohibits the
7 operation of audio equipment between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. such
8 that the equipment is audible inside an inhabited dwelling and at any other time
9 such that the equipment is audible at a distance greater than 100 feet from the
10 source. Additionally, Ordinance No. 847 Section (d), *Sound Amplifying Equipment*
11 *and Live Music*, prohibits the operation of sound amplifying equipment or
12 performance of live music between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., and at
13 any other time such that the equipment or live music is audible at a distance greater
14 than 200 feet from the source. Ordinance No. 847 Section 7, *Exceptions*, allows for
15 the application for single or continuous exceptions from the provisions of
16 Ordinance No. 847 which are subject to a fee and the County Planning Director's
17 approval.

18 The Winery District would promote the establishment of additional commercial
19 activities that support tourism while ensuring long-term viability of the wine
20 industry. Project implementation would facilitate construction of additional small,
21 medium, and large wineries which may be located in the vicinity of existing and
22 future rural residential uses and existing institutional uses. Therefore, the potential
23 exists for the generation of long-term noise levels from future implementing
24 projects which propose the development of wineries (in particular from special
25 events, tasting rooms, and shipping facilities) to exceed noise and land use
26 compatibility standards which could impact an adjoining sensitive land use, and
27 potentially resulting in a significant, adverse and unavoidable impact with respect
28 to stationary noise. Accordingly, mitigation is required.

1 2. Mitigation:

2 Mitigation Measures NOI-3 through NOI-6 in the Draft PEIR, specifically address
3 operational noise associated with special occasion facilities of the implementing
4 projects, including limitations on hours of operation. Mitigation Measure NOI-3
5 requires site-specific noise attenuation measures and will minimize noise impacts
6 from shipping facilities. To ensure noise from special events held at winery
7 facilities are further reduced, Mitigation Measure NOI-4 would require special
8 occasion facilities to submit a Noise Study and NOI-3 and NOI-5 would require
9 Noise Control Plans to be formulated prior to the issuance of building permits to
10 reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure NOI-5
11 prohibits amplified sound and special events at wineries after 10:00 p.m., restricts
12 special event clean-up activities to no later than midnight, and identifies potential
13 noise-attenuating features to be incorporated into future implementing projects (the
14 County has modified Ordinance No. 348.4729 to prohibit outdoor amplified sound
15 at Special Occasion Facilities, including winery events, unless such outdoor
16 amplified sound is subject to a Noise Ordinance exemption approval pursuant to
17 the existing County Noise Ordinance). NOI-6 ensures proper enforcement of
18 County noise requirements and Project conditions of approval.

19 Adherence to the existing Ordinance No. 847, *General Plan* policies, and
20 Mitigation Measures NOI-3 through NOI-6 would substantially reduce stationary
21 source noise impacts associated with the Project (such as special events).
22 However, given that it is not possible to predict the specific nature, frequency or
23 location of all of the wineries or all of the special events, some stationary source
24 activity may still represent unacceptable noise exposure within the Wine Country,
25 particularly for existing sensitive receptors. This unavoidable impact will be
26 reduced, but not eliminated, through compliance with policies, ordinances and
27 mitigation noted above, and will be implemented by the County on a project-by-
28 project basis. The only further means of reducing or avoiding this impact would be

1 to limit stationary source noise emissions (such as those associated with special
2 events) to the point where only one or two special events could occur at any one
3 time. However, because the objective of the Project is to encourage winery-related
4 uses in the Project area and to draw tourism into the area, it would be infeasible to
5 impose such a limitations. Therefore, this impact will remain significant and
6 unavoidable.

7 E. Cumulative Noise

8 *Cumulative Impacts*

9 **Threshold:** *Project implementation would result in cumulative impacts associated with*
10 *noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance,*
11 *or applicable standards of other agencies.*

12 1. Mobile Source Impacts:

13 Buildout of the Project would result in potential cumulative noise level increases
14 along major roadways from increase in traffic noise. Table 4-12-10 in the Noise
15 Section of the Draft EIR (See pages 4.12-31 through 4.12.35) identifies several
16 roadway segments that would exceed noise thresholds as the result of Project
17 implementation. Thus, the Project would substantially contribute to cumulative
18 mobile source noise impacts and mitigation would be required.

19 2. Mobile Sources Mitigation:

20 As an informational item, it should be noted that the Project represents a reduction
21 in potential land use intensity compared to what is currently allowed under the
22 existing General Plan and zoning. However, Project implementation (future
23 implementing projects) compared to currently existing baseline conditions would
24 result in significant cumulative noise impacts that could not be fully mitigated with
25 the implementation of the proposed policies and Mitigation Measures NOI-1
26 through NOI-7. Thus, the Project would substantially contribute to cumulative
27 mobile source noise impacts.

1 Potential noise impacts related to exposure to traffic noise of future implementing
2 projects involving residential or other noise-sensitive uses would be evaluated as
3 part of the project-specific environmental analysis that would be need for such
4 implementing projects and, if necessary dependent upon project-specific
5 conditions, project-level mitigation could be required to mitigate traffic noise from
6 adjacent roadways. However, project implementation would still result in
7 significant adverse and unavoidable impacts due to the increase in ambient traffic
8 noise as the result of project implementation. This impact is unavoidable since it is
9 a direct result of increases traffic that would be created by the project.

10 3. Stationary Sources Impacts:

11 The Project may result in significant stationary source impacts, even with
12 implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-3 through NOI-6 and applicable
13 policies and ordinances. All future implementing projects within the Project area
14 and surrounding region would be subject to comply with County, State, and Federal
15 guidelines regarding noise abatement and insulation standards. Cumulative
16 stationary source impacts may be significant and unavoidable, depending on site-
17 specific operations for a given implementing project. It may also be possible for
18 multiple stationary sources such as special events or wineries to operate
19 concurrently and in close proximity, which could further add to cumulative noise
20 impacts. These potential stationary noise impacts, including special events, are
21 best mitigated on a policy level as set forth above, including the Noise
22 Study/Acoustical Analysis, Noise Control Plan, and noise-attenuation measures as
23 required in Mitigation Measures NOI-3 through NOI-6. The Project's creation of
24 special Districts for each major land use also reduces the potential for future
25 cumulative noise impacts upon sensitive receptors by focusing future residential
26 implementing projects in the Residential District. Due to the potentially significant
27 nature of this impact, mitigation would be required.

28 4. Stationary Sources Mitigation:

1 Adherence to the existing Ordinance No. 847, *General Plan* policies, and
2 mitigation measures listed above would substantially reduce stationary source noise
3 impacts associated with the Project (such as special events). However, given that it
4 is not possible to predict the specific nature, frequency or location of all of the
5 wineries or all of the special events, some stationary source activity may still
6 represent unacceptable noise exposure within the Wine Country, particularly for
7 existing sensitive receptors. This unavoidable impact will be reduced, but cannot be
8 entirely eliminated, through compliance with policies, ordinances and mitigation
9 noted above, and will be implemented by the County on a project-by-project basis.
10 Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant, adverse and unavoidable.

11 F. Public Services, Recreation and Utilities

12 *Impact 4.13-2: Fire Protection Services*

13 **Threshold:** *Project implementation would result in impacts to fire protection services.*

14 1. Impacts:

15 The County Fire Department estimates that, pursuant to the County's standard of
16 one new fire station and/or engine company per 2,000 new dwelling units and/or
17 3.5 million square feet of commercial/industrial occupancy, as many as three
18 additional fire stations may be needed to meet anticipated service demands;
19 however, the availability of sufficient funding to equip and staff such new facilities
20 may not be available over the long term and the ability of the Department to
21 negotiate for adequate funding for either construction or long-term staffing with
22 individual developers is uncertain. Accordingly, mitigation is required to reduce
23 this impact.

24 2. Mitigation:

25 Mitigation Measures FIRE-1 through FIRE-5 will reduce impacts by requiring that
26 implementing projects analyze traffic impacts and effects on emergency response
27 time, participate in a fire mitigation fee program, prepare a fire
28

1 protection/vegetation monitoring program, ensure fire access to all lots, and
2 provide for water lines and hydrants sufficient to meet fire service needs.
3 Nonetheless, because of the uncertainties in future fire facility needs, the timing of
4 construction of those facility, and the availability of funding, a potentially
5 significant impact may result. It would be infeasible to construct all such facilities
6 now, because the location of future residential and commercial development (and
7 their attendant need for such services) is unknown. Additionally, the construction
8 of a comprehensive network of fire facilities at this time would result in air quality,
9 noise, GHG, traffic, and other impacts when there is not presently a need for an
10 extensive network of such facilities. Accordingly, this impact will remain
11 potentially significant and unavoidable.

12 *Impact 4.13-4: Libraries*

13 **Threshold:** *Project implementation would result in impacts to library facilities.*

14 Based on the current Riverside County standard, there are insufficient library facilities
15 available to provide the targeted level of service to the Project area and the balance of the
16 service area of the two existing libraries in the Temecula area. The Project would reduce
17 the total anticipated population within the Plan area at buildout and would therefore reduce
18 the Plan area's contribution to demand for library services and facilities. However, the
19 increase in demand for the Project compared to currently existing conditions would still
20 exceed the capacity of library facilities.

21 Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 requires all new residential, industrial, and
22 commercial development to pay development impact fees to offset impacts to existing and
23 future public facilities. For library services these funds are collected and used to provide
24 both library services and construction of new facilities pursuant to the Public Facilities
25 Needs List. General Plan policy LU 5.1 ensures that Riverside County shall take action to
26 ensure that development does not cause growth to exceed acceptable levels of service.
27 One mitigation measure prepared for the 2003 General Plan was adopted to set specific
28

1 levels of services for libraries (i.e. Riverside County shall provide a minimum of
2 approximately 0.5 square foot of library space and 2.5 volumes per County resident).
3 Nonetheless, there is an existing deficiency in library facilities both locally and
4 Countywide based on the County's current standard and, therefore, implementing projects
5 within the Project area would make an indirect but cumulatively considerable contribution
6 to that existing deficiency, resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impact on
7 library facilities and services.

8 3. Mitigation:

9 Aside from the collection of DIF fees to fund future library improvements, there
10 are no feasible mitigation measures to further reduce the impact on library services.
11 It would be infeasible to construct additional libraries now, because the location of
12 future residential and commercial development (and their attendant need for such
13 services) is unknown. Additionally, the construction of additional libraries at this
14 time would result in air quality, noise, GHG, traffic, and other impacts.
15 Accordingly, this impact will remain potentially significant and unavoidable.

16 4. Cumulative Impacts:

17 *Cumulative Impact*

18 **Threshold:** *Project implementation would result cumulative impacts to fire protection*
19 *services and library facilities.*

20 As discussed above, the Project's potential impacts to parks and recreational facilities, law
21 enforcement services, public education, water and water supply, wastewater, solid waste,
22 and other utilities will either be less than significant with existing regulations and Project
23 features or less than significant with the imposition of the mitigation measures outlined
24 above. Because those above-described regulations, Project features, and mitigation
25 measures apply in a Project-wide manner, such that all implementing projects will be
26 subject to them, no potentially significant cumulative impacts are anticipated as to any of
27 these resource areas.
28

1 However, the Project may, in combination with existing conditions and other future
2 implementing projects, result in unavoidable significant cumulative impacts in the areas of
3 fire protection and library services.

4 Specifically with regard to fire services, and according to the County Fire Department's
5 January 27, 2010 response to the Project's NOP, implementation of the Project would have
6 a cumulative adverse impact on the Fire Department's ability to provide an acceptable
7 level of service. Impacts include an increased number of emergency and public service
8 calls due to the increased presence of structures, traffic, and population (including transient
9 tourists).

10 After mitigation, potential impacts to fire protection services and library services would
11 remain significant. The Project itself mitigates this impact by reducing density as
12 compared to current General Plan and zoning¹. In addition, the County's existing
13 development fees, user fees and other means of generating revenue can provide for
14 necessary facilities as the Project area builds out. No other mitigation measures are
15 feasible.

16 G. Traffic and Circulation

17 *Impact 4.14-1: Conflict with an Applicable Plan, Ordinance, or Policy*

18 *Impact 4.14-2: Conflict with Congestion Management Program*

19 **Threshold:** *Project implementation would conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance,
20 or policy establishing LOS performance standards.*

21 **Threshold:** *Project implementation would conflict with an applicable Congestion
22 Management Plan establishing levels of service and travel demand measures.*

23
24 ¹ The current General Plan and zoning for the 17,910-acre Project area allows incidental commercial uses on parcels as small as
25 10 acres, representing an estimate total employment potential of over 44,000 employees. The "Project" addressed in the DEIR
26 provides a variety of development standards to create a balance in land uses, including requiring a minimum 20-acre parcel for
27 incidental commercial uses at a winery (except for certain specified Existing Wineries in the WC-WE zone). The DEIR
28 Project reduces total employment projections compared to the No Project, to an estimated 44,004 employees. The Project has
been further modified by the Planning Commission (November 20, 2013) and Board of Supervisors (December 3, 2013) to
reduce the overall Project area to 17,910 acres, reduce total employment to 41,261, and reduce the projected number of
wineries from the DEIR estimate of 105 to the current estimate of 95. The net effect of the modified Project is to substantially
reduce demands on public services and utilities, in comparison to the "No Project Alternative" and to the Project evaluated in
the DEIR.

1 1. Impacts:

2 Long-term operational traffic resulting from the Project would contribute to
3 degradation to the performance of the circulation system in the Project area in
4 comparison to existing conditions. Although the Project generally improves
5 operations compared to the adopted General Plan, implementation of the Project
6 would still contribute to increases in traffic volumes and degradation of levels of
7 service that would result in a significant and unavoidable impact with regard to
8 performance of the circulation system.

9 Additionally, as discussed in Chapter 4.14 of the Final Program EIR No. 524, the
10 Project conflicts with an existing Congestion Management Plan by degrading
11 operations from an acceptable LOS C or better to LOS D, E, or F at the following
12 intersections:

- 13 • Winchester Road at Nicolas Road
- 14 • Margarita Road at Rancho California Road
- 15 • Rancho California Road at Ynez Road
- 16 • Los Caballos Road at Temecula Parkway
- 17 • Camino del Vino at Glen Oaks Road
- 18 • Camino del Vino at Monte De Oro
- 19 • De Portola Road at Pauba Road
- 20 • Pauba Road at Temecula Parkway

21 The Project adds traffic to Anza Road south of Rancho California Road operating
22 at an unacceptable LOS F.

23 2. Mitigation:

24 Future implementing projects are subject to the EIR No. 524 mitigation measures.
25 Additional site-specific conditions of approval will be developed during the
26 development review process, as required by Mitigation Measure TRF-1.
27 Specifically, TRF-1 requires future development within the Project to prepare a
28

1 focused traffic study that will assess the following to ensure consistency with the
2 assessment prepared for the Project:

- 3 • Trip generation comparison to estimates assumed in the EIR
- 4 • Parking assessment
- 5 • Site access and on-site circulation assessment
- 6 • Interaction of driveways with adjacent intersections (if appropriate)
- 7 • Additional assessment deemed appropriate by the County of Riverside
8 Transportation Department

9 These supplemental traffic impact assessments for individual developments within
10 the Project will assist in assessing the phasing of development within the Project
11 area and will assist in identifying when improvements will need to be constructed
12 to accommodate new development as it occurs over time in the WCCP so that
13 adequate LOS is maintained.

14 Adherence to the existing General Plan policies, Project Design Features and
15 mitigation measures TRF-1 through TRF-3 would substantially reduce impacts
16 associated with the Project. Mitigation Measure TRF-2 specifically indicates
17 consideration of a shuttle for special events, pursuant to the required Traffic
18 Management Plan. Future implementing projects will require separate discretionary
19 review as described in measures TRF-1 through TRF-3, and as specifically set forth
20 in measure LU-1. Further, TRF-3 requires that the County implementing a Traffic
21 Impact Fee Program for the area in order to acquire sufficient funding to pay for
22 traffic improvements.

23 Ultimately, however, the County lacks legal authority to guarantee implementation
24 of mitigation measures and associated road improvements located within the
25 jurisdiction and control of the City of Temecula and/or Caltrans, and, consequently,
26 cannot assure that such improvements will be in place when needed to avoid
27 unacceptable LOS levels. Therefore, because measures outside of the County's
28

1 jurisdiction are legally infeasible for the County to enforce, these potential impacts
2 must be considered significant and unavoidable.

3 This conclusion does not change even in view of the late comment letters received
4 from the City of Temecula and others. Specifically, the Final EIR includes updated
5 traffic analysis in response to requests by the City of Temecula and others
6 (Response Nos. 10 and 17). This updated information clarifies DEIR analysis and
7 does not change fundamental conclusions in the DEIR. Additionally, the County's
8 transportation experts provided further clarification regarding the traffic analysis in
9 a letter confirming that – although the Project will increase traffic as compared to
10 existing conditions – the Project actually decreases traffic impacts as compared to
11 what was anticipated under buildout of the County's existing General Plan. (See
12 Letter from Farah Khorashadi to Dale West, September 24, 2013).

13 In addition to EIR measures TRF-1 through TRF-3, the EIR also includes measures
14 GHG-1 and GHG-2 which serve to reduce traffic impacts through trip reduction
15 measures including encouraging transit and other non-vehicular travel. However,
16 not all impacts will be reduced to a level that is less than significant. Therefore, a
17 potentially significant impact with regard to conflicts with existing applicable plans
18 and performance of the circulation system, as well conflict with the County
19 Congestion Management program, is still likely to occur.

20 **H. Cumulative Traffic and Circulation**

21 *Cumulative Impact*

22 **Threshold:** *Project implementation would result cumulative impacts to traffic and*
23 *circulation.*

24 1. **Impacts:**

25 As discussed in Chapter 4.14, the Project may, in combination with existing
26 conditions and other future implementing projects, result in potentially unavoidable
27 significant cumulative impacts in the areas of:
28

- conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system
- level of service degradation to unacceptable levels

2. Mitigation:

The Project has incorporated various Project Design Features to avoid or reduce these potential impacts, which are best addressed at a regional level through the County's General Plan and development review process. The Project's traffic analysis compares General Plan buildout under the "Project" and "No Project" scenarios, both of which show unavoidable significant impacts. The Project's impacts, although significant and unavoidable relative to existing conditions, represent less traffic and fewer associated impacts when compared to the current General Plan and policy areas. Adherence to the existing General Plan policies, Project Design Features and mitigation measures TRF-1 through TRF-3 would substantially reduce impacts associated with the Project. Mitigation Measure TRF-2 specifically indicates consideration of a shuttle for special events, pursuant to the required Traffic Management Plan. Future implementing projects will require separate discretionary review as described in measures TRF-1 through TRF-3, and as specifically set forth in measure LU-1, all future development within the Project shall be required to prepare a focused traffic study. Refer to finding for Impact 4.14-1 and 4.14-2, above.

These unavoidable impacts are due primarily either to intentionally "down-sizing" certain roadway segments to maintain the Project area's rural nature (and therefore road widening is not feasible) or due to certain improvements being outside the jurisdiction of the County of Riverside (in Temecula, or in Caltrans jurisdiction, where the County cannot ensure the timeliness or nature of future improvements). In addition, the County cannot guarantee that right-of-way necessary to make needed road improvements can be obtained timely to make such improvements in order to avoid unacceptable LOS occurring as a result of new development.

1 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has considered the
2 following alternatives identified in EIR No. 524 in light of the environmental impacts which cannot be
3 avoided or substantially lessened and has rejected those alternatives as failing to meet most of the
4 project's objectives, as failing to reduce or avoid the project's significant impacts or as infeasible for the
5 reasons hereinafter stated:

6 A. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21002 and the CEQA Guidelines Section
7 15126.6(a), an EIR must assess a reasonable range of alternatives to the project action or
8 location. Section 15126.6(a) places emphasis on focusing the discussion on alternatives
9 which provide opportunities for eliminating any significant adverse environmental
10 impacts, or reducing them to a level of insignificance, even if these alternative would
11 impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.
12 In this regard, the EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative among the
13 other alternatives. As with cumulative impacts, the discussion of alternatives is governed
14 by the "rule of reason". The EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be
15 reasonably ascertained, or does not contribute to an informed decision-making and public
16 participation process. The range of alternatives is defined by those alternatives, which
17 could feasibly attain the objectives of the project. As directed in CEQA Guidelines
18 Section 15126.6(c), an EIR shall include alternatives to the project that could feasibly
19 accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project.

20 B. The Project has been developed to achieve the following goals:

- 21 1. Ensure that the Wine Country region develops in an orderly manner that maximizes
22 the area's viticulture and related uses, and balances the need to protect existing
23 rural lifestyles in the area.
- 24 2. Ensure that the Riverside County General Plan and its supporting regulatory
25 documents, such as the Zoning Ordinance and Design Guidelines, provide a
26 comprehensive blueprint that will achieve the community's vision.
- 27 3. Ensure adequate provisions for the establishment of wineries and equestrian
28 operations, associated auxiliary uses, and other compatible uses, as deemed

1 appropriate.

2 C. To achieve these goals, the Project incorporates the following objectives:

- 3 1. To preserve and enhance the Wine Country region's viticulture potential, rural life
4 style and equestrian activities.
- 5 2. To continue to allow for an appropriate level of commercial tourist activities that is
6 incidental to viticulture activities.
- 7 3. To coordinate where, and under what circumstances, future growth should be
8 accommodated.
- 9 4. To develop provisions to ensure that future growth is balanced and coordinated
10 with the appropriate public services, infrastructure and other basic necessities for a
11 healthy, livable community.

12 As directed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), an EIR shall include alternatives to the project that
13 could avoid or substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects. Because not all significant
14 effects can be substantially reduced to a less-than-significant level either by adoption of mitigation
15 measures, Project Design Features, existing regulations or by standard conditions of approval, the
16 following section considers the feasibility of the Project alternatives as compared to the proposed Project.
17 As explained below, these findings describe and reject, for reasons documented in the Final Program EIR
18 No. 524 and summarized below, each one of the Project alternatives. The evidence supporting these
19 findings is presented in Section 6 of the Draft EIR and elsewhere in the administrative record as a whole.

20 D. No Build Scenario/Existing Condition alternative:

- 21 1. The No Build Scenario/Existing Condition Alternative ("No Build Scenario")
22 assumes that the future implementing projects envisioned under the Project would
23 not occur, and the Project site would remain in its existing condition. This
24 alternative assumes the breakdown of land use acreages listed in DEIR Table 3.0-1,
25 Existing Land Use Acreages provided in the DEIR Chapter 3.0, Project
26 Description. Essentially, this alternative assumes that only the existing
27 development that is presently on the ground would occupy the Project site into the
28 future.

- 1 2. No additional implementing projects would be considered/approved/developed
2 within the Project site. The existing wineries, residential, equestrian and vacant,
3 open space would remain, and property owners may continue to utilize their parcel
4 as they are currently being used.
- 5 3. This alternative does not reflect the future growth envisioned in the Southwest Area
6 Plan, existing Citrus Vineyard Policy Area, or the Project objectives. The site is
7 currently designated for development in a manner relatively similar to the Project
8 (albeit with more development intensity and density and more incompatibility in
9 land uses). The County's General Plan reflects this designation, and there have
10 been no indications by County staff, elected officials or the public through the EIR
11 scoping process that there is a desire to preserve the site in its current state and
12 without additional infrastructure support.
- 13 4. The No Build Alternative does not meet most of the basic Project objectives
14 because it does not implement a comprehensive and cohesive plan for the physical
15 and economic development of the Project area, does not enhance the Wine Country
16 region's viniculture potential, rural lifestyle and equestrian activities, does not
17 continue to allow for an appropriate level of commercial tourist activities, does not
18 coordinate where and under what circumstances future growth should be
19 accommodated, and does not develop provisions to ensure that future growth is
20 balanced and coordinated with appropriate public services, infrastructure and other
21 basic necessities for a healthy, livable community.
- 22 5. It does not provide for adequate water distribution, sewer, flood control,
23 circulation, and water quality improvements. The No Build Alternative would also
24 be inconsistent with the County General Plan in that it assumes no future
25 development (even development otherwise consistent with the existing General
26 Plan) would occur, and thus this alternative would fail to provide increased
27 revenue, employment and entertainment opportunities within the County, and
28 would not provide the various infrastructure and service improvements associated

1 with the Project. For these reasons, this Alternative is rejected by the County as
2 infeasible.

3 E. No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative:

- 4 1. The No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications
5 Alternative ("No Project Alternative") assumes that development of implementing
6 projects as allowed under the Project would not occur, and that the Project site
7 would instead remain subject to the provisions contained within the current, non-
8 amended General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Each parcel within the site would be
9 subject to the requirements of its corresponding General Plan land use designation
10 for those properties outside of the Citrus/Vineyard and Valle de los Caballos Policy
11 Area. For parcels within these Policy Areas, the General Plan land use designation
12 would apply, in conjunction with the applicable zoning classifications. This
13 alternative also assumes that most of the entitlements applications currently on file
14 with the County would be approved and constructed as proposed within the Project
15 site.
- 16 2. The existing General Plan and Policy Areas (i.e., No Project Alternative) in their
17 current state are anticipated to provide a mix of uses which would include a larger
18 number of acres within the Rural and Rural Community Foundation Components
19 (as displayed in Table 3.0-3). However, with these existing regulations, the build-
20 out of the Project area is anticipated to include less acres under the Agriculture and
21 Open Space Foundation Components. The existing General Plan would not
22 establish the proposed three Districts (i.e., Winery, Residential, and Equestrian) as
23 proposed under the Project and, thus, would not ensure to the same degree the long-
24 term viability of the wine industry and would not serve to protect the community's
25 equestrian and rural lifestyle.
- 26 3. The existing General Plan in its current state (i.e., pursuant to the existing
27 Citrus/Vineyard Policy Area) would require incidental commercial uses, such as
28 special occasion facilities, bed and breakfast and restaurants with wineries on a

1 minimum of ten (10) acres. The Project would require a minimum of ten (10) acres
2 only for these uses on existing wineries identified in the SWAP. For all other
3 wineries incidental commercial uses a 20-acre minimum lot size would be required.

4 4. Based on the existing land uses designation and Policy Areas within the Project
5 area, this alternative would result in a 58.4% increase in dwelling units and
6 population, while generating a 25.4% increase in employment/other (which is the
7 category used to quantify the number of employees and tourists anticipated to visit
8 the Project area) compared to the Project.

9 5. The existing General Plan would not include the circulation improvements
10 identified in the traffic study prepared for the Project (i.e., traffic signalization, re-
11 striping, addition of lanes, dedication of lanes, creation of intersections, and
12 creation of new roadway linkages). While nothing in the existing General Plan or
13 zoning would preclude these improvements from developing at a later date with the
14 appropriate permits and approvals (e.g., GPA), this alternative does not propose or
15 plan for these updates to the circulation network.

16 6. Private property owners have a right to develop their property, and this alternative
17 would not preclude future development of a similar or more intense nature as
18 compared to the uses proposed by the Project. Accordingly, this Alternative, due to
19 its substantially greater density than the proposed Project, would result in
20 substantially greater impacts in nearly all environmental topical areas, particularly
21 for traffic, air quality, noise, aesthetics, and public services and utilities. This
22 Alternative would also not include the proposed Design Guidelines, Sign Program
23 or Greenhouse Gas Reduction Workbook, nor would it include the amended
24 Ordinance language with updated development standards, allowable uses and
25 definitions, which were carefully developed after years of work and numerous
26 stakeholder meetings and public hearings. This Alternative does not meet the
27 Project's objectives, does not reduce or avoid the Project's significant impacts, and
28 would result in greater significant environmental impacts than the proposed Project.

1 Therefore, this Alternative is rejected by the County for these reasons.

2 F. Reduced Density (25% Reduction) Alternative:

- 3 1. The Reduced Density Alternative would reduce impacts from the Project related to
4 the number of units developed and the intensity of commercial development,
5 including wineries. Under this alternative, the total number of residential dwelling
6 units anticipated is assumed to be reduced from 1,916 to 1,437 representing a
7 reduction of 479 units, or approximately 25%. In addition, it is anticipated that
8 commercial square footage would be reduced by 25% under this alternative.
- 9 2. This reduced density alternative does not have the same design features as the
10 Project, and therefore, the impacts of this alternative could be greater than the
11 impacts of the Project with regard to specific issue areas. As a variation of this
12 alternative, the site could be developed with higher density product in a "cluster
13 development" fashion, leaving increased natural open space and reducing the extent
14 and cost of infrastructure improvements and site grading.
- 15 3. The Reduced Density Alternative may not require the same level of circulation,
16 water, sewer, flood control and other infrastructure improvement based on a
17 reduction in population, employment, and tourists within the Project site (due to the
18 lower allowable intensity of use in the Project site).
- 19 4. This alternative may partially accomplish the objectives enumerated for the Project.
20 However, the future growth of the Project area would be reduced compared to the
21 Project. The level of commercial tourist activities envisioned under the current
22 General Plan and this Project would not be reached as effectively through
23 implementation of this alternative, due to less density and interactive synergy
24 produced by the Project's balance of wineries/commercial tourism, equestrian and
25 residential uses. Feasibility and funding of required infrastructure would also be
26 more challenging under this Alternative due to a reduced development base from
27 which to derive fees and other funding sources, and much of this infrastructure
28 would be similar to that required for the Project. Finally, it should be noted that the

1 "Project" already represents a substantial reduced density from what is currently
2 allowed in the General Plan and Policy Areas, and this density has been further
3 reduced through the Planning Commission and Board hearing process. Aside from
4 the No Build Alternative, the Reduced Density Alternative is considered
5 environmentally superior overall. Even with a 25% reduction, similar to the
6 proposed Project, there would still be significant and unavoidable project impacts
7 associated with air, greenhouse gas emissions, agricultural resources, noise, traffic,
8 and growth-inducing impacts. In addition, the reduction in density would
9 substantially impair a key Project objective of preserving "and enhancing" the
10 area's viticulture industry. In addition, a reduced density necessitates further
11 restrictions on private property rights. Given that the Project already represents a
12 substantial reduction and added restrictions upon private properties, and several
13 property owners raised concerns even over the currently proposed levels of density
14 reduction and land use restrictions, it is reasonable to expect that further density
15 reductions would amplify private property owner concerns and jeopardize years of
16 stakeholder outreach and consensus building on the land use vision for the Project
17 area. For these reasons, the Reduced Density Alternative is rejected as infeasible
18 by the County.

19 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has, pursuant to CEQA
20 Guidelines Section 15093, balanced the benefits of the Wine Country Community Plan against the
21 unavoidable adverse environmental effects described herein, and has determined that each and every one
22 of the following benefits individually outweigh and render acceptable each and every one of those
23 significant environmental effects:

- 24 A. Ensures that the Wine Country region develops in an orderly manner that maximizes the
25 area's viticulture and related uses, and balances the need to protect existing rural
26 residential and equestrian lifestyles in the area.
- 27 B. Ensures that the Riverside County General Plan and its supporting regulatory documents,
28 such as the Zoning Ordinance and Design Guidelines, provide a comprehensive blueprint

1 that will achieve the community's vision.

- 2 C. Preserves and enhances the Wine Country region's viticulture potential, rural life style and
3 equestrian activities.
- 4 D. Allows an appropriate level of commercial tourist activities that are incidental to viticulture
5 and equestrian uses.
- 6 E. Ensures timely provision of appropriate public infrastructure and services that keeps up
7 with anticipated growth, including provision of roadway improvements and wastewater
8 conveyance systems.
- 9 F. Enacts Design Guidelines, development standards through Ordinance No. 348.4729 and a
10 Sign Program to minimize land use conflicts, create a more aesthetically appealing area,
11 and preserve and enhance an integrated Wine Country theme.
- 12 G. Fulfills a County commitment and stakeholder process to preserve and enhance the
13 Temecula Valley Wine Country as a unique regional asset.
- 14 H. Project approval allows future implementing Projects to be proposed, and creates an added
15 measure of certainty and value for potential future owners and tenants, facilitating creation
16 of an estimated 41,261 jobs at buildout.
- 17 I. The economic and social benefits of the Project will extend into the future for decades;
18 Any one of these reasons would be sufficient to justify approval of the Project.

19 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the State CEQA Guidelines
20 (Section 15126 (g)) require an EIR to discuss how a proposed project could directly or indirectly lead to
21 economic, population, or housing growth. A project may be growth inducing if it removes obstacles to
22 growth, taxes community service facilities or encourages other activities which cause significant
23 environmental effects. The discussion is as follows:

24 A. Economic, Population or Housing Growth:

25 The Project will allow for various onsite and offsite infrastructure improvements that could
26 remove impediments to growth and/or provide for additional capacity. The Project also
27 results in direct job growth through increased employment opportunities as a result of the
28 proposed update of the existing Southwest Area Plan (SWAP) and other elements of the

1 General Plan.

2 B. Removal of an Impediment to Growth:

3 Due to its size, its incremental implementation, its impact on infrastructure, and the
4 potential direct and indirect economic growth associated with it, the Project would be
5 viewed as growth-inducing pursuant to CEQA.” Additional growth that could occur as a
6 result of Project implementation has the potential to strain infrastructure and public service
7 facilities. Although the Project would result in less projected growth in the long term as
8 compared to current land use policies and regulations, compared to existing conditions, the
9 potential for growth inducement must be considered significant and unavoidable.

10 Therefore, the Board of Supervisors has, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section
11 15093, balanced the benefits of the Wine County Community Plan (WCCP) against the
12 significant and unavoidable impacts of the WCCP and finds that such impacts are
13 outweighed by the benefits of the WCCP that may result from this growth inducement that
14 are specified in the immediately prior section of this resolution. The Board acknowledges
15 this growth as a necessary byproduct and desired result of the Project, which has been
16 developed to stimulate the orderly, balanced development of the Project area.

17 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the Wine Country
18 Community Plan implements applicable elements of the Riverside County General Plan as follows:

19 A. Land Use Element

20 The Project ensures the region’s growth remains concentrated on agriculture, viticulture
21 and vitification, equine lands, large lot estates and open spaces by requiring these uses as
22 the primary uses, which makes up the region’s unique environmental character. The
23 Project carries forward Land Use Element policies to ensure the Community Plan is
24 designed to accommodate a balanced mix of land uses, including employment, recreation,
25 and housing and promotes the development and preservation of the region’s character.

26 The Project provides stronger standards and design features were develop to minimize land
27 use conflicts between residential, equestrian and winery activities. The Project supports
28 the Land Use Policy that allows for the continued occupancy, operation, and maintenance

1 of legal uses and structures that exist at the time of the adoption of the General Plan. The
2 Project coordinante growth to addresses mobility, transportation, economic development,
3 air and water quality, and watershed and habitat management; accommodate the
4 development of a balance of land uses that maintain and enhance the County's fiscal
5 viability, economic diversity, and environmental integrity; preserves and protect
6 outstanding scenic vistas and visual features for the enjoyment of the traveling public;
7 protect agricultural uses by discouraging inappropriate land division in the immediate
8 proximity and allowing only uses and intensities that are compatible with agricultural uses;
9 and ensures that development does not adversely impact the open space and rural character
10 of the surrounding area. The Project was coordinanted with input from City of Temecula
11 and consultation with Tribal Governments; as well, as collaboration with the San Diego
12 Regional Water Quaility Board, Eastern Municipal Water District and Rancho California
13 Water District to ensure that groundwater quality is maintained at its desirable level and
14 secure the necessary sewer infrastructure to keep up Project's growth projections. The
15 Project also considered its impacts on public facilities to ensure that implementing
16 development does not exceed the ability to adequately provide supporting infrasture and
17 services, such as libraries, recreational facilliteis, transportation systems, and
18 fire/police/medical services.

19 **B. Circulation Element**

20 The existing Circulation network was updated to reflect the Project's rural charactersitics
21 based on public input. The transportation system was designed in response to the Project's
22 objectives. This includes downgrading road classification for various roadways and
23 including roundabouts along Rancho California Road to improve traffic flow and improve
24 safety. The Project's development standards and design features also enhances the scenic
25 resources of SR-79, an eligible scenic highway. The Project also requires implementation
26 of the existing trails network of the General Plan to encourage non-motorized mobility and
27 connectivity to regional recreational areas.

28 **C. Multipurpose Open-Space, Saftey, Air Quality, Noise, Housing, and Healthy Communities**

1 Element

2 The Project's policies and development standards does not prevent implementation of the
3 policies provided in each General Plan Element, nor does it conflict with the General Plan
4 policies. Future land use developments within the Project area shall be consistent with the
5 Project's policies and development standards and the other elements of the General Plan.
6 The Policies and development standards ensures future land use development are scaled
7 appropriately to protect agricultural, open space, scenic, biological, and cultural resources.
8 Project sets density requirement and minimum lot sizes to enhance the region's character.
9 The Project also requires land use development to include design features to reduce
10 greenhouse gas emissions and design in a manner that reduces light pollution. The Project
11 development standards require implementing land use development site layouts and
12 building designs shall minimize noise impacts on surrounding properties and comply with
13 Ordinance No. 847. The Project also requires a noise study or acustical analysis for future
14 outdoor special occasion facilities. The Project encourages employment centers in close
15 proximity to residential uses; provides a land use pattern that reduces the number and
16 length of motor vehicle trips and promote alternative modes of travel. The land use
17 changes anticipated under the proposed Project would comply with the growth projections,
18 goals, and vision identified by Southern California Association of Governments. The
19 Project also promotes healthy land use pattern that preserves rural open space areas, and
20 scenic resources, preventing inappropriate development in areas that are environmentally
21 sensitive or subject to severe natural hazards, and provides development incentives, such
22 as clustered development, development easements, and other mechanisms, to preserve the
23 economic value of agricultural and open space lands.

24 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the Wine Country
25 Community Plan is consistent with the Riverside County General Plan as amended by Comprehensive
26 General Plan Amendment No. 568.

27 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the Final EIR also
28 discusses, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(c) and 15126.2(c), significant irreversible

1 environmental changes and provides in Section 7.0. Page 7.1 the following: [R]esources that would be
2 permanently and continually consumed by implementing projects would include water, electricity, natural
3 gas, and fossil fuels. However, new construction in California is required to conform to energy
4 conservation standards specified in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), as amended in
5 2010 (effective date: January 1, 2011). These standards establish "energy budgets" for different types of
6 residential and non-residential buildings with which all new buildings must comply. In order to conform
7 to CCR Title 24, efficient energy use would be designed into all new buildings developed within the
8 Project area. In addition, implementing projects would be required to comply with applicable building
9 codes, development standards, County ordinances and design requirements related to sustainability and
10 energy conservation. Accordingly pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Appendix F, this project will not
11 result in the wasteful or inefficient use or consumption of energy.

12 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has reviewed and
13 considered EIR No. 524 in evaluating the Wine Country Community Plan, that EIR No. 524 is an
14 accurate and objective statement that complies with CEQA and reflects the County's independent
15 judgment, and that EIR No. 524 is incorporated herein by this reference.

16 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it **ADOPTS** the statement of
17 overriding considerations, **CERTIFIES** EIR No. 524 and **ADOPTS** the Mitigation Monitoring Plan
18 attached as Attachment B hereto. To the extent that there are inconsistencies between the mitigation
19 measures set forth in EIR No. 524 and those set forth in the Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, the
20 Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall control.

21 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the **Wine Country**
22 **Community Plan**, on file with the Clerk of the Board, including the final exhibits and related cases, is
23 hereby **ADOPTED** for the real property described and shown in the Plan, and said real property shall
24 developed substantially in accordance with the Plan, unless the Plan is amended by the Board.

25 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that copies of the Wine Country
26 Community Plan and related cases shall be placed on file in the Office of the Clerk of the Board, in the
27 Office of the Planning Director, and in the Office of the Building and Safety Director, and that no
28 applications for subdivision maps, conditional use permits or other development approvals shall be

1 accepted for the real property described and shown in the Plan and related cases, unless such applications
2 are substantially in accordance therewith.

3 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the custodians of the
4 documents upon which this decision is based are the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and the County
5 Planning Department and that such documents are located at 4080 Lemon Street, Riverside, California.

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 MPC:mld
02/20/14
27 G:\PROPERTY\MCLACK\PLANNING AND LAND USE\WINE COUNTRY COMMUNITY PLAN\FINAL FORMATTED WINE COUNTRY
COMMUNITY PLAN CEQA RESOLUTION 1-30-14.DOC

Attachment "A"

Project Modification Chart

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

Attachment "B"

Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

Attachment "A"

Project Modification Chart

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

Attachment A

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
Definition Changes		
<p><u>Bed and Breakfast Inn</u></p> <p>BED AND BREAKFAST INN. Usually a dwelling unit, but sometimes a small facility, with 10 or fewer hotel rooms, which provides lodging and breakfast for temporary overnight occupants, in return for compensation. This facility may have a kitchenette (small counter with microwave, cabinets and mini refrigerator), but no provision for cooking (on stove or grill) in a room.</p>	<p><u>Bed and Breakfast Inn</u></p> <p>Kitchenettes were removed from the definition. The prohibition on cooking provisions was expanded to prohibit them on adjoining patios, balconies, and decks.</p>	<p>The definitions section of Ordinance No. 348.4729 was modified to clarify the definitions and to tailor them to existing and future developments in the area. Future projects including uses as defined are subject to the EIR No. 524 mitigation measures for potential impacts regarding air quality, noise, and traffic as discussed in Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i>, Section 4.12, <i>Noise</i>, and Section 4.14, <i>Traffic and Circulation</i>, of the EIR. Each project would be required to conduct a comprehensive site-specific environmental analysis in compliance with CEQA, and additional site-specific conditions of approval will be developed during the development review process, as provided for in EIR 524. The modifications to the definitions do not present any new or more severe environmental impacts because all projects including the uses as defined would be required to comply with applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures set forth in EIR No. 524. Additionally, the number of dwelling units and rooms permitted under each definition did not increase; thus impacts would remain the same. Rather, minor clarifications of each of the descriptions were added. Therefore, no further EIR analysis is required. Nonetheless, a few further clarifications regarding particular definitions are provided below.</p>
<p><u>Cottage Inn</u></p> <p>COTTAGE INN. A dwelling unit with 5 or fewer bedrooms, which provides lodging and breakfast for temporary overnight occupants in return for compensation and which is solely owned and operated</p>	<p><u>Cottage Inn</u></p> <p>The small preparation kitchen was removed from the definition and the prohibition on cooking provisions was expanded to prohibit them on adjoining patios, balconies, and decks.</p>	<p>Removing the option for a lodging facility to provide a kitchenette in a guest room would not increase traffic conditions projected within the Project Area. The Traffic Impact Study considered "winery-hopping" as part of the traffic model for this region, as discussed in Section 4.14, <i>Traffic and Circulation</i>, of the EIR (p. 4.14-19). Visitors are likely to visit three wineries per visit. A winery with a hotel is likely to also have a restaurant on premise for their guests or is located in close proximity to other restaurants. In fact, numerous</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>by the property owner. A Cottage Inn may have a small preparation kitchen utilized for nonmonetary consumption of food for the inn-guests.</p>		<p>wineries within the Project area already provide restaurant or dining services for visiting guests. The change does not present any new or more severe environmental impacts; thus, no additional EIR analysis is necessary.</p>
<p><u>Country Inn</u></p> <p>COUNTRY INN. A mid-size facility, usually an extension of the main dwelling unit, with 11 to 20 hotel rooms, which provides lodging and breakfast for temporary overnight occupants, in return for compensation. This facility may have a kitchenette (small counter with microwave, cabinets and mini refrigerator), but no provision for cooking on (stove or grill) in room.</p>	<p><u>Country Inn</u></p> <p>Kitchenette was removed from the definition. The prohibition on cooking provisions was expanded to prohibit them on adjoining patios, balconies, and decks.</p>	
<p><u>Cottage Industry</u></p> <p>COTTAGE INDUSTRY. A home-based occupation or service carried on by a resident within their dwelling in return for compensation. Such activity is conducted in a manner not to give an outward appearance, or manifest any characteristics of a business in the ordinary meaning of</p>	<p><u>Cottage Industry</u></p> <p>The definition was changed in style, but not content. The uses allowed under a cottage industry were moved to the use section of Ordinance No. 348.4729.</p>	<p>Because this change does not alter the suite of uses already analyzed as part of the Project EIR, this textual reorganization does not result in any impacts greater or different from those already analyzed in the EIR.</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>the term. Cottage industry may include, but not be limited to, knitting, sewing, quilting, pottery, accounting, book-binding, cooking, etc.</p> <p><u>Clustered Development</u></p> <p>CLUSTERED DEVELOPMENT. A development, in which the allowed number of dwelling units (density yield) are placed in closer proximity than usual, with the purpose of permanently preserving vineyards or equestrian lands, pursuant to the development standards of Section 14.96.c.</p>	<p><u>Clustered Subdivision</u></p> <p>The definition was revised to clarify the language. The content was not changed.</p>	<p>This textual clarification does not change the areas of the Project in which clustering may be acceptable. Therefore, this textual clarification does not result in any impacts greater or different from those already analyzed in the EIR.</p>
<p><u>Equestrian Establishment</u></p> <p>EQUESTRIAN ESTABLISHMENT. An equestrian facility where horses are kept, sheltered, trained, nursed, or boarded in return for compensation. An equestrian establishment may include enclosed stalls, horse-shelters, horse-arena, paddocks, pens, as well as associated appurtenant structures or</p>	<p><u>Class I Equestrian Establishment</u></p> <p>The definition was revised to make a distinction between a Class I and a Class II Equestrian Establishment. Language was added to include the following activities: horse training, guided trail rides, riding lessons, schooling shows and horse day camps.</p> <p>Language was also added to limit the number of animals allowed at a Class I Equestrian Establishment to the same as the</p>	<p>This revision clarifies and provided additional detail with respect to the specific types of uses defined as an Equestrian Establishment, but does not expand the range or intensity of such uses. In addition, the definition under the modified project provides for Class I and Class II Equestrian Establishments and limit the number of animals allowed under Class I (as compared to the project described in the EIR), and further specifies that the number of animals allowed under Class II would be limited to the number of noncommercial keeping of animals standard in the Wine Country-Equestrian Zone. Furthermore, a Class I Equestrian Establishment's average daily visitor trips were limited to one hundred per day as provided in Section 14.96.a (3) of Ordinance No. 348.4729.</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>buildings, including but not limited to, barns, tack sheds, washing stations, hot walkers or other horse exercise equipment storage areas, horse training schools, small-scale animal hospitals, feed storage facilities, covered forage/hay storage areas, equestrian trail riding areas, horse trailer parking areas, and other similar type facilities.</p>	<p>noncommercial keeping of animals standard in the Wine Country-Equestrian Zone.</p> <p>For Class II Equestrian Establishment, language was added to allow on-site activities such as but not limited to, horse training, guided trail rides, riding lessons, schooling shows and horse day camps. A Class II Equestrian Establishment may also conduct special equestrian events that are appurtenant and incidental to the equestrian facility provided the facility is located on a parcel one hundred (100) or more gross acres in size.</p> <p>The number of animals allowed at a Class II Equestrian Establishment is the same as the noncommercial keeping of animals standard in the Wine Country-Equestrian Zone.</p>	<p>Since the revised definition does not increase the scope or intensity of uses under this definition and actually specifies additional limitations with respect to the number of animals allowed, it would not create any impacts greater than those that were evaluated in the Draft EIR and will actually reduce impacts as compared to those disclosed in the EIR.</p>
<p><u>Equestrian Land</u> EQUESTRIAN LAND. A fenced-in open area in which the grazing of horses or other livestock may occur. Equestrian lands are actively managed to control weeds as well as suitability for</p>	<p><u>Equine Land</u></p> <p>The title of the definition was changed and the language was clarified. The content remained the same.</p>	<p>Because this change does not alter the suite of uses already analyzed as part of the Project EIR, this textual clarification does not result in any impacts greater or different from those already analyzed in the EIR.</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>use by livestock. Equestrian lands may include horse holding areas, open corrals, exercise areas, riding areas, or horse racing rings as long as no buildings or structures are present on it.</p> <p><u>Horse Show Facility</u></p> <p>HORSE SHOW FACILITY. A small or medium size equestrian facility, which provides a venue for judged exhibition, training event, competition of horses or equestrian sport activities. The maximum number of guests may not exceed 5 guests per acre per event.</p> <p><u>Hotel</u></p> <p>HOTEL. A bed and breakfast inn, country inn, or large scale lodging facility with more than 20 rooms/suits, which provides lodging and breakfast for temporary overnight occupants, in return for compensation. A hotel may have a kitchenette (small counter with microwave, cabinets, and mini refrigerator), but no provision for cooking (on stove or grill) in</p>	<p><u>Horse Show Facility</u></p> <p>The language was clarified, including clarifying that maximum number of guests was one hundred (100) people.</p> <p><u>Wine Country Hotel</u></p> <p>Title was changed to Wine Country Hotel and kitchenette was removed from the definition. The prohibition on cooking provisions was expanded to prohibit them on adjoining patios, balconies, and decks.</p>	<p>Because this change does not alter the suite of uses already analyzed as part of the Project EIR, this textual clarification does not result in any impacts greater or different from those already analyzed in the EIR. In fact, this clarification actually ensures that any impacts are minimized by restricting the number of guests that may attend such events.</p> <p>See above discussion with regard to why eliminating kitchenettes does not result in any impacts beyond those analyzed in the EIR.</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>a room or suite.</p> <p><u>Hotel Room</u></p> <p>HOTEL ROOM. A lodging room with bathroom access, which accommodates one or two persons and contains basic furniture, such as one or two beds, nightstands, a dresser, a desk, a chair, a wardrobe or built-in closet, and a television.</p>	<p><u>Guest Room</u></p> <p>The title was changed to Guest Room and revised to provide the following: a room without cooking facilities rented to transient visitors for a period not to exceed 30 days.</p>	<p>Because this change does not alter the suite of uses already analyzed as part of the Project EIR, this textual clarification does not result in any impacts greater or different from those already analyzed in the EIR.</p>
<p><u>Hotel Suites</u></p> <p>HOTEL SUITES. A hotel-room, which accommodates a maximum of four persons, and which generally, contains one bedroom and other rooms/spaces for living, kitchenette, closet, luxury bathroom etc. with one external access.</p>	<p><u>Guest Suites</u></p> <p>The title was changed to Guest Suites and revised to provide the following: a series of attached rooms without cooking facilities rented to transient visitors for a period not to exceed 30 days.</p>	<p>Because this change does not alter the suite of uses already analyzed as part of the Project EIR, this textual clarification does not result in any impacts greater or different from those already analyzed in the EIR.</p>
<p><u>Production Lot</u></p> <p>PRODUCTION LOT. An independent lot of twenty (20) acres gross or more that is set-aside for planting vineyards through a deed-restriction, fee-title purchase, or other conservation mechanism.</p>	<p><u>Production Lot</u></p> <p>The definition was clarified to provide the following: A legal lot that is set aside for planting vineyards through a deed restriction or other conservation mechanism.</p>	<p>Because this change does not alter the suite of uses already analyzed as part of the Project EIR, this textual clarification does not result in any impacts greater or different from those already analyzed in the EIR.</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p><u>Resort</u></p> <p>RESORT. A full-service hotel, with rooms, suites, or free standing villas, which provides lodging and meals for visitors, in return for compensation. Such self-contained large-scale lodging facility may provide additional commercial and recreational uses such as spas, amphitheaters, conference rooms, golf-courses, banquet halls etc. operated primarily by one entity for the convenience of the guests thereof.</p>	<p><u>Wine Country Resort</u></p> <p>The title was changed to Wine Country Resort and daytime driving ranges were added to the definition.</p>	<p>Adding daytime driving is not considered to represent any new or more severe environmental impacts for the reasons set forth below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Driving ranges are already permitted under the County's existing land use and zoning (Article XIVb Section 14.73.b.) as part of a golf course within the Project Area. • Day-use would avoid night-time light/glare, noise and traffic issues, as discussed in EIR No. 524, Sections 4.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>, 4.12, <i>Noise</i>, and 4.14, <i>Traffic and Circulation</i>; • As an accessory facility to a resort, the daytime driving range would attract at least some portion of use from existing resort visitors, as opposed to representing additional traffic or other impacts. • Even with "new" visitors (not associated with the resort), the daytime range would displace a large portion of the resort property's developable area, thereby effectively reducing the resort's potentially more intense activities such as hotel rooms, restaurants and related amenities. • A daytime driving range requires relatively nominal additional operational or maintenance staff beyond that required for the resort itself.
<p><u>Special Occasion Facility</u></p> <p>SPECIAL OCCASION FACILITY. An indoor or outdoor facility, which may include a gazebo, pavilion, amphitheater, structure, building or auditorium, which is used on special occasions such as wedding, party, concert, conference, charity event,</p>	<p><u>Special Occasion Facility</u></p> <p>The definition was clarified with no change to content.</p>	<p>Because this change does not alter the suite of uses already analyzed as part of the Project EIR, this textual clarification does not result in any impacts greater or different from those already analyzed in the EIR.</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>fundraiser etc. for a specific period of time in return for compensation. An outdoor special occasion facility may involve a gazebo, pavilion, or amphitheater for wedding ceremonies, concerts, or other celebrations. An indoor special occasion facility may involve a structure, building or auditorium for wedding receptions conferences, or other celebrations.</p> <p><u>Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association Event</u></p> <p>TEMECULA VALLEY WINEGROWERS ASSOCIATION EVENT. Fundraising efforts, normally 6 to 8 events per year, of member wineries of the Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association, including the region-wide barrel tastings, where the member wineries provides food and wine sampling for ticket holders, but excluding crushing events.</p>	<p><u>Winegrowers Trade Association Event</u></p> <p>The title of the definition was changed to Winegrowers Trade Association, the 6 to 8 events per year were removed and the crushing events exclusion was removed.</p>	<p>The limitation on the number of events per year was moved to the definition section and included within the definitions for Class II and Class VI Wineries. Therefore, this change does not present any new or more severe environmental impacts and would not require any further analysis.</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p><u>Vineyard</u></p> <p>VINEYARD. A farm where grapevines are planted, grown, raised or cultivated for the purpose of producing grape wine.</p> <p><u>Winery</u></p> <p>Winery. An agricultural facility designed and used to crush, ferment, and process grapes into wine.</p> <p>Included definitions for Equestrian, Grapes, and Grape Vines</p>	<p><u>Vineyard</u></p> <p>The definition was revised to remove "grown, raised" from the definition.</p> <p><u>Winery</u></p> <p>The definition was revised to add distill as a use at the facility and a wine related product as a result of the fermenting process.</p> <p>These terms were removed because they are common terms that do not need to be defined in the ordinance.</p> <p>Definitions for the following terms were added into the definition sections: Class I through Class VI Winery, Habitable Story, Incidental Commercial Use, Lodging Facilities, Net Project Area, Set Aside Area, Wine Club Activity, Wine Club Event, and Wine Tasting Area</p>	<p>Because these changes do not alter the suite of uses already analyzed as part of the Project EIR, this textual clarification does not result in any impacts greater or different from those already analyzed in the EIR.</p> <p>Because this change does not alter the suite of uses already analyzed as part of the Project EIR, this textual clarification does not result in any impacts greater or different from those already analyzed in the EIR.</p>
<p>Permitted Use Changes</p>		

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>Wine club events were not listed as an incidental use to a Winery</p>	<p>Permit Wine Club events as it is pertinent to a winery's business model; allow these events to occur on a Class II through Class VI Winery</p>	<p>The Draft Program EIR No. 524 assumed small, medium and large wineries would occur in the project area. Most existing wineries currently hold private wine club events as a standard operation to promote their wines. Accordingly, as part of the EIR's analysis of traffic, air quality, GHGs, and other resources, Wine Club Events were assumed to occur as part of a Winery's operation in the Project Area as an atypical event similar to a holiday event for a retail establishment. Future Wineries are subject to the EIR No. 524 mitigation measures for potential impacts regarding air quality, noise, and traffic as discussed in Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i>, Section 4.12, <i>Noise</i>, and Section 4.14, <i>Traffic and Circulation</i>, of the EIR. At this time, no specific development project is being proposed. Each implementing project would be required to conduct a comprehensive site-specific environmental analysis in compliance with CEQA, and additional site-specific conditions of approval will be developed during the development review process, as provided for in EIR 524. The number of wine club events will be determined through specific implementing projects, the associated development review process and transportation/parking management plan. Additionally, future projects would implement the Mitigation Measures provided in Sections 4.3, 4.12, and 4.14 of the EIR, potential air quality, noise and traffic impacts, which would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Based on the above, no additional analysis EIR analysis is necessary.</p>
<p>Cottage industry may include, but not be limited to, knitting, sewing, quilting, pottery, accounting, book-binding, cooking, etc.</p>	<p>Basket making and scrap booking were added as Cottage Industry uses. Additionally, a Cottage Industry was limited to no more than one full-time equivalent cottage industry employee and a maximum of ten customers at any given time. Additionally, no customer lodging shall occur onsite without an approved Cottage Inn, Bed and Breakfast Inn or</p>	<p>The Project analyzed in the EIR No. 524 assumed Cottage Industry would occur in the Project area. The definition further limits the number of employees and customers allowed at a Cottage Industry, which in turn limits potential environmental impacts with regard to increased traffic congestion generated by both patrons and employees, also in turn, limiting potential air quality and noise impacts. In addition, adherence to mitigation measures provided in Sections 4.3, 4.12, and 4.14 of the EIR, would further reduce air quality, noise and traffic impacts. Thus, this modification does not present any new or more severe environmental impacts.</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
	Country Inn.	
<p>All special occasion facilities shall conduct a noise study or an acoustical analysis if an outdoor facility is proposed. Based on such study or analysis, the Planning Director may require as a condition of approval that the project applicant enter into a good neighbor agreement with the surrounding neighbors.</p>	<p>Amplified sounds are prohibited at all times for outdoor special occasion facilities, unless an exception to Ordinance No. 847 has been applied for and approved.</p>	<p>This change further restricts amplified sounds that may potentially occur within the Project Area, which represents a reduced noise impact as compared to noise impacts discussed in Section 4.12, <i>Noise</i>, of EIR No. 524. Therefore, this change does not present any new or more severe environmental impacts and would not require any further analysis.</p>
<p>Systematic rotation of animals was not included</p>	<p>The systematic rotation of animals for grazing is allowed so long as the total number of animals does not exceed the maximum allowed pursuant to Section 14.92.a.(5) herein. Notwithstanding the foregoing, there shall be no limit to the allowable number of sheep, goats or cattle which may be temporarily grazed on any premises when the grazing is for the purpose of cleaning up unharvested crops</p>	<p>The baseline for the Project assumes agriculture uses and animal keeping would occur within the project area, and the EIR already accounted for, analyzed, and mitigated for the impacts of such activities through mitigation measures such as AQ-11. Thus, no additional analysis was necessary to the Project's PEIR in regards to animal keeping.</p>
<p>The non-commercial keeping, raising or boarding of horses, cattle, sheep and goats are permitted in all WC-Zones, the number of animals permitted in the WC-W and WC-WE Zones is 2 per acre.</p>	<p>The number of non-commercial animals permitted increased from 2 per acre to 5 per acre within the WC-W and WC-WE Zones.</p>	<p>The EIR's analysis of impacts associated with the non-commercial keeping of animals was not strictly limited by an assumption that only two animals per acre would be permitted. Instead, the EIR provided a program-level analysis that assumed widespread agriculture uses and animal keeping would occur throughout the Winery and Equestrian zones. (See, e.g., Draft EIR pp. 4.9-19 through 4.19-20 [analyzing runoff and water quality impacts associated with widespread animal keeping].) Furthermore,</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
		<p>the EIR already imposed mitigation measures to ensure that the impacts associated with future animal keeping would be mitigated and addressed, such that any impacts would be less than significant. (See, e.g., Mitigation Measures HYD-5 [imposing limitations on manured areas and drainage]; AQ-11 [imposing limitations on confined animal keeping].) Accordingly, this minor modification to the number of animals allowed within the WC-W and WC-WE zones is consistent with the analysis already provided in the EIR. Moreover, this minor modification only affects the non-commercial keeping of animals and only applies to the WC-W and WC-WE zones, and thus does not change the requirements that apply to implementing projects proposing commercial operations or to projects in other Project zones. Additionally, the 5 animals per acre limitation applicable to non-commercial animal keeping is in-line with the maximum number of animals that are currently permitted in other agricultural zones (A-1, A-2 and C/V) pursuant to existing underlying zoning. Thus, this Project revision actually increases the Project's consistency with land uses in surrounding areas, and will not result in any new or more intense impacts beyond what was evaluated in the Draft EIR.</p>
<p>Small animal keeping was not listed as a permitted use in the WC Zones, although they are permitted in the other existing agricultural zones (A-1, A-2 and C/V).</p>	<p>Small animal keeping (including poultry, small fowls or animals, miniature pigs) is permitted through the Wine Country-Equestrian (WC-E) zone classification.</p>	<p>The EIR's analysis of impacts associated with the keeping of animals was not based on the assumption that small animals would be excluded from Wine Country. Instead, the EIR provided a program-level analysis that assumed widespread agriculture uses and animal keeping would occur throughout the Winery and Equestrian zones. (See, e.g., Draft EIR pp. 4.9-19 through 4.19-20 [analyzing runoff and water quality impacts associated with widespread animal keeping].) Furthermore, the EIR already imposed mitigation measures to ensure that the impacts associated with future animal keeping would be mitigated and addressed, such that any impacts would be less than significant. (See, e.g., Mitigation Measures HYD-5 [imposing limitations on manured areas and drainage]; AQ-11 [imposing limitations on</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
		<p>confined animal keeping].) Accordingly, this minor clarification to confirm that small animal keeping is permitted in the Wine Country-Equestrian (WC-E) zone is consistent with the analysis already provided in the EIR. Moreover, this minor clarification only applies as to the WC-E zone, and does not change the requirements that apply to the other Project zones. Additionally, the keeping of small animals is consistent with what the existing underlying zoning already allows. Thus, this Project clarification actually increases the Project's consistency with land uses in surrounding areas, and will not result in any new or more intense impacts beyond what was evaluated in the Draft EIR.</p>
<p>In case of a clustered development, the overall project density yield must not exceed one dwelling unit per five (5) acres, within the Wine Country Residential District and one dwelling unit per ten (10) acres within the Wine Country-Winery District. While the lot sizes in a clustered development may vary, it requires a minimum lot size of 1 acre, with at least 75% of the project area set aside for permanent provision of vineyards.</p>	<p>The provision of clustered development under the WC-WE zone was removed because none of the existing wineries less than 20 gross acres include clustered subdivision. Furthermore, these wineries would not be able to meet the minimum acres to establish a winery with incidental commercial uses and additional dwelling units under the existing CV zone and proposed WC-WE Zone.</p>	<p>This modification clarifies provisions for clustered subdivision development standards allowed in the Project. This clarification does not represent any substantive variance from any of the major elements of EIR No. 524, such as the Project Description, Project Design Features, Environmental Analysis, or Mitigation Measures, and therefore, does not present new or more severe environmental impacts. This is because, even with clustering, the overall development density allowed on any given parcel is not increased. Therefore, the total traffic, air quality, GHG, and utility-related impacts would remain the same whether the development is clustered within particular areas of a site or evenly spread out across the entirety of the parcel.</p>
<p>Daytime driving range is not included as a permitted use in conjunction with Wine Country</p>	<p>Class VI wineries are allowed daytime driving ranges in conjunction with Wine Country Resorts.</p>	<p>Allowing day-use driving ranges is not considered to represent any new or more severe environmental impacts for the reasons set forth below:</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
Resorts.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Driving ranges are already permitted as part of a golf course within the Project Area. • Day-use would avoid night-time light/glare, noise and traffic issues, as discussed in EIR No. 524, Sections 4.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>, 4.12, <i>Noise</i>, and 4.14, <i>Traffic and Circulation</i>; • As an accessory facility to a resort, the daytime driving range would attract at least some portion of use from existing resort visitors, as opposed to representing additional traffic or other impacts. • Even with "new" visitors (not associated with the resort), the daytime range would displace a large portion of the resort property's developable area, thereby effectively reducing the resort's potentially more intense activities such as hotel rooms, restaurants and related amenities. • A daytime driving range requires relatively nominal additional operational or maintenance staff beyond that required for the resort itself.
Class V winery required an approved plot plan.	Class V wineries require an approved conditional use permit.	A conditional use permit requires, among others, consideration by the Planning Commission rather than just the Planning Director. Requiring an approved conditional permit did not alter the definition of the winery or add potential uses associated with the winery that might result in any new or different impacts from those already disclosed in the EIR. Therefore, this change does not present any new or more severe environmental impacts and would not require any further analysis.
Winegrowers Association Trade events are permitted on every parcel within the Project Area.	Winegrowers Association Trade events are only allowed on vineyards and winery properties, not on every parcel within the Project Area.	This clarification limits Winegrowers Association Trade events to occur only on Vineyards and Wineries. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRF-2, as discussed in Section 4.14, <i>Traffic and Circulation</i> , of EIR No. 524 (p. 4.14-40) would reduce traffic congestion generated from special events such as Winegrowers Association Trade events. Furthermore, this change actually further restricts the parcels on which Trade events can occur, thus further reducing any potential traffic impacts of the Project. Thus, this minor change does not present any new or more severe environmental impacts.

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
Development Standard Changes		
<p>Includes the following density requirements under residential development standards:</p> <p>For WC-W, WC-WE and WC-E zones, the density shall be one (1) dwelling unit for every ten (10) gross acres in the WC-W, WC-WE, and WC-E zones. For WC-R zone, the density shall be one (1) dwelling unit for every five (5) acres.</p>	<p>Removed The density requirements were removed and the following minimum lot sizes were included under development standards:</p> <p>WC-W Zone the minimum lot size shall be 20 acres, unless the project includes clustered subdivision then the minimum lot size is 1 acre.</p> <p>WC-WE the minimum lot size shall be 20 acres.</p> <p>WC-E the minimum lot size shall be 10 acres.</p> <p>WC-R the minimum lot size shall be 5 acres, unless the project includes clustered subdivision then the minimum lot size is 1 acre.</p>	<p>The density requirement was removed from the zoning ordinance because density provisions are more appropriate in the General Plan and do not belong in the Zoning Ordinance. The overall density for each district does not change from what was analyzed in EIR No. 524. The minimum lot size increase of from 10 acres to 20 acres would decrease the overall residential units within the Winery District.</p>
<p>The minimum setback for residential developments was 50' and 300' along selected roadways.</p>	<p>The minimum setback for residential developments was reduced to 100' along selected roadways.</p>	<p>The development standard of 100' setback for residential developments would allow flexibility in site design that would reduce or offset potential visual, noise, and air quality impacts to future residents. The reduction in the setback for residential uses from 300' to 100' would not create additional traffic congestion on major roadways adjacent to these residential uses because it does not alter future roadway improvements as identified in the County of Riverside General Plan. In addition, the revised setback does not increase the overall development potential of the project or increase vehicle trips beyond what was evaluated in the Draft EIR, because the trip generation factors used in the Draft EIR's traffic study for residential uses is based</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
		<p>on the gross per-acre density of such uses, which did not account for potential constraints that may have been caused by the 300' setback for individual properties with respect to dwelling unit yields.</p> <p>Thus, this revision does not result in any new or more intense impacts beyond what was evaluated in the Draft EIR.</p> <p>The setbacks for the other uses (Winery, Special Occasion Facility, Lodging Facility, and Equestrian Establishments) were not modified from the original project.</p>
<p>No general front, side or rear setback requirements</p>	<p>The following was added: minimum side and rear setback for buildings and structure is thirty feet (30') from the property line; minimum front setback is fifty feet (50') from the property line.</p>	<p>Clarifying the setbacks would result in a beneficial impact by preserving views within the Project area, and does not present any new or more severe environmental impacts</p>
<p>For Resorts, the maximum number of stories is 3 stories and a maximum height is 50'.</p> <p>For Residential, Special Occasion Facilities, other Lodging Facilities, and Equestrian Establishments, the maximum height for a single level building shall be 30', if terraced the maximum shall be 40'.</p> <p>Wineries in the WC zones shall not exceed 50 feet.</p>	<p>A restriction on habitable stories was added to limit habitable stories to two. Three habitable stories are allowed for Wine Country Hotels if it includes a split level or terraced design conforming to the natural topography with slopes of 10% or greater and not more than 2 habitable stories are visible from any road way.</p> <p>The maximum height for Wineries and Resorts is decreased to 30', 40' if project incorporates terraced lots.</p> <p>A maximum height of 50 feet for structures was added to the zoning</p>	<p>The uniform height standard will further preserve the community's rural and agriculture characteristics, as discussed in Section 4.1, <i>Aesthetics, Light and Glare</i>, in EIR No. 524. The Project Design Features provided in Section 4.1 of the EIR require that future projects adhere to the new development standards under the County's Zoning Ordinance, including consistent allowable maximum height requirements (p. 4.1-13). Further, the maximum number of stories that may be visible from any road way remains 2 stories, which is consistent with the EIR's assumptions and existing analysis. Therefore, reduction of height standards would result in a beneficial impact by preserving views within the Project area, and does not present any new or more severe environmental impacts.</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>The 75% utilization of grapes grown in Riverside County for wine production and the following exemptions a) first three years, and two one year extension of time, after the issuance of building permit. b) request by the Temecula Valley Wine Growers Association and approved by the Board of Supervisors during an Agricultural Emergency for the Temecula Valley Wine Country Area</p> <p>Exemptions requests shall be submitted to the Planning Director on forms provided by the Planning Department.</p>	<p>ordinance.</p> <p>New development standards were added requiring 50% of the wine sold shall be produced on the site.</p> <p>A Winery may be exempt from the 75% utilization requirement under an agricultural emergency declared for the Temecula Valley Wine Country Area by the Board of Supervisors.</p> <p>The provisions for two one-year extensions as well as the submittal of forms to request for exemption will be necessary.</p>	<p>This clarification does not modify the uses that are anticipated to occur in Wine Country, and thus will not result in any new or different environmental impacts as compared to those already analyzed and disclosed in the EIR. Instead, this clarification is intended to strengthen the Wine County Community Plan by requiring that wine produced in Riverside County be made from grapes that are also grown in Riverside County. This revision provides for relief from the 75% utilization requirement provided the Board of Supervisors declares and agricultural emergency. this clarification does not result in a change in the physical environment or represent any substantive variance from any of the major elements of EIR No. 524, such as the Project Description, Project Design Features, Environmental Analysis, or Mitigation Measures.</p>
<p>No standards existed in the original development standards to quantify the required 75% vineyard planting standard for future wineries. The original project also specified that Olive trees could comprise up to 10% of the 75% planting standard.</p>	<p>New developments standards were added requiring the 75% planting requirement to include a density of 450 vines per acre or 100 olive trees per acre to meet the planting requirements. Additionally, olive trees may be used to make up 15% of the planting requirements.</p>	<p>The Project analyzed in the EIR No. 524 already assumed that 75% of the project area for Wineries would be set aside for planting of vineyards. As discussed in Section 4.1, <i>Aesthetics, Light and Glare</i>, in the EIR, this minimum planting requirement will effectively reduce building mass, increase open space, and promote the rural agricultural feel of the Project site (p. 4.1-13). Allowing olive trees to be a part of this 75% planting requirement will further improve the Project's aesthetic by providing a mix of crops, with varying heights and colors. Providing, quantifiable density standards for the vines/olive tree densities would result in beneficial aesthetic impacts and make the Project design features more enforceable and specific. In addition, since</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
		<p>the revised standard only requires an increase in Olive trees of 5% (10% versus 15%), given the drought-tolerant nature of Olive trees, potential effects on water consumption would not be considered substantial. Therefore, this minor change does not present any new or more severe environmental impacts.</p>
<p>Cottage inns were not required to obtain an approved plot plan.</p>	<p>Cottage inns will need to obtain an approved plot plan.</p>	<p>The plot plan process for cottage inn development within the Project Area provides an additional review to ensure the health and safety provisions are addressed. Since this modification does not represent a substantive variance from any of the major elements of EIR No. 524, such as the Project Description, Project Design Features, Environmental Analysis, or Mitigation Measures, this modification does not present any new or more severe environmental impacts.</p>
<p>Special Occasion Facility Standards.</p> <p>A maximum of five (5) guests shall be permitted per gross acre for a special occasion facility was included in the original project.</p>	<p>Special Occasion Facility Standards</p> <p>The maximum number of 5 guests per acre was removed.</p>	<p>Traffic generation used in the traffic study was not based on 5 guests per acre for any of the uses typically associated with a winery in the Temecula Valley. The method used to evaluate trip generation characteristics specific to wineries was based on an evaluation of the following factors for existing wine country wineries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tasting Room Size - Banquet Room Size - Number of Parking Spaces - Number of Hotel Rooms - Presence of a Spa <p>The trip generation characteristics developed for the existing wineries were then used to estimate trip generation for projected growth (with respect to wineries) for future conditions. (For a full discussion of trip generation used in the traffic analysis see Appendix A of "Final Traffic Impact Study For The Wine Country Community Plan" which is located in Appendix I of the Draft EIR. Therefore, number of guests per acre for a special occasion facility was not a determining factor with respect to trip generation, and the removal of the 5 guests per acre standards would not result in increased impacts beyond what was evaluated in the Draft EIR.</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>Lodging Facility Standards</p> <p>(1) In the WC-W zone, the minimum lot size for a lodging facility shall be twenty (20) gross acres.</p> <p>(2) In the WC-WE zone, the minimum lot size for a lodging facility in conjunction with a vineyard shall be five (5) gross acres.</p> <p>(3) In the WC-WE zone, the minimum lot size for a lodging facility in conjunction with a winery shall be ten (10) gross acres.</p> <p>(4) The minimum lot size for resorts in conjunction with a winery shall be forty (40) gross acres.</p> <p>(5) A maximum of two (2) bedrooms per gross acre shall be permitted for a lodging facility.</p>	<p>Development Standards for Lodging Facilities for WC-W and WC-WE Zone:</p> <p>The minimum lot sizes were moved to the development standards section of Ordinance No. 348.4729. The incidental uses were moved to the definition section for the various classes of wineries.</p>	<p>A Site-specific CEQA evaluation with be required for all implementing projects, including those that propose special occasion facilities. Potential impacts with respect to such facilities including the maximum number of guests, will be determined on a case by case basis for implementing projects and will be dependent on site location, surrounding uses, site design, and site-specific existing traffic conditions. Additionally, implementing projects will conduct a project specific environmental analysis. Thus, no additional analysis for the Project's Program EIR No. 524 is needed.</p> <p>The modifications to development standards for facilities within each of the Wine Country Zones do not represent substantive variances from any of the major elements of EIR No. 524, such as the Project Description, Project Design Features, Environmental Analysis, or Mitigation Measures. Additionally, overall development on each property would not increase with clustering, and therefore, impacts would not change. Therefore, these modifications would not result in new or more severe environmental impacts than those analyzed in EIR No. 524.</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>(6) Golf-courses may only be considered with a resort as identified in prior section.</p> <p>(7) Day spas and professional culinary academies shall only be allowed in conjunction with a lodging facility as identified in prior section.</p> <p>Commercial Equestrian Establishment Standards: In the WC-E zone: (2) A minimum of twenty (20) enclosed stalls shall be required in a commercial equestrian establishment. (7) Enclosed commercial stalls shall provide a minimum of 12'x12' space per horse. (8) Outdoor corrals may be partially covered; however, they shall provide a minimum of 12'x12' space per horse.</p> <p>Winery Standards. The following standards shall apply to all wineries in the WC zones: (2) A total of</p>	<p>Development Standards for Equestrian Establishment for the WC-WE Zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The required number and size of stalls were removed from the development standards. ii. Outdoor amplified sound for special occasion facilities is prohibited except for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Polo grounds; 2. Horse racing track; 3. Rodeo arena; or 4. When an exception to Ordinance No. 846 has been applied for and approved. <p>Development Standards for Wineries</p> <p>The following new development standards were added: Class I wineries need to be less</p>	<p>These clarifications would actually decrease potential impacts as compared to the Project analyzed in the EIR. This is because commercial equestrian establishments could now be permitted even with fewer than 20 enclosed stalls, thus resulting in a reduced development footprint and fewer construction and operational impacts. Furthermore, these clarifications restrict the facilities at which amplified sound is permitted, thus reducing the potential noise impacts that may otherwise occur as a result of future implementing projects. Accordingly, no new or more substantial environmental impacts will result from these changes as compared to EIR No. 524.</p> <p>The addition of the six classes of wineries provides an additional level of detail as to how the 75% requirement is to be met by identifying specific amounts of wine to be produced, based on classification. This</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>seventy-five percent (75%) of the net lot area shall be planted in vineyards – fifty percent (50%) prior to issuance of a building permit and twenty five percent (50%) prior to issuance of building occupancy. Ten percent (10%) of this planting requirement may be satisfied by planting olive trees. The planting of grapevines in parking lots shall not be counted towards the planting requirement; however, planting in the road right-of-way may be.</p> <p>(3) At least 75% of the grapes utilized in wine production and retail wine sales shall be grown or raised on site or within the County except in the following situations:</p> <p>a. An exemption from this requirement may be requested for the first three years, and two one year extension of time, after the issuance of building permit.</p> <p>b. An exemption from this requirement may be requested by the Temecula Valley Winegrowers' Association and</p>	<p>than 1,501 square, Class II, III, IV wineries need to be at least 1,500 square feet and produce 3,500 gallons of wine, Class V wineries need to be at least 3,000 square feet and produce 7,000 gallons of wine, Class VI wineries shall be at least 6,000 square feet and produce 14, 000 gallons of wine.</p> <p>It was also clarified that wineries shall be constructed and operational prior to issuance of a building permit for any incidental use.</p> <p>Additionally, wineries shall obtain all necessary alcohol licenses prior to Certificate of Occupancy.</p> <p>The approved Project increases the percentage of olive trees that can be used to satisfy the 75% planting requirement to 15%.</p> <p>The two year time extension to fulfill 75% utilization requirement was removed.</p> <p>50% of the wine sold on site shall be produced on site.</p>	<p>revision also includes specifics with respect to development of incidental uses and requires securing alcohol licenses prior to occupancy. These provisions are all more strict than the original project. Therefore, no new or more substantial environmental impacts will result from these changes as compared to EIR No. 524.</p> <p>Also please see the above discussion regarding why the inclusion of olive trees as part of the 75% planting requirement further reduces Project impacts as compared to what was analyzed in EIR No. 524.</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>approved by the Board of Supervisors during an Agricultural Emergency for the Temecula Valley Wine Country Area. Such request shall be for a specific amount of time and apply to all wineries within the Temecula Valley Wine Country Area.</p> <p>c. Exemptions requests shall be submitted to the Planning Director on forms provided by the Planning Department.</p> <p>(4) A winery facility shall have the capacity to produce at least 3,500 gallons of wine annually.</p> <p>(5) A winery facility shall be at least fifteen hundred (1,500) square feet in size.</p> <p>Clustered Development Standards The following standards for clustering shall apply to residential developments that propose to cluster their density in the WC Zones: (1) Unique site characteristics, such as natural topography, soil</p>	<p>Development Standards for Clustered Subdivisions</p> <p>The following development standards were added, modified or removed:</p> <p>The development shall be designed consist with the Temecula Valley Wine Country Design Guidelines,</p>	<p>Please see above for a discussion of why clustering does not result in any new or different environmental impacts as compared to those already presented and analyzed in EIR No. 524.</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>quality, drainage patterns, scenic vistas etc. shall be identified and utilized in site planning.</p> <p>(2) One (1) dwelling unit shall be allowed for every five (5) gross acres in the WC-R zone and ten (10) gross acres in the WC-W and WC-WE zones.</p> <p>(3) The minimum lot size shall be one (1) gross acre.</p> <p>(4) At least seventy five percentage (75%) of net project area shall be set-aside for planting vineyards or equestrian lands through either a production lot and/or deed-restricted easements (depending upon the scale of the project) prior to tentative approval of the subdivision map.</p> <p>(5) The set-aside areas established by the production lot or deed-restricted easements shall be planted in vineyards or used as equestrian lands prior to issuance of building permit for dwelling units. The planting of vineyards shall be phased in conjunction with issuance of building permits.</p>	<p>Density requirement were removed from the clustered development standards. Prescribed density is a function of the General Plan and does not belong in the Zoning Ordinance.</p> <p>A wine country clustered subdivision that includes a production lot of at least 25 gross acres may have a Class I winery, which does not permit incidental commercial uses. Wine Country-Equestrian District does not permit clustered subdivision; therefore this provision does not apply in conjunction with a commercial equestrian establishment.</p> <p>The set aside areas for production of grapes in perpetuity by any of the following: a property owner's association, home owners associations or County Service Area.</p> <p>Number 9 is removed. This follows the basic requirement for development applications required by the County and does not need to be stated.</p>	

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>(6) A clustered development consisting of forty (40) gross acres or more, shall provide at least one (1) production lot, in conjunction with deed-restricted easements if need be.</p> <p>(7) A production lot that provides 25 gross acres or more shall be allowed only a winery facility or a commercial equestrian establishment. Incidental commercial uses, such as eating, living or lodging establishments, shall not be allowed in conjunction with the winery, commercial equestrian establishment or production lot.</p> <p>(8) The set-aside areas (production lot and/or deed-restricted easements) shall be maintained for production of grapes in perpetuity by a property owner, home owners association, the County, or a County authorized entity, as defined in the Conditions of Approval.</p> <p>(9) A clear indication</p>	<p>On-site improvements for clustered lots, including but not limited to, roads, signage, parking, street furniture, exterior lighting, etc. shall be consistent with the "Temecula Valley Wine Country Design Guidelines Policy Area" and comply with all applicable County signage requirements.</p> <p>Wine Country Clustered Subdivisions shall include an established on-site vineyard and comply with Ordinance No. 460.</p> <p>The following timeline was added: Fifty percent (50%) of the set aside area shall be planted prior to issuance of the building permit for the first dwelling unit, and the remaining twenty five percent (25%) prior to final inspection for the first dwelling unit.</p>	

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>of anticipated uses for every lot (e.g. residential lot, winery lot, production lot, residential or winery lot in conjunction with deed-restricted easement etc.) of a clustered development shall be outlined in the development proposal, and shall be recorded in the Conditions of Approval.</p> <p>(10) On-site improvements for clustered lots, such as roads, signage, parking, street furniture, exterior lighting, etc. shall be compatible with the rural atmosphere established by the "Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area" policies of the Riverside County General Plan and shall be in compliance with other County requirements.</p> <p>(11) On-site improvements for production lots and/or deed-restricted easements shall be discouraged / minimized.</p>		
	<p>Policy Changes to GPA 1077</p>	<p>EIR No. 524 Consistency</p>
<p>Southwest Area</p>	<p>New SWAP 1.3 was</p>	<p>Revising the policy language of GPA No. 1077</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>Plan (SWAP) Policy 1.3 Permit wineries that maintain on site vineyards on 10 acres or more provided that at least:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% of the project site is planted in vineyards; • 75% of the grapes utilized in wine production and retail wine sales are grown or raised within the county; and • The winery facility has a capacity to produce 3,500 gallons of wine annually. <p>SWAP 1.4 Permit limited commercial uses such as wineries, sampling rooms, and retail wine sales establishments on a minimum lot size of ten (10) acres to promote viticulture potential of this region.</p>	<p>included to add a description of Class I wineries, which included a 75% planting requirement, minimum lot size of 5 acres and a maximum size of 1,500 square feet.</p> <p>The original SWAP 1.3 and SWAP 1.4 was combined to include a description of a Class II Winery, which includes a minimum lot size of 10 acres, 75% planting requirement, 75% of the Grapes utilized in wine production are grown or raised within Riverside County, a minimum size of 1,500 square feet for the facility and minimum production of 3,500 gallons.</p>	<p>was to ensure consistency between the general plan policies and the language of Ordinance No. 348.4729. The different size wineries were assumed to occur in the Project area and studied in the EIR No. 524.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 4.2, <i>Agricultural and Forestry Resources</i>, of the EIR, one of the major intents of the Project is to preserve the viticulture of the Project area and promote agricultural activities (p. 4.2-19), which would be accomplished through the implementation of the winery classifications. The inclusion of a Class I Winery as an allowable use in all Wine County Zones would not result in increased environmental impacts because the activities that would occur in Class I Wineries would be consistent with typical agricultural activities, and would not introduce uses or activities that are incompatible or inconsistent with typical agricultural activities.</p> <p>The activities associated with a Class I Winery are similar to other agricultural processing and packing activities that are permitted through the Citrus/Vineyard Zone and other existing agricultural zones established within the Project boundary. The Project proposes to continue these agricultural uses through the implementation of the proposed Wine Country Zones. Thus, the Draft Program EIR No. 524 assumed these agricultural activities would continue to occur within the Project Area.</p> <p>In addition, the Project Design Features provided in Section 4.2 of the EIR require that only 75% of implementing projects on future winery sites be planted with vineyards on 10 acres or more (p. 4.2-11), which allows for 25% of implementing projects to be less than 10 acres, such as Class I Wineries which would be required to be located on a minimum of 5 acres. Therefore, inclusion of Class I Wineries would not conflict with Project Design Features with respect to agricultural resources. No additional analysis in EIR No. 524 is necessary.</p>
<p>SWAP 1.10 referenced 28 existing wineries</p>	<p>SWAP 1.10 updated the number of existing wineries from 28 to 31.</p>	<p>Adding two (2) wineries (Ponte Winery and Pelzer Winery) of less than 20 gross acres to the SWAP Figure 4B: Wine Country Policy</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>shown on Figure 4a.</p>		<p>Area with District would not present any new or more severe environmental impacts because it represents a minor increase in acreage as compared to the total existing wineries' acreage. The total acreage of the Project is approximately 18,005 acres, of which the additional wineries comprise less than 20 acres each, or less than 1 percent of the total existing wineries' acreage. Since this additional acreage is negligible and unlikely to result in additional environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in EIR No. 524, no further analysis is necessary. Additionally, Ponte Winery is currently constructed and operational. Therefore, traffic associated with this winery was already calculated in the traffic, air quality, noise, and GHG models identified in the EIR. Pelzer Winery was included in the cumulative projects list used for analysis in the EIR. As such, anticipated impacts of the additional undeveloped Pelzer Winery were included in the cumulative impacts discussion embedded in each section of the EIR. In addition, all future projects including winery uses would be required to comply with applicable Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures set forth in EIR No. 524.</p>
<p>There was no Winery District Overlay.</p>	<p>SWAP 1.12 was added to allow properties within the Winery District Overlay the opportunity to utilize either the density and uses allowed under the Rural Community-Estate Density Residential land use designation or the density and uses allowed in the Wine Country-Winery District within the Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area.</p> <p>SWAP 1.13 was added to indicate that the Winery District Overlay is</p>	<p>The purpose of the Winery District Overlay is to identify property that may be developed either under the Winery District Overlay or under the Wine Country-Winery District within the Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area. These policies do not represent any substantive variances from any of the major elements of EIR No. 524, such as the Project Description, Project Design Features, Environmental Analysis, or Mitigation Measures, and therefore, does not present new or more severe environmental impacts. As such, no further environmental analysis is required.</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
	<p>within the area depicted on Figure 4B.</p> <p>SWAP 1.14 was added to clarify the allowable development in the Winery District Overlay under the Rural Community- Estate Density Residential land use designation,</p> <p>SWAP 1.15 was added to clarify the allowable development in the Winery District Overlay under the Wine</p> <p>SWAP 1.16 was added to clarify that in the Winery District Overlay adequate water resources, sewer facilities and/or septic capacity would need to exist to meet the demands of the proposed land use and development.</p>	
<p>SWAP 1.13 Permits incidental commercial uses with commercial equestrian establishments</p>	<p>SWAP 1.13 was renumbered to SWAP 1.18 and the incidental uses were updated to eliminate horse auction facilities, no new uses were introduced.</p>	<p>No new incidental commercial uses with equestrian establishments were added. Therefore, this modification would not require additional environmental impacts beyond those discussed in EIR No. 524 and no further environmental analysis is required.</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
<p>SWAP 1.15 encourages cluster development in conjunction with onsite vineyards or equestrian lands</p>	<p>SWAP 1.15 was renumbered to SWAP 1.20 and the option of clustered development in conjunction with equestrian land was eliminated because clustered development is not permitted in the Wine-Country Equestrian District.</p>	<p>Clustered development is encouraged in the Wine Country-Winery (WC-W) and Wine Country-Residential (WC-R) Districts with areas set aside for vineyards. Since the Wine Country-Equestrian District does not permit clustering, the option of setting aside equestrian land in lieu of vineyards was eliminated. This modification does not represent any substantive variances from any of the major elements of EIR No. 524, such as the Project Description, Project Design Features, Environmental Analysis, or Mitigation Measures, and therefore, does not present new or more severe environmental impacts. As such, no further environmental analysis is required.</p>
<p>The original project proposed an update to the SWAP Trails Network that encourages non-motorized mobility for various users and included a conceptual trails map.</p>	<p>The conceptual trails map was removed from GPA 1077.</p>	<p>Although the update of the conceptual SWAP trails map is now not included as part of GPA 1077, the existing SWAP trails map as well as SWAP Policy 1.7 are still in place. SWAP Policy 1.7 requires the development of an integrated trails network that carefully considers equestrian uses, incidental commercial activities and agricultural operations, and includes, but is not limited to, regional trails, combination trails, bike paths, open space trails, historic trails, etc. Implementing projects would be required to comply with SWAP Policy 1.7. Also to provide a conservative analysis, no trip reduction credit was used in the traffic analysis for non-motorized trips that would use the trails – that is the analysis was conducted as if no new trails were provided as part of the project. Likewise and as presented in the Draft EIR at p. 4.7-28, no reduction in GHG emissions was assumed due to the usage of trails in lieu of motorized vehicles. Therefore, this revision does not present new or more severe environmental impacts. As such, no further environmental analysis is required.</p>

Original Project	Approved Project	EIR Consistency Analysis
The total Project area analyzed was 18,990 acres	<p>The approved Project area is approximately 18,005 acres.</p> <p>Approximately 17,910 acres of the total 18,005 are included within the Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area.</p>	** See below

** EIR No. 524 analyzed a Project area totaling 18,990 acres. The approved Project was reduced to approximately 18,005 acres. Approximately 17,910 acres of the total 18,005 acres are included in the Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area (WCPA). The 95 acres not included in the WCPA were included in the former Citrus/Vineyard and Valle de los Caballos Policy Areas. In EIR No. 524, these 95 acres were analyzed as being a part of the Project's Wine Country-Winery District.

With the removal of the Citrus/Vineyard and the Valle de los Caballos Policy Areas, future development on these 95 acres will need to be consistent with their underlying general plan land use designations.

The 32 acres of the former Citrus/Vineyard Policy Area are designated Agriculture and zoned Citrus Vineyard. The Citrus Vineyard Zone is consistent with the Agriculture land use designation. The Agricultural land use designation encourages productive agricultural lands such as, but not limited to, row crops, citrus groves and vineyards. Additionally, single family residences on a minimum of 10 acres are allowed. The WCPA policies also encourage such uses as, but not limited to, vineyards, groves, and field crops. Additionally, the parcels remaining within the Citrus Vineyard zone will still be required to comply with the 75% planting requirement. Therefore, future development under the Agricultural land use designation and Citrus Vineyard zone will be similar to development allowed under the WCPA and analyzed in EIR No. 524.

The approximately 63 acres of the former Valle de los Caballos Policy Area are designated Commercial Tourist and zoned Rural-Residential. The removed Valle de los Caballos Policy Area policy SWAP 2.1 restricted residential lot size to 10 acres minimum regardless of the underlying land use designation. Since the removed SWAP 2.1 only limits future residential lot size, removing the Valle de los Caballos Policy area would not change the commercial development potential for this area. The Commercial Tourist land use designation encourages such uses as, among others, hotels, golf courses and recreation facilities, which will be permitted based on compatibility with surrounding land uses. The WCPA policies also encourages tourist accommodations such as, but not limited to, lodging facilities, special occasion facilities and restaurants in conjunction with wineries. Therefore, future land development under the Commercial Tourist land use designation will be similar to development allowed under the WCPA and analyzed in EIR No. 524.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Attachment "B"
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that public agencies adopting Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) take affirmative steps to determine that approved mitigation measures, standard conditions, and project design features are implemented subsequent to project approval. The lead or responsible agency must adopt a reporting and monitoring program for the mitigation measures incorporated into a project or included as conditions of approval. The program must be designed to ensure compliance with the EIR during project implementation (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6(a)(1)).

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) will be used by the Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency Planning Department (County) as Lead Agency to ensure compliance with mitigation measures associated with the Wine Country Community Plan Project, as the Lead Agency pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines, will ensure that all mitigation measures are carried out.

The County's mitigation measures would avoid or substantially lessen environmental impacts to below a level of significance for all impact issues except for the potential for liquefaction due to severe seismic activity.

The remainder of this MMRP consists of a checklist that identifies the mitigation measures by resource. The table identifies the mitigation monitoring and reporting requirements, including the person(s) responsible for verifying implementation of the mitigation measure, timing of verification (prior to, during or after construction) and responsible party. Space is provided for sign-off following completion/implementation of the mitigation measure.

CEQA requires that when a public agency completes an environmental document, which includes measures to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects, the public agency must adopt a reporting or monitoring program. This requirement ensures that environmental impacts found to be significant will be mitigated. The reporting or monitoring program must be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6).

In compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Checklist has been prepared for the Wine Country Community Plan Project. This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Checklist is intended to provide verification that all applicable mitigation measures relative to significant environmental impacts are monitored and reported. Monitoring will include 1) verification that each mitigation measure has been implemented; 2) recordation of the actions taken to implement each mitigation; and 3) retention of records in the Project file.

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program delineates responsibilities for monitoring the project, but also allows the County flexibility and discretion in determining how best to monitor implementation. Monitoring procedures will vary according to the type of mitigation measure. Adequate monitoring consists of demonstrating that monitoring procedures took place and that mitigation measures were implemented.

Reporting consists of establishing a record that a mitigation measure is being implemented, and generally involves the following steps:

- The County will distribute reporting forms to the appropriate entities for verification of compliance.

- Department/agencies with reporting responsibilities will review the EIR, which provides general background information on the reasons for including specified mitigation measures.
- Problems or exceptions to compliance will be addressed to the County as appropriate.
- Periodic meetings may be held during the project implementation to report on compliance of mitigation measures.
- Responsible parties provide the County with verification that monitoring has been conducted and ensure, as applicable, that mitigation measures have been implemented. Monitoring compliance may be documented through an existing review and approval program such as field inspection reports and plan review.
- The County prepares a reporting form periodically during the construction phase and an annual report summarizing the status of all project mitigation monitoring efforts.
- Appropriate mitigation measures will be included in construction documents and/or conditions of permits/approvals.

Minor changes to the Mitigation Monitoring Program, if required, would be made in accordance with CEQA and would be permitted after further review and approval by the County. Such changes could include reassignment of monitoring and reporting responsibilities, program redesign to make any appropriate improvements, and/or modification, substitution or deletion of mitigation measures subject to conditions described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. All permitted changes to the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program must satisfy the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6.

The following mitigation measures reflect minor corrections as noted in the Final EIR (Responses to Comments), Section 3, Errata, as well as minor corrections pursuant to Board of Supervisors project modifications at the December 3, 2013 public hearing.

Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party or Parties	Timing for Mitigation Measure	Method of Verification	County Verification of Compliance (Date/Initials)
Aesthetics/Light and Glare				
<p>AES-1 The County shall work with utility and infrastructure providers to make sure that all sewer, water, and storm drain infrastructure improvements located along the Highway 79 South corridor do not significantly detract from the scenic quality of this area, or affect the County's ability to designate this roadway as a County Scenic Highway at a later date consistent with applicable County General Plan policies, ordinances and EIR mitigation measures.</p>	County Planning Department or designee	Pre-construction	Onsite Inspection Plan Check	
<p>AES-2 All implementing projects shall provide a signage plan for the project area prior to approval. This plan shall include the location of onsite buildings and structures, the location of existing buildings and structures within surrounding properties, the distance between existing buildings and structures and proposed signage, and other details of the proposed signage (i.e. type, size, lighting, and architectural design) during each phase of project development. No off-site signage shall be considered for an implementing project during any phase of project development without prior approvals per Article XIX of County Ordinance 348.</p>	County Planning Department or designee	Concurrent with discretionary application During construction	Review/approval of required studies. Field inspection	
<p>AES-3 All implementing projects shall provide a lighting plan for the project area prior to approval. This plan shall include the location of onsite buildings and structures, the location of existing buildings and structures within surrounding properties, the distance between existing buildings and structures and proposed light sources, and other details of the proposed lighting (i.e., type, size, wattage, lumens, shielding type, etc.) during each phase of project development. The Plan shall comply with applicable County General Plan policies, ordinances and EIR mitigation measures.</p>	County Planning Department	Concurrent with discretionary application During construction	Review/approval of required studies. Field inspection	
Agricultural and Forestry Resources				
<p>AG-1 Prior to project approval and in accordance with County Resolution No. 84-526, all implementing projects within an agricultural preserve shall cancel the applicable land conservation contract where incidental commercial uses are proposed within the Equestrian or Winery Districts or where clustered lots are</p>	County Planning Department	Prior to discretionary approval or grading permit	Proof of cancellation	

Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party or Parties	Timing for Mitigation Measure	Method of Verification	County Verification of Compliance (Date/Initials)
Air Quality				
<p>AQ-1 The County shall require new commercial and industrial implementing projects to develop a trip reduction program (TRP) that promotes commuter-choices, employer transportation management, guaranteed ride home programs and commuter assistance and outreach-type programs intended to reduce commuter vehicle miles traveled. , which can be applied toward GHG-2 for operational emission reductions. The program shall be submitted as part of Project's implementing project's discretionary review applications, and in place prior to Certificate of Occupancy.</p>	<p>County Planning Department</p>	<p>Concurrent with applications Prior to COO</p>	<p>Review/approval of required studies. Plan approval</p>	
<p>AQ-2 The County shall condition all implementing projects to implement policy 18.1 in the Southwest Area Plan, which implements the Trails and Bikeway System policies pursuant to the Non-Motorized Transportation section of the County General Plan Circulation Element. These policies are more conducive to the region's destination places and multiple users' (bikers, equestrian, pedestrians, visitors, etc.) needs. Hence, changing the focus of land use from automobile-centered transportation would result in a reduction in vehicle miles traveled.</p>	<p>County Planning Department</p>	<p>Concurrent with discretionary application</p>	<p>Map consistency determination</p>	
<p>AQ-3 In addition, the County shall require implementing projects to incorporate bicycle parking areas at agreed upon locations during application review (for projects having more than 10 employees or involving special events). Horse hitching posts may also be considered, for projects involving special events or wine-tasting, and in proximity to an existing or planned equestrian trail.</p>	<p>County Planning Department</p>	<p>Concurrent with discretionary application</p>	<p>Application review</p>	
<p>AQ-4 The County shall require all implementing projects that require onsite or offsite special event parking to incorporate a comprehensive parking program for private parking lots during application review, to promote ultra-low or zero emission vehicle parking; provide larger parking spaces that can accommodate</p>	<p>County Planning Department</p>	<p>Concurrent with discretionary application</p>	<p>Application and parking program review</p>	

Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party or Parties	Timing for Mitigation Measure	Method of Verification	County Verification of Compliance (Date/Initials)
<p>vans and limousines; include adequate passenger waiting/loading areas; and provide safe pedestrian/equestrian pathways through parking areas.</p> <p>AQ-5 The County shall promote the expanded use of renewable fuel and low-emission vehicles within implementing projects. Implementing projects may earn points in the GHG Mitigation Workbook Option Tables by making low-emissions or electric vehicle use more accessible by including one or both of the following project components: provide preferential parking for ultra-low emission, zero-emission, and alternative-fuel vehicles; and provide electric vehicle charging stations within the development.</p>	<p>County Planning Department or designee</p>	<p>Concurrent with discretionary application</p>	<p>Application review based on GHG Mitigation Workbook</p>	
<p>AQ-6 The County shall require implementing projects to prohibit idling of on- and off-road heavy duty diesel vehicles for more than five minutes. This measure shall be implemented by new commercial and industrial projects with loading docks or delivery trucks. Such projects shall be required to post signage at all loading docks and/or delivery areas directing drivers to shut down their trucks after five minutes of idle time. Also, employers who own and operate truck fleets shall be required to inform their drivers of the anti-idling policy.</p>	<p>Construction Contractors, Inspector</p>	<p>Concurrent with discretionary application Prior to COO</p>	<p>Application review Site inspection</p>	
<p>AQ-7 The County shall work with the Winegrowers' Association, and their partners, to promote alternative modes of transportation, such as shuttles, cable-cars, trolley, etc. In addition, where feasible, the County shall work with the local transit provider – RTA – by adding or modifying existing transit service to enhance service near the Project site. This will encourage the use of transit and therefore reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Unincorporated Riverside County hosts one Metrolink transit station; the County shall collaborate with the neighboring cities to expand connections to this station as well as other Metrolink stations which will increase ridership and decrease vehicle miles traveled (VMT).</p>	<p>County Planning Department or designee</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Annual report to the Board of Supervisors on WCCP Implementation Progress</p>	
<p>AQ-8 The County shall require implementing projects to comply with the following SCAQMD Applicable Rule 403 Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to 	<p>County Planning Department or designee</p>	<p>Pre-construction (notes on plans)</p>	<p>Plan check</p>	