

Attachment F:

Resolution No. 2014-044
Adopting the Wine Country Community Plan and
Certifying the Program EIR No. 524

RESOLUTION NO. 2014-044

**ADOPTING THE WINE COUNTRY COMMUNITY PLAN
AND CERTIFYING PROGRAM EIR NO. 524**

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 65450 et.seq., public hearings were held before the Riverside County Board of Supervisors (“Board”) in Riverside, California on September 24, 2013 and December 3, 2013 and before the Riverside County Planning Commission in Temecula, California on July 25, 2012, August 22, 2012 and September 26, 2012 and in Riverside California on December 5, 2012, December 19, 2012, November 6, 2013 and November 20, 2013, to consider the Wine Country Community Plan which is located east of the City of Temecula, approximately one half mile north of the Pechanga Reservation, south of Lake Skinner, and northwest of Vail Lake; and,

WHEREAS, all the procedures of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the Riverside County Rules to Implement CEQA have been met, and Environmental Impact Report No. 524 (EIR No. 524), prepared in connection with the Wine Country Community Plan and related cases (referred to alternatively herein as the “Wine Country Community Plan” or the “Project”), is sufficiently detailed so that all the potentially significant effects of the project on the environment and measures necessary to avoid or substantially lessen such effects have been evaluated in accordance with the above-referenced Act and Rules; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15151, the evaluation of environmental effects is to be completed in light of what is reasonably feasible; and,

WHEREAS, the Wine Country Community Plan involves broad land use policies to guide the future growth of the Project Area. The Plan does not authorize site specific construction, ground disturbance or any other specific development. Therefore, a program level EIR was prepared to analyze the Project’s potential environmental impacts. As permitted by CEQA guidelines section 15168, subsequent implementing activities will be examined in light of this program level EIR to determine what level of additional CEQA review may be required.

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
BY: MICHELLE CLACK 03/11/14
DATE

1 **WHEREAS**, Riverside County Planning Department (County) circulated a Notice of Preparation
2 (NOP) for a 30-day public review period commencing December 28, 2009 to January 26, 2010, and held
3 one public scoping meeting on January 19, 2010. The Project also was subject to numerous stakeholder
4 meetings through the Wine Country Community Plan (WCCP) Advisory Committee process, as well as
5 town hall meetings, focus groups and information sharing via a Project website. In addition to required
6 CEQA noticing, County staff provided all property owners with opportunity to provide input as part of
7 the July 2009 Vision 2020 survey and as part of the initial Planning Commission hearing notification in
8 July 2012. The County prepared a Draft Program EIR No. 524 (State Clearinghouse No. 2009121076) to
9 address the Wine Country Community Plan. The Draft Program EIR No. 524 was circulated for public
10 review and comment as specified in the State CEQA Guidelines for an extended 60-day period
11 (December 5, 2011 through February 2, 2012). Public comments were received by the County and have
12 been responded to by the County in accordance with CEQA requirements. The Project Final Program
13 EIR Responses to Comments document dated September 3, 2013 (the "Responses") also provides further
14 discussion regarding the Draft EIR notification and the purposes of the Program EIR (Response No. 29).

15 **WHEREAS**, the matter was discussed fully with testimony and documentation presented by the
16 public and affected government agencies; now, therefore,

17 **BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED, AND ORDERED** by the Board of
18 Supervisors County of Riverside, in regular session assembled on March 11, 2014 that:

- 19 A. The Wine Country Community Plan involves a 17,910-acre policy area located east of the
20 City of Temecula, approximately one half mile north of the Pechanga Reservation, south of
21 Lake Skinner, and northwest of Vail Lake.
- 22 B. The Wine Country Community Plan is associated with General Plan Amendment (GPA)
23 No. 1077, Zoning Ordinance Amendment No. 348.4729, the Temecula Valley Wine
24 Country Design Guidelines and the Temecula Valley Wine Country Greenhouse Gas
25 Reduction Workbook, all of which were considered concurrently at the public hearings.
- 26 C. The Wine Country Community Plan and certain mitigation measures, as analyzed in EIR
27 No. 524, were modified in response to public comments and public testimony at the
28 public hearings. The approved Wine Country Community Plan and final mitigation

1 measures do not present “significant new information” as defined by State CEQA
2 Guidelines § 15088.5 as compared to that information already presented in EIR No. 524.
3 Instead, the minor revisions to the Project merely clarify and amplify existing
4 information, reduces the footprint of the Project in order to minimize impacts, does not
5 substantially increase the severity of a potential environmental impact and does not create
6 a new substantial environmental impact. Attachments A and B, attached hereto and
7 incorporated herein by this reference, along with the staff reports and memorandums
8 presented during the public hearings and other information in the record, further
9 document and explain that such modifications are individually and cumulatively
10 adequately addressed in EIR No. 524 and do not require recirculation of the EIR.

11 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following environmental
12 issues associated with the Wine Country Community Plan are determined to have no environmental
13 impacts in consideration of existing regulations and Project Design Features.

14 A. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

15 *Conflict with Forest Land and Timberland Zoning*

16 **Threshold:** *Would the Project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of,*
17 *forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined*
18 *by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as*
19 *defined by Government Code section 51104(g)).*

20 1. No Impact:

21 No land zoned as forest land or timberland occurs within the area under
22 consideration for the Project. No timber resources or related activities would be
23 affected by the Project.

24 *Loss of Forest Land*

25 **Threshold:** *Would the Project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest*
26 *land to non-forest use.*

27 2. No Impact:

28 No timber resources, forest land, or related activities occur within the boundary of

1 the Project.

2 B. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

3 *Airport Master Plan*

4 **Threshold:** *Would the project result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?*

5 1. No Impact:

6 The Project is not located within an Airport Influence Area and would not result
7 in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan.

8 *Airport Land Use Commission*

9 **Threshold:** *Would the project require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?*

10 2. No Impact:

11 The Project is not located within an Airport Influence Area and would not require
12 review by an Airport Land Use Commission.

13 *Public Airport Hazards*

14 **Threshold:** *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan
15 has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the
16 project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

17 3. No Impact:

18 The Project is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use
19 airport. Activities authorized under the Project would not result in a safety hazard
20 for people residing or working in the Project area.

21 C. Mineral Resources

22 *Loss of Locally-Imported Mineral Resource Recovery Site*

23 **Threshold:** *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important
24 mineral resource recovery site delineated in the local general plan, specific plan, or other
25 land use plan?*

26 1. No Impact:

27 According to the SWAP, the Project area does not include any locally-important
28

1 mineral resources recovery sites. The Project does not propose to change this.
2 Therefore, the Project would not have the potential to result in the loss of
3 availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated in the
4 General Plan, Specific Plans, or any other land use plan.

5 D. Noise

6 *Noise from Public Use Airport*

7
8 **Threshold:** *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan*
9 *has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the*
10 *project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

11 1. No Impact:

12 The Project study area is not within two miles of a public airport or public use
13 airport. Therefore, implementing project activities authorized pursuant to the
14 Project would not expose people to excessive airport-related noise sources.

15 E. Population and Housing

16 *Displacement of Existing Housing*

17 **Threshold:** *Would the project displace substantial number of existing housing,*
18 *necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

19 1. No Impact:

20 While isolated residential structures may be located within areas designated for
21 commercial uses, the Project would not include changes that would result in the
22 substantial displacement of housing.

23 *Displacement of Substantial Number of People*

24 **Threshold:** *Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the*
25 *construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

26 2. No Impact:

27 While isolated residential structures may be located within areas designated for
28 commercial uses, the Project would not include changes that would result in the

1 substantial displacement of people that would necessitate the construction of
2 replacement housing.

3 *Cumulative Impacts*

4 3. No Impact:

5 Because the Project will have no impact as to either of the Population and
6 Housing thresholds discussed above, the Project will likewise result in no
7 cumulatively considerable impacts under either of these thresholds. Thus,
8 cumulative impacts will be less than significant. With regard to the Project's
9 potential to contribute to growth inducement, the County makes the findings set
10 forth in the Resolution, below, regarding potential economic and population
11 growth.

12 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following environmental
13 impacts associated with the Wine Country Community Plan are determined to be less than significant in
14 consideration of existing regulations and Project Design Features.

15 A. Aesthetics, Light and Glare

16 *Impact 4.1-2. Mt. Palomar Observatory*

17 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not interfere with the*
18 *nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County*
19 *Ordinance No. 655.*

20 1. Project Impact:

21 Development of the Project area is expected to occur over a 25-year period and
22 will involve constructing buildings, signage, lighting and utilities. The Project
23 would introduce new sources of light within 15-45 miles of the Palomar
24 Observatory. However, compliance with existing regulatory programs, including
25 General Plan policies (Policy LU 4.1), Southwest Area Plan policies (Policy 13.1),
26 County ordinances (Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, Ordinance No. 655,
27 and Ordinance No. 915), and standard conditions or requirements will reduce
28 impacts to the operation of the Palomar Observatory to less than significant.

1 2. Cumulative Impact:

2 The incremental amount of light and glare from the Project's implementing
3 projects would be limited and would make a minimal contribution to the
4 cumulative impact in the region due to existing regulatory programs, including
5 General Plan policies, County ordinances, and standard conditions or
6 requirements currently in place.

7 The Project has incorporated various Project Design Features specifically intended
8 to maintain and protect the rural Wine Country character, including limitations on
9 the location, nature and allowed density of the implementing project, and
10 requirements for all future implementing projects to adhere to the proposed
11 Temecula Valley Wine Country Design Guidelines. Therefore, no significant
12 impacts are anticipated with implementation of the Project and cumulatively
13 impacts related to aesthetics, light or glare are not considered significant.

14 Additionally, as an informational item, the Project is generally consistent with the
15 City of Temecula's and County General Plan EIR's from an overall land use plan,
16 type, and density basis (resulting in substantially less overall development, and
17 creating similar or improved aesthetic conditions through the Design Guidelines),
18 and as such the cumulative impacts of the Project have been factored into the City
19 of Temecula's and County General Plan EIRs, and consequently, potential
20 impacts would be no greater than those previously evaluated in these two
21 documents.

22 In light of the above, implementation of the Project would not result in cumulative
23 impacts to aesthetics, light and glare.

24 B. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

25 *Impact 4.2.2: Encroachment and Conflicts with Existing Agriculture*

26 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not conflict with existing*
27 *zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland*
28 *Production.*

1 *Impact 4.2-3: Other Environmental Changes*

2 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not result in the loss of*
3 *forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.*

4 *Impact 4.2-3: Other Environmental Changes*

5 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not involve other changes*
6 *in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in*
7 *conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest*
8 *use.*

9 1. Project Impact:

10 No land zoned as forest land or timberland occurs within the area under
11 consideration for the Project. According to Riverside County GIS data, no timber
12 resources or related activities would be affected by the Project. The County does
13 not identify any existing or currently proposed zoning of forest land, timberland or
14 Timberland Production Zones within the County. Thus, no impacts would occur
15 in this regard.

16 No timber resources, forest land, or related activities occur within the boundary of
17 the Project. Thus, no such resources would be affected by the Project.

18 Although the Project would potentially result in the introduction of new
19 development within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property in portions of the
20 Project area, the objectives of the Project are to ensure that the Temecula Valley
21 Wine Country Policy Area develops in an orderly manner that minimizes conflicts
22 between agricultural and urban uses and decreases the likelihood that conversions
23 from Farmland would occur. The intent of the Project is to prevent the
24 diminishing effects of urbanization on the rural and agricultural character of the
25 community by restricting incompatible uses. Therefore, less than significant
26 impacts would occur.

27 Since the intent of the Project is to preserve the viticulture of the Project area and
28 promote agricultural activities throughout the entire Project area, less than
significant impacts associated with "other environmental changes" are identified.

1 Construction related impacts are expected to be minimal, and temporary in nature.
2 Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur. Most infrastructure
3 including sewer lines, domestic water transmission lines, and dry utilities will be
4 placed underground, and therefore would not disturb existing or proposed
5 agricultural activities. In the event that infrastructure (such as an underground
6 transmission line) would need to traverse an area used for agricultural purposes,
7 such a disturbance would be temporary in nature and would not permanently
8 reduce the potential to use a particular area for agricultural uses. There is a
9 possibility that certain infrastructure improvements (i.e., pump stations, etc.)
10 could occur within areas designated for agricultural uses. Additionally, it should
11 be noted that California Government Code Section 53091(d), “building
12 ordinances of a county or city shall not apply to the location or construction of
13 facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of
14 water, wastewater, or electrical energy by a local agency.” The Code (Section
15 53091[e]) also states, “Zoning ordinances of a county or city shall not apply to the
16 location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage,
17 treatment, or transmission of water” In addition, these infrastructure
18 facilities could be constructed in agricultural areas with or without the Project.

19 2. Cumulative Impact:

20 The conversion of farmland in western Riverside County, and in the Temecula
21 Valley in particular, may have an adverse cumulative effect on the County’s
22 agricultural economy. However, the intent of the Project is to encourage the
23 preservation and expansion of land designated within the Agriculture Foundation
24 Component. While the proposed zoning and policies would increase the acreage
25 of designated Agricultural land uses, it is possible that implementing project sites
26 could be located on Prime Farmland (or another designation indicating
27 agricultural suitability) and would allow development consistent with Policy
28 SWAP 1.4 which allows up to 25 percent of a subject site to be developed with

1 winery and associated facilities (e.g., delicatessens, tasting rooms, special event
2 facilities, etc.). Additionally, under the Project active agricultural land would be
3 allowed to convert only 25 percent of its land to non-agricultural uses. As a
4 result, this Project site's impact on farmland would not be considered
5 cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

6 Project construction and implementation would not result in cumulative impacts
7 to agricultural resources because it would not impede the future use of such
8 resources.

9 C. Air Quality

10 *Impact 4.3-4: Objectionable Odors*

11 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not create objectionable*
12 *odors affecting a substantial number of people.*

13 1. Project Impact:

14 Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include the
15 use of architectural coatings and solvents. SCAQMD Rule 1113 limits the
16 amount of volatile organic compounds from architectural coatings and solvents.
17 Via mandatory compliance with SCAQMD Rules, no construction activities or
18 materials are proposed which would create objectionable odors. Therefore, no
19 impact would occur with regards to odors.

20 Potential odors associated with the Project would result from maintenance and
21 cultivation of the vineyards and the wine-making process itself. Objectionable
22 odors associated with the vineyards would result primarily from the use of
23 fertilizers and the wine-making process itself; crushing and fermentation of grapes
24 and decomposition of pomace (grape waste). However, vineyards are currently
25 maintained and operated in the Project area, so the implementing projects would
26 not introduce any new types of odors beyond what currently exists today.

27 Another source of potential odors from the implementing projects would be
28

1 equestrian uses in the area. Odors would result primarily from horses and their
2 waste. As new equestrian facilities would be built in the Equestrian district which
3 currently has equestrian uses, no new types of odors beyond what currently exists
4 would be introduced by the implementing projects. Wastes would be disposed of
5 in accordance with any applicable requirements.

6 Currently operating and future agricultural or equestrian facilities are required to
7 comply with Rule 402, which limits the amount of nuisance odors. Agricultural
8 operations, which are exempt from Rule 402, are nonetheless subject to applicable
9 Best Management Practices, Southwest Area Plan policies (Policies 1.2, 1.9 and
10 1.18), and any site-specific conditions imposed by the County. Therefore, impacts
11 from objectionable odors are less than significant.

12 D. Biological Resources

13 *Impact 4.4-2: Adverse Effect on Endangered or Threatened Species*

14 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not have a substantial*
15 *adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered or*
16 *threatened species.*

17 1. Project Impacts:

18 The Project is located within Southwest Area Plan of the Western Riverside
19 County's Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The MSHCP
20 provides for the long-term survival of protected and sensitive species by
21 designating a contiguous system of habitat to be added to existing public/quasi-
22 public lands. The Project contains areas designated by the MSHCP as proposed
23 Core, proposed Extension of Existing Core, and proposed Constrained Linkage.
24 Implementing projects within the Project area, depending on their location, may
25 be required to undergo the Habitat Acquisition and Negotiation Strategy (HANS)
26 process, prepare habitat assessments and conduct focused surveys to verify the
27 biological resources located within an implementing project site. The HANS
28 process outlines a methodology for permittees to utilize in order to negotiate for,

1 set-aside or purchase of areas needed for conservation. Existing General Plan
2 policies (Policies OS 8.1, OS 17.1 through 17.5, and OS 18.1); and compliance
3 with the MSHCP are intended to protect species and their habitats within Western
4 Riverside County. Since implementing projects will be required to comply with
5 these General Plan policies and MSHCP requirements as part of the development
6 process, impacts associated with the adverse effects on threatened or endangered
7 species are considered to be less than significant.

8 *Impact 4.4-3: Adverse Effect on Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Species*

9 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not have a*
10 *substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any*
11 *species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status.*

12 2. Project Impacts:

13 Migratory birds are regulated and protected under the MSHCP and the Migratory
14 Bird Treaty Act, among other regulations. The MSHCP has as a major focus the
15 identification, preservation and protection of key wildlife corridors, referred to as
16 “linkages” or “corridors” in the MSHCP. In addition, the “Project” itself is not
17 proposing any specific development, and as such it would be speculative to
18 provide a detailed assessment of potential site-specific effects on migratory birds
19 or corridors. The Project does provide for extensive wildlife mitigation simply
20 through requiring that 75% of every commercial equestrian, clustered subdivision
21 or winery project be set aside for open space, as well as requires larger lot sizes.
22 Therefore, less than significant impacts to migratory species would occur.

23 *Impact 4.4-4: Interfere with the Movement of Migratory Species*

24 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not interfere substantially*
25 *with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or*
26 *with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use*
of native wildlife nursery sites.

27 3. Project Impacts:

1 Migratory species are regulated and protected under the MSHCP. Additionally,
2 migratory birds are regulated and protected the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, among
3 other regulations. The MSHCP has as a major focus the identification, preservation
4 and protection of key wildlife corridors, referred to as “linkages” or “corridors” in
5 the MSHCP. In addition, the “Project” itself is not proposing any specific
6 development, and as such it would be speculative to provide a detailed assessment
7 of potential site-specific effects on migratory birds or corridors. In part, the Project
8 avoids significant impacts to wildlife by requiring that 75% of every commercial
9 equestrian, clustered subdivision or winery project be set aside for open space, as
10 well as requires larger lot sizes. Implementing projects within the Project area,
11 depending on their location, may be required to undergo the Habitat Acquisition
12 and Negotiation Strategy (HANS) process, prepare habitat assessments and conduct
13 focused surveys to verify the biological resources located within an implementing
14 project site. The HANS process outlines a methodology for permittees to utilize in
15 order to negotiate for, set-aside or purchase of areas needed for conservation. Less
16 than significant impacts to migratory species would occur.

17
18 *Impact 4.4-6: Adverse Effect on Federally Protected Wetlands*

19 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not have a substantial*
20 *adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean*
21 *Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct*
removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

22 4. Project Impacts:

23 Given the programmatic nature of the EIR, the size of the study area, and the long
24 buildout timeframe for implementing projects, it is not practical to conduct site-
25 specific jurisdictional delineations at this time. Exhibits 4.4-1 and 4.4-2a-c of EIR
26 No. 524 (Pages 4.4-29 – 4.4-36 of the Final Program EIR No. 524) show
27 “waterways” and “streams,” which roughly correspond to potential jurisdictional
28 drainages.

1 The Project area contains a number of native creeks and streams. Prior to
2 development of implementing projects within the Project area, a habitat
3 assessment and MSHCP Consistency Report would be prepared to demonstrate
4 that there would be no indirect effect on conservation areas. All implementing
5 projects proposed within the Project area would be required to comply with the
6 wetlands permitting process (Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act as
7 administered by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the U.S. Army
8 Corps of Engineers, respectively, and Section 1600 of the State's Fish and Game
9 Code, as administered by the California Department of Fish and Game) as well as
10 meet the requirements of the MSHCP. These processes and plans prevent and
11 reduce impacts to federally protected wetlands by requiring analysis of the
12 affected resource and the creation of adequate mitigation over equal or greater
13 biological/ hydrological value. Compliance with these existing laws and
14 regulations, including the MSHCP and General Plan policies would reduce
15 impacts to less than significant.

16 *Impact 4.4-7: Conflict with Local Policies or Ordinances*

17 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not conflict with any local*
18 *policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy*
19 *or ordinance.*

20 5. Project Impacts:

21 The Project is located within the MSHCP and contains 34 criteria cells.
22 Implementing projects within criteria cells must undergo the HANS process to
23 determine if the development will be consistent with the conservation
24 requirements of the MSHCP. Implementing projects outside criteria cells may still
25 require habitat assessments and focused surveys to verify the biological resources
26 within the area proposed for development and to ensure that these resources
27 would not be impacted as a result of the proposed development. Since future
28 implementing projects allowed under the Project would be required to be

1 compliant with the MSHCP and General Plan, and these regulatory documents are
2 intended to minimize conflicts with conservation plans, impacts associated with
3 the Project are considered to be less than significant. Therefore, the project would
4 not conflict with the General Plan or MSHCP policies protecting biological
5 resources.

6 6. Cumulative Impacts:

7 A significant component of any MSHCP and, in particular the Western Riverside
8 County MSHCP, is the recognition and advanced planning to cover potential
9 cumulative impacts on sensitive habitats and covered species. Since
10 implementing projects that would occur within the Project area will be in
11 compliance with the Project policies, zoning, and guidelines and would comply
12 with the MSHCP which provides full CEQA mitigation for all species and habitat-
13 related impacts, cumulative impacts associated with the Project would be
14 considered less than significant.

15 Therefore, Project construction and implementation would not result in
16 cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Wine Country
17 Community Plan.

18 E. Geology, Soils and Seismicity

19 *Impact 4.6-1: Fault Rupture, Ground Shaking, Ground Failure and Landslides*

20 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not expose people or*
21 *structures to potential substantial adverse effects from fault rupture.*

22 1. Project Impacts:

23 There are no known active Alquist-Priolo earthquake faults in the Project area;
24 however, the Project area lies approximately four miles from the Elsinore fault,
25 which runs through the Cities of Murrieta and Temecula to the west/northwest,
26 then south to San Diego County (Exhibit 4.6-2, Alquist-Priolo Fault Zones, Page
27 4.6-35 of the Final Program EIR No. 524). There are County fault zones which
28

1 traverse the Project area; refer to Exhibit 4.6-3, Fault Hazard Map (Page 4.6-37 of
2 the Final Program EIR No. 524).

3 All implementing projects would be required to comply with design measures
4 given in the California Building Code (CBC) to ensure impacts from fault rupture
5 are reduced to less than significant levels. In addition, future implementing
6 projects would be required to comply with County Ordinance No. 547, which
7 subjects all development proposed within an identified earthquake fault zone, as
8 shown maps prepared by the State Geologist, to the requirements of the Alquist-
9 Priolo Act and the criteria identified within the Ordinance No. 547. Similarly,
10 implementing project would be required to adhere to General Plan Policy S 2.1 for
11 County Fault Zones to ensure impacts from fault rupture are reduced to less than
12 significant levels. Before an implementing project can be permitted within an
13 Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, County Fault Zone, or within 150 feet of
14 any other potentially active or active fault mapped in published U.S. Geological
15 Survey (USGS) or California Geologic Survey (CGS) (formerly known as the
16 California Division of Mining and Geology) reports, a geologic investigation must
17 demonstrate that proposed buildings will not be constructed across active faults.
18 If an active fault is found, a structure for human occupancy must be set back 50
19 feet from the fault, unless adequate evidence, as determined and accepted by the
20 County Engineering Geologist, is presented to support a different setback. Prior
21 to approval of a grading permit, applicants would be required to prepare a site-
22 specific geotechnical evaluation to determine potential geological hazards and to
23 adhere to recommendations made in the report to reduce potential risk of damage
24 to structures or other improvements. This is a standard condition of approval that
25 will prevent potentially significant impacts from occurring, such that no
26 mitigation is required pursuant to CEQA.

27 Additionally, implementing projects would be subject to the requirements of
28 County Ordinance 547, which identify requirements for development subject to

1 the provisions of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, as well as
2 pertinent requirements of the State Mining and Geology Board, to reduce potential
3 structural damage caused by fault rupture.

4 Implementing projects within the Project area would also be subject to County of
5 Riverside General Plan Policy S.2.1 of the Safety Element Policy (see Section
6 4.6.1, above) which specifically addresses the potential effects of fault rupture and
7 requires enforcement of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act
8 provisions through preparation of a site-specific geotechnical analysis for those
9 areas located within fault zones.

10 All implementing projects would be subject to the above-described State and local
11 regulations, ordinances, General Plan policies, and standard conditions or
12 requirements, which are intended to reduce damage to structures and loss of life
13 caused by an earthquake. Such conformance would be adequate to ensure that
14 potential impacts from the effects of fault rupture on any habitable structure,
15 critical facility, or other infrastructure will remain less than significant, and no
16 CEQA mitigation measures are required or proposed. This analysis is consistent
17 with the requirements of a program EIR and future site-specific implementing
18 projects proposed within the Project area will require site-specific CEQA analysis
19 at a later date.

20
21 *Impact 4.6-2: Soil Erosion/Loss of Topsoil*

22 ***Threshold:*** *Project construction and implementation would not result in substantial soil*
23 *erosion or the loss of topsoil.*

24 **2. Project Impacts:**

25 As lands within the Project area develop over the next 25 years, an increase in the
26 disturbance of existing land surfaces from grading, development, or removal of
27 existing vegetation/topsoil would potentially occur. As a result, the potential for
28 erosion caused by wind and/or water would increase.

1 Implementing projects within the Project area are required to comply with County
2 of Riverside Ordinance No. 484, which provides requirements intended to reduce
3 the potential for blowing sand within areas designated as Agricultural Dust
4 Control Areas. Ordinance No. 484 identifies certain restrictions on land
5 disturbance activities within these areas and identifies procedures necessary to
6 obtain valid permit. As needed, an erosion control plan would be prepared and
7 submitted to the County to identify methods by which potential soil run-off during
8 rain events and erosion hazards would be minimized to ensure that no adverse
9 effects on water quality occur to downstream properties or water bodies.

10 Additionally, implementing projects in the Project area are required to comply
11 with County of Riverside General Plan Policies S 3.5 and S 3.6 to minimize the
12 potential effects of soil erosion and loss of topsoil. These policies require the
13 identification of design and/or other measures to address onsite and offsite slope
14 instability, debris flow, and erosion hazards on properties where substantial land
15 disturbance is required to allow for the proposed implementing project.

16 As applicable, proposed implementing projects are required to comply with
17 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements and Best
18 Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce potential effects on downstream water
19 bodies, as the result of erosion. Applicants of implementing projects within the
20 Project area are required to include erosion and sediment control measures as part
21 of the grading plan in order to minimize land modification and potential erosional
22 effects. Specific design measures would be implemented on a project-specific
23 basis, thereby reducing potential impacts caused by erosion and/or the loss of
24 topsoil to less than significant.

25
26 *Impact 4.6-4: Expansive Soils*

27 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not potentially expose*
28 *people and/or structures to potential impacts associated with expansive soils.*

1 3. Project Impacts:

2 The potential exists for expansive soils, as defined in Section 1803.5.3 of the 2010
3 California Building Code (previously defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform
4 Building Code), to occur sporadically throughout the Project area. Currently, no
5 comprehensive mapping of expansive soils exists for the Project area. If not
6 managed properly, implementing projects occurring on such soils within the
7 Project area could pose a significant risk to life and property, in particular
8 structural damage and/or the disruption of utility facilities. Construction activities
9 would also have the potential to create risk to existing structures by disturbing or
10 altering underlying soils or geologic conditions.

11 All implementing projects within the Project area would be required to comply
12 with the requirements of the California Building Standards Code in Title 24 for
13 construction occurring within areas subject to expansive soils. Prior to any
14 construction in such areas, a site-specific geotechnical assessment would be
15 required to identify potential adverse impacts and appropriate recommendations to
16 ensure stability of a specific site if implementing projects are to occur. Prior to the
17 issuance of a grading permit, applicants would be required to prepare grading
18 plans consistent with recommendations of the geotechnical study to ensure that
19 impacts relative to expansive soils remain less than significant.

20 Implementing projects within the Project area would also remain subject to all
21 applicable mitigation measures imposed through General Plan EIR No. 441,
22 including Mitigation Measure 4.10.7A and other geology related measures, to
23 reduce potential impacts with regard to expansive soils.

24 *Impact 4.6-5: Soils Incapable of Supporting Wastewater Disposal Systems*

25 **Threshold:** *The project would not result in adverse impacts as a result of soils*
26 *incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater*
27 *disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.*

28 4. Project Impacts:

1 Extensive areas of unincorporated territory within Temecula Valley Wine Country
2 lie outside of existing special districts that provide sewer services. As a result,
3 implementing projects on such lands would be required to rely on the use of septic
4 tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Within certain areas, soils have
5 moderate to severe limitations that restrict the potential use of septic tanks or
6 alternative wastewater disposal systems (refer to Exhibit 4.6-6, *Wine Country*
7 *NRCS Soils Mapping*, Page 4.6-43 of the Final Program EIR No. 524). Therefore,
8 to the extent that the Project would accommodate future implementing projects in
9 these areas, there is the potential for resulting effects on soils that cannot
10 adequately support the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal
11 systems.

12 Prior to approval of a grading permit, all future implementing project applicants
13 would be required to demonstrate compliance with State and/or County
14 requirements and prepare a site-specific geotechnical investigation to determine
15 underlying soil type, permeability, structural loads, design and integrity, and to
16 evaluate the properties of onsite soils and their potential to adequately
17 accommodate septic tanks or alternative wastewater systems.

18 5. Cumulative Impacts:

19 Geologic hazards are generally localized in nature, as they are related to the soils
20 and geologic character of a particular site. Cumulative impacts could occur related
21 to an earthquake, depending on the magnitude of the earthquake and location of
22 the fault(s) traversing the region. Impacts due to seismic activity would be
23 cumulative if State and local building and development codes and regulations
24 were not actively being implemented throughout the region.

25 All implementing projects within the Project area, as well as all future
26 development within surrounding areas, would be subject to applicable State and
27 local building codes, ordinances, and policies, and site-specific design measures
28 intended to reduce the potential for significant damage to occur as the result of

1 seismic activity, landslides, and other such geologic hazards.

2 For the reasons stated above, the Project is not considered to result in significant
3 cumulative impacts relative to geology or soils. Impacts would be less than
4 significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required or proposed. This
5 analysis is consistent with the requirements of a program EIR and future site-
6 specific implementing projects proposed within the Project area will require site-
7 specific CEQA analysis at a later date.

8 F. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

9 *Impact 4.8-2: Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment*

10 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not create a significant*
11 *hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and*
12 *accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials in the environment.*

13 1. Project Impacts:

14 Implementing projects would require the use of hazardous materials during
15 construction and operation of facilities. Typical hazardous materials on a
16 construction site include concrete curing compounds, asphalt products, paints,
17 petroleum products from equipment operation and maintenance, and pesticides.
18 Typical hazardous materials found on agricultural sites include Ammonium nitrate
19 and Anhydrous Ammonia fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides, and fuels for farm
20 equipment such as diesel fuel, gasoline, and propane. Typical hazards associated
21 with equestrian uses include pesticides, fertilizers, manure, and fuels for
22 machinery.

23 Future agricultural, viticulture or winery-related uses would be subject to
24 implementing project site-specific development review pursuant to the County's
25 standard development review process, as modified and expanded through this
26 Project. Draft PEIR No. 524 Chapter 4.2 (page 4.2-7) addresses the County's
27 "Right to Farm" Ordinance, which protects existing agricultural operations.

28 Additionally, all implementing projects within the Project area would be subject

1 to applicable State and local regulations intended to manage the transport, use,
2 storage, manufacture, and disposal of hazardous materials ensuring that these
3 materials do not impact people and the environment. Therefore, conformance with
4 these state regulations and existing standard conditions or requirements will
5 ensure that impacts remain less than significant.

6
7 *Impact 4.8-3: Emergency Response of Evacuation Plan*

8 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not impair implementation*
9 *of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency*
10 *evacuation plan*

11 2. Project Impacts:

12 The Riverside County Operational Area Emergency Operation Plan (EOP)
13 describes the operations of the Riverside County Emergency Center (EOC). The
14 EOP is designed to establish the framework for implementation of the California
15 Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) for Riverside County,
16 which is located within Mutual Aid Region VI as defined by the Governor's
17 Office of Emergency Services. By extension, the EOP also implements the
18 National Incident Management System (NIMS). The EOP is intended to facilitate
19 multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional coordination, particularly between Riverside
20 County and local governments, including special districts and state agencies, in
21 emergency operations.

22 The County has mutual aid agreements with local jurisdictions (24 cities) and
23 special districts or other governmental entities (e.g., school district, water districts,
24 Soboba Indian Tribe, etc.) that developed the Riverside County Multi-
25 Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) which identifies and
26 analyzes an extensive list of the hazards (natural and technical) faced by the
27 County. Implementing projects would be in compliance with the EOP and
28 comply with County standards and all implementing projects would be consistent
with the goals and policies of the EOP and therefore, would not reduce the

1 effective response of emergency services.

2 *Impact: Hazardous and Hazardous Materials – A – Airport Master Plan, B – Airport Land*
3 *Use Commission, and C – Public Airport Hazards.*

4 **Threshold:** *The Project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two*
5 *miles of a public airport or public use airport.*

6 3. Project Impacts:

7 The French Valley Airport is located more than 2 miles beyond the boundary of
8 the Project area. The Project is not located within the French Valley Airport
9 Influence Area. Therefore, the Project would not result in an inconsistency with
10 the *French Valley Airport Master Plan*. There are no other Airport Influence
11 Areas within the Project.

12 *Impact: Hazardous and Hazardous Materials – D – Private Airport Hazards*

13 **Threshold:** *The Project would not result in in a safety hazard for people residing or*
14 *working in the vicinity of a private airport.*

15 4. Project Impacts:

16 A private airstrip, historically known as Billy Joe Airport, is located in the western
17 portion of the Project area, within the proposed western Residential District. The
18 airstrip is paved and is infrequently used. Permission must be granted by the
19 owner of the airstrip prior to landing. Currently, this facility is not covered by the
20 Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Policy Document. Due to
21 the infrequent use of the airstrip and the lack of an existing airport land use plan
22 governing this facility, impacts are considered to be less than significant.

23 In addition, a private-use heliport was approved by the Planning Commission in
24 2009 through Conditional Use Permit No. 3551. This site is located in the
25 southerly portion of the Project area in the proposed Equestrian District. The
26 Conditions of Approval for the heliport specify that the helicopter pad may be
27 operated a maximum of two round trips daily between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to
28 7:00 p.m., and the project applicant will be required to demonstrate compliance to

1 the Riverside County Planning Department that all conditions stated by the
2 Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in their formal 2007 letter will be met
3 prior to and during operation, as appropriate. Similar to the private airstrip,
4 permission must be granted by the owner of the airstrip prior to use. This facility
5 is also not covered by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
6 Policy Document. Due to the infrequent use of the airstrip and compliance with
7 FAA's conditions of approval, impacts would be considered to be less than
8 significant.

9 G. Hydrology and Water Quality

10 *Impact 4.9-10: Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow*

11 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not be subject to inundation*
12 *by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.*

13 1. Project Impacts:

14 Two lakes (Lake Skinner and Vail Lake) are located near the Project; however, it
15 is not likely that the Project would be inundated by seiche from either body of
16 water due to intervening topography and distance from the site. The Project is
17 located approximately 44 miles inland from the Pacific coast and protected by the
18 Santa Margarita Mountains. It is unlikely that the Project would be inundated by
19 a tsunami. Mudflow could occur in any area, especially with the mixture of
20 wildfires and rain. There is a high potential for mudflows to occur in some areas
21 of unincorporated Riverside County which contain areas with steep slopes.

22 The Project area includes slopes that are greater than 15%. Slope stability would
23 be specific to the physical characteristics of a site, such as underlying soil and
24 rock type, slope steepness, and water content of the soils.

25 All implementing projects within the Project area would be required to comply
26 with the requirements of the California Building Standards Code in Title 24. In
27 areas where steep slopes occur that are susceptible to mudflow hazards,
28

1 proponents for implementing projects would be required to prepare a site-specific
2 geologic and geotechnical investigation to identify potential impacts and provide
3 recommendations as to slope stability and design requirements to reduce potential
4 hazards.

5 2. Cumulative Impacts:

6 The Project would not directly result in degradation of surface water quality,
7 groundwater, drainage or erosion, or flooding impacts. Compliance with Federal,
8 State, and local requirements on a project-by-project basis would reduce
9 cumulative impacts to a less than significant level at the time of a implementing
10 project is developed. In addition, cumulative impacts to surface water resources
11 are also regulated and mitigated by regional plans, permits and programs managed
12 by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and U.S.
13 Army Corps of Engineers.

14 H. Land Use and Relevant Planning

15 *Impact 4.10-1: Divide a Community*

16 **Threshold:** *The Project would not divide any established communities.*

17 1. Project Impacts:

18 The Project includes land use policies, zoning regulations, development standards,
19 and design guidelines that apply to 17,910-acres with the intent to promote land use
20 and community cohesion. The associated General Plan Amendment, Zoning
21 Ordinance Amendment, and Design Guidelines further integrate these uses and
22 protect Wine Country from suburban development.

23 The purpose of the Project is to provide for a compatible pattern of development.
24 The goals and policies direct future growth and development, while minimizing
25 existing and potential land use conflicts. Properties within the Project's three
26 Districts would be required to comply with the corresponding zone of their
27 respective District at the time an implementing project approval is sought. The
28

1 implementing zones each contain similar development standards, including
2 similar height requirements, setbacks, and open space requirements. In addition,
3 the implementing zones and revised design guidelines contain standards to ensure
4 compatible architectural themes throughout the Project area.

5 Implementation of the Project would not create a physical divide in established
6 communities, but rather implementation of the Project would—as previously
7 mentioned—consolidate and preserve the existing communities within the Project
8 area. Likewise, the proposed circulation improvements would also serve as a
9 means of better connecting the unique communities and activity centers
10 throughout the Project area.

11 *Impact 4.10-2: Plan Consistency*

12 **Threshold:** *The Project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation*
13 *plan or natural community conservation plan.*

14 2. Project Impacts:

15 The General Plan includes provisions to ensure that future development, such as
16 the proposed Project, does not conflict with existing conservation plans. In
17 particular, the MSHCP would apply to all future implementing projects within the
18 Project area. The implementing projects resulting from the implementation of the
19 Project will be subject to existing General Plan policies and mitigation measures
20 relating to applicable conservation plans. The Project would interact with the
21 MSHCP in the same manner as the existing land uses and policies. Compliance
22 with these requirements will ensure that impacts related to habitat plan
23 consistency will be less than significant. In addition, this impact is addressed in
24 Chapter 4.4 of EIR No. 524, Biological Resources. Implementing projects within
25 criteria cells must undergo the HANS process to determine if the development
26 will be consistent with the conservation requirements of the MSHCP.

27 Implementing projects outside criteria cells may still require habitat assessments
28

1 and focused surveys to verify the biological resources within the area proposed for
2 development and to ensure that these resources would not be impacted as a result
3 of the proposed development. Project impacts are less than significant because
4 future implementing projects resulting from the Project are required to be
5 compliant with the MSHCP and General Plan, and these regulatory documents are
6 intended to minimize conflicts with conservation plans.

7 3. Cumulative Impacts:

8 The proposed Project would not result in any adverse cumulative impacts to land
9 use and planning within the Project area. The Project would help to guide
10 development in a way that preserves the existing land uses and rural feel while
11 allowing for growth consistent with the established vision. The land use Districts
12 proposed in the Project includes Winery, Residential, and Equestrian. These
13 Districts are part of the Project to guide development and meet the goals of the
14 Project: to increase viticulture potential; protect rural lifestyle and equestrian
15 activities; allow appropriate levels of commercial tourist activities; and so that
16 future growth is coordinated to avoid land use conflicts and provide appropriate
17 levels of public facilities, services, and infrastructure. Project implementation
18 would nonetheless increase development in the future; however, it would reduce
19 the density of land uses currently permitted under the General Plan, SWAP,
20 Citrus/Vineyard Policy Area and Valle de los Caballos Policy Area.

21 Therefore the incremental impact of the Project, when considered in combination
22 with development within the subregion and within the Project area (i.e.,
23 implementing projects), is not anticipated to result in cumulatively considerable
24 land use impacts. If future implementing projects are consistent with the Project
25 (including the associated General Plan Amendment, Zoning Ordinance
26 Amendment and revised design guidelines), their cumulative impacts would be
27 consistent with the Project-related land use impacts identified and evaluated in
28 this EIR (Section 4.10) and would thus be less than significant. In addition, the

1 land use changes anticipated under the proposed Project would comply with the
2 growth projections, goals, and vision identified by SCAG (Southern California
3 Association of Governments); thus significant Project-related cumulative land use
4 impacts are not anticipated. Therefore, Implementation of the Project would not
5 result in significant cumulative land use impacts.

6 I. Mineral Resources.

7 *Impact: 4.3-1: Loss of Availability of Known Mineral Resources*

8
9 ***Threshold:*** *Project construction and implementation would not result in the loss of*
10 *availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated in the local*
11 *general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.*

12 1. Project Impacts:

13 According to the Southwest Area Plan, the Project area does not include any
14 locally-important mineral resources recovery sites. The Project does not propose
15 to change this. Therefore, the Project would not have the potential to result in the
16 loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated
17 in the General Plan, Specific Plans, or any other land use plan.

18 J. Public Services, Recreation and Utilities

19 *Impact 4.3-1: Law Enforcement*

20 ***Threshold:*** *Project construction and implementation would not result in the need for*
21 *new law enforcement facilities.*

22 1. Project Impacts:

23 The Project would facilitate future implementing projects, and therefore, could
24 indirectly increase the demand for law enforcement services within the Project area.
25 The County Sheriff's Department would provide law enforcement services to the
26 Wine Country area as it does now. It currently meets the General Plan-stated goal
27 (General Plan EIR No. 441, Mitigation Measure 4.15.2C) of 1.5 officers for each
28 1,000 residents. Additionally As noted in the Project Description, Table 3.0-2,
Wine Country Planning Assumptions, implementation of the Project would result

1 in an overall 33 percent reduction in the number of permanent residents within the
2 Plan area as compared to what it is provided for in the current General Plan.
3 Accordingly, the Sheriff's Department would not be required to increase staffing
4 beyond previously anticipated levels to serve the resident population.

5 *Impact 4.13-3: Public Education*

6 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation of the Project would not result in*
7 *the need for additional schools.*

8 2. Project Impacts:

9 The Project would result in a reduction in the number of residential units
10 constructed within the Project area as compared to the number anticipated
11 pursuant to the current General Plan and anticipated by the Temecula Valley
12 Unified School District, which would serve the Project area. As shown in Table
13 4.13-9, Wine Country Student Generation (Page 4.13-21 of the Final Program EIR
14 No. 524), residential implementing projects within the Project area would not
15 exceed 1,433 students at full build-out, spread between elementary, middle
16 school, and high school.

17 As shown in Table 4.13-3 (Page 4.13-6 of the Final Program EIR No. 524), the
18 Temecula Unified School District has school facilities available to serve the
19 Project area with unused capacity sufficient to accommodate 1,406 elementary
20 students, 1,268 middle school students, and 868 high school students and,
21 therefore, will have sufficient capacity to handle additional numbers of students
22 generated by implementing projects facilitated by the Project, and since all
23 residential and non-residential implementing projects would be required to pay
24 school impact fees in effect at the time of development, which are intended to
25 fully mitigate project impacts on public schools, the Project's impact on public
26 school facilities would be less than significant.

27 K. Traffic and Circulation

1 *Impact 4.14-3: Air Traffic Patterns*

2 **Threshold:** *The project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.*

3
4 1. Project Impacts:

5 The closest municipal airport to the Project is the French Valley Airport, located
6 approximately three (3) miles northwest of the project boundary. The Project is
7 outside of the French Valley Airport's zone of influence, and would not result in a
8 change in the air traffic patterns for French Valley Airport. The Project area has
9 one or more small private airstrips or heliports that would not be affected by the
10 Plan, in terms of changing air traffic activity levels. Hot air balloon rides takes
11 place within the Project's area, however, the Project will not increase the use of the
12 balloons beyond what is currently contemplated in the County's General Plan.

13 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following environmental
14 impacts associated with the Wine Country Community Plan are potentially significant unless otherwise
15 indicated, but each of these impacts will be avoided or substantially lessened to a level of less than
16 significant by the identified existing regulations, Project Design Features or mitigation measures
17 specified in the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program which is incorporated herein by
18 this reference. Accordingly, the County makes the following finding as to each of the following impacts
19 pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a): "Changes or alterations have been required in, or
20 incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as
21 identified in the final EIR."

22 A. Aesthetics/Light & Glare

23 *Impact 4.1-1: Scenic Highways and Scenic Resources*

24 **Threshold:** *Construction and implementation of the Project would not result in impacts*
25 *to a scenic highway corridor or substantially damage scenic resources, including through*
26 *the degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site, with the*
27 *implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B",*
28 *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

1 1. Impacts:

2 SR-79, which runs east to west through the southern portion of the Project area, is a
3 County Eligible Scenic Highway and may one day be designated as a State Scenic
4 Highway. The construction of buildings, fencing, signage, and lighting could
5 detract from the scenic country feel for travelers using this highway.

6 Operational impacts will mainly be associated with the change in visual character
7 of the Project area resulting from implementing projects associated with new
8 wineries and equestrian uses on vacant/ agricultural lands and/or the expansion of
9 existing uses (i.e., wineries, equestrian facilities, single-family homes).

10 Construction activities will comply with applicable County policies and standard
11 conditions, as well as the mitigation measures from General Plan EIR No. 441.

12 Additionally, the approved Project, while allowing Wine Hotels to have three (3)
13 habitable stories for terraced designs, it maintains the overall building height
14 limitation to 40 feet. Based on the above, and even with the implementation of the
15 Temecula Valley Wine Country Design Guidelines and Temecula Valley Wine
16 Country Sign Program, potential visual impacts from construction and
17 implementation of future projects within the Project area could occur.

18 2. Mitigation:

19 These above impacts would be reduced to less than significant through Mitigation
20 Measures AES-1 and AES-2. Mitigation Measure AES-1 requires the County
21 shall to work with utility and infrastructure providers to make sure that all sewer,
22 water, and storm drain infrastructure improvements located along the Highway 79
23 South corridor do not significantly detract from the scenic quality of this area, or
24 affect the County's ability to designate this roadway as a County Scenic Highway
25 at a later date. Mitigation Measure AES-2 requires all implementing projects to
26 provide signage plans to ensure that signage does not obstruct or degrade scenic
27 vistas or views, or result in the creation of public views that are aesthetically
28 offensive – thus preserving the existing visual character and quality of future

1 development sites to the fullest extent feasible. The Wine Country Design
2 Guidelines – which includes a signage plan – sets out performance standards and
3 examples of acceptable and unacceptable signage for future implementing projects.
4 In addition, the approved Project imposed further restrictions on Class V Wineries
5 by a requiring a Conditional Use Permit. Additionally, a 3rd habitable story was
6 allowed for Wine Country Hotels only if the hotel included a split-level or terraced
7 design that conformed to the natural topography with slopes of 10% or greater and
8 no more than two habitable stories are visible from a road way. Current C/V Policy
9 Area zoning allows for three-story hotels. Therefore, with the implementation of
10 mitigation, the Project will not result in any potentially significant environmental
11 impacts.

12
13 *Impact 4.1-3: Other Lighting Issues*

14 **Threshold:** *Construction and implementation of the Project would not result in impacts*
15 *to surrounding uses due to light and glare, or expose residential property to unacceptable*
16 *light levels during construction with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to*
17 *Project Resolution Attachment “B”, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

18 3. Impacts:

19 Implementation of the Project could increase the effects of light and glare upon
20 existing day or nighttime views by introducing development into previously
21 undeveloped areas. Construction and infrastructure-related lighting impacts will
22 not be significant due to their short-term natures and underground locations,
23 respectively, and the application of requirements already imposed under Riverside
24 County’s existing ordinances and policies. However, operational lighting impacts
25 could be potentially significant unless limited by a Mitigation Measure.

26 4. Mitigation:

27 Mitigation Measure AES-3 requires all implementing projects to provide lighting
28 plans to ensure that proposed lighting does not create new sources of substantial
light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views or expose

1 residential properties to unacceptable light levels. The Wine Country Design
2 Guidelines – which includes requirements for lighting – sets out performance
3 standards and examples of lighting requirements that must be met as part of any
4 future lighting plan. As examples, the Design Guidelines require that all lighting
5 be directed downwards, and limited to the minimum number of fixtures necessary.
6 Therefore, with the implementation of mitigation, the Project will not result in any
7 potentially significant environmental impacts.

8 B. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

9 *Impact 4.2-2: Encroachment and Conflicts with Existing Agriculture*

10 **Threshold:** *Implementation of the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for*
11 *agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract with the implementation of mitigation*
12 *measures, nor would it involve other changes to the environment which, due to their*
13 *location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses (refer*
to Project Resolution Attachment “B”, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).

14 1. Impacts:

15 The Project establishes new General Plan policies for the 17,910-acre area to, in
16 large part, preserve and protect the agricultural value of the Temecula Valley Wine
17 Country. The Project establishes 9,734 acres of Winery Districts, in addition to
18 establishing 75% vineyard set-asides for Clustered Subdivisions and Wineries
19 within the Residential District and a 75% vineyard set-aside for Wineries within the
20 Equestrian District. Additionally, and although the Project does not require the
21 cancellation of any Williamson Act contracts, it is possible that future
22 implementing projects may propose development inconsistent with existing
23 Williams Act contracts.

24 2. Mitigation:

25 The Project includes a general plan amendment, zoning ordinance amendment, and
26 design guidelines with the purpose of reducing/ eliminating land use and zoning
27 conflicts. Through the zoning ordinance amendment, four new zoning
28

1 classifications would be established. At the time a development proposal for an
2 implementing project is submitted to the County, the project would be
3 required to conform to its new corresponding zoning classification.

4 Adherence to existing programs, ordinances and General Plan policies would
5 ensure that impacts associated with the Project remain less than significant.
6 Implementing projects proposed within the Project area will also require individual
7 site-specific CEQA analysis at a later date to evaluate potential project-specific
8 impacts. In addition, in order ensure that conflicts do not occur with respect to
9 Williamson Act Land Conservation Contract, Mitigation Measure AG-1 requires
10 all implementing projects within an agricultural preserve to cancel the applicable
11 contract where incidental commercial uses are proposed within the Equestrian or
12 Winery Districts or where clustered lots are proposed in the Residential District,
13 and further requires all implementing projects to diminish or disestablish the
14 subject site from the boundaries of such agricultural preserve prior to issuance of a
15 grading permit for any of these uses.

16 Therefore, the Project resolves any agricultural land use and zoning issues through
17 the GPA and Zoning Amendment, and because the Mitigation Measure AG-1
18 requires that all Williamson Act conflicts be resolved before the development of a
19 site-specific uses, less than significant impacts related to existing zoning for
20 agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts would occur.

21 C. Air Quality

22 *Impact 4.3-1: Air Quality Management Plan*

23 ***Threshold:*** *Implementation of the Project would not conflict with or obstruct*
24 *implementation of the applicable air quality plan with the implementation of mitigation*
25 *measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and*
26 *Reporting Program).*

27 1. Impacts:

1 The improvements planned under the Project would serve to accommodate
2 anticipated growth within the County of Riverside and southern California.
3 Specifically, the Project contains land use planning policies and programs designed
4 to comply with the implementation of all applicable air quality plans. In addition,
5 the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has regulatory authority over motor
6 vehicle emissions, and the South Coast Air Quality Management District
7 (SCAQMD) has regulatory authority over stationary source emissions and is
8 empowered to enact regulations toward implementing the South Coast Air Basin's
9 Air Quality Management Plan. The Project is consistent with overall land use
10 density contained in the current County General Plan (actually representing a
11 substantial reduction in density that is allowed under current zoning, as discussed
12 below and in DEIR Section 6, Alternatives), and is therefore consistent with
13 regional growth planning by CARB and SCAQMD. Therefore, the Project will
14 result in less than significant impact with mitigation with respect to clean air
15 attainment plans. Although the Project's accommodation of growth and provision
16 of jobs is consistent with the applicable Air Quality Management Plan, the
17 Project's implementing projects will increase vehicle miles traveled as they will
18 bring in more tourism, employment, and residential land uses to the area. The
19 emissions resulting from this increase in VMT could be potentially significant,
20 such that mitigation is required to ensure consistency with the Air Quality
21 Management Plan's requirements.

22 2. Mitigation:

23 Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-7 will reduce vehicle miles traveled and
24 the resultant air emissions, as well as furthering compliance with the other
25 applicable air quality management and attainment plans. Specifically, Mitigation
26 Measures AQ-1 through AQ-4 will reduce VMT by taking cars off the road and
27 making it convenient and easy for workers and residents to travel within Wine
28 Country via trails, bikeways, on-horseback, and through carpooling, vanpooling

1 and other ride-share options. Mitigation Measures AQ-4, AQ-5, and AQ-7 will
2 further reduce emission from VMT by providing incentives to use alternative-fuel
3 vehicles, providing infrastructure to service those vehicles throughout wine
4 country, and by working with wine growers and local transit providers to make
5 mass transit services available to those who live and work in wine country. Finally,
6 Mitigation Measure AQ-6 will reduce emissions by imposing idling restrictions on
7 heavy duty diesel trucks who visit Wine Country.

8 D. Biological Resources

9 *Impact 4.4-1: Conflict with any Conservation Plan*

10 **Threshold:** *The Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat*
11 *Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local,*
12 *regional, or state conservation plan with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer*
13 *to Project Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

14 1. Impacts:

15 The Project is located within the MSHCP and contains 34 criteria cells.
16 Implementing projects within criteria cells must undergo the HANS process to
17 determine if the development will be consistent with the conservation requirements
18 of the MSHCP. Implementing projects outside criteria cells may still require habitat
19 assessments and focused surveys to verify the biological resources within the area
20 proposed for development and to ensure that these resources would not be impacted
21 as a result of the proposed development. Absent confirmation that site-specific
22 implementing projects comply with the MSHCP and other biological requirements,
23 a potential conflict with plans that protect biological resources could occur.

24 2. Mitigation:

25 Discretionary implementing projects, or those projects that wish to benefit from the
26 provisions of the Wine Country Community Plan, would be required to obtain a
27 change of zone. Pursuant to Mitigation Measure LU-1, a project specific CEQA
28 analysis would be required during the review process for such change of zone,

1 which would include any necessary studies for biological resources. Depending
2 upon the location of the implementing project, Planning staff shall recommend that
3 a restrictive zoning classification (such as an open space zone) be placed on areas
4 where sensitive resources require protection. Therefore, implementation of the
5 above Mitigation Measure will reduce any potentially significant impacts with
6 regard to consistency with biology resource plans to less than significant levels.

7
8 *Impact 4.4-5: Adverse Effect on Riparian or Sensitive Natural Communities*

9 **Threshold:** *The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian*
10 *habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies,*
11 *regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife*
Service with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution
Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).

12 3. Impacts:

13 The Project area includes a variety of riparian and sensitive habitats, including
14 streams, vernal pools, and riparian and riverine areas. Individual, site-specific
15 implementing projects could have potential impacts with respect to riparian habitat
16 or other sensitive natural communities.

17 4. Mitigation:

18 Discretionary implementing projects, or those projects that wish to benefit from the
19 provisions of the Wine Country Community Plan, would be required to obtain a
20 change of zone. Pursuant to Mitigation Measure LU-1, a project specific CEQA
21 analysis would be required during the review process for such change of zone,
22 which would include any necessary studies for biological resources. Depending
23 upon the location of the implementing project, Planning staff shall recommend that
24 a restrictive zoning classification (such as an open space zone) be placed on areas
25 where sensitive resources require protection. Therefore, implementation of the
26 above Mitigation Measure will reduce any potentially significant impacts with
27 regard to consistency with biology resource plans to less than significant levels.

28 E. Cultural Resources

1 *Impact 4.5-1: Historical Resources*

2
3 **Threshold:** *Construction of the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in*
4 *the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 with the*
5 *implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B",*
6 *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 1. Impacts:

22 While substantial historical resources exist in the vicinity of the Project area, no
23 known historical-era resources are identified within the boundaries of the Project.

24 The existing structures and facilities within the Project area are less than 50 years
25 of age and do not meet the established criteria for historical landmarks or historic
26 resources pursuant to federal, State, or County criteria at this time. However, over
27 the life of the Project, original structures and features associated with winery and
28 equestrian uses or other potentially significant structures and sites, may attain
historic status, or become eligible for historic status. Portions of the original Wolf
Ranch and Vail Ranch are included in the Project area, and there is potential for
historic artifacts associated with these ranches, or the ranchos that preceded them,
to be unearthed within the Project area.

Ground-disturbing activities associated with implementing projects within the
Project area could unearth previously unknown historic resources, including
historic infrastructure or buried resources.

2. Mitigation:

Mitigation Measures CUL-1, and CUL-2 would ensure that impacts are reduced to
a level of less than significant. Mitigation Measure CUL-1- specifies procedures
and requirements for archeological field surveys, studies, monitoring and tribal
consultation to ensure that the potential presence of significant of historical
resources, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines is properly
evaluated for implementing projects before any discretionary project approval is
granted by the County. Mitigation Measure CUL-2 addresses instances where

1 previously unknown cultural resources are identified during grading activities,
2 including requirements and procedures for the evaluation, treatment and disposition
3 of artifacts found on a project site to ensure that the viability of such artifacts is not
4 compromised. With the implementation of these mitigation measures, potential
5 impacts to historic resources would be less than significant.
6

7 *Impact 4.5-2: Archaeological Resources*

8 **Threshold:** *Construction of the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in*
9 *the significance of an archaeological resource with the implementation of mitigation*
10 *measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and*
11 *Reporting Program).*

12 3. Impacts:

13 Adoption of the Project could facilitate development that has the potential to
14 disturb or destroy archaeological resources, and thus the Project could indirectly
15 result in impacts to these resources. Although the County has complied with
16 Traditional Tribal Cultural Places Law ("Senate Bill 18") as defined in California
17 Government Code 65352 and other analysis and notification requirements
18 concerning the identification of archeological resources, there remains a possibility
19 that unanticipated discoveries will be made during actual construction.
20 Accordingly, mitigation is required.

21 4. Mitigation:

22 Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 provide protection these resources as
23 discussed under Impact 4.5-1, above. Additionally, Mitigation Measure LU-1
24 requires surveys and site-specific studies be completed as part of the review of
25 future implementing projects. With implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-
26 1, CUL-2, and LU-1, the County's extensive development review process,
27 mandatory CEQA statutes, compliance with "Senate Bill 18", and other regulation
28 identified above, future implementing projects allowed pursuant to the Project are
anticipated to result in less than significant impacts.

1 *Impact 4.5-3: Human Remains*

2 **Threshold:** *Construction of the Project would not disturb any human remains;*
3 *including those interned outside of formal cemeteries with the implementation of*
4 *mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring*
and Reporting Program).

5 5. Impacts:

6 The Project area has a long history of occupation by Native American peoples and
7 may include areas of prehistoric habitation where human remains may have been
8 interred. Ground-disturbing activities in the Plan area such as grading, excavation,
9 or tilling have the potential to disturb as yet unidentified human remains.

10 6. Mitigation:

11 As set forth in Mitigation Measure CUL-3, if human remains are found, those
12 remains would require proper treatment in accordance with applicable laws. State
13 of California Public Resources Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5-7055
14 describes the general provisions for treatment of human remains. Specifically,
15 Health and safety Code Section 7050.5 prescribes the requirements for the
16 treatment of any human remains that are accidentally discovered during excavation
17 of a site. As required by State law, the procedures set forth in Public Resources
18 Code Section 5087.98 would be implemented, including evaluation by the County
19 Coroner and notification of the Native American Heritage Commission.
20 Compliance with State regulations as required by Mitigation Measure CUL-3
21 would ensure that impacts in this regard would be less than significant and no
22 additional mitigation measures are required.

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

26 F. Paleontological Resources

27 *Impact 4.5-4: Paleontological Resources*

1 **Threshold:** *Construction of the Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique*
2 *paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature with the implementation of*
3 *mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring*
4 *and Reporting Program).*

5 1. Impacts:

6 The County's General Plan identified the Project area as an area with high
7 sensitivity for the presence of paleontological resources. Additionally, significant
8 resources have been uncovered within or abutting the Project area. Implementing
9 projects facilitated by the Project could indirectly result in ground-disturbing
10 activities, including excavation for site development, grading, and trenching.
11 Given the underlying geology of the area, such excavation required for
12 implementing projects could result in disturbance or destruction of paleontological
13 resources. In addition, maintenance activities associated with future infrastructure
14 installed to support implementing projects facilitated by the Project could result in
15 additional ground-disturbing activities such as additional excavation that could
16 result in the disturbance or destruction of paleontological resources. The Project is
17 required to comply with existing policies and regulations intended to protect the
18 integrity of paleontological resources. These policies and regulations correspond to
19 policies contained in the County's General Plan and would be applied to all
20 implementing projects, both public and private, that could arise out of the adoption
21 of the proposed Project. Nonetheless, mitigation is required to ensure that any
22 potentially significant impacts are reduced to a level of less than significant.

23 2. Mitigation:

24 Mitigation Measure CUL-4 specifies procedures and requirements for
25 paleontological field surveys, studies and monitoring to ensure that the potential
26 presence of significant of paleontological resources are properly evaluated for
27 implementing projects before any discretionary project approval is granted by the
28 County. Mitigation Measure CUL-5 addresses instances where previously unknown
 paleontological resources are identified during grading activities, including

1 requirements and procedures for the evaluation, treatment and disposition of
2 artifacts found on a project site to ensure that the viability of such artifacts is not
3 compromised. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-4 and CUL-5 would
4 ensure impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.

5 3. Cultural Resources Cumulative Impacts:

6 Future implementing projects facilitated by the Project within the Project area
7 boundaries would likely involve grading, tilling, subsurface excavation, and other
8 ground-disturbing activities that may uncover cultural resources. However, each
9 such project would be subject to applicable federal, state, and local laws
10 protecting Native American archaeological and historical resources such that
11 significant resources, if any, would be preserved through avoidance or
12 preservation to the fullest extent feasible. Nonetheless, mitigation is required to
13 further reduce any potential cumulative impact.

14 4. Mitigation:

15 Implementation of mitigation measures: CUL-1 which requires all implementing
16 projects to provide archeological field surveys/studies/monitoring as appropriate;
17 CUL-2, which specific requirement if previously unknown unique cultural
18 resources are discovered during grading; and CUL-3, which addresses discovery
19 of previously unknown human remains during grading would further reduce
20 potential cumulative impacts to cultural resources to a less than significant level.

21 5. Paleontological Resources Cumulative Impacts:

22 Future implementing projects facilitated by the Project within the Project area
23 boundaries would likely involve grading, tilling, subsurface excavation, and other
24 ground-disturbing activities that may uncover paleontological resources.
25 However, compliance with existing applicable federal, State, and local laws and
26 regulations protecting paleontological resources basis, will help to ensure that
27 significant resources, if encountered, would be preserved through avoidance or
28 preservation in an appropriate repository or by other appropriate measures.

1 Nonetheless, mitigation is required to further reduce any potential cumulative
2 impact.

3 6. Mitigation:

4 Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-4 requires all implementing projects
5 to provide all necessary and appropriate paleontological field
6 surveys/studies/monitoring which would be required as part of the permitting
7 approval process for individual projects. In addition, Mitigation Measure CUL-5,
8 addresses the discovery during grading activities of previously unknown
9 paleontological resources and specifies requirement and procedures for the
10 evaluation, removal and disposition of such resources. Accordingly, implementing
11 projects facilitated by the proposed Project are not anticipated to result in potential
12 cumulative impacts to paleontological resources within the region.

13 G. Geology, Soils & Seismicity

14 *Impact 4.6-1: Ground Shaking*

15 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not expose people or*
16 *structures to potential substantial adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking with*
17 *the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B",*
18 *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

19 1. Impacts:

20 Implementation of the Project would potentially increase exposure of future
21 development associated with implementing projects within the Project area to
22 damage caused by seismic shaking associated with an earthquake event.

23 Additionally, implementation of the Project would potentially increase exposure of
24 future development associated with implementing projects within the Project area
25 to damage caused by secondary seismic impacts such as ground failure, soil
26 settlement, subsidence or liquefaction during an earthquake associated with an
27 earthquake event.
28

1 The Project area includes slopes that are greater than 15%. Although landslides
2 may occur as the result of seismic activity or other natural processes, the potential
3 for such events can also be increased as the result of human activities such as
4 grading or manufactured slope construction.

5 As identified in the Final Program EIR No. 524, areas subject to subsidence and
6 liquefaction are found within the Project area (Exhibit 4.6-4, *Liquefaction Zones*,
7 and Exhibit 4.6-5, *Subsidence Areas*). Areas subject to landslide hazards are
8 identified on General Plan Figure S-4, *Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map*.

9 All implementing projects would be subject to the provisions of the California
10 Building Standards Code in Title 24, which provides regulations for structural
11 design and construction with regard to seismic safety, as well as local regulations,
12 ordinances, General Plan policies, and standard conditions or requirements.
13 Nonetheless, mitigation is required to ensure that impacts remain less than
14 significant.

15 2. Mitigation:

16 Mitigation measures GEO-1 and LU-1 require implementing projects to prepare a
17 site-specific assessment as determined by the County Geologist to ascertain all site-
18 specific geologic/geotechnical information, including, but not limited to, ground
19 shaking potential, liquefaction potential, fault rupture potential and landslide/slope
20 instability potential. Mitigation measure GEO-1 further requires the assessment and
21 associated report to be prepared by a California-licensed geologist and/or
22 geotechnical engineer which is subject to approval for by the County Geologist.

23 This report shall include site-specific measures such as grading recommendations,
24 foundation design recommendations, slope stability recommendations, and the
25 alternative siting of structures, as appropriate, to reduce the significance of
26 potential geologic and/or geotechnical hazards associated with the proposed
27 implementing project. Compliance with the recommendations in this report would
28 reduce potential damage to structures and loss of life caused by an earthquake, and

1 thus reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Furthermore, and
2 even though the impact is already less than significant with the implementation of
3 GEO-1, mitigation measure GEO-1a was added in response to comments and will
4 further reduce the already insignificant impact by requiring that future
5 developments within the Project area consider retention of topsoil during any
6 grading, so that the topsoil can be re-applied to areas proposed for viticulture
7 production or other agricultural use.

8
9 *Impact 4.6-1: Seismic - Related Ground Failure including Liquefaction*

10 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not expose people or*
11 *structures to potential substantial adverse effects from seismic related ground failure,*
12 *including liquefaction, with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project*
13 *Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

14 *Impact 4.6-3: Landslide, Lateral Spreading, Subsidence, Liquefaction, or Collapse*

15 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not result in a geologic unit*
16 *or soil to become unstable as a result of the project, resulting in on- or off-site landslide,*
17 *lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse with the implementation of*
18 *mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring*
19 *and Reporting Program).*

20 3. Impacts:

21 Implementation of the Project would potentially increase the risk of exposure of
22 persons and property associated with future development within the Project area
23 due to damage caused by hazards such as landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence,
24 liquefaction, or collapse during an earthquake. All implementing projects would be
25 subject to the provisions of the California Building Standards Code in Title 24,
26 which provides regulations for structural design and construction with regard to
27 seismic safety, as well as local regulations, ordinances, General Plan policies, and
28 standard conditions or requirements. This would include compliance with General
Plan Policies S 2.2 through S 2.8 to minimize potential effects of landslides and
rockfalls on new development and/or infrastructure. Nonetheless, mitigation is
required to ensure that impacts remain less than significant.

1 4. Mitigation:

2 As discussed above, compliance with Mitigation Measures GEO-1 and LU-1 and
3 the geotechnical studies they require will reduce damage to structures and loss of
4 life caused by an earthquake. Such conformance would be adequate to ensure that
5 potential impacts from the effects of ground shaking on any habitable structure,
6 critical facility, or other infrastructure would be reduced to less than significant.

7 Similarly, in areas where steep slopes occur that are susceptible to landslide
8 hazards, implementing projects would be required to prepare a site-specific
9 geologic and geotechnical investigation to identify potential impacts and provide
10 recommendations as to slope stability and design requirements to reduce potential
11 hazards resulting from landslides to a less than significant level (Mitigation
12 Measure GEO-1). Accordingly, with the implementation of mitigation, no
13 potentially significant impacts will result.

14 H. Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions

15 *Impact 4.7-2: Consistency with Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations*

16 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not conflict with any*
17 *applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the*
18 *emissions of greenhouse gases with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to*
19 *Project Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

20 1. Impacts:

21 Implementation of numerous policies of the Southwest Area Plan (SWAP) and
22 proposed zoning, the implementing projects would comply with the goals and
23 policies established by AB 32, and would meet or exceed CalGreen requirements
24 for reducing emissions.

25 2. Mitigation:

26 The Project would result in a reduction of 32 percent from "business as usual"
27 (BAU) forecasted emissions levels based on Project build-out conditions, when
28 considering Project Design Features, existing General Plan policies, and EIR

1 Mitigation Measures GHG-1 and GHG-2 and would therefore exceed the BAU
2 threshold, which is 28.5 percent (See Table 4.7.4 of the DEIR). The Project
3 includes a Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Workbook to ensure future
4 implementing projects achieve the desired GHG emission reduction targets. In
5 addition, the CARB and SCAQMD are each empowered to regulate GHG
6 emissions, with CARB playing a major role due to regulating motor vehicle
7 emissions (which account for over 70% of Project GHG emissions), and SCAQMD
8 regulating the region's major stationary sources such as electricity generating
9 stations. Utilities, such as Southern California Edison, are also regulated by CARB
10 to achieve AB32 targets, including a 33% renewable energy portfolio for all
11 electricity generation by 2020. Therefore, Project GHG impacts would be reduced
12 to a less than significant level with respect to GHG-reducing plans, policies, and
13 regulations.

14 I. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

15 *Impact 4.8-1: Transport of Hazardous Materials*

16 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not create a significant*
17 *hazard to the public or the environment with the implementation of mitigation measures as*
18 *a result of routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials (refer to Project*
19 *Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

20 1. Impacts:

21 The Project includes a proposed change in land use policy intended to promote the
22 expansion and co-existence of winery, residential, and equestrian uses within this
23 part of the County. Implementing projects allowed pursuant to the Project would
24 require the use of hazardous materials during construction and operation of
25 facilities. Typical hazardous materials on a construction site include concrete
26 curing compounds, asphalt products, paints, petroleum products from equipment
27 operation and maintenance, and pesticides. Pesticides are substances or mixtures of
28 substances intended for preventing, destroying, repelling or mitigating any pest.

1 The term pesticide also applies to herbicides, fungicides and various other
2 substances used to control pests. Typical hazardous materials found on agricultural
3 sites include Ammonium nitrate and Anhydrous Ammonia fertilizers, pesticides/
4 herbicides/fungicides, and fuels for farm equipment such as diesel fuel, gasoline,
5 and propane. Typical hazards associated with equestrian uses include pesticides,
6 fertilizers, manure, and fuels for machinery. The use of these materials, however,
7 is not anticipated to result in potentially significant impacts regarding the transport
8 of materials because such uses are subject to federal, State, and local regulations,
9 ordinances, General Plan policies, and standard conditions.

10 Moreover, future agricultural, viticulture or winery-related uses would be subject to
11 implementing project site-specific development review pursuant to the County's
12 standard development review process, including detailed development review
13 process as well as site specific CEQA review. Likewise, implementing projects
14 would be subject to the same site- specific/CEQA review, including the potential
15 impacts of proximate agricultural operations on the new implementing project. All
16 implementing projects will be required to comply with federal, state, and local
17 regulations regarding pesticide use for agricultural purposes. The California
18 Environmental Protection Agency Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) is the
19 agency responsible for a statewide pesticide regulatory program and has the
20 authority to oversee, evaluate and improve local pesticide enforcement programs.
21 Impacts regarding pesticide use are anticipated to be less than significant because
22 the DPR scientists perform continuous evaluation and reevaluation of registered
23 pesticides or pesticides being considered for registration. Under California law
24 (statutes of 1969, Chapter 1169) the DPR must eliminate from use any pesticide
25 that endangers the agricultural or nonagricultural environment. The DPR conducts
26 a human health risk assessment to estimate the nature and likelihood of adverse
27 health effects in humans who may be exposed to pesticides now and in the future.
28 The DPR ensures safe pesticide use because of they perform the following actions:

- 1 - Scientific evaluation of products before they can be sold or used.
- 2 - Examination and licensing of individuals and businesses that recommend,
- 3 perform or supervise pest control.
- 4 - Surveillance of products sold in the marketplace to ensure they are registered
- 5 and meet state health, environmental and safety standards.
- 6 - Site specific permitting for the use of certain hazardous pesticides.
- 7 - Full reporting of agricultural pesticide use.
- 8 - Sampling and residue testing of fresh produce.
- 9 - Strict laws, regulations and programs to protect workers and the environment,
- 10 including field inspections and monitoring of air, soil and water.
- 11 - Grants and outreach promoting greater use of pest management strategies that
- 12 lower risks associated with pesticides and reduce pesticide use where possible.
- 13 - Local enforcement agents in all 58 counties that conduct safety inspections and
- 14 investigations. The Riverside County Agricultural Commissioner's Office has 4
- 15 District offices in 4 different regions of Riverside County (Corona District, San
- 16 Jacinto District, Coachella Valley District, and Palo Verde Valley District). The
- 17 Riverside County Pesticide Use Enforcement Work Plan (years 2011 – 2013)
- 18 has been developed using the California Department of Pesticide Regulation
- 19 Enforcement Letter ENF 08-18, *Pesticide Use Enforcement Program Planning*
- 20 *and Evaluation Guidance*. This document is used as guidance to target core
- 21 program priorities and evaluate the County pesticide use enforcement program.
- 22 This document is used by the Agricultural Commissioner to analyze resources
- 23 available to focus on core enforcement programs (restricted materials
- 24 permitting, compliance monitoring and enforcement response) to assure high
- 25 levels of compliance by the regulated community regarding pesticide laws and
- 26 regulations. Riverside County pesticide enforcement program statistics can be
- 27 found in the Pesticide Regulatory Activities Monthly Report and the DPR
- 28 Regulation Pesticide Use Report Database.

1 Pesticide use for agricultural purposes has been ongoing in the Wine Country
2 Community Plan region and pesticides are anticipated to continue to be used in the
3 future with implementing projects. The DPR has been and continues to monitor air,
4 water and fresh produce to find out if there are residues of concern. The DPR also
5 monitors pesticide exposure in the workplace and other settings, investigates and
6 tracks pesticide illness and injury issues, and utilizes local enforcement to ensure
7 laws and regulations are being obeyed. The DPR has a web-based database that is
8 continually updated that includes enforcement actions and penalty actions on
9 noncompliance pesticide use throughout the state. Other Project features that will
10 help reduce impacts in regards to pesticide use is the Wine Country Community
11 Plan area large lot size requirement of 10 acres per dwelling unit (1 acre minimum
12 in clustered development) and the 50 foot minimum structural setback from the lot
13 line requirements, which will create a buffer from pesticides used on an adjacent
14 property. Furthermore, General Plan Land Use Element Policy 23.6 requires that
15 commercial projects abutting residential properties are to protect the residential use
16 from the impacts of noise, light, fumes, odors, vehicular traffic, parking, and
17 operational hazards. Because pesticide use is strictly regulated in California (as
18 noted above), direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts associated with pesticide
19 usage are anticipated to be less than significant.

20 The Environmental Impact Report prepared for the Project is a "Program EIR",
21 which evaluates broad-scale impacts of the Project that can be expected to result
22 from the revision of the General Plan, Zoning Ordinance No. 348, and Design
23 Guidelines pursuant to the Project. The EIR does not and cannot evaluate site
24 specific impacts of each potential individual implementing project, because the
25 location, extent, and timing of individual implementing projects is unknown. Any
26 implementing project will be required to prepare appropriate CEQA compliance
27 documentation in regards to hazards and hazardous materials. However, it is
28 possible that – during construction – unanticipated hazardous materials (such as

1 underground storage tanks) could be encountered. Such unanticipated discoveries
2 could result in potentially significant impacts requiring mitigation.

3 2. Mitigation:

4 Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 specifies the protocols and requirements that must be
5 met in the event of an unanticipated discovery of potentially hazardous materials,
6 and provides the necessary information and guidance to effectively respond and
7 address a release of hazardous materials ensuring limited impact to the
8 environment. Such conformance would be adequate to ensure that potential
9 impacts from the effects of a release of hazardous materials on any habitable
10 structure, critical facility, or other infrastructure would be reduced to less than
11 significant.

12 *Impact 4.8-4: School Safety*

13 ***Threshold:*** *Project construction and implementation would not emit hazardous*
14 *emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within*
15 *one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school with the implementation of mitigation*
16 *(refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting*
Program).

17 3. Impacts:

18 Crowne Hill Elementary School is located within a quarter mile of the Project's
19 Residential District, and one existing private school is located within the Project
20 area. Given that the Project approvals do not authorize any site-specific
21 development, and given that the timing and nature of future implementing projects
22 is unknown, it is possible that the Project could generate construction-related
23 impacts resulting from hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely
24 hazardous materials, substances or wastes within a quarter-mile of a school. Future
25 agricultural, viticulture or winery-related uses would be subject to implementing
26 project site-specific development review pursuant to the County's standard
27 development review process, as modified and expanded through this Project,
28 including a detailed development review process and project-level CEQA review.

1 Likewise implementing project proposals for school expansions or new schools
2 would be subject to the same review process and procedure and would necessarily
3 take into consideration potential impacts from existing proximate land uses,
4 including agricultural operations. Additionally, existing federal, State, and local
5 school district policies and procedures, including the Federal CERCLA Program,
6 Federal RCRA Program, Federal HMTA, State HWCL, State Health and Safety
7 Code, State CCR Titles 22 and 26, and County Ordinance Nos. 615, 651, 718, and
8 348 (refer to Section 4.8.3 above for details regarding these regulations), would
9 minimize risks to school facilities, students, faculty, as well as the general public
10 related potential hazardous materials impacts. Nonetheless, mitigation for potential
11 implementing projects is required.

12 4. Mitigation:

13 As described above, Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 would reduce the potential hazards
14 impacts of unanticipated future discoveries to a less than significant level by
15 specifying the procedures and requirements for the identification and removal of
16 leaking underground storage tanks or other potential environmental concerns.

17 *Impact 4.8-5: Hazardous Material Site*

18 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not create a significant*
19 *hazard to the public or the environment with the implementation of mitigation as a result*
20 *of being included on a list of hazardous materials sites (refer to Project Resolution*
21 *Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

22 5. Impacts:

23 There is one hazardous material site within the Project area (refer to Exhibit 4.8-1
24 *Hazards Material Site*). The Temecula Bomb Target #107 is a 160 acre property
25 acquired by the Navy before October 1945. There is no information available
26 detailing history of the site as a bombing target for rocket firing. The State actively
27 began cleaning the site and disposing of unexploded ordnance on February 15,
28 2007. Development on or near the site could result in a potentially significant

1 hazardous materials impact to the public by exposing the public to unexploded
2 ordnance and other hazards, such that mitigation is required.

3 6. Mitigation:

4 Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-2 through HAZ-3 will ensure that
5 impacts are reduced. These measures require special surveys to be conducted
6 within a one mile radius of the hazardous materials site and prevention of
7 construction activities within the site until the cleanup is complete, and
8 requirements in the event that an unexploded ordnance is encountered during
9 construction activities. Adherence to Mitigation Measures HAZ-2 through HAZ-3
10 will ensure that impacts associated with development of a site identified on a list of
11 hazardous materials sites are less than significant.

12 *Impact 4.8-6: Wildland Fires*

13 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not expose people or*
14 *structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires with the*
15 *implementation of mitigation(refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation*
16 *Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

17 7. Impacts:

18 As shown in Exhibit 4.8-3 of EIR No. 524, *Wildfire Susceptibility*, the northeastern
19 and southern portions of the Project are located in areas with high fire hazard risk.
20 Portions of the Project's Residential and Equestrian Districts are located in high
21 fire hazard areas. This will increase both the number of people and property
22 potentially exposed to fire hazards. Additionally, there is the potential for an
23 increase in the occurrence of fire, particularly in urban-wildland interface areas,
24 due to increasing human encroachment. Accordingly, mitigation is required to
25 reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.
26
27
28

1 8. Mitigation:

2 Implementation of existing laws and regulations in conjunction with Mitigation
3 Measure HAZ-4 will help reduce potential fire safety impacts on land uses within
4 the Project area to less than significant levels.

5 Mitigation Measure HAZ-4 requires the Fire Department to evaluate all
6 implementing projects located within areas of wildfire susceptibility to determine
7 whether the Department's Urban-Wildland Interface requirements should be
8 implemented as part of the development. If the Department determines that either
9 an interim or permanent condition of high fire risk would be present, a Fuel
10 Modification Plan that meets the current requirements of the Fire Department shall
11 be prepared and shall be approved by the Fire Department prior to approval of the
12 implementing project. This will ensure that conditions of high fire risk are abated,
13 such that the risk of wildlands fires is reduced to a level of less than significant.

14 9. Cumulative Impacts:

15 In the case of the Project, hazards within the Project area would be addressed in
16 accordance with their respective applicable regulations, laws, programs, and
17 policies. Based on these existing regulations and guidance, some hazardous
18 conditions cannot be adequately mitigated. To further reduce impacts,
19 implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-4 are required, which
20 reduces impacts associated with Hazards and Hazardous Materials to a less than
21 significant level. As a result, the Project would not be expected to contribute to any
22 new cumulative adverse impacts as a result of implementation of the Project.

23 10. Mitigation:

24 The Project would comply with all federal, State, and local regulations regarding
25 hazardous materials, airports and aircraft hazards, and wildland fires. Therefore,
26 implementation of applicable federal, State, and local regulations, in conjunction
27 with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-4,
28 will reduce potential impacts related to hazardous materials, airport and aircraft

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*

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:

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

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

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

23 6. Mitigation:

24 Adherence to the existing General Plan policies, project design features and
25 mitigation measures HYD-7 through HYD-8 would ensure that impacts associated
26 with the Project remain less than significant. HYD-7 would require all
27 implementing projects within the Murrieta Creek Area Drainage Plan to pay
28 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 **Threshold:** *Project implementation would not conflict with any applicable land use*
10 *plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project with the*
11 *implementation of mitigation (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation*
12 *Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

13 1. Impacts:

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

24 The Project does not change the zoning classifications on individual parcels. The
25 Project only establishes land use development policies that implement the County's
26 goals of preserving and enhancing the viticulture potential, rural lifestyle and
27 equestrian activities within this unique area of the County. The Project's policies
28 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*
Project Resolution Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).

11 1. Impacts:

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

21 2. Mitigation:

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

25 Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the Project area, a park
26 and recreational facilities dedication plan or fee-in-lieu shall be submitted to the
27 County Regional Recreation and Parks District for review and approval (Mitigation
28 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
23 **Threshold:** *Operation of the proposed Project would not result in impacts to landfill*
24 *capacity or violate federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste*
25 *with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment*
26 *"B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

27 7. Impacts:

28 The Southern California Association of Governments projects that Riverside
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 are 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*
Attachment "B", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).

10 3. Impacts:

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

17 4. Mitigation:

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

21 The Project is not anticipated to result in inadequate emergency access or impacts
22 to public transit because Mitigation Measure TR-2 requires site-specific traffic
23 management plans (TMPs) for each individual implementing project at the time of
24 project design to reduce traffic and circulation impacts resulting from construction.
25 Additionally, mitigation measure TRF-5 would reduce programmatic impacts
26 related to emergency service access by requiring that emergency services personal
27 review each implementing project to ensure that proper emergency access is
28 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
5 *Impact 4.14-6: Public Transit*

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

9 5. Impacts:

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

15 6. Mitigation:

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

22 Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

23 The Traffic and Circulation mitigation measures addressed above reduce traffic
24 impacts to less than significant levels because proposed implementing projects
25 shall be required to comply with existing regulations, ordinances and the mitigation
26 measures stated in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
27 TRF-1 through TRF-5. These measures require implementing projects to provide
28 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 (NO_x);
12 Carbon Monoxide (CO); PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}.

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 NO_x
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, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. 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 mobil
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
10 **Threshold:** *Project implementation would result in cumulative impacts associated with*
11 *noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance,*
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
13 *Impact 4.13-4: Libraries*

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

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

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

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