Because construction of the project would be temporary, and the use of heavy-duty diesel equipment during construction would be intermittent, construction-related emissions from the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial emissions of TACs. In addition, the residential, vineyard, winery and resort uses that would occur from project operations would not generate substantial sources of TACs, as those operational emissions are anticipated to be less than the emissions generated during construction. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?

No Impact. The project would develop residential uses, which are considered sensitive receptors. However, the project site is not located within one-mile of an existing substantial point source emitter. Thus, impacts would not occur.

f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

No Impact. According to the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses associated with odor issues include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting activities, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding operations. The proposed project would develop and operate winery, vineyards, resort, and residential uses, which would not involve the types of activities that would emit objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. In addition, odors generated by new and existing land uses are required to be in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent odor nuisances on sensitive land uses, which is provided as PPP AQ-2. Overall, impacts related to odors affecting a substantial number of people would not occur from implementation of the project.

Plans Programs or Policies

The mitigating plans, programs, or policies that are relevant to the proposed project includes the following:

PPP AQ-1: SCAQMD Rule 1113 – Architectural Coatings: No person shall apply or solicit the application of any architectural coating within the SCAQMD with VOC content in excess of the values specified in a table incorporated in the Rule.

PPP AQ-2: SCAQMD Rule 402 – Nuisance: A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property.

PPP AQ-3: SCAQMD Rule 445 – Wood Burning Devices: No wood-burning devices (e.g., fireplaces and woodstoves) shall be permanently installed into any new development.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures that are applicable to the proposed project and will be incorporated in the COAs are as follows:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure AQ-6: The County shall require implementing projects to prohibit idling of on- and off-road heavy-duty diesel vehicles for more than five minutes. This measure shall be implemented by new commercial and industrial projects with loading docks or delivery trucks. Such projects shall be required to post signage at all loading docks and/or delivery areas directing drivers to shut down their trucks after five minutes of idle time. Also, employers who own and operate truck fleets shall be required to inform their drivers of the anti-idling policy.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure AQ-8: The County shall require implementing projects to comply with the following SCAQMD Applicable Rule 403 Measures:

- Apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).
- Water active sites at least three times daily. (locations where grading is to occur will be thoroughly watered prior to earthmoving).
- All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered, or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).
- Pave construction access roads at least 100 feet onto the site from main road.
- Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 mph or less.
- Stockpiled dirt may be covered with a tarp to reduce the need for watering or soil stabilizers.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure AQ-9: The County shall require implementing projects to comply with the following additional SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook Dust Control Measures:

- Revegetate disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
- All excavating and grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.
- All streets shall be swept once a day if visible soil materials are carried to adjacent streets (recommend water sweepers with reclaimed water).
- Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure AQ-10: The County shall require implementing projects to comply with the following Mitigation Measures for Construction Equipment and Vehicles Exhaust Emissions:

- The County shall require implementing projects to select construction equipment to be used on site based on low emission factors (equipment which releases little atmospheric pollutants) and high energy efficiency (equipment which requires less energy to do the same work). Examples of low emission and high energy efficiency equipment include use of EPA Tier 3 (or better) emission compliant construction equipment and use of alternative fueled construction equipment (natural gas), as deemed appropriate by the County during application review.
- The County shall require implementing projects to include a statement on grading plans that all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.
- The County shall require implementing projects to utilize electric- or diesel-powered equipment, in lieu of gasoline-powered engines, as deemed appropriate by the County during application review.
- The County shall require implementing projects to include a statement on grading plans that work crews will shut off equipment when not in use. During smog season (May through October), the overall length of the construction period will be extended, thereby decreasing the size of the area prepared each day, to minimize vehicles and equipment operating at the same time.
- The County shall require implementing projects to time construction activities so as to not interfere with peak hour traffic and minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the site; if necessary, a flag person shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways.
- The County shall require implementing projects to use EPA-rated engines of Tier 3 or better, or prevailing Air Resource Board construction fleet specifications.
- As soon as electric utilities are available at construction sites, the County shall require implementing projects to supply the construction site with electricity from the local utility and all equipment that can be electrically operated shall use the electric utility rather than portable generators, where reasonable and feasible.

- The County shall require implementing projects to retain on site dust generated by the development activities, and keep dust to a minimum by following the dust control measures listed below:

  a) During clearing, grading, earthmoving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day's activities cease.

  b) During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this would require watering at least three times per day which include wetting down such areas in the late morning, mid-day after work is completed for the day, and whenever wind exceeds 15 miles per hour. Soil stabilizers may also be used instead of watering, as deemed appropriate by the County during application review, to comply with County and SCAQMD nuisance and dust regulations.

  c) Immediately after clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation is completed, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be treated until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur.

  d) Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.

  e) Trucks transporting soil, sand, cut or fill materials, and/or construction debris to or from the site shall be tarped/covered from the point of origin.

Completed WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure:

The following WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure that is applicable to the project has been completed as part of this EA/MND:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure AQ-12: Proponents of non-residential implementing projects, or projects larger than 5 acres in total size, shall prepare appropriate air quality studies which demonstrate that emissions resulting from project construction and operation do not result in significant localized impacts, or are mitigated to the extent feasible. The site-specific studies shall utilize SCAQMD's Localized Significance Threshold methodology, as reflected at http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/LSA/LSA.html. This methodology is a guidance document and may be modified for site specific implementing actions as determined appropriate by the County.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project				
7. Wildlife & Vegetation a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a	☐	☒	☐	☐

candidate, sensitive, or special status species, in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U. S. Wildlife Service?				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
f) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☒	☐	☐
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: General Biological Resources Assessment Report, 2018 (BRA 2018), Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation, 2018, (DBESP 2018), and 2016 Burrowing Owl Survey Report (BOUW 2016), which were prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc, included in Appendix B; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?

No Impact. The project site is located within the Western Riverside County Multiple-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), the project site occurs within Subunit 4, Cactus Valley/SWRC-MSR/Johnson Ranch in the Southwest Area Plan. The project site was previously assessed under the approved Owner Initiated Habitat Acquisition and Negotiation Strategy (HANS) No. 00408, which resulted in dedication of 468 acres of the project site to MSHCP conservation that occurred with the previously approved TR34466. Therefore, MSHCP conservation related to development of the project site has already occurred and no additional conservation is required (BRA 2018).

The conservation areas are located adjacent to the north and west of the project site. The addition of this acreage resulted in expansion the Core 6 area. This expanded Core area will contribute to Conservation of species occurring within the Core Areas in Diamond Valley Lake, Lake Skinner, and Johnson Ranch, including mountain lion, bobcat, coastal California gnatcatcher, Quino checkerspot butterfly (QCB) and Stephens' kangaroo rat (SKR). It would also broaden the connection between Johnson Ranch and Lake Skinner. Maintenance of habitat quality and contiguity with adjacent Core Areas is important for these species. In addition, potential impacts related to MSHCP covered species were evaluated pursuant to the requirements of the MSHCP, as described in the responses below. Overall, the proposed project would implement the provisions of, and not conflict with, the MSHCP. Therefore, project impacts related to the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan would not occur.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12); and

c) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U. S. Wildlife Service?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Sensitive Plant Species

The project site is generally comprised of a mix of non-native grassland and Riversidean sage scrub, the majority of which has been subject to historical agricultural uses. As described in the General Biological Resources

Assessment Report (BRA 2018) prepared for the project, onsite habitat assessment surveys were completed for special status plant and animal species known to occur in the region. There is one listed plant species, Munz's onion (*Allium munzii*), with a low potential to occur in the project area. This species is federally listed as endangered and state listed as threatened. However, previous focused plant surveys conducted in 2003 were negative for Munz's onion and this species was not observed during preparation of the 2018 BRA. Thus, special status plant species do not occur on the project site.

One non-listed sensitive plant species (paniculate tarplant [*Deinandra paniculate*]) was observed in scattered patches adjacent to the ephemeral streams in southwestern portion of the project site (BRA 2018). Paniculate tarplant is not a covered species under the MSHCP but is a California Native Plant Society Rank 4.2 species. Species in this category are considered to be of limited distribution and are uncommon enough that their status requires monitoring. However, most of the plants of this rank do not meet the definitions of a Section 1901, Chapter 10 of the Native Plant Protection Act, or Sections 2062 and 2067 of the California Endangered Species Act. In addition, this species has a Global Rank of G4 and State Rank of S4, which identifies that the species as being secure within California (BRA 2018). Furthermore, Paniculate tarplant is relatively common in southern California and is regularly documented in the project region (BRA 2018). The species is being conserved in areas close to the project site, that include lands near Lake Skinner Park, which is approximately 1.0-mile northeast of the site and the Johnson Ranch Preserve, which is approximately 1.0-mile west of the site. Multiple other occurrences are reported in the region, including those at Skunk Hollow Preserve and Lake Skinner Reserve Area, among others (BRA 2018).

The General Biological Resources Assessment Report (BRA 2018) prepared for the project determined that potential project related impacts to paniculate tarplant would be less than significant due to the low number of individuals that exist, their location onsite, and the species' current conservation status in the region. Thus, potential impacts related to paniculate tarplant, and sensitive plant species, would be less than significant.

Sensitive Wildlife Species

Sensitive Listed Wildlife Species. The following listed species have the potential to occur on the project site. However, with compliance to existing MSCHP regulations, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level, as described below (BRA 2018):

- The Quino checkerspot butterfly (QCB) was observed on the western edge of the project site. However, the majority of the property is comprised of grasslands that are not habitat for QCB. The project site and the 468 acres of lands that were dedicated to MSHCP conservation, (pursuant to HANS No. 00408) do include potential QCB habitat. The preservation of the conservation area pursuant to HANS No. 00408 and payment of the MSHCP development fees (included as PPP-BIO-1) would reduce potential impacts to QCB to a less than significant level.

- The Stephens' kangaroo rat has moderate to high potential to occur onsite, although a large portion of the grassland has dense cover. However, impacts related to SKR were implemented through conservation of the MSHCP lands pursuant to HANS No. 00408. In addition, compliance with the MSHCP and payment of the MSHCP and SKR development fees, included as PPP-BIO-1, would reduce potential impacts related to SKR to a less than significant level.

- The Least Bell's Vireo (LBV) has a low potential to occur on the project site because it does not include typical LBV habitat. Due to lack of habitat, onsite impacts related to LBV would be less than significant with compliance with the MSHCP and payment of the MSHCP development fees, included as PPP-BIO-1. In addition, based on the marginal quality of the off-site southern willow scrub habitat east of Warren Road, LBV have only a low potential to occur and no off-site direct impacts are anticipated. Potential impacts to LBV are fully covered by compliance with the MSHCP and payment of the MSHCP development fees. Nevertheless, updated 2018 protocol-level surveys for LBV occured in April through June 2018, which confirmed no LBV. In addition, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 requires pre-construction nesting bird surveys if construction occurs during the breeding season. Thus, with implementation of PPP BIO-1 and Mitigation Measure BIO-1 impacts to LBV would not occur.

- The coastal California gnatcatcher has a moderate potential to occur onsite. However, the site does not contain habitat to support a gnatcatcher breeding territory, and the species is not anticipated to breed

onsite. Due to the lack of breeding habitat, impacts would be less than significant with compliance with the MSHCP and payment of the MSHCP development fees, included as PPP BIO-1.

- The Swainson's hawk has a low potential to occur on site (BRA 2018). This species is only known to occur in Riverside County for short periods as it migrates through the region from wintering to breeding grounds. Thus, potential impacts to Swainson's hawk would be less than significant and are also covered by compliance with the MSHCP.

As further described below in response 7e), the project site includes 4.05 acres of streambed and riparian habitat. Although these riparian/riverine areas exist on site they are not suitable for fairy shrimp. The General Biological Resources Assessment Report describes that no suitable habitat for fairy shrimp occurs on the project site due to lack of vernal pools, non-vernal pool features (e.g., depressions, road ruts, etc.), evidence of prolonged standing water (e.g., soil cracks, water marks, hydrophytic vegetation, etc.), associated soils mapped in flat landscape positions (e.g., clay soils on flat land that does not drain), and evidence of underlying hard pan.

Sensitive Non-Listed Wildlife Species. The General Biological Resources Assessment Report (BRA 2018) describes that the site contains potential burrowing owl habitat. The burrowing owl is an MSHCP Covered Species; and the project site was surveyed pursuant to the Burrowing Owl Survey Instructions for the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Area (County 2006). The surveys identified 3 unpaired burrowing owls on the site, and additional burrows that had potential to be used by burrowing owls throughout the project site. As a result, impacts could occur to individuals and/or occupied burrows during project construction. Therefore, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 has been included to require pre-construction surveys and, if necessary, relocation and monitoring in coordination with the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA), USFWS, and CDFW. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2, impacts related to burrowing owl would be less than significant.

In addition, the following sensitive non-listed bird species also have the potential to occur onsite: coopers hawk, loggerhead shrike, yellow warbler, and white tailed kite. Potential impacts related to these sensitive bird species could occur if they are nesting in the project area during construction activities. To avoid potential impacts, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would be implemented to require pre-construction surveys and avoidance of nesting birds. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 impacts related to sensitive non-listed bird species would be less than significant.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Wildlife corridors are linear features that connect areas of open space and provide avenues for the migration of animals and access to additional areas of foraging. The project site consists of an open space area, which is adjacent to the 575-acre HANS No. 00408 MSHCP conservation area that expanded the Core 6 area. The project site does not include such a linear connective feature, nor a specific wildlife corridor. Thus, impacts related to a wildlife corridor or connective feature would not occur from implementation of the project. Conversely, the expanded core area would allow for continued movement of native resident and migratory species within the open space areas that surround the project area. It would also broaden the connection between Johnson Ranch and Lake Skinner (BRA 2018). Thus, the proposed project's impacts related to movement of native resident species would be less than significant.

The project site has the potential to support birds that are subject to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Disturbance to or destruction of migratory bird eggs, young, or adults is in violation of the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code. If construction of the proposed project occurs during the general bird breeding season, which for this project is defined as January 15 to September 15 to account for LBV nesting season, then pre-construction surveys and avoidance of nesting birds will be required pursuant to Mitigation Measure BIO-1. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 impacts related to native wildlife nursery sites would be less than significant.

e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site is generally comprised of a mix of non-native grassland and Riversidean sage scrub, the majority of which has been subject to historical agricultural uses. Impacts to the non-native grassland and Riversidean sage scrub have previously been mitigated to a less than significant level through conservation of the adjacent 575-acres of land pursuant to HANS No. 00408. In addition, tributaries of Santa Gertrudis Creek cross the project area at 13 locations. The project site includes 4.05 acres of streambed and riparian habitat subject to CDFW jurisdiction, which is comprised of 0.49-acre southern willow scrub, 0.69-acre southern riparian woodland (including 0.10 acre of existing disturbed area), 0.71-acre alkali marsh, 0.18-acre disturbed wetland, 1.62-acres streambed (including 1.16-acres ephemeral and 0.09-acre intermittent), and 0.36-acre round-bottom swale (Table BIO-1). No vernal pool habitat occurs in the project area (DBESP 2018).

The project design is focused on maximum avoidance of the riparian/riverine areas by providing setbacks from development areas that range from 50 feet, to over 200 feet. Additionally, roadways that are proposed to cross riparian/riverine areas would be done by installations of culverts at small road crossings to convey water at grade from one side of the road to the other, and arch-spanned roadways at larger crossings locations that would maintain the soft bottom of the watercourse and the existing flow patterns. Of 4.05 acres of riparian/riverine area, 3.74 acres would be avoided and/or restored and preserved, as shown in Table BIO-1. However, the project would result in 0.02 acre of temporary impacts and 0.29 acre of permanent impacts that are described below (DBESP 2018, BRA 2018).

Table BIO-1: CDFW Jurisdictional and Riparian/Riverine Areas

Habitat	Existing Acres[1]	Impacted Acres
Southern willow scrub	0.49	0
Southern riparian woodland (including disturbed)	0.69	0
Alkali Marsh	0.71	0
Disturbed Wetland	0.18	0
Streambed	1.62	0.20 permanent
Round-Bottom Swale	0.36	0.09 permanent 0.02 temporary
Total	**4.05**	**0.29 permanent** **0.02 temporary**

[1]Rounded to nearest one-hundredth.
Source: DBESP 2018

Construction/Temporary Impacts. Existing RQWCB and County regulations, and WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-3 require the project to implement a project specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be developed by a QSD (Qualified SWPPP Developer) and implemented during construction activities to reduce the velocity of runoff and reduce the potential for pollutants to leave construction areas. In addition, Mitigation Measure BIO-3 has been included to require that the SWPPP include that prior to construction, the avoided Riparian/Riverine Areas and their associated buffers would be delineated on construction drawings as environmentally sensitive areas with notes for restricting construction activities from the areas. Temporary construction snow fence and silt fence would be placed around the perimeter of the avoided riparian/riverine areas. The temporary fencing would remain in place during the construction unless otherwise replaced by permanent fencing that provides the same level of protection to the riparian/riverine area.

As shown in Table BIO-1, construction would result in temporary impacts to 0.02 acre to round-bottom swale where arch culverts are installed to span existing swales and retain earthen channel and flow characteristics. As a result, Mitigation Measure BIO-4 is provided to provide re-establishment, rehabilitation, and enhancement of the area impacted during construction. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4, construction impacts related to riparian/riverine areas would be less than significant.

Operation/Permanent Impacts. Also, as shown in Table BIO-1, permanent impacts would consist of 0.2-acre of ephemeral streambed and 0.9-acre of round-bottom swale. Thus, Mitigation Measure BIO-4 requires a

combination of on- and/or off-site establishment/re-establishment, rehabilitation, enhancement, and/or preservation. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4, permanent impacts related to riparian/riverine areas would be less than significant.

f) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As described in the previous response, the proposed onsite roadways would cross water courses at 13 locations. The project would install culverts at small crossings to convey water at grade from one side of the road to the other. Larger crossings would consist of an arched roadway that would maintain the soft bottom of the watercourse and the existing flow patterns. The project would avoid 1.12 acres (97 percent) of the waters of the U.S., however, it would result in permanent impacts to 0.3 acre of non-wetland waters of the U.S. No temporary impacts to waters of the U.S. would occur.

As a result, the project would require a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit from the USACE and a Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification from the RWQCB, and a Notification of Lake and Streambed Alteration from the CDFW and, if required by CDFW, a Streambed Alteration Agreement. These permits are listed as project requirements under PPP BIO-2. In addition, Mitigation Measure BIO-4 is provided to reduce the loss of this non-wetland habitat through a combination of on- and/or off-site establishment/re-establishment, rehabilitation, enhancement, and/or preservation. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4, impacts related to non-wetland habitat areas would be less than significant.

g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No Impact. The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances. The County of Riverside has two tree management ordinances; one which manages the removal of oak trees, and the other that manages the removal of trees above 5,000 feet in elevation. The project site does not contain any oak trees and the site is between 1,440 and 1,600 feet above sea level. Thus, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Plans Programs or Policies

The mitigating plans, programs, or policies that are relevant to the proposed project includes the following:

PPP BIO-1: Payment of MSHCP and Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Fees. The applicant shall pay MSHCP and SKR Local Development Mitigation fees as determined by the County and the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA).

PPP BIO-2: Agency Permitting. The project would require a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit from the USACE, a Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification from the RWQCB, a Notification of Lake and Streambed Alteration from the CDFW and, if required by CDFW, a Streambed Alteration Agreement.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure that is applicable to the proposed project is the following:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-3: Prior to issuance of grading permits, implementing projects shall prepare the necessary Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) and comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Storm Water Permit from the State Water Resources Control Board.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Pre-Construction Nesting Bird Survey and Avoidance. Vegetation clearing should be conducted outside the nesting season, which is generally defined as January 15 to August 31. If vegetation

clearing must take place during the nesting season, a qualified biologist shall be retained to perform a pre-construction survey for nesting birds, including raptors. A pre-construction nesting bird survey would not be required unless direct impacts to vegetation are proposed to occur. The nesting bird survey shall occur no more than 7 days prior to vegetation removal. If active bird nests are confirmed to be present during the pre-construction survey, temporary avoidance of the nests shall be required until a qualified biologist has verified that the young have fledged or the nest has otherwise become inactive.

The pre-construction survey shall include the off-site Warren Road demolition and re-establishment mitigation component of the project, which is conceptually planned to occur to the immediate east of the site and adjacent to areas where nesting birds, including sensitive species such as the least Bell's vireo (LBV), have potential to occur. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted in this off-site area regardless of whether direct impacts to vegetation are proposed occur and shall be conducted no more than 7 days prior to the initiation of component activities. Similarly, if active bird nests belonging to non-sensitive bird species are confirmed to be present during the pre-construction survey, temporary avoidance of the nests shall be required until a qualified biologist has verified that the young have fledged or the nest has otherwise become inactive. If active bird nests belonging to the LBV or other sensitive bird species are confirmed, the nest sites shall be avoided, with a 500-foot avoidance buffer, until September 15 or until a qualified biologist determines that the nest is no longer active, whichever occurs first.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Pre-Construction Burrowing Owl Survey and Avoidance. Within 30 days prior to initiating ground-disturbance activities, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to complete a pre-construction take avoidance survey in accordance with the MSHCP. If the take avoidance survey is negative and burrowing owls are confirmed to be absent, then ground-disturbing activities shall be allowed to commence, and no further mitigation would be required.

If the survey is positive and burrowing owls are confirmed to be present, then the project applicant shall consult with the CDFW and prepare and implement a project specific burrowing owl mitigation plan. The plan shall be reviewed and approved by the CDFW. To avoid take, any impacted individuals shall be relocated outside of the impact area by a qualified biologist and in consultation with CDFW using passive relocation methodologies and the off-site lands managed by the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) and already conserved under HANS No. 00408 to the immediate north and west of the project site, unless otherwise required by CDFW.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Riparian/Riverine Area Avoidance. The project's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) shall require that prior to construction, the avoided Riparian/Riverine Areas will be delineated on construction drawings as environmentally sensitive areas with notes for restricting construction activities from the areas. Temporary construction snow fence and silt fence will be placed around the perimeter of the avoided riparian/riverine areas. The temporary fencing will remain in place during the construction, unless otherwise replaced by permanent fencing that provides the same level of riparian/riverine protection.

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Compensatory Mitigation for Riparian/Riverine Areas. The project plans, and permits for any construction, grading, or grubbing activities, shall include the following measures to offset the temporary loss of 0.02 acre and permanent loss of 0.29 acre of riparian/riverine areas on the site and provide for biologically equivalent or superior preservation:

1. Preservation of project open space area that includes a total of 4.44 acres of riparian/riverine areas and adjacent uplands;
2. Establishment of a protective instrument, such as a restrictive covenant or conservation easement, over the open space containing the riparian/riverine areas;
3. Installation of fencing and signage to protect the open space containing the riparian/riverine areas;
4. Restoration of 0.02 acre temporarily impacted riparian/riverine areas at proposed roadway crossings through the construction of arched culverts to retain earthen streambed functions equivalent or superior to the existing earthen streambeds;
5. Re-establishment of a minimum 0.29 acre of riparian/riverine areas through the removal of an undergrounded pipeline to daylight and restore a historic reach of Santa Gertrudis Creek;

6. Re-establishment of a minimum 0.29 acre of riparian/riverine areas through removal of a section of Warren Road and adjacent uplands to restore an unnamed tributary to Santa Gertrudis Creek;
7. Restoration and rehabilitation of a minimum 0.29 acre of existing riparian/riverine areas through removal of non-natives and planting native riparian and wetland habitat within existing Riparian/Riverine Areas;
8. Preparation of a Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) for CDFW approval, which is forthcoming, outlining the proposed treatments for re-establishment, restoration, and rehabilitation, success criteria, and maintenance and monitoring requirements;
9. Active management of the open space containing the riparian/riverine areas in perpetuity, including preparation of a Property Analysis Record (PAR) or PAR-like cost estimate for CDFW approval, Long-term Management Plan for CDFW approval, and annual monitoring and reporting to CDFW – alternatively, the open space shall be conveyed to the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) and managed in conjunction with the existing conserved lands to the immediate north and west of the project site; and
10. Provision of a non-wasting endowment to fund long-term management according to the CDFW-approved PAR and Long-term Management Plan – alternatively, if open space conveyance to the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) is selected, funding shall be provided to the RCA in a reasonable amount necessary determined in consultation with RCA and CDFW to supplement existing funding for the management of the conserved lands to the immediate north and west of the site.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project				
8. Historic Resources a) Alter or destroy an historic site?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Cultural Resources Inventory, prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc, 2018 (HELIX 2018) (Appendix C); and the WCCP EIR.

a) Alter or destroy an historic site?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?

a-b) No Impact. The project site consists of relatively flat and sloping terrain that was historically used for agricultural purposes, such as vineyards and cattle grazing. The project site is undeveloped; however, the site contains 53 acres of vineyards, various dirt roads, and an abandoned modern-age corral located in the southwestern portion of the property. As described in the Cultural Resources Inventory (HELIX 2018), historic maps and aerial photographs show that the site has been historically used for agricultural uses and buildings for agricultural workers previously existed in the southeastern portion of the project area. However, none of these buildings remain, and there are no historic structures or known resources on the project site. The existing buildings on-site first appear on aerial photographs from 1978 and are not historic in age. Therefore, the proposed project would not alter or destroy a historic site or cause an adverse impact to a historical resource.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

There are no mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to historic resources.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR did not include any historic resources mitigation measures that are applicable to the proposed project.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. Archaeological Resources a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Cultural Resources Inventory and Assessment, prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc, 2018 (HELIX 2018) (Appendix C); and the WCCP EIR.

a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site; and

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The WCCP EIR describes that the project area is considered highly sensitive for the presence of prehistoric Native American archaeological resources and has a high potential for buried and surficial archaeological sites. As required by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure CUL-1, a site specific Cultural Resources Inventory and Assessment (HELIX 2018), was prepared that identified the 5 resources that have been previously recorded within the project area and identified 2 new previously unrecorded isolated artifacts within the project site. In response to identification of the existing resources, the proposed project has been designed to avoid impacts to cultural resources and grading and other project features would occur outside the archaeological site areas. The project would include a buffer of 20 to 50 feet around each site and has located the sites within open space areas. Additionally, a planting plan was developed to avoid the cultural resource sites, and deed restrictions would be placed on individual lots to ensure that no ground-disturbing activity would be permitted within these buffer zones. Also, an open space area is designated to be used as a reburial location if cultural material is recovered that the Tribe determines should be reburied. Therefore, sites would be protected by as required by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure CUL-1, which states that resources shall be avoided as a first priority. Also, given the cultural sensitivity of the area and the existence of known resources on the project site, WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure CUL-2 would be implemented along with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-5 to provide for archaeological monitors to ensure that any resources uncovered during construction activity are recovered, and that existing resources are protected. With implementation of these Mitigation Measures, potential impacts related to archaeological resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site was not used for human remains or adjacent to a cemetery or other area that was used for human remains. The project site has historically been used for agriculture and is not

anticipated to contain any human remains. In addition, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, CEQA Section 15064.5, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, and WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure CUL-3 mandate a specific process to be followed in the event of a discovery of human remains. Specifically, WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure CUL-3 and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that if human remains are discovered within the project site, disturbance of the site near the human remains shall remain halted until the coroner has conducted an investigation into the circumstances, manner, and cause of death, and made recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner has reason to believe the human remains to be those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission. Although soil-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project is unlikely to result in the discovery of human remains, should it occur, compliance with existing law would ensure that significant impacts to human remains would be less than significant.

d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?

No Impact. The project site has been historically used for agricultural purposes, and no existing or historic religious uses are known to have occurred on the project site. The Cultural Resources Inventory (HELIX 2018) prepared for the project site conducted archival research and a site survey and identified archaeological resources that consist of bedrock milling stations, a rock cairn, and similar isolates. However, these resources are not specifically related to any previous or existing religious or sacred uses within the project site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the project site; and impacts would not occur.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

There are no mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to archaeological resources.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures that are applicable to the proposed project are as follows:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure CUL-1: For all implementing projects, the necessary archeological field surveys/studies/monitoring shall be required as part of the County's permitting approval process. Prior to discretionary project approval or issuance of a grading permit for ministerial projects, the County Archaeologist and/or architectural historian shall do the following:

- Review, and if evidence suggests the potential for historic resources on a future implementing project site, require a County-certified qualified archaeologist (retained by the future project applicant) to conduct a field survey for historical resources on specific sites not previously surveyed or those not surveyed within 5 years of the date of the application for cultural resources. The appropriate survey report shall be completed per current Riverside County Archaeological Survey Report Guidelines and shall include contacting the Native American Heritage Commission and the appropriate local tribes.
- Review, and if evidence suggests the potential for historic resources on a future implementing project site, require a County-certified qualified archaeologist to conduct an appropriate records search to obtain information on historical property records.
- Review, and if evidence suggests that potential for subsurface cultural deposits, consider archaeological monitoring during grading, trenching, and related construction activities, to facilitate project specific avoidance or other mitigation measures.
- Consider Tribal observation and consultation during archaeological monitoring when requested by local tribal government(s) or individual(s) recognized by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), when that entity provides specific information suggesting the potential for subsurface cultural deposits may be present. Tribal monitoring shall not replace archaeological monitoring as they serve different purposes and have different responsibilities under different authorities.

- Evaluate the significance and integrity of all historical resources identified on implementing project sites within the project area, using criteria established in the CEQA Guidelines for important archaeological resources (eligibility for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources [CRHR]), and/or 36 CFR 60.4 for eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

- Where site investigations identify significant cultural resources (specifically including, but not limited to, site investigations related to potential trail or circulation improvements), consistent with CEQA and County guidelines, these resources shall be avoided as a first priority wherever feasible, prior to considering salvage or invasive mitigation. Feasibility of avoidance case-specific and potentially subject to different variables unique to a project site that have to be analyzed. Feasibility could involve modifying the project design.

- Propose recommended mitigation measures and conditions of approval for implementing projects (if a local government action is required) to reduce adverse project effects on significant, important, and/or unique historical resources, following appropriate CEQA and/or National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 guidelines.

- Require from the designated project-specific County-certified project Archaeologist documentation of all required mitigation treatments and the results of those treatments for previously known and inadvertent finds according to current County reporting requirements to document environmental mitigation compliance.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure CUL-2: If previously unknown unique cultural resources are identified during grading activities associated with the implementing projects, the following procedures shall be followed. For this project, unique cultural resources are defined as being multiple artifacts in close association with each other but may include fewer artifacts if the area of the find is determined to be of significance due to its sacred or cultural importance.

- If not previously retained, a County-certified qualified archaeologist shall be retained to assess the nature and significance of the find(s).

- All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resources shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, the archaeologist, the Native American tribal representative and the Planning Director to discuss the significance of the find.

- At the meeting, the significance of the discoveries shall be discussed and after consultation with the Native American tribal representative and the archaeologist, a decision shall be made, with the concurrence of the Planning Director, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc.) for the cultural resources.

- Grading of further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to the appropriate mitigation.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure CUL-3: If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner shall be notified of the find immediately and the remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours, which shall determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. The MLD may recommend reburial somewhere within the project boundaries where they can be protected in perpetuity. The MLD may also request avoidance and preservation in place.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Prior to the issuance of the first grading permit, the Applicant shall provide a letter to the County Planning Department, or designee, from a qualified professional archeologist meeting the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications for Archaeology as defined at 36 CFR Part 61, Appendix A and Native American monitors stating that the archeologists have been retained to monitor all ground disturbing activities, including but not limited to brushing/ grubbing, grading, excavation, and trenching. In the event a previously unrecorded archaeological deposit is encountered during construction, all activity within 100 feet of the area of discovery shall cease and the County shall be immediately notified. The archeologist shall be contacted to flag the area in the field and shall determine, in consultation with the County and the Native American monitors, if the archaeological deposits meet the CEQA definition of historical (State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(a)) and/or unique archaeological resource (Public Resources Code 21083.2(g)). If the find is considered a "resource" the archaeologist shall pursue either protection in place or recovery, salvage and treatment of the deposits. Recovery, salvage and treatment protocols shall be developed in accordance with applicable provisions of Public Resource Code Section 21083.2 and State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 and 15126.4 in consultation with the County and the Native American monitors. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3), preservation in place shall be the preferred means to avoid impacts to archaeological resources qualifying as historical resources. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C). If unique archaeological resources cannot be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state, recovery, salvage and treatment shall be required at the developer/applicant's expense. The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources that are unearthed on the during any ground-disturbing activities and one of the following treatments shall be applied to resources that cannot be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state:

a. Reburial of unearthed resources on the project site shall include, at least, the following: measures to protect the reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all required cataloguing, analysis and studies have been completed on the cultural resources. There shall be no destructive or invasive testing on sacred items, burial goods and Native American human remains. Any reburial processes shall be culturally appropriate. Listing of contents and location of the reburial shall be included in the confidential Phase IV Report. The Phase IV Report shall be filed with the County under a confidential cover and not subject to a Public Records Request.

b. If reburial is not agreed upon by the Consulting Tribes then the resources shall be curated at a culturally appropriate manner at the Western Science Center, a Riverside County curation facility that meets State Resources Department Office of Historic Preservation Guidelines for the Curation of Archaeological Resources ensuring access and use pursuant to the Guidelines. The collection and associated records shall be transferred, including title, and are to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence of curation in the form of a letter from the curation facility stating that subject archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid, shall be provided by the landowner to the County.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Project plans, specifications, and permits shall state that prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activities, including brushing and grubbing, temporary construction fencing or flagging shall be placed around the perimeter of the archaeological sites (CA-RIV-4133, CA-RIV-4135, and CA-RIV-4136) to ensure that there is no encroachment into these resources. The archaeologist and Luiseño Native American monitor shall be present to observe and direct placement of the fencing/ flagging. The fencing can be removed only after grading operations have been completed.

Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Project plans, specifications, and permits shall state that at least thirty (30) days prior to the first of either: seeking a grading permit or starting any operations that will have an effect of ground disturbance, the Project Applicant shall contact the Pechanga Tribe to notify the Tribe of its intent to obtain permits for the proposed grading and excavation, or to start any ground disturbing activities and to coordinate with the Tribe to develop a Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement ("Agreement"). The Agreement shall address the treatment of known cultural resources; the treatment and final disposition of any tribal cultural resources, sacred sites, human remains, or archaeological resources inadvertently discovered on the project site; project grading, ground disturbance and development scheduling; the designation, responsibilities, and participation of professional Pechanga Tribal Monitor(s) during grading, excavation and ground disturbing activities. At least seven business days prior to project grading, the Project Applicant shall contact the Tribal monitors to notify the Tribe of grading/ excavation and the monitoring program/schedule, and to coordinate with the Tribe on the monitoring work schedule.

Mitigation Measure CUL-4: Project plans, specifications, and permits shall state that prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activities, including brushing and grubbing, The Project Archaeologist and if required, a representative designated by the Tribe shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to provide Cultural Sensitivity Training for all construction personnel. Training will include a brief review of the cultural sensitivity of the project site; the areas to be avoided during grading activities; what resources could potentially be identified during earthmoving activities; the requirements of the monitoring program; the protocols that apply in the event unanticipated cultural resources are identified, including who to contact and appropriate avoidance measures until the find(s) can be properly evaluated; and any other appropriate protocols. This is a mandatory training and all construction personnel must attend prior to beginning work on the project site. A sign-in sheet for attendees of this training shall be included in the Phase IV Monitoring Report.

Mitigation Measure CUL-5: Project plans and specifications shall state that prior to grading permit final inspection, a Phase IV Cultural Resources Monitoring Report shall be submitted that complies with the Riverside County Planning Department's requirements for all ground disturbing activities. The report shall follow the County of Riverside Planning Department Cultural Resources (Archaeological) Investigations Standard Scopes of Work and shall include results of any relocation or residue analysis required as well as evidence of the required cultural sensitivity training for the construction staff held during the required pre-grade meeting and evidence that any artifacts have been treated in accordance to procedures stipulated in the Cultural Resources Management Plan.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project				
10. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Geotechnical Review of the Proposed Twelve Oaks Development (NMG 2018), Geotechnical Report GEO180010 included as Appendix D; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?

Less Than Significant Impact. The geotechnical investigations prepared for the project states that the project site does not contain or adjacent to an Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault (NMG 2018). Thus, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death related to an Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault. Additionally, the project is subject to the California Building Code (CBC) requirements and thereby mitigating any potential impact to less than significant. As CBC requirements are applicable by operation of law and they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. Impacts will be less than significant.

b) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

Less Than Significant Impact. As described in the previous response, the project site does not contain or adjacent to an Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault (NMG 2018). Therefore, the proposed project would not be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map or other substantial evidence of a known fault. Additionally, the project is subject to the California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to commercial development and thereby mitigating any potential impact to less than significant. As CBC requirements are applicable by operation of law, they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. Impacts will be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to an Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault are applicable to the project.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures related to Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zones that are applicable to the proposed project were adopted by the WCCP EIR.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

11. Liquefaction Potential Zone a) Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Geotechnical Review of the Proposed Twelve Oaks Development (NMG 2018), geotechnical report GEO180010 included as Appendix D; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less Than Significant Impact. The term "liquefaction" describes a phenomenon in which a saturated cohesionless soil loses strength and acquires a degree of mobility as a result of strong ground shaking during an earthquake. The factors known to influence liquefaction potential include soil type and depth, grain size, relative density, groundwater level, degree of saturation, and both the intensity and duration of ground shaking. Soils that are most susceptible to liquefaction are clean, loose, saturated, and uniformly graded fine-grained sands that lie below the groundwater table within approximately 50 feet below ground surface.

The geotechnical investigations prepared for the project states that historic groundwater in the project vicinity range from approximately 64 to 200 feet below the ground surface (NMG 2018). In addition, the site is underlain by dense soils and granitic and metasedimentary bedrock. Therefore, the geotechnical investigation determined that the project site has a low to nil potential for liquefaction and seismically induced settlement. Thus, impacts related to seismic-related ground failure and liquefaction would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction are applicable to the project.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures related to liquefaction that are applicable to the proposed project were adopted by the WCCP EIR.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. Ground-shaking Zone				
a) Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Source: Geotechnical Review of the Proposed Twelve Oaks Development (NMG 2018), Geotechnical Report GEO180010 included as Appendix D; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The project area, like most of southern California, could be subject to seismically related strong ground shaking. Ground-shaking is a major cause of structural damage from earthquakes. The amount of motion expected at a building site can vary from none to forceful depending upon the distance to the fault, the magnitude of the earthquake, and the local geology. The closest fault to the project site is the Elsinore Fault, which is located approximately 7.7 miles from the project site.

Structures built in the County are required to be built in compliance with the California Building Code (CBC Regulations, Title 24, Part 2), which is included in the County's Municipal Code as Chapter 16.08 and provides provisions for soils conditions. Compliance with the CBC, as included as PPP GEO-1 and WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure GEO-1, would require proper construction of buildings to withstand the effects of potential strong seismic ground shaking. In addition, the mitigation adopted by the WCCP EIR requires implementing projects to prepare structural specific engineering studies to ensure the proposed structures meet or exceed the existing seismic regulations.

The Riverside County Department of Building and Safety reviews structural plans and geotechnical data prior to issuance of a grading permit and conducts inspections during construction, which would ensure that all required CBC measures are incorporated. Mandatory compliance with Section 1613 of the current CBC, structures within the site would be designed and constructed to resist the effects of seismic ground motions. The County's review process and included as PPP GEO-1 and WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure GEO-1, would ensure that impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking are less than significant. Impacts would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

The mitigating plans, programs, or policies that are relevant to the proposed project includes the following:

PPP GEO-1: California Building Code Compliance. The project is required to comply with the California Building Standards Code as included in the County's Municipal Code Chapter 16.08 to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic and soils hazards. CBC related and geologist and/or civil engineer specifications for the proposed project are required to be incorporated into grading plans and building specifications as a condition of construction permit approval.

Completed WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure:

The following WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure that is applicable to the proposed project has been completed and is included as Appendix D:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure GEO-1: All implementing projects shall prepare a site-specific assessment as determined by the County Geologist to ascertain all site-specific geologic/geotechnical information, including, but not limited to, ground shaking potential, blasting hazards, liquefaction potential, fault rupture potential and landslide/slope instability potential. This assessment and report shall be prepared by a California-licensed geologist and/or geotechnical engineer and shall be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior to approval of the implementing project. This report shall include site-specific measures such as grading recommendations, foundation design recommendations, slope stability recommendations, and the alternative siting of structures, as appropriate, to reduce the significance of potential geologic and/or geotechnical hazards associated with the proposed implementing project.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. Landslide Risk a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Source: Geotechnical Review of the Proposed Twelve Oaks Development (NMG 2018), geotechnical report GEO180010; included as Appendix D; Drainage Study for Twelve Oaks Wine Resort Project, prepared by Fuscoe, 2017 (Drainage 2017), included as Appendix E; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Landslides are the downhill movement of masses of earth and rock and are often associated with earthquakes; but other factors, such as the slope, moisture content of the soil, composition of the subsurface geology, heavy rains, and improper grading can influence the occurrence of landslides. The geotechnical investigation describes that the project site has a relatively low gradient terrain and that the potential for seismically induced landslides is low. Also, the Drainage Study describes that the site topography generally has gradual slopes in the range of 0.5 to 10 percent (Drainage 2017). The potential for landslides or slope instabilities to occur as a result of project construction on the site will be determined at the grading plan review stage of development. Proposed cut and fill slopes, as well as the natural slopes onsite would be evaluated and are expected to be grossly stable at proposed design conditions. A detailed evaluation and analysis of slope stability will be performed during future grading plan review and after additional exploratory work once final plans are available. In addition, proposed slopes would be further assessed for the potential for wedge type failures and/or rock fall. In addition, Compliance with the California Building Code (CBC), as included as PPP GEO-1, would ensure the proposed structures meet or exceed the existing seismic regulations. As described in the previous response, the WCCP EIR mitigation requires specific engineering studies related to seismic risks, and the Riverside County Department of Building and Safety review of structural plans and geotechnical data prior to issuance of a grading permit would ensure that all required CBC measures are incorporated. Adherence to CBC requirements are applicable by operation of law and they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. A Condition of Approval for a slope stability report (SSR) will be placed on the project, which would approved by the County Geologist prior to issuance of a grading permit. Thus, impacts related to unstable geologic units, landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, and rockfall hazards are less than significant. Impacts would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

The mitigating plans, programs, or policies that are relevant to the proposed project includes the following:

PPP GEO-1: CBC Compliance. Listed previously in Response 12, Ground-shaking Zone.

Completed WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure:

The following WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure that is applicable to the proposed project has been completed and is included as Appendix D:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Listed previously in Response 12, Ground-shaking Zone.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. Ground Subsidence a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in ground subsidence?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Geotechnical Review of the Proposed Twelve Oaks Development (NMG 2018), Geotechnical Report GEO180010; included as Appendix D; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in ground subsidence?

Less Than Significant Impact. Subsidence is a general lowering of the ground surface over a large area that is generally attributed to lowering of the ground water levels within a groundwater basin. Localized or focal subsidence or settlement of the ground can occur as a result of earthquake motion in an area where groundwater in a basin is lowered. Because the groundwater has been historically deep at the project site (ranging from approximately 64 to 200 feet below the ground surface) (NMG 2018), the project does not involve groundwater pumping, and the geotechnical review did not identify any risks related to subsidence. Grading would be conducted in accordance with the CBC and local codes. Furthermore, remedial grading would extend beyond the perimeter of the proposed structures. Additionally, the grading and foundation recommendations may need to be updated once final grading and foundation plans are developed. Adherence to CBC requirements are applicable by operation of law and they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. Thus, impacts related to subsidence would not occur from implementation of the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to subsidence are applicable to the project.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures related to subsidence that are applicable to the proposed project were adopted by the WCCP EIR.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. Other Geologic Hazards a) Be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Geotechnical Review of the Proposed Twelve Oaks Development (NMG 2018), included as Appendix D; Drainage Study for Twelve Oaks Wine Resort Project, prepared by Fuscoe, 2017 (Drainage 2017), included as Appendix E; geotechnical report GEO180010; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard?

Less than Significant Impact. A seiche is the sloshing of a closed body of water from earthquake shaking. Seiches are of concern relative to water storage facilities because inundation from a seiche can occur if the wave overflows a containment wall, such as the wall of a reservoir, water storage tank, dam, or other artificial body of water. There are no water bodies near enough to the project area to pose a flood hazard to the site resulting from a seiche. The closest water body is Lake Skinner, which is over one mile from the project site. Due to this distance, no seiche impacts would occur.

A mudflow is an earthflow consisting of material that is wet enough to flow rapidly and typically occurs in small, steep stream channels. As described in response 14.a), the project site has a relatively low gradient terrain of approximately 0.5 to 10 percent (Drainage 2017); therefore, the potential for a mudflow onsite is low, and mudflow impacts would be less than significant.

In addition, there are no known volcanoes in the project region. Thus, impacts related to volcanic hazards would not occur. Overall, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazards. Impacts would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to a seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard are applicable to the project.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures related to seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard that are applicable to the proposed project were adopted by the WCCP EIR.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16. Slopes				
a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Geotechnical Review of the Proposed Twelve Oaks Development (NMG 2018), included as Appendix D; Drainage Study for Twelve Oaks Wine Resort Project, prepared by Fuscoe, 2017 (Drainage 2017), included as Appendix E; geotechnical report GEO180010; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?

Less Than Significant Impact. As described in the Drainage Study prepared for the project, the site contains sloped rolling foothills with gradual slopes in the range of 0.5 to 10 percent (Drainage 2017). As stated in section 1.b), the proposed project has been designed to follow the existing topography such that streets and lots would be integrated into the rolling hills of the site. The existing topographical features are central to the WCCP aesthetic vision of the area and therefore have been incorporated into the proposed pad location on each development site. Thus, the existing vineyard and proposed winery resort would minimize grading and resulting change to the existing topography, and impacts related to topography or ground surface relief features would be less than significant. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As described in the previous response, the project site contains sloped rolling foothills and the project has been designed to around the existing topography, whereas streets and lots would be integrated into the rolling hills of the site. However, project construction would require manufactured slopes that would be a maximum of 42-feet in height and cut and fill slopes at 3:1, with a maximum slope ratio of 2:1. This design is consistent with the County Municipal Code regulations. In addition, compliance with the CBC, as included as PPP GEO-1, would ensure the proposed slopes meet or exceed the regulations. The potential for slope instabilities to occur at the site as a result of project construction will be determined at the grading plan review stage of development. Proposed cut and fill slopes, as well as the natural slopes onsite are expected to be grossly stable at proposed design conditions. A Condition of Approval for a slope stability report (SSR) will be placed on the project, which is to be approved by the County Geologist prior to issuance of a grading permit. The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requires site specific engineering studies and the Riverside County Department of Building and Safety review of grading plans prior to issuance of a grading permit, which ensures that all regulations are implemented. Thus, impacts related to slopes would be less than significant. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?

No Impact. The proposed grading would not negate the use of the sewage disposal systems. The proposed project would extend the existing offsite regional sewer system to serve the project, and would install an onsite sewer system, as detailed in the Project Description. Prior to receipt of permits to construct these sewer improvements, the proposed grading and infrastructure design would be reviewed by the County's Department of Building and Safety, which would ensure that grading would not impact sewer functions. There would be no impacts.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

The mitigating plans, programs, or policies that are relevant to the proposed project includes the following:

PPP GEO-1: CBC Compliance. Listed previously in Response 12, Ground-shaking Zone.

Completed WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The following WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures that is applicable to the proposed project has been completed and is included as Appendix D:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Listed previously in Response 12, Ground-shaking Zone.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. Soils				
a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Riverside County Permits. Accessed: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water_issues/programs/stormwater/riverside_permit.shtml; Geotechnical Review of the Proposed Twelve Oaks Development (NMG 2018), included as Appendix D; geotechnical report GEO180010; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Construction of the proposed project has the potential to contribute to soil erosion and the loss of topsoil. Grading activities that would be required for the project would expose and loosen topsoil, which could be eroded by wind or water. However, the County's Municipal Code Chapter 13.12, Article 2 Stormwater Management and Discharge Controls implement the requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Riverside County (RWQCB) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water Permit Order No. R8-2010-0033 (MS4 Permit) establishes minimum stormwater management requirements and controls that are required to be implemented by the project.

A QSD (Qualified SWPPP Developer)-prepared Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required by the above County and RWQCB regulations, which would be implemented by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-3 and reduce the potential for soil erosion and the loss of topsoil. The SWPPP is required to address site-specific conditions related to specific grading and construction activities that could cause erosion and the loss of topsoil and provide erosion control BMPs to reduce or eliminate the erosion and loss of topsoil. Erosion control BMPs include use of: silt fencing, fiber rolls, or gravel bags, stabilized construction entrance/exit, hydroseeding, etc.

The proposed project includes installation of landscaping that would reduce areas of loose topsoil that could erode by wind or water, would not exist upon operation of the proposed project. In addition, as described in Section 25, Hydrology and Water Quality the hydrologic features of the proposed project have been designed to slow, filter, and retain stormwater within landscaping, bioretention swales, and vineyards, which would also reduce the potential for stormwater to erode topsoil. Furthermore, implementation of the project requires County approval of a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), which is required by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures HYD-1 and would ensure that RWQCB requirements and appropriate operational BMPs would be implemented to minimize or eliminate the potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil to occur. With compliance with these existing requirements, which would be ensured through the County's permitting process, impacts related to erosion and loss of topsoil would be less than significant. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Expansive soils contain significant amounts of clay particles that swell when wet and shrink when dry. Foundations constructed on expansive soils are subjected to forces caused by the swelling and shrinkage of the soils. Without proper measures taken, heaving and cracking of both building foundations and slabs-on-grade could result.

The geotechnical investigation determined that the site is underlain by silty sand and sandy clay, and conducted soils testing, which determined that onsite soils have a very low expansion index (NMG 2018). Compliance with the CBC, as included as PPP GEO-1, pertaining to commercial development regulate the potential impact to less than significant. As CBC requirements are applicable to all development by operation of law and they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. These requirements would ensure the proposed structures meet or exceed the existing seismic regulations, including those related to expansive soils. The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure GEO-1 also requires specific engineering studies related to seismic risks, and the Riverside County Department of Building and Safety review of structural plans and geotechnical data prior to issuance of a grading permit would ensure that all required CBC measures are incorporated. With implementation of these existing regulations, impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

No Impact. The proposed project would extend the existing offsite regional sewer system to serve the project, and would install an onsite sewer system, as detailed in the Project Description. The proposed project would not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. As a result, impacts related to septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems would not occur from implementation of the proposed project. There would be no impacts.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

The mitigating plans, programs, or policies that are relevant to the proposed project includes the following:

PPP GEO-1: CBC Compliance. Listed previously in Response 12, Ground-shaking Zone.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures that are applicable to the proposed project are as follows:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-1: All implementing projects shall utilize the County's Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) checklist to determine if a project-specific WQMP is required. All implementing projects, regardless of the need for a WQMP, shall incorporate the appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to maintain conformance to the County's active MS4 permit.

Depending upon the location of the implementing project and whether it is considered a "Significant Redevelopment" or "New Development", the County shall require the project proponent to submit the necessary additional information and condition about the project accordingly.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-3: Listed previously in Response 7, Biological Resources.

Completed WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure:

The following WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure that is applicable to the proposed project has been completed and is included as Appendix D:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Listed previously in Response 13, Ground-shaking Zone.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18. Erosion				
a) Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Source: Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Riverside County Permits. Accessed at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water_issues/programs/stormwater/riverside_permit.shtml; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site does not include, nor is adjacent to, a river, stream, or bed of a lake. In addition, as described in response 18. a), above, existing RQWCB and County regulations require the project implement a project specific SWPPP during construction activities, as required by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-3, which implement erosion control BMPs, such as silt fencing, fiber rolls, or gravel bags, stabilized construction entrance/exit, hydroseeding, etc. to reduce the potential for siltation or erosion. In addition, the project is required to implement a WQMP (pursuant to WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-1) that would implement operational BMPs to ensure that the project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation. With implementation of these regulations, potential impacts related to erosion to any downstream rivers, streams, or lakes would be less than significant. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As described in response 17. a), above, existing RQWCB and County regulations, and WCCP EIR mitigation measures require the project to implement a project specific SWPPP during construction activities that would implement erosion control BMPs, such as silt fencing, fiber rolls, and gravel bags, that would reduce the velocity of runoff and reduce the potential for water erosion both on and off-site. In addition, the proposed project has been designed to slow, filter, and retain stormwater within landscaping and an infiltration basin on the project site, which would reduce the velocity of stormwater and the potential for water erosion on and off-site. Furthermore, the project is required to implement a WQMP, included as WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-3 that would implement operational BMPs to ensure that operation of the project would not result in water erosion. With implementation of these regulations, potential impacts related to water erosion would be less than significant. Impacts would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to erosion are applicable to the project.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures that are applicable are as follows:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-1: Listed previously in Response 17, Soils.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-3: Listed previously in Response 17, Soils.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
19. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site. a) Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-8 "Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map," Ord. No. 460, Article XV & Ord. No. 484; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site?

Less Than Significant Impact. Like the majority of the County, the project site is identified by the General Plan Safety Element Figure S-8 as having a moderate wind erosion susceptibility. The General Plan, Safety Element Policy for Wind Erosion requires buildings and structures to be designed to resist wind loads that are covered by the CBC. In addition, County Ordinance No. 484 (Control of Blowing Sand) regulates activities within areas that are susceptible to blowing sand. The regulations of this ordinance are included as PPP WND-1. Also, as described above, the proposed project includes installation of landscaping that would reduce loose topsoil that could erode by wind during operation of the proposed project. As described previously, the proposed project would be developed in compliance with CBC regulations (included as PPP GEO-1), which would be verified by the County Department of Building and Safety prior to approval of building permits. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant impacts related to wind erosion and blow sand. Impacts would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

The mitigating plans, programs, or policies that are relevant to the proposed project includes the following:

PPP WND-1: County Municipal Code Chapter 16.52, Soil Erosion. County Code Chapter 16.52 identifies areas that are subject to wind erosion and includes soil erosion requirements and a wind erosion control plan.

PPP GEO-1: CBC Compliance. Listed previously in Response 12, Ground-shaking Zone.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures related to wind erosion or blowsand that are applicable to the proposed project were adopted by the WCCP EIR.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project				
20. Greenhouse Gas Emissions a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Greenhouse Gas Technical Report for the 12 Oaks Winery Resort Project, prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, 2018 (GHGTR 2018), included as Appendix G; County of Riverside Climate Action Plan; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

GHG Thresholds

The County of Riverside has developed a Climate Action Plan (CAP) to address the issues of climate change as it relates to growth in the County. The 2018 CAP establishes a screening level threshold of 3,000 MT CO2e per year for mixed-use projects. Consistent with the SCAQMD methodology for GHG assessments, County guidance also recommends including construction emissions (amortized over a typical duration of 30 years) in the comparison to the screening threshold.

In addition, the CAP includes emission reduction efforts to coordinate with the state strategies of reducing emissions in an efficient and cost-effective manner. For projects that exceed the 3,000 MT CO2e per year screening level, projects must demonstrate incorporation of certain measures to reduce GHG emissions as listed in Appendix F-Screening Tables of the CAP. The Screening Table contains a menu of 47 overall measures potentially applicable to discretionary development that include energy conservation, water use reduction, increased residential density or mixed uses, transportation management and solid waste recycling.

Projects that garner at least 100 points (equivalent to an approximate 15% reduction in GHG emissions) are determined to be consistent with the CAP and are considered to result in a less than significant individual and cumulative impact on GHG emissions.

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Construction. Project construction activities would temporarily generate GHG emissions by heavy equipment usage and construction employee vehicle trips. As shown in Table GHG-1, the total GHG emissions associated with construction are estimated to be 4,046 MT CO2e. Per SCAQMD and County guidance, construction emissions are amortized over 30 years, which equates to 135 MT per year of CO2e emissions.

Table GHG-1: GHG Construction Emissions

Phase	Emissions (MT CO2e)
Phase 1 – Winery and Hotel	1,750
Phase 2 – Winery Estates	968
Phase 3 – Ranch Lots	1,328
Total Emissions	**4,046**
Amortized Over 30 Years	135

Source: GHGTR 2018.

Operation. Implementation of the project would generate GHG emissions from usage of electricity; natural gas use for space and water heating; the electricity embodied in water consumption; the energy associated with solid waste disposal; and mobile source emissions from project related vehicular trips. As described in the Traffic Impact Analysis Prepared for the project (TIA 2018), at full buildout the project would generate 4,082 average daily trips (ADTs) on the weekdays and 4,847 ADTs on the weekends. In addition, emissions of CO_2 occur during the fermentation and aging/storage step in the wine making process.

The proposed project is anticipated to generate 9,481 MT CO2e per year. This includes 135 CO2e construction emissions amortized over 30 years and 9,337 CO2e of annual operational emissions shown in Table GHG-2. Because this exceeds the CAP screening level of 3,000 MT CO2e, the project is required to be evaluated against the County's CAP Screening Tables.

Table GHG-2: GHG Operation Emissions

Source	Emissions (MT CO_2e)
Area	23
Energy	3,093
Mobile	5,305
Waste	39
Water	829
Wine Fermentation	48
Total	**9,337**

Source: GHGTR 2018.

The County of Riverside CAP determined that projects that achieve at least 100 points on the County's GHG Screening Table (equivalent to an approximate 15% reduction in GHG emissions) are less than significant. As shown on Tables GHG-3 and GHG-4, the proposed project would obtain 156 points on the County's Residential GHG Screening Table, and 138 points on the County's Commercial GHG Screening Table. Because the project achieved over 100 points on both tables, impacts would be less than significant.

Table GHG-3: Proposed Project Residential Screening Table of GHG Measures

Feature	Description	Project Points
Insulation	Modestly Enhanced Insulation (walls R-13; roof/attic R-38)	12
Windows	Modestly Enhanced Window (0.4 U-Factor, 0.32 SHGC)	6
Cool Roofs	Enhanced Cool Roof (CRRC Rated 0.2 aged solar reflectance, 0.75 thermal emittance)	12
Air Infiltration	Air barrier applied to exterior walls, calking, and visual inspection such as the HERS Verified Quality Insulation installation (QII or equivalent)	10
Thermal Storage of Building	Modest Thermal Mass (10% of floor area or 10% of walls: 12" or more thick exposed concrete or masonry. No permanently installed floor covering such as carpet, linoleum, wood or other insulating materials)	2
Heating/Cooling Distribution System	Modest Duct Insulation (R-6)	7
Space Heating/Cooling Equipment	High Efficiency HVAC (SEER 15/72% AFUE or 8.5 HSPF)	7
Water Heaters	High Efficiency Water Heater (0.72 Energy Factor)	15
Daylighting	All rooms within the living space have daylight (through use of windows, solar tubes, skylights, etc.)	1
Artificial Lighting	Efficient Lights (25% of in-unit fixtures considered high efficacy. High efficacy is defined as 40 lumens/watt for 15 watt or less fixtures; 50 lumens/watt for 15-40 watt fixtures, 60 lumens/watt for fixtures >40 watts)	8
Appliances	Energy Star refrigerator, dishwasher, and washing machine.	3
Shading	At least 90% of south facing glazing will be shaded by vegetation or overhangs on June 21st.	4
Energy Star Homes	EPA Energy Star for Homes (version 3 or above)	25
Photovoltaic	Solar ready homes (sturdy roof and electric hookups)	2
Water Efficient Landscaping	Only California native plants that require no irrigation or some supplemental irrigation	8
Water Efficient Irrigation Systems	Weather based irrigation control systems or moisture sensors (demonstrate 20% reduced water use)	3
Showers	Water efficient showerheads (2.0 gpm)	3
Toilets	Water efficient toilets (1.5 gpm)	3
Faucets	Water efficient faucets (1.28 gpm)	3
Dishwasher	Water efficient dishwasher (6 gallons per cycle or less)	1
Washing Machine	Water efficient washing machine (water factor <5.5)	1
Recycled Water	5% of the total project's water use comes from recycled/reclaimed water	5
Sidewalks	Provide pedestrian linkage between residential and commercial uses within 1 mile	3
Bicycle paths	Provide bicycle path linkages between residential and other land uses	2
Electric vehicle recharging	Install electric vehicle charging stations in the garages of residential units	8
Landscape equipment	Electric lawn equipment are available. Project provides outlets on the exterior of all building walls so that electric landscaping equipment is compatible with all built facilities.	2
	Total Points	**156**

Source: GHGTR 2018.

Table GHG-4: Proposed Project Commercial Screening Table of GHG Measures

Feature	Description	Project Points
Insulation	Modestly Enhanced Insulation (walls R-13; roof/attic R-38)	15
Windows	Enhanced Window Insulation (15%> title 24)	8
Cool Roofs	Modest Cool Roof (CRRC Rated 0.15 aged solar reflectance, 0.75 thermal emittance)	12
Air Infiltration	Reduced Building Envelope Leakage (15%> title 24)	8
Heating/Cooling	Modest Duct Insulation (R-6)	8

Feature	Description	Project Points
Distribution System		
Space Heating/Cooling Equipment	Improved Efficiency HVAC (EER 14/65% AFUE or 8 HSPF)	7
Water Heaters	Improved Efficiency Water heater (0.675 energy factor)	14
Daylighting	All peripheral rooms within building have at least one window or skylight	1
Artificial Lighting	Efficient Lights (25% of in-unit fixtures considered high efficacy. High efficacy is defined as 40 lumens/watt for 15 watt or less fixtures; 50 lumens/watt for 15-40 watt fixtures, 60 lumens/watt for fixtures >40 watts)	9
Appliances	Energy Star refrigerator and dishwasher	8
Shading	At least 90% of south facing glazing will be shaded by vegetation or overhangs on June 21st.	6
Photovoltaic	Solar Ready Roofs (sturdy roof and electric hookups)	2
Water Efficient Landscaping	Eliminate turf and only provide drought tolerant plants	4
Water Efficient Irrigation Systems	Weather based irrigation control systems or moisture sensors (demonstrate 20% reduced water use)	5
Showers	Water efficient showerheads (2.0 gpm)	3
Toilets	Water efficient toilets (1.5 gpm)	3
Faucets	Water efficient faucets (1.28 gpm)	3
Recycled Water	Graywater (purple pipe) irrigation system on site	5
Employee bicycle /pedestrian programs	Bike lockers and secure racks; showers and changing facilities	3
Parking	Provide reserved preferential parking spaces for car-share, carpool, and ultra-low or zero emission vehicles	1
Electric vehicle recharging	Install electric vehicle charging stations in garages/parking areas	8
Recycling	Provide separated recycling bins within each commercial building/floor and provide large external recycling collection bins at central location for collection truck pick-up	2
Recycling of Construction / Demolition Debris	Recycle 10% of debris	3
	TOTAL POINTS	138

Source: GHGTR 2018.

For the Project, the significance of GHG emissions was determined through use of the screening tables, as described in Tables GHG-3 and GHG-4, above.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. As described in the previous response, the project would demonstrate the reduction of GHG emissions as required by the County of Riverside CAP. The CAP is implemented in accordance with the guidelines of all existing state and federal regulations and contains goals and policies related to reduction of GHG emissions. In addition, the project would comply with regulations imposed by the State and the SCAQMD that reduce GHG emissions, as described below:

- Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) is applicable to the project because many of the GHG reduction measures outlined in AB 32 (e.g., low carbon fuel standard, advanced clean car standards, and cap-and-trade) have been adopted over the last five years and implementation activities are ongoing. The proposed project would develop winery, resort, and residential uses that would not conflict with fuel and car standards or cap-and-trade.

- Pavley Fuel Efficiency Standards (AB1 493). Establishes fuel efficiency ratings for new (model year 2009-2016) passenger cars and light trucks. AB 1493 is applicable to the project because the vehicles traveling to and from the project site would meet the manufacturer required fuel efficiency standards that would reduce GHG emissions.
- Title 24 California Code of Regulations (Title 24) establishes energy efficiency requirements for new construction that address the energy efficiency of new (and altered) residences and commercial buildings. The proposed project is required to comply with Title 24, which would be verified by the County during the project permitting process.
- Title 17 California Code of Regulations (Low Carbon Fuel Standard [LCFS]). Requires carbon content of fuel sold in California to be 10 percent less by 2020. Because the LCFS applies to any transportation fuel that is sold or supplied in California, all vehicles trips generated by the project would comply with LCFS.
- California Water Conservation in Landscaping Act of 2006 (AB 1881) provides requirements to ensure water efficient landscapes in new development and reduced water waste in existing landscapes. The proposed project is required to comply with AB 1881 landscaping requirements, which would be verified by the County during the project permitting process.
- Emissions from vehicles, which are a main source of operational GHG emissions, would be reduced through implementation of federal and state fuel and air quality emissions requirements that are implemented by CARB.
- The County's Standard Conditions of Approval, require electrical hookups for refrigerated trailers and do not allow the use of truck engines for auxiliary power for extended periods of time, which reduces GHG emissions.

Overall, implementation of the project would not conflict with the Riverside 2018 CAP or other applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to GHG emissions are applicable to the project.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures that are applicable to the proposed project are as follows:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure GHG-1: All implementing projects shall use the following mitigation measures to reduce impacts from construction activities as related to construction equipment and vehicle exhaust emissions:

- The County shall require implementing projects to use low-emission and high energy efficiency construction equipment on site. Examples of low-emission and high energy efficiency equipment include use of EPA Tier 3 (or better) emission compliant construction equipment and use of alternative-fuel construction equipment (natural gas), if available.
- The County shall require implementing projects to include a statement on grading plans that all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.
- The County shall require implementing project to utilize electric- or diesel-powered equipment, in lieu of gasoline-powered engines, where feasible.
- The County shall require implementing projects to include a statement on grading plans that work crews shall shut off equipment when not in use. During smog season (May through October), the overall length of the construction period shall be extended, thereby decreasing the size of the area prepared each day, to minimize vehicles and equipment operating at the same time.

- The County shall require implementing projects to time construction activities so as to not interfere with peak hour traffic and minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the site; if necessary, a flag person shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways.
- The County shall require implementing projects to use EPA-rated engines of Tier 3 or better for construction equipment.
- As soon as electric utilities are available at construction sites, the County shall require implementing projects to supply the construction site with electricity from the local utility and all equipment that can be electrically operated shall use the electric utility rather than portable generators.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure GHG-2: Individual implementing projects shall have the option to use the Option Tables or project specific GHG analysis in order to demonstrate that GHG emissions from the implementing project are less than significant.

- Implementing projects which implement enough reduction measures from the Option Tables and achieve 100/70 points shall be considered to be consistent with the County's GHG reduction goals for the Project area. Refer to Temecula Valley Wine Country Greenhouse Gas Reduction Workbook.
- Those implementing projects that do not garnish the minimum points using the Option Tables presented in the Temecula Valley Wine Country Greenhouse Gas Reduction Workbook, Appendix A shall require quantification of project-specific GHG emissions and shall provide mitigation measures to reduce GHG emissions at least 28.5% below Business as Usual (BAU) emissions.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

The measures listed in Table GHG-3 and GHG-4 shall apply to achieve the minimum 100 points on the Riverside County Climate Action Plan Screening Tables. These measures may be replaced with other measures as listed in the table, as long as they are replaced at the same time with other measures that in total achieve a minimum of 100 points on the screening table.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project				
21. Hazards and Hazardous Materials a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Phase II Soil Evaluation, prepared by GeoSoils (Phase I 2015), included as Appendix H; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less Than Significant Impact. A hazardous material is defined as any material that, due to its quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released into the workplace or environment. Hazardous materials include, but are not limited to, hazardous substances, hazardous wastes, and any material that a business or the local implementing agency has a reasonable basis for believing would be injurious to the health and safety of persons or harmful to the environment if released.

The proposed construction activities would involve transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as paints, solvents, oils, grease, and caulking. In addition, hazardous materials may be needed for fueling or operating construction equipment on the site. These types of materials are not acutely hazardous, and all storage, handling, use, and disposal of these materials are regulated by federal and state requirements, which the project construction activities are required to strictly adhere to. These regulations include: the federal Occupational Safety and Health Act and Hazardous Materials Transportation Act; Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations (CalOSHA), and the state Unified Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Materials Management Regulatory Program. As a result, hazardous material impacts related to construction activities would be less than significant.

Operation of the proposed project includes activities related to residential, vineyard, winery, resort, and retail/restaurant development, which would use hazardous materials including: solvents, cleaning agents, paints, pesticides, batteries, and aerosol cans. Although residents and employees of the project would utilize common types of hazardous materials, normal routine use of these products as indicated by product safety labeling in compliance with federal and state regulations would not result in a significant hazard to residents or workers in the vicinity of the project. Therefore, operation of the proposed project would not result in a significant hazard to the public or to the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous waste during operation of the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment describes that two fuel underground storage tanks (USTs) and five above ground storage tanks (ASTs) were previously located on the project site. Although these USTs and ASTs have been removed in accordance with County of Riverside regulations, a potential environmental concern could exist if substances from the previous storage tanks exist within onsite soils. Thus, Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 has been included, which requires any potentially contaminated soils identified during excavation, grading, or construction activities be analyzed for contaminants of concern for concentrations above worker safety thresholds. Any soils with chemicals exceeding the RWQCB Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs) for residential uses or hazardous waste limits will be characterized, removed, and disposed of off-site at a licensed hazardous materials disposal facility in compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations that are overseen by the County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 would reduce potential impacts related to hazardous materials to a less than significant level.

c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. The County of Riverside has implemented a Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan that identifies risks by natural and human-made disasters and ways to minimize the damage from those disasters. The proposed project would provide residential, vineyard, winery, resort, restaurant, and retail uses that would be permitted and approved in compliance with existing safety regulations, such as the CBC and

Fire Code to ensure that it would not conflict with implementation of the Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan.

The proposed construction activities, including equipment and supply staging and storage, would occur within the project site and would not restrict access of emergency vehicles to the project site or adjacent areas. During construction of the street improvements to Rancho California Road and Buck Road, one lane would remain open to ensure adequate emergency access to the project area and vicinity, and impacts related to interference with an adopted emergency response of evacuation plan during construction activities would be less than significant.

Operation of the project would also not result in a physical interference with an emergency response evacuation. Direct access to the project site would be provided from the roadways adjacent to the project site. The project is also required to design and construct internal access and provide fire suppression facilities (e.g., hydrants and sprinklers) in conformance with the Codified County of Riverside Ordinances. The Riverside County Fire Department would review the development plans prior to approval to ensure adequate emergency access pursuant to the requirements in Municipal Code Chapter 8.32, Fire Code, which incorporates the Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 9. As a result, the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No Impact. There are no proposed or existing schools within 0.25 mile of the project site. The closest existing schools are approximately 6 miles from the project site and include the Vintage Hills Elementary School at 42240 Camino Romo; Bella Vista Middle School at 31650 Browning Street; Crown Hill Elementary at 33535 Old Kent Road; Rancho Elementary School at 31530 La Serena Way. In addition, as described above, the use of hazardous materials during project construction and operational activities would be limited and used and disposed of in compliance with federal, state, and local regulations, which would reduce the potential of accidental release into the environment.

Furthermore, the emissions that would be generated from construction and operation of the proposed project were evaluated in the air quality analysis presented in Section 6, and the emissions generated from the proposed project would not cause or contribute to an exceedance of the federal or state air quality standards. Thus, the proposed project would not emit hazardous or handle acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of school, and impacts would not occur.

e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No Impact. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I 2015) prepared for the project conducted a database search to determine if the project site or any nearby properties are identified as having hazardous materials. The Phase I record search determined that the project site is not located on or near by a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites. As a result, impacts related to hazards from being located on or adjacent to a hazardous materials site would not occur from implementation of the proposed project.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

The mitigating plans, programs, or policies that are relevant to the proposed project includes the following:

Riverside County Ordinance No. 757 and Riverside County Municipal Code Chapter 8.32, Fire Code: The County of Riverside Municipal Code adopts the California Code of Regulations (CCR) as Title 24, Part 9, titled the California Fire Code. This ensures that the appropriate measures would be included in project planning and construction to reduce potential hazards related to fire.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure that is applicable to the proposed project is the following:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: During development of implementing projects, if underground storage tanks (UST) or other potential environmental concerns associated with the implementing project site are encountered, these areas of concern shall be handled as follows:

- The contractor/property owner shall retain all responsibility associated with activities surrounding the safe and legal removal of the tank(s);
- The contractor/ property owner shall notify the local Fire Department jurisdiction prior to removal of the UST as local fire restrictions may be more stringent than County Department of Environmental Health (DEH), Hazardous Materials Management Division requirements;
- The contractor (licensed in accordance with the requirements of the State Contractors License Board) shall submit an Underground Storage Tank Closure by Removal completed permit application (or similar permit application as deemed appropriate) to the County Hazardous Materials Management Division along with applicable closure fees;
- The contractor shall submit a work plan (with the permit application) to the Hazardous Materials Management Division prior to UST removal, which shall demonstrate compliance with the required closure procedures as set forth in the UST closure application currently in effect; and
- The Division will inspect the tank removal, as necessary, evaluate all sample results, determine whether or not an unauthorized release has occurred, and determine if any further corrective actions are required.

Project Specific Mitigation Measure:

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: The grading plans shall include a note that states that should potentially contaminated soils be identified during excavation, grading, or construction activities, the applicant's hazardous materials specialist will collect soils samples and have them analyzed for contaminants of concern for concentrations above worker safety thresholds established by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and/or County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health. Any soils with chemicals exceeding the RWQCB Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs) for residential uses or hazardous waste limits will be characterized, removed, and disposed of off-site at a licensed hazardous materials disposal facility in compliance with state regulations.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
22. Airports				
a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-20 "Airport Locations"; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?

No Impact. As described in the WCCP EIR, the project site is not located within an Airport Master Plan area. The French Valley Airport is located more than 4 miles beyond the boundary of the project site, and the project site is not located within the French Valley Airport Influence Area. As a result, the project would not result in an inconsistency with the French Valley Airport Master Plan. There would be no impacts.

b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?

No Impact. As described in the previous response, the project site is located more than 4 miles from the French Valley Airport, which is the closest airport to the project site. There are no other Airport Influence Areas near the project area. As a result, the project would not require review by the Airport Land Use Commission. There would be no impacts.

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

No Impact. As described in the previous response, the project site is located more than 4 miles from the French Valley Airport, which is the closest airport to the project site. Additionally, the project site is not located within the French Valley Airport land use plan. Due to the distance from the French Valley Airport, safety impacts to people residing or working in the project area related to the airport would not occur. There would be no impacts.

d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is located approximately 4.7 miles from the Billy Joe private airstrip, which is located at 33800 Linda Rosea Road. The airstrip is infrequently used, and permission must be granted by the owner of the airstrip prior to landing. Due to the location and infrequent use of the airstrip, the project would not result in an airstrip related safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. In addition, the ECCP EIR describes that a private-use heliport is located in the southerly portion of the WCCP EIR area, which is farther away than the French Valley Airport, which is 4 miles from the site. The Conditions of Approval for the heliport specify that the helicopter pad may be operated a maximum of two round trips daily between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Similar to the private airstrip, due to the location and infrequent use of the private-use heliport, safety impacts related the heliport would be less than significant.

Plans Programs or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to airport hazards are applicable to the project.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures related to airport hazards that are applicable to the proposed project were adopted by the WCCP EIR.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
23. Hazardous Fire Area a) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-11 "Wildfire Susceptibility"; and the WCCP EIR

a) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Less than Significant Impact. The project is located in a moderate to high fire hazard area. The project shall adhere to all Fire Department requirements for projects located within high fire hazard areas. Any building constructed within this project shall comply with the special construction provisions contained in Riverside County Ordinance No. 787, California Fire Code (CFC), and CBC. The CFC and CBC are applicable by operation of law and are required as a standard condition of approval; therefore, no mitigation is required and impacts would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

The mitigating plans, programs, or policies that are relevant to the proposed project includes the following:

Riverside County Ordinance No. 757 and Riverside County Municipal Code Chapter 8.32, Fire Code: Listed previously in Response 22, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures related to airport hazards that are applicable to the proposed project were adopted by the WCCP EIR.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project				
24. Water Quality Impacts a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐

h) Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors or odors)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Drainage Study for Twelve Oaks Wine Resort Project, prepared by Fuscoe, 2017 (Drainage 2017), included as Appendix E; Water Supply Assessment for the Twelve Oaks Winery Resort Project, prepared by Rancho California Water District, 2018 (WSA 2018), included as Appendix I; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Construction

Construction of the proposed project would require grading and excavation of soils, which would loosen sediment and could result in erosion or siltation. However, construction requires County approval of a grading and erosion control plan per the State General Permit to Discharge Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities (NPDES No. CAS000002), which requires preparation of a SWPPP by a Qualified SWPPP Developer, which would be implemented by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-3, listed previously. The grading and erosion control plan and SWPPP are required for plan check and approval by the County's Building and Safety Division prior to provision of permits for the proposed project and would include construction BMPs to reduce erosion or siltation. Typical BMPs for erosion or siltation, include: use of silt fencing, fiber rolls, gravel bags, stabilized construction driveway, and stockpile management (as further described in the response below). Adherence to the existing requirements and implementation of the required BMPs per the permitting process would ensure that erosion and siltation associated with construction activities would be minimized, and impacts would be less than significant.

Operation

As described by the Drainage Study prepared for the project and as required by the State Water Resources Board Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002, the runoff generated by the proposed project would be conveyed to landscaped areas, bio-retention swales, or to an underground infiltration/detention system that is sized to capture and control all the increased runoff from the developed areas. The onsite drainage system would also filter, retain, and slowly discharge drainage, such that drainage would be controlled and would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

In addition, a WQMP is required to be developed, approved, and implemented to satisfy the requirements of the adopted NPDES program, which would be verified by the County's Building and Safety Division through the County's permitting and inspection process. With implementation of WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures HYD-1, HYD-3, HYD-4, and HYD-5 and as verified during the County's standard review and permitting process. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site is within the Santa Margarita Watershed Region of Riverside County and under the jurisdiction of the RWQCB, which sets water quality standards for all ground and surface waters within its region. Water quality standards are defined under the Clean Water Act (CWA) to include both the beneficial uses of specific water bodies and the levels of water quality that must be met and maintained to protect those uses (water quality objectives). Water quality standards for all ground and surface waters are implemented through the County's standard permitting process.

Construction

Construction of the proposed project would require grading and excavation of soils, which would loosen sediment, and then have the potential to mix with surface water runoff and degrade water quality. Additionally, construction would require the use of heavy equipment and construction-related chemicals, such as concrete,

cement, asphalt, fuels, oils, antifreeze, transmission fluid, grease, solvents and paints. These potentially harmful materials could be accidentally spilled or improperly disposed of during construction and, if mixed with surface water runoff could wash into and pollute waters.

These types of water quality impacts during construction of the project would be prevented through implementation of a grading and erosion control plan that is required by the Construction Activities General Permit (State Water Resources Board Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002), which requires preparation of a SWPPP by a Qualified SWPPP Developer, as included WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures HYD-1 and HYD-3, listed previously in Section 18. The SWPPP is required for plan check and approval by the County's Building and Safety Division, prior to provision of permits for the project, and would include construction BMPs such as:

- Silt fencing, fiber rolls, or gravel bags
- Street sweeping and vacuuming
- Storm drain inlet protection
- Stabilized construction entrance/exit
- Vehicle and equipment maintenance, cleaning, and fueling
- Hydroseeding
- Material delivery and storage
- Stockpile management
- Spill prevention and control
- Solid waste management
- Concrete waste management

Adherence to the existing requirements and implementation of the appropriate BMPs per the WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures HYD-1, HYD-3, HYD-4, and HYD-5, would ensure that activities associated with construction would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and impacts would not occur.

Operation

The proposed project would introduce new development to the project site that includes winery, resort, vineyards resort, and residential uses, which would introduce the potential for pollutants such as, chemicals from cleaners, pesticides and sediment from landscaping, trash and debris, and oil and grease from vehicles. These pollutants could potentially discharge into surface waters and result in degradation of water quality. However, in accordance with State Water Resources Board Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002 the proposed project would be required to incorporate a WQMP with post-construction (or permanent) Low Impact Development (LID) site design, source control, and treatment control BMPs. The LID site design, along with implementation of WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures to increase onsite infiltration would minimize impervious surfaces and provide infiltration of runoff into landscaped areas.

Additionally, source control BMPs would minimize the introduction of pollutants that may result in water quality impacts; and treatment control BMPs that would treat stormwater runoff. The proposed project would install an onsite detention system that is sized to capture and control all the increased runoff from the developed areas, and remove coarse sediment, trash, and pollutants (i.e., sediments, nutrients, heavy metals, oxygen demanding substances, oil and grease, bacteria, and pesticides). The types of BMPs that would be implemented as part of the proposed project are listed in Table HWQ-1.

Table HWQ-1: Types of BMPs Incorporated into the Project Design

Type of BMP	Description of BMPs
LID Site Design	Optimize the site layout: The site has been designed so that runoff from impervious surfaces would flow over pervious surfaces or to the infiltration basin. Runoff would be directed to the onsite infiltration basin that would slow and retain runoff.

	Use pervious surfaces: Landscaping and onsite infiltration areas are incorporated into the project design to increase the amount of pervious area and onsite retention of runoff.
Source Control	Storm Drain Stenciling: All inlets/catch basins would be stenciled with the words "Only Rain Down the Storm Drain," or equivalent message.
	Need for future indoor & structural pest control: Buildings would be designed to avoid openings that would encourage entry of pests.
	Landscape/outdoor pesticide use: Final landscape plans would accomplish all of the following: • Design landscaping to minimize irrigation and runoff, to promote surface infiltration where appropriate, and to minimize the use of fertilizers and pesticides that can contribute to storm water pollution. • Consider using pest-resistant plants, especially adjacent to hardscape. • To ensure successful establishment, select plants appropriate to site soils, slopes, climate, sun, wind, rain, land use, air movement, ecological consistency, and plant interactions
	Roofing, gutters and trim: The architectural design would avoid roofing, gutters, and trim made of copper or other unprotected metals that may leach into runoff.
	Plazas, sidewalks and parking lots: Plazas, sidewalks, and parking lots shall be swept regularly to prevent the accumulation of litter and debris. Debris from pressure washing would be collected to prevent entry into the storm drain system. Wash water containing any cleaning agent or degreaser would be collected and discharged to the sanitary sewer and not discharged to a storm drain.
Treatment Control	Biofiltration Systems: The infiltration system proposed for the project would detain runoff, filter it prior to discharge.

With implementation of the operational BMPs that would be required by the County pursuant to the NPDES permit, which would be verified during the permitting process for the proposed project, potential pollutants would be reduced to the maximum extent feasible, and the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not deplete groundwater supplies. The Rancho California Water District provides water services to the project area, which receives a large portion of water from imported sources. Historically, groundwater has supplied between 25 to 40 percent of the District's total water supply and imported water has supplied between 60 to 70 percent (WSA 2018). The project area overlies the Temecula Valley Groundwater Basin, which is managed by a water master to ensure that groundwater production is within safe yield limits (WSA 2018). Because the project would receive water from the Rancho California Water District, it would not pump water from the project area and would not result in a substantial depletion of groundwater supplies.

In addition, development of the proposed project would result in large areas of impervious surfaces that could include up to 329.1 acres of vineyards, 95.9 acres of open space, as well as the 468 acres of MSHCP dedicated open space would infiltrate water into the basin. The project also includes installation of landscaping and bio-retention swales along both sides of the proposed roadways that would treat and infiltrate stormwater onsite. As a result, the proposed project would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level, and impacts would be less than significant.

d) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As described above in response 26.a), the runoff generated by the proposed project would be conveyed to pervious and landscaping areas, and to an onsite

stormwater drainage system that would filter, retain, and slowly discharge runoff. The onsite retention and filtration system have been sized to accommodate the anticipated flows from development of the project, and would control drainage, such that it would not exceed the capacity of the existing and planned stormwater drainage system or change the rate of pre-project offsite flows. In addition, the storm drain system would include hydrodynamic separators, vault systems, and filters to remove heavy particulates, debris, trash, oil and grease, sediment and other particulates from runoff.

Additionally, a SWPPP and a WQMP are required to be developed, approved, and implemented to satisfy the requirements of the adopted NPDES program, which are implemented by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures HYD-1, HYD-3, HYD-4, and HYD-5, and would be verified during the County's standard review and permitting process to ensure that the proposed project would not provide additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, impacts related to polluted runoff would be less than significant.

e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

No Impact. The project site is not mapped as within a 100-year flood hazard area. As described by the Drainage Report, the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Number 06065C2745G indicates that the southern portion of the site is not within a flood zone, and the northern portion of the site is not located within a FIRM and is also outside of a mapped flood zone (Drainage 2017). Therefore, the proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood zone, and impacts would not occur.

f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

No Impact. As described above, the project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, the proposed project would not place structures within a flood hazard area that could impede or redirect flood flows, and impacts would not occur.

g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Construction
Construction of the proposed project is not expected to pose any additional threats to water quality not already identified above. The project would be required to have an approved grading and erosion control plan and approval of a SWPPP, which would include construction BMPs to minimize the potential for construction related sources of pollution, per WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-3, which would be implemented during construction to protect water quality. As a result, impacts related to the degradation of water quality during construction of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Operation
Operation of the proposed project is not expected to pose any threats to water quality in addition to those described above. As described, the proposed project would be required to implement source control BMPs to minimize the introduction of pollutants; and treatment control BMPs to treat runoff. With implementation of the operational source and treatment control BMPs that would be outlined in a WQMP that would be implemented pursuant to WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-1 and required by the County during the project permitting and approval process, potential pollutants would be reduced to the maximum extent feasible, and implementation of the proposed project would not substantially degrade water quality. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

h) Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors or odors)?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would install an onsite stormdrain systems that would retain and treat stormwater. The system would only contain runoff periodically, which would slowly filter and discharge.

The drainage system has been designed to maintain the flow of runoff, and it would not retain water long enough for an increase in vectors or odors to occur. Thus, the proposed stormwater treatment control BMPs would result in a less than significant impact.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to erosion are applicable to the project.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures that are applicable to the proposed project are as follows:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-1: Listed previously in Section 17, Soils.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-3: Listed previously in Section 17, Soils.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-4: Infiltration may be utilized by implementing projects for maintaining water quality standards. However, any implementing projects proposing onsite stormwater runoff infiltration shall conduct individual percolation tests, prepared by a soils engineer, to determine the feasibility of using infiltration onsite, as well as to provide design recommendations for the chosen BMPs. If infiltration is not feasible based on a specific site's soils properties, some form of on-site detention should be considered to mitigate any additional stormwater runoff that exceeds the existing calculated flows. In this case other BMP's should be evaluated to meet the water quality requirements for the project. Maintaining the use of existing roadside swales in compliance with the current MS4 permit is also recommended to help maintain existing drainage patterns and help with water quality.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-5: All implementing projects shall include measures designed to increase infiltration and reduce impacts to water quality within the upper aquifer. Depending upon project location, the applicable measures shall include the following:

- Require that all wastewater discharges conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board Basin Plan groundwater quality objectives.
- Requires the use of cisterns and infiltrators to capture and reuse rainwater as a water conserving system (Riverside County Policy OS 2.1).
- Require the use of natural drainage systems, permeable parking bays and porous parking lots to provide rainwater detention (Riverside County Policy OS 2.2 and 4.4).
- Require that adequate aquifer water recharge areas are preserved and protected and that rainwater is used to recharge the aquifers (Riverside County Policy OS 4.2 and 4.3).
- Restrict pollutant discharge into the drainage systems and aquifer (Riverside County Policy OS 3.3).
- Prohibit the use of fertilizing, manure spreading, pesticide application, and runoff from animal/horse corrals within all drainage courses, especially Temecula Creek.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

			Mitigation Incorporated	
25. Floodplains				
Degree of Suitability in 100-Year Floodplains. As indicated below, the appropriate Degree of Suitability has been checked.				
NA - Not Applicable ☒	U - Generally Unsuitable ☐			R - Restricted ☐
a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 "Special Flood Hazard Areas," Figure S-10 "Dam Failure Inundation Zone," Drainage Study for Twelve Oaks Wine Resort Project, prepared by Fuscoe, 2017 (Drainage 2017), included as Appendix E; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Construction

As detailed previously in response 26.a), construction of the proposed project would require County approval of a SWPPP, which would be implemented by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-3, listed previously. The SWPPP would include construction BMPs to provide that an increase in the rate of amount of runoff would not increase. With implementation of the required SWPPP the potential of construction activities to result in an increase in the amount of runoff would be less than significant.

Operation

As detailed previously in response 26.a), runoff generated by the proposed project would be conveyed to landscaping and other impervious areas onsite, in addition to an onsite storm water drainage system that would filter, retain, and slowly discharge runoff, such that drainage would be controlled and would not result in an increase in runoff that could result in on or off-site flooding. The infiltration basin and the storm drain lines that connect to the basin have been designed by the drainage study prepared for the project to meet the stormwater needs of the proposed project (Drainage 2017), and the project would be required to implement WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures HYD-1, HYD-4, and HYD-5 that provide for a WQMP and onsite infiltration of stormwater, which would reduce the amount of surface runoff as required by regional stormwater regulations. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially change absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff, and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site is currently undeveloped and has a pervious surface. The proposed project would include development of buildings, driveways, and parking areas that would result in a substantial increase of impervious surfaces. However, as described previously, the proposed project would install an onsite stormwater drainage system that would capture and retain runoff have been designed to meet the stormwater needs of the proposed project and would implement WCCP EIR Mitigation

Measures HYD-1, HYD-4, and HYD-5. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, and impacts would be less than significant.

c) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area)?

No Impact. The County General Plan Safety Element Figure S-10, Dam Failure Inundation Zones, shows that the project site is not located within a dam inundation area. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to risks related to flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. There would be no impacts.

d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?

No Impact. The project site is over 2 miles south of Lake Skinner, which is the closest substantial water body. As described in response 7.e) and f) previously, the project site includes small areas of wetlands that total 1.16 acres. However, as described in the previous responses, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially alter the drainage patterns of the project site. Runoff that is not infiltrated into landscaped and pervious areas onsite would drain to an onsite stormwater system that would retain, filter, and slowly discharge runoff to ensure that runoff is controlled. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a change in the amount of surface water in a water body. There would be no impacts.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to floodplains are applicable to the project.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures: that are applicable to the proposed project are as follows:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-1: Listed previously in Section 17, Soils.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-3: Listed previously in Section 17, Soils.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-4: Listed previously in Section 24, Water Quality.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-5: Listed previously in Section 24, Water Quality.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project				
26. Land Use a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Riverside County General Plan; Riverside County Zoning Ordinance; the WCCP; the WCCP EIR; Riverside County Parcel Report. Accessed: https://gis.countyofriverside.us/Html5Viewer/?viewer=MMC_Public.

a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is currently undeveloped, and the proposed project would develop residential uses, a Winery Resort, wineries, vineyards, orchards, and recreational and supporting uses on the project site. However, the proposed project is an "implementing project" of the approved WCCP, which allows for:

- Cottage Inns
- Class I, II, V and VI Wineries
- Wine Country Clustered Residential subdivisions

The proposed use is in compliance with the current land use of Agriculture: Agriculture (AG: AG) and Rural Residential (RR) in the Southwest Area Plan. It is also located within the Wine Country Policy Area; within the Winery District. The clustered subdivision lies within the RR land use designation and the Winery Resort lies within the AG designation. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in an alteration of the planned land use of the area, and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?

No Impact. The proposed project site is not located within a city sphere of influence. The closest city to the project site is the City of Temecula, which is located approximately 4.5 miles west of the site. In addition, the project site is not located near the County boundary. Thus, impacts related to a city sphere of influence or land within another county would not occur from implementation of the proposed project. There would be no impacts.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to land use are applicable to the project.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures related to land use that are applicable to the proposed project were adopted by the WCCP EIR.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
27. Planning				
a) Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element Table LU-4, Land Use Designations Summary; the WCCP EIR; Riverside County Parcel Report. Accessed: https://gis.countyofriverside.us/Html5Viewer/?viewer=MMC_Public

a) Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?

No Impact. The proposed project does not involve a proposed zone change. The project site is zoned Wine Country-Winery Zone (WC-W). As described previously in Response 28, the proposed project is an "implementing project" of the approved WCCP and would be developed pursuant to the WC-W zoning regulations and the development requirements within the WCCP. The County's standard development review and permitting process ensures that all applicable zoning regulations are implemented. Thus, the proposed project would be consistent with the site's existing zoning. There would be no impacts.

b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not include a proposed zone change, and implementation of the project would be consistent with the WC-W zoning of the project site. The project site is surrounded by areas that are zoned for Citrus/Vineyard, Light Agriculture, and Open Space Conservation, which provide for similar low density residential, winery, resort, vineyard, and open space uses that are proposed for the project. The project is consistent with the existing zoning of the project site and is compatible with the surrounding area's zoning. Both the WC-W and C/V zones allow for farming operations of crops, orchards, groves, and vineyards. The clustered subdivision would have approximately 109 acres (76%) of vineyard planting, as required per the Temecula Wine Country Policy Area) for a winery or winery clustered subdivision. The winery resort would have about 91 acres (75%) of vineyard planting. Additionally, besides residential dwellings along Borel Road, there are existing wineries along Rancho California Road; down Summitville Street (those being Chapin Family Vineyards and Doffo Winery) and other wineries further down Ranch California Road approximately ½ mile (those being Wilson Creek, Monte De Oro, and Paulk Wineries) to name a few. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?

No Impact. The project site is bound on three sides by roads. Buck Road, which is unpaved west of the intersection with Rancho California Road, forms the entirety of the southern boundary and a portion of the eastern boundary. Buck Road becomes Warren Road north of the intersection with East Benton Road. Borel Road forms the project's northern boundary.

Beyond these roadways, the project site is surrounded by undeveloped land, agricultural uses, open space, wineries and vineyards, and low-density residential uses. Chapin Family Vineyards and Doffo Winery are located immediately east of the project site, and a plant nursery is located to the southeast. These facilities allow wine tasting, visitors and events similar to the proposed project. Vineyards, an orchard, and greenhouses are located directly south of the project site. Low density residential uses are located to the south along Buck Road and Rancho California Road, to the southeast along Camino del Vino, and east of Warren Road. In addition, open space is located northeast across Warren Road, and northwest of the project site. To the west is conserved land given over to the Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) for MSHCP conservation. This occurred through this development's previous project entitlement (TTM34466).

The existing low density residential, vineyards, wineries, and open space uses that surround the project site are consistent with the proposed low density residential, Winery Resort, Cottage Inns, wineries, vineyards, and open space uses proposed by the project. Impacts related to compatibility with existing land uses would occur. In addition, as described previously, the proposed project is an "implementing project" of the approved WCCP and would be developed pursuant to the Wine Country-Winery zoning regulations and the development requirements within the WCCP. Additionally, the previous entitlement (TTM34466) was approved in April 2007. Therefore, the proposed project would be compatible with planned surrounding land uses, which are also regulated by the WCCP. Overall, impacts related to existing and planned land use compatibility would not occur from implementation of the proposed project. There would be no impacts.

d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?

Less than Significant Impact. The project site has a General Plan land use designation of Agriculture (AG) and Rural Residential (RR). The AG designation allows agricultural land including row crops, groves, nurseries, dairies, poultry farms, processing plants, and other related uses, and one single-family residence per 10 acres except as otherwise specified by a policy or an overlay. In addition, as described previously, the project is an "implementing project" of the WCCP, which allows for:

- Cottage Inns
- Class I, II, V and VI Wineries
- Wine Country Clustered Residential subdivisions

The RR designation allows for single-family residences with a minimum of 5 acres, limited animal and agricultural uses, recreational uses, compatible resource development, and associated uses. The WC-W zoning grants developments the ability to cluster subdivisions and allow for dwelling units (density yield) as low as 1 per acre. The clustered subdivision lies within the RR designation and the Winery Resort lies within the AG designation. The project site is located within the Winery District of the WCCP. The WCCP EIR describes that the primary purpose of the Winery District is to promote the establishment of additional commercial activities that support tourism associated with viticulture while ensuring long-term viability of the wine industry in the area. The secondary purpose of the Winery District is to recognize, and allow the expansion of, existing wineries that are an integral part of the Temecula Valley Wine Country economy.

As provided in the project description, the proposed project would develop Cottage Inns that are on 10-acre minimum lots, various class wineries, promotes tourism by development of the Winery Resort. In addition, the clustered residential subdivisions would conform to the WC-W zone standards within the AG General Plan land use designation. Overall, the project would be developed pursuant to the General Plan and WCCP regulations and standards, which would be ensured through the County's permitting process; and as described in the WCCP EIR, the WCCP does not result in inconsistencies with the County's General Plan. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?

No Impact. The physical division of an established community could occur if a major road (expressway or freeway, for example) were built through an existing community or neighborhood, or if a major development was built which was inconsistent with the land uses in the community such that it divided the community. The environmental effects caused by such a facility or land use could include lack of, or disruption of, access to services, schools, or shopping areas. It might also include the creation of blighted buildings or areas due to the division of the community.

The proposed project site is undeveloped and surrounded on three sides by roadways, and one side by preserved open space. Beyond the adjacent roadways, land uses include low density residential, vineyards, wineries, and open space, which are consistent with the proposed low density residential, winery resort, and open space uses proposed by the project. The proposed project would develop the undeveloped site and provide onsite roadways to serve the project area and connect to Buck Road and Warren Street. These new roads would not change any existing street systems or divide any developed areas. Overall, implementation of the proposed project would not physically divide an established community. There would be no impacts.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to planning are applicable to the project.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

No project applicable mitigation measures related to planning were adopted by the WCCP EIR.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project				
28. Mineral Resources a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-6 "Mineral Resources Area"; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?

Less than Significant Impact. As described in the WCCP EIR, aggregate mineral resources contribute significantly to the development and economic wellbeing of Riverside County, and the statewide assessment of mineral resources prepared by the California Geological Survey, indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist within project area. However, the significance of these deposits is undetermined, and thus, the project area is classified as MRZ-3. Therefore, the project area is not considered to be an area of known mineral resources, and impacts related to known mineral resources would not occur. In addition, the WCCP EIR includes Mitigation Measure MIN-1, which requires the County Geologist to make a site-specific determination of the potential of the site to contain or yield important or significant mineral resources of value, which would ensure that the proposed project does not result in the loss of known mineral resources. A geotechnical investigation was completed for the project site, which determined that no important or significant mineral resources of value occur onsite. The County Geologist reviewed the report and accepted the findings that no mineral resources are located on the project site. Thus, the WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure MIN-1 has been implemented and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact. The project site has been historically used for agriculture and is not considered to be an area of known mineral resources. In addition, the project site is not identified as a locally-important mineral resources recovery site on any land use plan. Therefore, the project would not have the potential to result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated in the General Plan, Specific Plans, or any other land use plan. There would be no impacts.

c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?

No Impact. There are no existing surface mines or state classified/designated mining areas in the vicinity of the project site. Thus, impacts related to incompatible land uses in mine areas would not occur from implementation of the project. There would be no impacts.

d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?

No Impact. As described above, no existing or abandoned quarries or mines exist in or adjacent to the project site. Thus, impacts related to exposure to hazards from quarries or mines would not occur from implementation of the proposed project. There would be no impacts.

Plans Programs or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to mineral resources are applicable to the project.

Completed WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure:

The following WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure that is applicable to the proposed project has been completed and is included as Appendix D:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure MIN-1: Pursuant to Public Resources Code, the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act, Chapter 9, Article 4, Section 2762(e), prior to approval of a future implementing project on lands classified by the State Geologist as MRZ-3 (as described in paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of Section 2761), the County Geologist shall make a site-specific determination as to the site's potential to contain or yield important or significant mineral resources of value to the region and the residents of the State of California.

- If it is determined by the County Geologist that lands classified as MRZ-3 have the potential to yield significant mineral resources which may be of "regional or statewide significance" and the proposed use is considered "incompatible" (as defined by Section 3675 of Title 14, Article 6 of the California Code of Regulations) and could threaten the potential to extract said minerals, the project proponent shall prepare an evaluation of the area in order to ascertain the significance of the mineral deposit located therein. This site-specific mineral resource study shall be performed to, at a minimum, document the site's known or inferred geological conditions; describe the existing levels of development on or near the site which might preclude mining as a viable adjacent use; and analyze the State standards for designating land as having "regional or Statewide significant" under the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act. The results of such evaluation shall be transmitted to the State Geologist and the State Mining and Geological Board (SMGB).
- Should significant mineral resources be identified, future implementing projects shall either avoid said resource or shall incorporate appropriate findings subject to a site-specific discretionary review and CEQA process.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
NOISE Would the project result in				
Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings Where indicated below, the appropriate Noise Acceptability Rating(s) has been checked. NA - Not Applicable A - Generally Acceptable B - Conditionally Acceptable C - Generally Unacceptable D - Land Use Discouraged				
29. Airport Noise a) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the	☐	☐	☐	☒

project area to excessive noise levels?
NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-20 "Airport Locations," County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map; and the WCCP EIR.

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

No Impact. As described in the WCCP EIR, the project site is not located within an Airport Land Use Plan area. The French Valley Airport is the closest airport to the project site and is located more than 4 miles beyond the boundary of the project site. Due to the distance from the French Valley Airport, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. There would be no impacts.

b) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. The project site is located approximately 4.7 miles from the Billy Joe private airstrip, which is located at 33800 Linda Rosea Road. The airstrip is infrequently used, and permission must be granted by the owner of the airstrip prior to landing. Due to the location and infrequent use of the airstrip, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels related to the heliport. There would be no impacts.

Plans Programs or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to airport or airstrip noise are applicable to the project.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures related to airport or airstrip noise that are applicable to the proposed project were adopted by the WCCP EIR.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
30. Railroad Noise NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure C-1 "Circulation Plan"; and the WCCP EIR

No Impact. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a railroad, and development on the project site would not expose people to railroad noise. Impacts related to railroad noise would not occur from implementation of the proposed project. There would be no impacts.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to railroad noise are applicable to the project.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures related to airport or airstrip noise that are applicable to the proposed project were adopted by the WCCP EIR.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
31. Highway Noise NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Acoustical Site Assessment Report (NOISE 2018), prepared by HELIX and is included as Appendix J; and the Transportation Impact Analysis, prepared by Fehr and Peers and included as Appendix K.

No Impact. There are no highways that can be heard from the project site. The project site is bound by Buck Road to the south, Warren Road to the east, and Borel Road to the north, which are two-lane roadways with speed limits of 55 miles per hour. These roads are classified as a Mountain Arterials in the Wine Country Community Plan and are not highways. Additionally, the closest highways are Interstate 15 and Interstate 215 which is approximately 8.00 miles west from the Project site. Thus, impacts related to highway noise would not occur from implementation of the proposed project. Impacts related to noise on the adjacent roadways is provided below in Response 35.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to highway noise are applicable to the project.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures related to highway noise that are applicable to the proposed project were adopted by the WCCP EIR.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
32. Other Noise NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Acoustical Site Assessment Report (NOISE 2018), prepared by HELIX and is included as Appendix J; and the WCCP EIR.

No Impact. The project site is not subject to any existing noise sources that could impact the proposed project, or that could be impacted by the proposed project. Therefore, impacts related to other noise would not occur. There would be no impacts.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to other noise are applicable to the project.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures related to other noise that are relevant to the proposed project were adopted by the WCCP EIR.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
33. Noise Effects on or by the Project a) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Source: Acoustical Site Assessment Report (Noise 2018), prepared by HELIX and is included as Appendix J; and the WCCP EIR.

Existing Ambient Noise

The ambient noise levels in the project area are dominated by traffic-related noise associated with the existing roadways. The Acoustical Site Assessment Report conducted noise level measurement near the Warren Road/ Summitville Street intersection, which identified a noise level of 52.3 dBA; and near the Rancho California Road/ Buck Road intersection, which identified a noise level of 54.6 dBA (Noise 2018). These noise levels are within the County's acceptable limits for the adjacent agricultural land uses (75 CNEL), planned hotel room uses (65 CNEL), and low density residential (60 CNEL) (Noise 2018).

Noise Thresholds

As described in the Acoustical Site Assessment Report, noise generated by the project would be significant if noise at a "habitable dwelling, hospital, school, library or nursing home" exceeds 45 dBA for more than 10 minutes between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.; or 65 dBA for more than 10 minutes between the daytime hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. In addition, impacts would be significant if new agricultural uses are subjected to levels above 75 CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level), hotel uses are subjected to 65 CNEL, or low-density residential uses are subjected to 60 CNEL.

The County does not have specific thresholds for traffic-related noise increases. Therefore, the FTA's Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment criteria is implemented, which states that a substantial permanent increase in traffic noise would occur if the project results in an ambient noise of:

- 3 dBA for roadways where the baseline noise level is less than 60 CNEL
- 2 dBA for roadways where the baseline noise level is 60-64.9 CNEL
- 1 dBA for roadways where the baseline noise level is 65 CNEL or over

Ordinance No. 847 states that sites designated Rural Residential and Agriculture have daytime and nighttime noise standard of 45 dBA L_{EQ}.

The use of the FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment criteria is a conservative approach to ambient noise impacts and provides for a smaller increase in ambient noise levels caused by a proposed project when the existing noise exposure is already high.

a) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less than Significant Impact.

Traffic Generated Noise: As described in Section 16, Transportation and Traffic, the project would generate 263 trips in the a.m. peak hour, 457 trips in the p.m. peak hour, and 664 trips during the Saturday peak hour (Fehr & Peers 2017) with build out of the project in 2020. Table N-1, provides the traffic noise levels along street segments surrounding the project site during weekday p.m. peak hour and Saturday peak hour for existing conditions, 2020 conditions without the project, and 2020 conditions including build out of the project.

Table N-1: Estimated Roadway Noise Levels at 100 feet

Roadway	Segment	Existing (CNEL)	No Project (2020) (CNEL)	Project Build Out (2020) (CNEL)	Increase in Noise Level (dBA)
Weekday					
Rancho California Road	Glen Oaks Road to Monte de Oro	63.5	64.0	65.1	+1.1
	Monte de Oro to Anza Road	64.5	65.0	65.9	+0.9
Warren Road	Benton to Borel Road	58.9	59.4	60.1	+0.7
Borel Road	West of Warren Road	58.9	59.4	60.2	+0.8
Buck Road/Future Road	Glen Oaks to Benton Road	60.3	60.9	61.9	+1.0
Weekend					
Rancho California Road	Glen Oaks Road to Monte de Oro	64.2	64.7	66.0	+1.3
	Monte de Oro to Anza Road	65.8	66.3	67.2	+0.9
Warren Road	Benton to Borel Road	59.0	59.5	60.6	+1.1
Borel Road	West of Warren Road	59.0	59.5	60.3	+0.8
Buck Road/Future Road	Glen Oaks to Benton Road	59.3	59.8	61.6	+1.8

Source: Helix, 2018

As shown in Table N-1, the maximum traffic noise increase from build out the project in 2020 would be 1.8 dBA at 100 feet from the Buck Road roadway centerline on the weekend. This increase is less than the 3 dBA increase threshold for areas with existing ambient noise levels below 60 CNEL, such as this location. Therefore, this increase in ambient noise would be less than significant.

The second highest increase would be on Rancho California Road between Glen Oaks Road to Monte de Oro, where noise levels would increase by 1.3 dBA at 100 feet. This increase is less than the 2 dBA increase threshold for areas with existing ambient noise levels between 60-64.9 CNEL, such as this location. Therefore, this increase in ambient noise would be less than significant. In addition, Rancho California Road between Monte de Oro to Anza Road has an existing noise level above 65 dBA CNEL, and traffic from build out of the project would result in a 0.9 dBA increase, which is less than the 1 dBA threshold for roadways where the baseline noise level is 65 CNEL or over. Therefore, impacts related to a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels would be less than significant.

b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Construction of the proposed project would involve grubbing, grading, excavation and re-compaction of soils, utility and infrastructure installation, building construction, roadway pavement, and architectural coatings. Construction of the proposed project would require use of heavy equipment that would increase noise levels in the immediate project area. The noise from construction activity would fluctuate depending on the particular type, number, and duration of use of construction equipment.

The Acoustical Site Assessment Report prepared for the project describes that construction of Phase 2 may occur during operation of Phase 1, and Phase 3 construction may continue construction following completion of Phase 2. Construction noise would be audible to both on-site and off-site receivers. The southernmost residential construction pad of the second phase is approximately 300 feet from the nearest off-site residence. Construction

of Phase 2 would occur at approximately 800 feet from the completed winery resort and hotel. Construction of Phase 3 would occur at distances as short as 200 feet from completed Phase 2 residences. Thus, the closest noise sensitive use would be 200 feet from construction activity.

It is assumed that the two loudest pieces of equipment (an excavator and dump truck) would be operating at the same time in a given hour. As shown in Table N-2, the loudest estimated noise level would be 68.7 dBA at a distance of 200 feet and would result in a temporary and periodic increase in noise levels at some residences.

Table N-2: Construction Equipment Noise Levels

Unit	Percent Operating Time	dBA L_{EQ} (1-hour) @ 200 feet	L_{MAX} @ 200 feet
Excavator	40	64.7	68.7
Dump Truck	40	60.4	64.4

Source: Helix, 2018

As described in the WCCP EIR, implementing projects, such as the proposed project would be subject to compliance with Ordinance No. 847, Section 2, which exempts construction noise provided that construction of projects located within one-quarter mile from an inhabited dwelling does not occur between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. from June through September, and between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. from October through May, which would limit the construction noise impacts to the daytime hours. Additionally, implementation of WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would reduce construction noise associated with future implementing projects through site-specific, noise-reduction features and requiring alternatives to pneumatic power tools. Also, WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure NOI-2 includes a list of measures to respond to and track complaints related to construction noise. With implementation of WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures NOI-1 and NOI-2, as well as compliance with Ordinance No. 847, short-term construction noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

c) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Traffic Generated Noise: The Acoustical Site Assessment conducted noise modeling for maximum traffic noise levels at distances between 50 and 500 feet using daily traffic estimates that included ambient growth, traffic from the proposed project, and traffic from cumulative growth. The modeling identified the following noise levels:

- Traffic noise near the Warren Road/Summitville Street intersection would be 52.8 CNEL.
- Traffic noise from the project public roadway would be 52.2 CNEL.
- Traffic noise near Rancho California Road would be 59.2 CNEL.
- Traffic noise near Buck Road would be 56.5 CNEL.

These levels would be below the exterior low-density residential noise limits of 60 CNEL. Therefore, traffic generated by the proposed project would not generate noise in excess of County standards, and impacts would be less than significant.

Stationary Noise (HVAC Units): The Acoustical Site Assessment describes that the nearest property line to a rooftop HVAC at the Winery Resort would be approximately 300 feet. At this distance, five of these units operating on a rooftop shielded behind a parapet wall would generate noise levels of approximately 45 dBA L_{EQ}, which would not exceed the exterior noise threshold, and noise impacts from HVAC equipment at the Winery Resort would be less than significant.

The nearest property line to a HVAC unit at a proposed residence would be approximately 300 feet. At this distance, an HVAC unit would generate noise levels of approximately 23.4 dBA L_{EQ}, which would not exceed the exterior noise threshold. Additionally, a residential HVAC unit would produce noise levels of 45 dBA L_{EQ} at less than 25 feet from a receiver; however, no proposed residences would be within 25 feet of a neighboring HVAC

unit. Thus, residential HVAC units would not exceed these exterior noise thresholds and impacts from residential HVAC equipment would be less than significant.

Event Noise: The proposed project includes approximately 24,300 square feet of indoor event space and 1,700 square feet of outdoor event space at the Winery Resort that would be used to host events such as weddings, concerts, and corporate meetings. Special events may be held indoors or outdoors. Ordinance 847 and the WCCP Program EIR include specific restrictions on outdoor events with noise amplification, likely due to the typical lack of noise attenuation from structures. Stationary noise emanating from the wineries would occur from both live/amplified music and activities involving crowds of people (e.g., parties, weddings, receptions, social gatherings, etc.). Crowd noise is dependent on several factors including vocal effort, total number of people, whether the source is synchronous or random in time, and whether the orientation of the crowd members is random or diffused.

The Acoustical Site Assessment describes that noise levels generated by human speech ranges from 55 to 65 dBA at a distance of 5 feet. Assuming that a maximum of three simultaneous functions with up to 250 attendees per function are occurring and that approximately 30 percent of these individuals are talking in a moderate to loud voice, there would be an approximate noise level of 65 dBA. With attendees scattered over an area spaced approximately 5 feet apart, the noise would be approximately 74 to 77 dBA. The proposed intervening building structures between the outdoor event space and the nearby receivers would reduce noise to approximately 25 dBA at 250 feet. Any outdoor amplified sound would be oriented toward the center of the property and away from adjoining land uses. The nearest quasi-residential use is a cottage inn, located approximately 420 feet to the east from the Wedding Pavilion/Event Barn. The Cottage Inns are primarily commercial in nature but may have residents for extended periods of time; therefore, for purposes of analyzing the potential highest noise level condition, Cottage Inns are considered a residential use.

Indoor and outdoor amplification is required to comply with Ordinance No. 847 and the WCCP. Ordinance No. 847 Section (c), Audio Equipment, prohibits the operation of audio equipment between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. such that the equipment is audible inside an inhabited dwelling, and at any other time such that the equipment is audible at a distance greater than 100 feet from the source. Additionally, Ordinance No. 847 Section (d), Sound Amplifying Equipment and Live Music, prohibits the operation of sound amplifying equipment or performance of live music between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., and at any other time such that the equipment or live music is audible at a distance greater than 200 feet from the source. Ordinance No. 847 Section 7, Exceptions, allows for the application for single or continuous exceptions from the provisions of Ordinance No. 847. As shown in Table N-3, Special Event Noise, exterior noise from music sound at 320 feet would be approximately 63.5 dBA and would exceed the daytime Rural Residential and Agriculture maximum of 45 dBA L_{EQ} at the nearest Cottage Inn structure. Approval of the proposed CUP 03719 and Noise Exception (NE18003) would satisfy the Section 7 Exceptions requirement for a continuous event. The WCCP EIR predicted combined music and crowd outdoor noise levels for multiple distances.

Table N-3 Special Event Noise

Source	dBA at 20 feet	dBA at 40 feet	dBA at 80 feet	dBA at 160 feet	dBA at 320 feet	dBA at 640 feet	dBA at 1,280 feet
Crowd Noise and Live Band	84.9	78.9	72.9	66.9	60.9	54.9	48.9
Crowd Noise and DJ	87.5	81.5	75.5	69.5	63.5	57.5	51.5
Notes/Assumptions: Crowd noise of 62 dBA at one meter was added to the reference noise levels for a live band and DJ. Noise calculations at various receptor distances use a standard attenuation rate of 6 dBA per doubling of distance and do not assume attenuation by intervening structures.							

Source: WCCP EIR, Table 4.12-11, Special Event Noise, 2018

Ordinance No. 847 indicates that exterior sound levels of up to 55 dBA is considered compatible with low density residential uses, and that 65 dBA is considered acceptable for Tourist Commercial uses. The closest estate residential lot to the Winery Resort's wedding pavilion is approximately 418 feet away. The structure closest to the Winery Resort to be located on this closest lot would be occupied by a cottage inn, which would have up to 5

rooms, and be separated from the Resort by a vineyard planting area and a road. As a cottage inn, the use of the estate residential lot closest to the Winery Resort would operate similarly to a Tourist Commercial use, and therefore exterior noise levels of 65 dBA would be considered conditionally acceptable. As shown in Table N-3, the maximum special event noise would not exceed 63.5 dBA under the loudest outdoor noise scenario at a distance that is closer to the noise source than the cottage inn. If the exception application is approved, reasonable conditions may be imposed to minimize the public detriment, including, but not limited to, restrictions on sound level, sound duration and operating hours. In addition, the project would be implemented in compliance with WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures NOI-3 through NOI-6, which would reduce noise from activities and events.

Therefore, with approval of the CUP and Noise Exception, which permits continuous events at the Resort, the project would comply with County Noise Ordinance No. 847 and impacts would be less than significant.

d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As described in the Acoustical Site Assessment Report, excessive ground-borne vibration is defined as equal to or in excess of 0.2 in/sec peak particle velocity (PPV). Construction activities within 200 feet and pile driving within 600 feet of a vibration sensitive use would be potentially disruptive to vibration-sensitive operations.

No pile driving or blasting would occur as part of project construction. However, project construction would utilize a vibratory roller (primarily used to achieve soil compaction as part of the foundation and paving construction), which would generate the maximum groundborne vibration from the project. A vibratory roller creates approximately 0.210 in/sec PPV at a distance of 25 feet. Vibratory rollers are expected to be used during paving of Buck Road and would operate approximately100 feet from the nearest occupied residence. At this distance, vibration would be 0.046 in/sec PPV, which would not exceed 0.2 in/sec PPV; thus, vibration impacts would be less than significant. In addition, the project would be implemented in compliance with WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures NOI-1 and NOI-7, which regulate the use of construction equipment which would reduce vibration from construction activities. Furthermore, project operation of the Winery Resort, residences, wineries, vineyards, and other proposed uses does not include operation of equipment or activities that would produce excessive groundborne vibration.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

PPP NOI-1: County Municipal Code Chapter 9.52.020. Exempts construction noise from noise limit requirements between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. during the months of June through September, and 7:00 a.m. through 6:00 p.m. during all other months.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures that are applicable to the proposed project are as follows:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure NOI-1: All implementing projects shall comply with the following noise reduction measures during grading and building activities:

- If construction occurs within one-quarter mile of an inhabited dwelling, construction activities shall be limited to the daytime hours of 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. during the months of June through September, and to 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. during the months of October through May.
- To minimize noise from idling engines, all vehicles and construction equipment shall be prohibited from idling in excess of three minutes when not in use.
- Best efforts should be made to locate stockpiling and/or vehicle staging area as far as practicable from existing residential dwellings.
- Equipment and trucks shall utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible).

- Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) shall be hydraulically or electronically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler shall be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to about ten dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves shall be used where feasible, and this could achieve a reduction of five dBA. Quieter procedures shall be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment, whenever feasible.
- Stationary construction noise sources shall be located as far from adjacent receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and incorporate insulation barriers, or other measures to the extent feasible.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Implementing project proponents shall submit a list of measures to respond to and track complaints pertaining to construction noise, ongoing throughout demolition, grading, and/or construction. These measures may include the following:

- A sign posted on-site pertaining the permitted construction days and hours and complaint procedures and who to notify in the event of a problem. The sign may also include a listing of both the County and construction contractor's telephone numbers (during regular construction hours and off-hours); and
- A pre-construction meeting may be held with the job inspectors and the general contractor/on-site project manager to confirm that noise measures and practices (including construction hours, neighborhood notification, posted signs, etc.) are completed.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure NOI-3: All implementing projects involving a new winery or expansion of an existing winery shall be reviewed by the Riverside County Office of Industrial Hygiene and include at least the following conditions:

- The hours of operation for tasting rooms associated with wineries shall be limited to 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Sunday in the Wine Country - Winery District and 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Sunday in the Wine Country - Equestrian and Residential Districts.
- Mechanical equipment including but not limited to, de-stemming, crushing, and refrigeration equipment shall be enclosed or shielded for noise attenuation. Alternatively, the proponent may submit a Noise Study prepared by a qualified acoustical analyst that demonstrates that the unenclosed/unshielded equipment would not exceed the County's allowable noise levels.
- The hours of operation for shipping facilities associated with wineries shall be limited to 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Sunday in the Wine Country - Winery District and 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Sunday in the Wine Country - Equestrian and Residential Districts.
- Shipping facilities and parking areas which abut residential parcels shall be located away from sensitive land uses and be designed to minimize potential noise impacts upon nearby sensitive land uses.
- Site-specific noise-attenuating features such as hills, berms, setbacks, block walls, or other measures shall be considered for noise attenuation in noise-producing areas of future wineries including, but not limited to, locations of mechanical equipment, locations of shipping facilities, access, and parking areas.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure NOI-4: All implementing projects involving a special occasion facility shall be required to conduct a noise study prior to its approval. Similarly, all implementing projects involving an outdoor special occasion facility shall be required to conduct an acoustical analysis (that shows the noise contours outside the property boundary) prior to its approval.

- The said noise study or acoustical analysis shall be submitted to the Office of Industrial Hygiene for review and comments.
- Based on those comments, the implementing project shall be conditioned to mitigate noise impacts to the applicable County noise standards through site design and buildings techniques.
- Prior to the issuance of any building permit for the special occasion facility, those noise mitigation measures shall have received the necessary permits from Building and Safety Department.

- Prior to issuance of occupancy permit for the special occasion facility, those noise mitigation measures shall be constructed/implemented.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure NOI-5: All implementing projects involving a special occasion facility shall be reviewed by the Riverside County Office of Industrial Hygiene and include at least the following conditions:

- All special event venders (e.g. DJs, musical bands, etc.) shall be notified regarding noise conditions of approval.
- Outdoor special events and associated audio equipment, sound amplifying equipment, and/or performance of live music shall be limited to the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Monday through Sunday.
- Noise levels shall be kept below levels prescribed in the County's General Plan Noise Element and County Noise Ordinance No. 847 by using a decibel-measuring device to measure music sound levels when amplified music is used.
- Clean-up activities associated with special events shall terminate no later than midnight.
- Outdoor amplified sound for all scheduled events shall be prohibited, except as necessary for public safety or incidental to the event, as determined appropriate by the County Planning Director. Existing County Ordinance No. 847 allows exemptions for outdoor amplified sound for single events or ongoing activity, subject to discretionary review. If considered for an exemption under Ordinance No. 847, the outdoor amplified sound would be oriented toward the center of the property and away from adjoining land uses.
- Padding/carpeting shall be installed under music speakers for early absorption of music.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure NOI-6: All implementing projects involving a special occasion facility shall include at least the following conditions to ensure proper enforcement of the County Ordinances and project conditions:

- After issuance of two Code Violation Notices for excessive noise, noise measurements shall be performed by the Office of Industrial Hygiene for every event at the property line, to determine if the Noise Ordinance and project conditions are being followed during the special events.
- If violations of the Noise Ordinance or project conditions are found, the County shall reconsider allowed hours of operation, number of guests, amount of special events per year, or approval of the specific facility.
- The proponents shall be required to pay fees assessed per the Department's hourly rate pursuant to Ordinance No. 671.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure NOI-7: Prior to the issuance of each grading permit, all implementing projects shall demonstrate compliance with the following measures to reduce the potential for human annoyance and architectural/structural damage resulting from elevated groundborne noise and vibration levels:

- Pile driving within a 50-foot radius of occupied units or historic or potentially historic structures shall utilize alternative installation methods where possible (e.g., pile cushioning, jetting, pre-drilling, cast-in-place systems, resonance-free vibratory pile drivers).
- If no alternative to pile driving is deemed feasible, the preexisting condition of all designated historic buildings within a 50-foot radius of proposed construction activities shall be evaluated during a preconstruction survey. The preconstruction survey shall determine conditions that exist before construction begins for use in evaluating damage caused by construction activities. Fixtures and finishes within a 50-foot radius of construction activities susceptible to damage shall be documented (photographically and in writing) prior to construction. All damage shall be repaired back to its preexisting condition.
- Vibration monitoring shall be conducted prior to and during pile driving operations occurring within 100 feet of the historic structures. Every attempt shall be made to limit construction-generated vibration levels during pile driving and impact activities in the vicinity of the historic structures.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
34. Paleontological Resources a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8 "Paleontological Sensitivity"; Paleontological Resource Assessment, prepared by Applied EarthWorks, Inc, 2016 (Paleo 2016) (Appendix F); and the WCCP EIR.

a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As described in the WCCP EIR, the project area is identified as having high sensitivity for paleontological resources and is underlain by soil formations with substantial potential for containing substantial fossil vertebrate specimens. Thus, the WCCP EIR included Mitigation Measures CUL-4 and CUL-5, which require site specific paleontological investigation and monitoring activities. Pursuant to measure CUL-4, a Paleontological Resource Assessment was prepared for the project site that determined no resources have been previously recorded onsite. However, the project site has the potential to contain paleontological resources. Pauba Formation and older Quaternary alluvial channel deposits have a high paleontological resource potential and have resulted in significant vertebrate fossils in the vicinity of the project area and elsewhere in the region. Also, younger Quaternary alluvial channel deposits have a low to high paleontological resource potential, increasing with depth, because they are generally too young to preserve fossilized remains but may shallowly overlie older intact Pleistocene sediments of the Pauba Formation.

The Paleontological Resource Assessment determined that ground disturbances of depths greater than 4 feet below the ground surface (bgs) may adversely impact paleontological resources. Thus, project-specific Mitigation Measures CUL-3 through CUL-5 are provided to implement worker's environmental awareness training, paleontological construction monitoring, and appropriate fossil curation and reporting. With implementation of the WCCP EIR included Mitigation Measures CUL-4 and CUL-5 and the project specific Mitigation Measures CUL-3 through CUL-5, potential impacts to paleontological resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to paleontological resources are applicable to the project.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures that are applicable to the proposed project are as follows:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure CUL-4: For all implementing projects, the necessary paleontological field surveys/studies/monitoring would be required as part of the permitting approval process. Prior to grading for ministerial projects, and prior to approval of discretionary projects, the County Geologist shall do the following:

- Review and, if evidence suggests the potential for paleontological resources on a future implementing project site, require a County-certified qualified paleontologist (retained by the future project applicant) to conduct a field survey for paleontological resources on specific sites not previously surveyed for paleontological resources.

- Review and, if evidence suggests the potential for paleontological resources on a future implementing project site, require a County-certified qualified paleontologist to conduct an appropriate records search to obtain information on paleontological resource records.
- Review and, if evidence suggests that potential for subsurface paleontological deposits, consider paleontological monitoring during grading, trenching, and related construction activities, to facilitate appropriate mitigation treatment.
- Evaluate the significance and integrity of all paleontological resources identified on implementing project sites within the project area, using criteria established in the CEQA Guidelines for important paleontological resources.
- Propose recommended mitigation measures and recommend conditions of approval for implementing projects (if a local government action is required) to reduce adverse project effects. on significant, important, and/or unique paleontological resources.
- Require from the designated project-specific County-certified project Paleontologist documentation of all required mitigation treatments and the results of those treatments for previously known and inadvertent finds according to current County reporting requirements to document environmental mitigation compliance.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure CUL-5: If previously unknown paleontological resources are identified during grading activities associated with the implementing projects, the following procedures shall be followed:

- All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered paleontological resources shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, the project paleontologist, and the Planning Director to discuss the significance of the find.
- At the meeting, the significance of the discoveries shall be discussed and after consultation with the paleontologist, a decision shall be made, with the concurrence of the Planning Director, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc.) for the paleontological resources.
- Grading of further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until the fossil has been properly recovered/removed from the area to be graded and/or the fossil has been determined to be insignificant.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Project plans, permits, and grading specifications shall state that prior to the start of construction, all field personnel should be briefed regarding the types of fossils that could be found in the project area and the procedures to follow should paleontological resources be encountered. This training shall be accomplished at the pre-grade kick-off meeting or morning tailboard meeting and shall be conducted by the project paleontologist or his/her representative. Specifically, the training shall provide a description of the fossil resources that may be encountered in the project area, outline steps to follow in the event that a fossil discovery is made and provide contact information for the project paleontologist and on-site monitor(s). The training shall be developed by the project paleontologist and may be conducted concurrent with other environmental training (e.g., cultural and natural resources awareness training, safety training, etc.).

Mitigation Measure CUL-4: Project plans, permits, and grading specifications shall state that prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities, a qualified professional paleontologist shall be retained to prepare and implement a Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) for the project. Initially, full-time monitoring is required for grading and excavation activities 4 feet below the ground surface that will disturb previously undisturbed Pauba Formation (Qps) and Quaternary older alluvium (Qvoa). Due to soil development and previous grading disturbances, monitoring shall not be required in project areas where construction activities disturb native sediments at depths less than 4 feet below the ground surface in areas mapped as Pauba Formation (Qps) and Quaternary older alluvium (Qvoa). Spot-checking may occur in previously undisturbed young alluvial deposits (Qya) in order to determine if project activities are impacting the underlying highly sensitive Pleistocene units. Monitoring shall not be required in project areas underlain by

geologic units with low to no paleontological resource potential (i.e., the rocks of the Triassic metasedimentary rocks and phyllites [Trmu, Trmp], and Cretaceous granites and granodiorites [Khg, Kgd]).

Monitoring shall entail the visual inspection of excavated or graded areas and trench sidewalls. In the event that a paleontological resource is discovered, the monitor shall have the authority to temporarily divert the construction equipment around the find until it is assessed for scientific significance and collected. In areas of high sensitivity, monitoring efforts can be reduced or eliminated at the discretion of the project paleontologist if no fossil resources are encountered after 50 percent of the excavations are completed.

Mitigation Measure CUL-5: Project plans, permits, and grading specifications shall state that upon completion of fieldwork, all significant fossils collected shall be prepared in a properly equipped paleontology laboratory to a point ready for curation. Preparation shall include the careful removal of excess matrix from fossil materials and stabilizing and repairing specimens, as necessary. Following laboratory work, all fossils specimens shall be identified to the lowest taxonomic level, cataloged, analyzed, and delivered to the Western Science Center for permanent curation and storage. The cost of curation is assessed by the repository and is the responsibility of the project applicant.

At the conclusion of laboratory work and museum curation, a final report shall be prepared describing the results of the paleontological mitigation monitoring efforts associated with the project. The report shall include a summary of the field and laboratory methods, an overview of the project area geology and paleontology, a list of taxa recovered (if any), an analysis of fossils recovered (if any) and their scientific significance, and recommendations. If the monitoring efforts produced fossils, then a copy of the report shall also be submitted to the Western Science Center.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project				
35. Housing				
a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Project Application Materials, Riverside County General Plan Housing Element; Riverside County General Plan Housing Element, California Employment Development Department Labor Market info (EDD, 2017); and the WCCP EIR.

a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The project site is undeveloped and does not include housing. Implementation of the proposed project would develop 76 single-family residences and 21 Cottage Inns/Wineries, which would provide additional housing in the project area. Thus, the project would add housing, not displace any permanent housing, and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing. There would be no impacts.

b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?

No Impact. The proposed project would provide additional housing in the project area, in addition to employment opportunities related to the Winery Resort, Cottage Inns and vineyards. The Winery Resort, Cottage, Inns, vineyards, and wineries would generate the need for employees, which are anticipated to come from the project region, as the unemployment rate was 4.3 percent in Riverside County (State Employment Development Department, December 2017), which is down from the 6.1 percent annual average unemployment rate average in the County from 2016. In addition, the 4.3 unemployment rate within Riverside County is the lowest it has been for the last 10 years (EDD 2017). Thus, it is anticipated that new employees at the project site would be within commuting distance and would not generate needs for any housing.

In addition, should project employees relocate to work at the project site, sufficient vacant housing is available within the region to fill the project's need. The County of Riverside had a vacancy rate of 14.0 percent, and the City of Temecula had a vacancy rate of 6.7 percent (5.3 percent were vacant rental units) in 2016 (Census Factfinder 2016). Thus, the proposed project would not create a demand for any housing, including housing affordable to households earning 80 percent or less of the County's median income. There would be no impacts.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The project site is undeveloped and does not include any housing. There are no people residing on the project site, and no people would be displaced. Implementation of the proposed project would develop 76 single-family residences and 21 Cottage Inns/Wineries, which would provide additional housing in the project area and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing. There would be no impact.

d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?

No Impact. The proposed project would develop the site pursuant to the allowable uses of the Wine Country-Winery Zone. The Redevelopment Agency for the County of Riverside was dissolved in February 2012 and Redevelopment Agency development projects are no longer active within the County. In addition, the project site and surrounding areas were not previously identified as a Redevelopment Agency site. Thus, the proposed project would not affect a Redevelopment Project Area. There would be no impacts.

e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

Less than Significant Impact. All three phases of the proposed project are anticipated to be operational by 2022. The U.S. Census Bureau data provides that in 2016 there were 2,323,892 residents within the County of Riverside. As shown in Table P-1, the population of the County is anticipated to grow by 6.7 percent between 2016 and 2020.

Table P-1: County of Riverside SCAG Projected Population

	Population
Actual 2016[1]	2,323,892
2020 SCAG Projections[2]	2,479,800
Increase	155,908 (6.7%)

Source: [1]Census American Factfinder, [2]SCAG 2016 Growth Forecast by Jurisdiction.

Based on the existing average household size of 3.16 persons per household, as assumed in the WCCP EIR, the 97 residences that would be developed on the project site would result in approximately 307 residents a full occupancy. The 307 residents of the project would consist of 0.02 percent of the anticipated population growth between 2016 and 2020. This percentage is minimal and would not cumulatively exceed the 6.7 percent population growth projection.

In addition, as described in Section 2.2, Project Background, the project site was approved for development of 216 single-family residences and 8 winery production lots in April of 2007. Thus, current local projections for the project site anticipate population growth related to the 216 residences. However, the proposed project would develop 97 residences, which is a reduction of 118 residences, and would result in a reduction of residents in the project area compared to the previously approved project. Thus, impacts related to population projections would be less than significant.

f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Less than Significant Impact. As described in the previous response, the proposed project would develop 97 residences that would result in approximately 307 residents at full capacity, which would equate to 0.02 percent of the anticipated population growth between 2016 and 2020. This population growth is within the SCAG population projections. In addition, the project site has anticipated the population growth related to 216 single-family residences and 8 winery production lots since April of 2007, and development of the proposed 97 residences would result in a reduced resident population compared to the previously approved project. Thus, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth directly.

Infrastructure improvements are necessary to accommodate the proposed project, which would be sized to specifically accommodate the project and as planned by the utility providers. This includes roadway improvements, which would accommodate the increased traffic that would result from the proposed project and the cumulative growth that is currently anticipated by the County. The roadway improvements would improve existing offsite roadways or develop onsite roadways that would connect to existing roads. The project would not develop new roadways in new areas beyond the project boundary, and thus would not extend the existing roadway infrastructure in a manner that could induce substantial growth.

Regarding water and wastewater infrastructure, the project would develop offsite infrastructure that has been planned by RCWD or EMWD to serve build out of the Wine Country area. The new offsite infrastructure would be connected to the onsite sewer system that would be developed by the proposed project. The project would not develop any offsite infrastructure beyond that planned for by RCWD or EMWD, and that which would support the proposed project. Thus, the development of the water and wastewater infrastructure would not induce substantial growth. Impacts would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

No mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to population and housing are applicable to the project.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

No project applicable mitigation measures related to population and housing were adopted by the WCCP EIR.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
36. Fire Services	☐	☒	☐	☐

Source: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element, Riverside County Fire Department Website, Accessed: www.rvcfire.org/; and the WCCP EIR

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The Riverside County Fire Department provides fire protection and emergency medical services to the project area. The nearest fire station is Glen Oaks Fire Station No. 96, which is 2.3 miles east from the project site at 3770 Glen Oaks Road and the Parkview Fire Station No. 84 located at 30650 Pauba Rd. approximately 7.00 miles southwest. The Fire Department's targeted response time is 5 minutes for emergency calls for service, and the WCCP EIR (Table 4.13-8) shows that response times from Station 96 to the intersection of Rancho California Road and Monte De Oro, which is 1 mile further than the project site from the fire station, averages 4:37 minutes. Also, as described in the WCCP EIR, all implementing projects, including the proposed project are required to install water mains, fire flow, fire hydrants, and other required improvements for fire suppression pursuant to County Ordinances No. 460 and No. 787 (included as PPP PSU-1 and PPP PSU-2), and WCCP Mitigation Measure PSU FIRE-5, which would be verified by the Fire Department as part of the project permitting process.

Implementing projects, such as the project, that are adjacent to open space areas, are also required to prepare a fire protection/vegetation management plan (fuel modification plan) for Fire Department review and approval, as required by WCCP Mitigation Measure PSU FIRE-3. Additionally, WCCP Mitigation Measure PSU FIRE-1 requires analysis of the project-related traffic's impact on emergency service response times, which as detailed in Section 44, Transportation and Traffic, the project would result in a less than significant impact related to emergency responses and access to the project area. Furthermore, County Ordinance 659 (implemented by WCCP Mitigation Measure PSU FIRE-2) requires payment of appropriate fees for funding and construction of fire facilities necessary to address direct and cumulative environmental effects generated by new development. With implementation of existing County Ordinances and the WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures PSU FIRE-1 through PSU FIRE-5 (listed below), which would be verified during the County's project permitting process, impacts related to fire protection services would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

The mitigating plans, programs, or policies that are relevant to the proposed project includes the following:

PPP PSU-1 County Ordinance No. 460: This Ordinance requires the division of land into lots be is required to be reviewed and approved by the Riverside County Fire Department.

PPP PSU-2 County Ordinance No. 787: This Ordinance adopts the 2010 California Fire Code and adds further regulations related to fire protection.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures that are applicable to the proposed project are as follows:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU FIRE–1: All implementing projects requiring a traffic impact analysis (TIA) shall analyze the project-related traffic's impact on emergency service response times. Implementing projects shall participate in a land acquisition and fire facility construction program, as necessary, to ensure adequate response times, as determined by the Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD).

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU FIRE–2: All implementing projects shall participate in a fire mitigation fee program pursuant to County Ordinance No. 659, Development Impact Fees, which would allow one-time capital improvements such as land and equipment purchases (e.g. fire suppression equipment) and construction development.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU FIRE-3: Prior to the approval of any implementing project for lands adjacent to open space areas, a fire protection/vegetation management plan (fuel modification plan) shall be submitted to the Fire Department for review and approval. Provision shall be made as part of the development entitlement process for a Home Owners Association (HOA) or other appropriate management entity to be responsible for maintaining the elements of the plan, including the power to assess HOA fees or other fees required to fund the maintenance activity.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU FIRE-4: Flag lots will not be permitted without adequate secondary access or alternative measures as deemed appropriate by the Fire Chief.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU FIRE-5: For those residential areas planned for rural residential estate lots, the proponent of the implementing project shall ensure the construction of water lines and hydrants (and maintain sufficient water pressure) per current applicable fire code to ensure adequate fire protection.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

37. Sheriff Services	☐	☒	☐	☐

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Sheriff Website Accessed: www.riversidesheriff.org/; and the WCCP EIR

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Law enforcement in the project area is provided by the Riverside County Sheriff Department (RCSD), which is also contracted to provide law enforcement services to 15 incorporated cities, including Temecula. Services provided by the RCSD include: First Responder Service, Police Services, Search and Rescue Services, Emergency Response Services, Mutual Aid Coordination Services, Enforcement of Criminal Law on Tribal Lands, Jail System Services, Court Services, Coroner-Public Administrator Services, and Joint Task Force Services. The closest RCSD station serving the project area is the Southwest Station located at 30755-A Auld Road, Murrieta, which is approximately 6 miles west of the project site. The General Plan staffing level for the RCSD is 1.5 officers per 1,000 residents. The WCCP EIR describes that the RCSD meets the General Plan staffing goal and allocates its resources flexibly so that it can respond to changing needs within its service area. In addition, the WCCP EIR determined that build out of the WCCP (which includes the proposed project) would not result increasing sheriff department staffing beyond the previously anticipated levels.

Consistent with the WCCP EIR, the proposed project would result in an additional onsite population that could create the need for RCSD services. However, to reduce the need for law enforcement services, security concerns are addressed in the project design by providing low-intensity security lighting, security cameras, and access gates to specific areas of the project site. Pursuant to the County's existing permitting process, the Sheriff's Department would review and approve the site plans to ensure that crime prevention and emergency access measures are incorporated appropriately to provide a safe environment.

Although an incremental increase could occur from implementation of the project, the need for law enforcement services from the project would not result in the need for, new or physically altered sheriff facilities. Thus, substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or expanded facilities would not occur, and impacts would be less than significant. In addition, Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, listed below, sets forth policies, regulations, and fees related to the funding and construction of facilities necessary to address direct and cumulative environmental effects generated by new development. This includes fees for sheriff facilities. Overall, impacts related to sheriff services from implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

There are no mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to sheriff services.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU FIRE–2: Listed previously in Public Services Response 36.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

38. Schools	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Temecula Unified School District Website, accessed: www.tvusd.k12.ca.us/; and the WCCP EIR.

Less than Significant Impact. The project area is served by the Temecula Valley Unified School District, which serves a 148-square-mile area. The schools that would serve the project site include the Alamos Elementary School, Bella Vista Middle School, and Chaparral High School. The closest school is a private school, St. Jeanne De Lestonnac School which is approximately 4.00 miles south from the Project site. Development of the proposed project would generate a new student population on the project site, who would generally (unless homeschooled or attending a private school) attend one of these three schools. This would generate additional students to be served at local public schools. However, the WCCP EIR determined that the Temecula Unified School District has capacity to serve build out of the WCCP, which includes the proposed project. In addition, SB 50 (Chapter 407 of Statutes of 1998) that sets forth a state school facilities construction program, in which school districts (including the Temecula Valley Unified School District) collect fees at the time of issuance of building permits for development projects to provide for school facilities. The existing Temecula Valley Unified School District development impact fee is $3.48 per square foot for all new residential development, and $0.56 per square foot for all commercial development. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65995 (implemented by PPP PSU-3), payment of the school impact fees provides full and complete mitigation of school impacts. As a result, impacts to school facilities from the increase in students generated by the proposed project would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

The mitigating plans, programs, or policies that are relevant to the proposed project includes the following:

PPP PSU-3 Government Code Section 65995 et seq: Prior to the issuance of either a certificate of occupancy or prior to building permit final inspection, the applicant shall provide payment of the appropriate fees set forth by the Temecula Valley Unified School District.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures related to school services that are relevant to the proposed project were adopted by the WCCP EIR.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

39. Libraries	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Riverside County General Plan; and the WCCP EIR

Less than Significant Impact. The project area is served by the Riverside County Library District, which has 2 full service libraries in the City of Temecula. The Temecula Public Library located at 30600 Pauba Road, which is 7.4 miles southwest of the project site, and the Grace Mellman Community Library located at 41000 County Center Drive, 10 miles from the project site. In addition, the Country Library System website provides a variety of resources remotely, and the need for library services are changing with the advent of increasing resources being available online and the availability of high speed internet services.

Implementation of the proposed residential development would increase the demand for library services; however, the 97 new residences would not substantially increase the need for library resources/services or square footage of library space. A majority of the residential units would be equipped with internet access, which provides access to many of the same resources provided by the library and would limit the increased need for

physical library facilities and resources. In addition, the Riverside County Library System is funded by a 1.15 percent ad valorem property tax dedicated to the library. Implementation of the project would increase the value of property within the project site through the development of low density residential, wineries, and the Winery Resort; and therefore, increase the amount of library funding for library facilities. Overall, impacts related to library services from implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

There are no mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to library services.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures related to library services that are relevant to the proposed project were adopted by the WCCP EIR.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

40. Health Services	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Riverside County General Plan

Less than Significant Impact. The project would not result in the need to alter existing health services or result in the need to construct new health service facilities. There are numerous medical facilities in the project vicinity, including the Temecula Valley Hospital, Loma Linda University Medical Center in Murrieta, Kaiser Permanente Medical Center in Murrieta, and various medical clinics and physicians. Development of the Winery Resort, 97 residences, and smaller wineries would result in a small incremental need for health services. The closest health services facility is the Temecula Valley Hospital approximately 5.65 miles away. However, these services are anticipated to be accommodated by the existing health services in the region. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

There are no mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to health services.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures related to health services that are applicable to the proposed project were adopted by the WCCP EIR.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
RECREATION				
41. Parks and Recreation a) Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☒	☐	☐

c) Is the project located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35 (Regulating the Division of Land – Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications); Ord. No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees); and the WCCP EIR.

a) Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As detailed in the Project Description, the proposed project includes a 2-acre community center and club house for residents of the project. In addition, the project includes 95.9 acres of open space with an approximately 6.5-mile trail network that provides connectivity between the residential and Winery Resort portions of the project site. In addition, there are existing trails within the 468-acre MSHCP open space area. The impacts of development of the proposed recreational amenities are considered part of the impacts of the proposed project as a whole and are analyzed throughout the various sections of this document. For example, activities such as excavation, grading, and construction as required for the recreational components of this project would result in impacts that are analyzed in the Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Noise, and Transportation and Traffic.

In addition, as described previously, the proposed project would result in approximately 307 residents at full occupancy. The County of Riverside's Parkland Dedication Standard is five acres per 1,000 population. The 307 residents that would result from the project would require 1.5 acres of parkland dedication. In addition, to the recreational acreage included in the project; WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU REC-2 requires a park and recreational facilities dedication plan or fee-in-lieu, which implements County Ordinances provided in PPP REC-1 and PPP REC-2 and would ensure that that park and recreation facilities are dedicated and maintained as required. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As described by the WCCP EIR, there are numerous existing parks and recreational facilities in the vicinity of the project site, which could be used by the approximately 307 residents of the proposed project. However, the project includes a 2-acre community center and club house for residents of the project, an approximately 6.5-mile trail network, and substantial open space area that could be used for recreation purposes. In addition, the project would implement WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU REC-2 that requires a park and recreational facilities dedication plan or fee-in-lieu, which implements County Ordinances for parkland provision and maintenance (PPP REC-1 and PPP REC-2). With provision of the proposed recreation facilities and implementation of these requirements, impacts related to physical deterioration of recreation facilities would be less than significant.

c) Is the project located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?

Source: Riverside County Assessor-County Clerk-Recorder, accessed at: http://www.asrclkrec.com/

No Impact. The project site is not located within a CSA or recreation park district with a Community Park and Recreation Plan. Thus, no impacts related to a park district or recreation plan would occur from implementation of the proposed project. There would be no impacts.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

PPP REC-1: Riverside County Ordinance No. 460. Section 10.35 of this Ordinance details the methods in which land shall be dedicated, fees shall be paid or a combination thereof pursuant to the Quimby Act. Implementation of Ordinance No. 460 ensures that Riverside County is in compliance with the state's Quimby Act and that an adequate amount of park and recreational facilities are available to the residents of Riverside County.

PPP REC-2: Riverside County Ordinance No. 328. This Ordinance prescribes rules and regulations for parks and open space areas within Riverside County. The regulations found in Ordinance No. 328 reduce the potential wear and tear that facilities may experience due to population growth.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures that are applicable to the proposed project are as follows:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU REC-1: All implementing projects within the project area shall participate in any future trails phasing and financing plan being developed by the County.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU REC-2: Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the project area, a park and recreational facilities dedication plan or fee-in-lieu shall be submitted to the County Regional Recreation and Parks District for review and approval. This includes at minimum the "half-width" dedication of trail right-of-way (ROW) for any trails bordering a proposed implementing project, and full dedication and/or construction of trails traversing a proposed implementing project. Where private recreational facilities are proposed, provision shall be made as part of the development entitlement process for a HOA or other appropriate management entity to be responsible for maintaining the elements of the plan, including the power to assess HOA fees or other fees required to fund the maintenance activity.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU REC-3: To the extent feasible, the County Regional Recreation and Park District should work to negotiate joint use agreements with the Temecula Valley Unified School District for the joint use of school recreational facilities including playing fields, to contribute to the supply of public parks located within reach of residents of the project area.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

42. Recreational Trails	☐	☒	☐	☐

Source: The WCCP EIR.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As detailed in the Project Description, the proposed project includes 95.9 acres of open space with an approximately 6.5-mile trail network that provides connectivity between the residential and Winery Resort portions of the project site. In addition, there are existing trails within the 468-acre MSHCP open space area, and the WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU REC-1 requires the project to participate in any future trails phasing and financing plan, and WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU REC-2 requires the project to provide for certain trail improvements. With provision of the proposed trail facilities and implementation of the WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures, impacts related to recreational trails would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

There are no mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to recreational trails.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures that are applicable to the proposed project are as follows:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU REC-1: Listed previously in Recreation Response 41.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU REC-2: Listed previously in Recreation Response 41.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project				
43. Circulation a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?	☐	☒	☐	☐
h) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	☐	☐	☒	☐
i) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Twelve Oaks Transportation Impact Analysis, prepared by Fehr and Peers, 2018 (TIA 2018) included as Appendix K; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

Traffic Thresholds

Intersections within the project study area are under the jurisdiction of the County of Riverside, Caltrans, and the City of Temecula. The thresholds for these jurisdictions are listed below.

County of Riverside: The project is within the Southwest Area Plan that defines LOS D as the minimum acceptable operating level at study area intersections in the County of Riverside. A project impact would occur if the project

causes the LOS to deteriorate from acceptable LOS D or better to unacceptable LOS E or F. Additionally, a project impact would occur at an unsignalized intersection if addition of project traffic causes an intersection to satisfy the peak hour traffic signal warrant criteria or causes worsening of an already deficient intersection.

Caltrans: LOS C is the minimum acceptable operating level for Caltrans facilities. The project would have an impact if it would:

- Degrade operations from an acceptable LOS C or better to an unacceptable LOS D, LOS E, or LOS F; or
- Increase density on a freeway facility, increase delay at an intersection or add traffic to a roadway already operating at LOS D, LOS E, or LOS F.

City of Temecula: LOS D is the minimum acceptable operating level at study area intersections in the City of Temecula. The project would have an impact if it causes an increase in delay of 2.0 seconds or more at intersections operating at LOS E or LOS F.

Senate Bill 743: On September 27, 2013, Governor Brown signed Senate Bill (SB) 743 (Steinberg, 2013). Among other things, SB 743 creates a process to change the methodology to analyze transportation impacts under CEQA (Public Resources Code section 21000 and following) based on vehicle miles traveled (VMT) rather than impacts to intersection Level of Service. Over the last five years, the State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) released a series of technical advisories to evaluate alternative methods of transportation analysis. OPR released a final technical advisory in December 2018 to accompany the revised CEQA Guidelines, which took effect in January 2019. Cities have until July 1, 2020 to implement a change in transportation analysis method from delay-based level of service to VMT.

Traffic Study Area and Existing Conditions

As shown in Table T-1, the project study area includes 18 intersections, 14 of which are currently operating at satisfactory LOS as defined in the traffic thresholds. Thus, 4 intersections are currently operating at an unsatisfactory LOS, which include:

- 1. Rancho California Rd & I-15 SB Ramp in the weekend peak hour
- 6. Rancho California Rd & Butterfield Stage Road in the p.m. and weekend peak hours
- 8. Rancho California Rd & Calle Contento in the weekend peak hour
- 10. Rancho California Rd & Monte De Oro Road in the p.m. and weekend peak hours

Table T-1: Existing Intersection Levels of Service

Intersection	Jurisdiction	Control	AM Peak		PM Peak		Weekend Peak	
			Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Rancho California Rd & I-15 SB Ramp	Caltrans	Signal	27.7	C	31.7	C	**35.6**	**D**
2. Rancho California Rd & I-15 NB Ramp	Caltrans	Signal	7.1	A	14.8	B	8.6	A
3. Rancho California Rd & Ynez Rd	Temecula	Signal	32.0	C	30.2	C	26.0	C
4. Rancho California Rd & Margarita Rd	Temecula	Signal	22.8	C	5.8	D	24.6	C
5. Rancho California Rd & Meadow Pkwy	Temecula	Signal	20.6	C	23.9	C	17.7	B
6. Rancho California Rd & Butterfield Stage Rd	Temecula	Signal	31.5	C	**58.1**	**E**	**59.3**	**E**
7. Rancho California Rd & La Serena Rd	County	Side Street Stop	11.2	B	12.1	B	20.5	C
8. Rancho California Rd & Calle Contento	County	Side Street Stop	15.6	C	20.1	C	**>50.0**	F
9. Rancho California Rd & Anza Rd	County	Roundabout	5.7	A	6.2	A	8.5	A
10. Rancho California Rd & Monte De Oro Rd	County	All-Way Stop	13.8	B	**42.6**	**E**	**40.5**	**E**

11. Rancho California Rd & Glen Oaks Rd	County	All-Way Stop	11.3	B	10.9	B	11.0	B
12. Rancho California Rd & Buck Rd	County	Side Street Stop	0.0	A	0.0	A	8.6	A
13. Warren Rd & East Benton Rd	County	Side Street Stop	8.7	A	8.7	A	8.6	A
14. Washington St & Benton Rd	County	All-Way Stop	11.8	B	16.0	C	8.2	A
15. Borel Rd & Auld Rd	County	All-Way Stop	9.9	A	12.5	B	8.2	A
16. Anza Rd & Pauba Rd	County	All-Way Stop	8.4	A	9.2	A	9.3	A
17. Anza Rd & De Portola Rd	County	All-Way Stop	9.5	A	10.6	B	11.9	B
18. Anza Rd & Temecula Pkwy (SR-79)	Caltrans	Signal	16.1	B	16.1	B	23.8	C

Notes: Intersections operating below acceptable standards are noted in **bold**. Worst case movement delay is reported for side street stop-controlled intersections.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2018

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Table T-2 provides the estimated number of vehicle trips that would be generated by the proposed project. As shown, the project would generate 4,082 daily weekday and 4,847 daily weekend trips. Peak hour trip generation would be 263 trips during the a.m. peak hour, 369 trips during the p.m. peak hour and 516 trips during the Saturday peak hour. It should be noted that the trip generation for the winery was based on the WCCP, Large Winery trip generation. This designation is based on the trip generation of South Coast Winery which includes 50 hotel rooms. Because 50 hotel rooms are already included in the winery trip generation, the trip generation calculation only includes an additional 200 rooms, bringing the total analyzed rooms to 250. The trip generation also analyzes 100 beds in the winery estates (20 cottages with 5-beds per cottage) instead of the 21 cottages noted in the project description. In total, the trip generation analyzes 1 fewer hotel room and 5 fewer beds in the cottage units than noted in the project description. However, the trip generation was calculated using the trip rate for occupied rooms, rather than total rooms. This means that the trip generation assumes that all hotel rooms and winery estate beds would be 100 percent occupied at all times. The approach overestimates trips during a typical day, therefore the minor discrepancy between the project description and trip generation would not change the conclusions of the traffic analysis.

As presented in Table T-2, a pass-by reduction of 33% was applied to the net winery trip generation during the p.m. and weekend peak hours because winery visitors commonly visit more than one winery per visit to Wine Country and therefore, one third of the existing trips to the winery already exist on the network. In addition, an internalization reduction of 20% was applied to the net hotel trip generation based on the mixed land uses in the project site and because many of the winery guests will also be staying at the hotel. The 20% was only applied to hotel trips and assumed that 20% of the hotel trips for local vacation destinations, such as winery visits, spa visits, and dining would be satisfied onsite. The pass-by and internalization reductions are consistent with trip generation data collected at existing wineries during preparation of the WCCP Traffic Impact Analysis and were approved by County staff.

Table T-2: Project Trip Generation

			AM Peak				PM Peak				Saturday Peak				Daily	
Use	**ITE Code**	**Intensity**	**Trip Rate**	**Total**	**In**	**Out**	**Trip Rate**	**Total**	**In**	**Out**	**Trip Rate**	**Total**	**In**	**Out**	**Weekday**	**Weekend**
Winery(1)	-	Large	-	8	5	3	-	183	86	97	-	343	158	185	1,784	2,100
Hotel Rooms(2)	310	200 rooms	0.67	134	78	56	0.70	140	69	71	0.87	174	87	87	1,522	2,284
Single-Family Homes(2)	210	76 units	0.75	57	14	43	1.00	76	48	28	0.93	71	38	33	724	753
Winery Estates(2)	320	100 beds	0.64	64	23	41	0.58	58	31	27	0.76	76	34	42	911	884
Net Trip Generation				**263**	**120**	**143**		**457**	**234**	**223**		**664**	**317**	**347**	**4,941**	**6,021**
Pass-by (Winery Only) (-33%)				-	-	-		-60	-28	-32		-113	-52	-61	-502	-754
Internalization (Hotel Only) (-20%)				-	-	-		-28	-13	-14		-35	-16	-17	-357	-420

Total External Trips	**263**	**120**	**143**		**369**	**193**	**177**		**516**	**249**	**269**	**4,082**	**4,847**

Sources:
(1) *Traffic Impact Study For The Wine Country Community Plan, Riverside County, CA, Fehr & Peers, 2011*
(2) *Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition (ITE, 2012)*

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2018

Existing Plus Project: The intersection operations analysis for the Existing plus Project in the "with project" condition includes the following roadway improvements that are included in the proposed project:

- Extending Rancho California Road from Buck Road to the intersection of Warren Road and East Benton Road (consistent with the Wine Country Community Plan).
- Construction of a roundabout at the intersection of Buck Road & Rancho California Road. This improvement would also realign Camino Del Vino to the existing alignment of Rancho California Road.
- Construction of the hotel access driveway on Rancho California Road (between Buck Road and Warren Road).
- Construction of the winery access driveway that would connect as the fourth leg at the intersection of Rancho California Road, Benton Road and Warren Road.
- Construction of the Winery Estates access driveway to the north of the project site at Warren Road and to the south of the project at Buck Road.
- Construction of two residential subdivision driveways that access to the south of the site from Buck Road.

The Existing plus Project intersection operations are shown in Table T-3. As shown, the 4 intersections that currently operate with unsatisfactory LOS, would continue to operate at an unsatisfactory LOS with addition of project traffic. Of these 4 intersections, the project would result in an impact at 3 locations because the project would cause the LOS to deteriorate and result in an unsignalized intersection meeting the peak hour signal warrant at intersection 1; would add two or more seconds of delay to intersection 6 that operates at LOS E or F in the City of Temecula; and would cause the already deficient LOS at intersection 10 to deteriorate as described below.

- At intersection 1, Rancho California Road/I-15 SB Ramp, the project would cause the LOS to deteriorate from LOS C to LOS D during the p.m. peak hour. To mitigate the impact, the signal timing at the intersection would need to be optimized. Additionally, since Rancho California Road is a coordinated corridor, the Adaptive Traffic Signal Timing Program would need to be updated. These improvements are included in the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) program. Project payment of the applicable TUMF fee would reduce the impact to a less-than significant level.
- At intersection 6, Rancho California Road/Butterfield Stage Road, the project would cause the LOS to deteriorate from LOS C to LOS E during the a.m. peak hour and would add more than 2 seconds of delay to the deficient LOS during the p.m. and weekend peak hours. There is currently a planned and funded improvement at Rancho California Road/Butterfield Stage Road that would result in the intersection operating at acceptable LOS in the with project condition. The City is currently selecting the construction contractor for the improvement at Rancho California Road/Butterfield State Road and expects construction to be complete by the end of 2019. Therefore, no additional mitigation is required at this location. If the City improvement at Rancho California Road/Butterfield State Road is not complete prior to the opening of the project, then the project shall be responsible for implementation of the improvement. At intersection 10, Rancho California Road/Monte do Oro Road, the project would cause the LOS to deteriorate from LOS E to LOS F during the weekend peak hours. To mitigate the impact, improve the intersection to a roundabout. This improvement is identified in the WCCP EIR and is included in the fee program required by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure TRF-3, and implemented by Mitigation Measure TRF-2, which would reduce the impact to a less-than significant level.

Table T-3: Existing Plus Project Intersection Level of Service

Intersection	Jurisdiction	Control	AM Peak	PM Peak	Weekend Peak

Intersection	Jurisdiction	Control	AM Peak		PM Peak		Weekend Peak	
			Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Rancho California Road & I-15 SB Ramp	Caltrans	Signal	32.1	C	**38.7**	**D**	**47.9**	**D**
2. Rancho California Road & I-15 NB Ramp	Caltrans	Signal	8.2	A	17.1	B	10.5	B
3. Rancho California Road & Ynez Road	Temecula	Signal	36	D	36	D	35.7	D
4. Rancho California Road & Margarita Road	Temecula	Signal	26.9	C	52.3	D	34.8	C
5. Rancho California Road & Meadow Parkway	Temecula	Signal	25.9	C	26.4	C	20.7	C
6. Rancho California Road & Butterfield Stage Road	Temecula	Signal	**58.5**	**E**	**>80.0**	**F**	**63.9**	**E**
7. Rancho California Road & La Serena Way	County	Side Street Stop	12	B	13.2	B	24.4	C
8. Rancho California Road & Calle Contento	County	Side Street Stop	18.1	C	25.7	D	**>50.0**	**F**
9. Rancho California Road & Anza Road	County	Roundabout	5.9	A	6.7	A	23.5	C
10. Rancho California Road & Monte De Oro Road	County	All-Way Stop	20.0	C	**42.2**	**E**	**55.4**	**F**
11. Rancho California Road & Glen Oaks Road	County	All-Way Stop	14.1	B	16.3	C	19.2	C
12. Rancho California Road & Buck Road	County	Side Street Stop	15	C	13.2	B	17.3	C
13. Warren Road & Benton Road/Buck Road	County	Side Street Stop	14.2	B	21.5	C	26.4	D
14. Washington Street & Benton Road	County	All-Way Stop	10.8	B	17.5	C	8.7	A
15. Washington Street/Borel Road & Auld Road	County	All-Way Stop	9.7	A	13.9	B	8.7	A
16. Anza Road & Pauba Road	County	All-Way Stop	8.7	A	9.8	A	10.2	B
17. Anza Road & De Portola Road	County	All-Way Stop	9.8	A	11.5	B	11.9	B
18. Anza Road & Temecula Parkway	Caltrans	Signal	17.1	B	18.7	B	30.7	C
19. Driveway 1 & Rancho California Road	County	Side Street Stop	12.7	B	12.6	B	13.2	B
20. Driveway 2 &Warren Road	County	Side Street Stop	12.5	B	13.1	B	12	B
21. Driveway 3 & Warren Road	County	Side Street Stop	8.6	A	8.6	A	8.6	A
22. Driveway 4 & Buck Road	County	Side Street Stop	8.8	A	8.8	A	8.8	A
23. Driveway 5 & Buck Road	County	Side Street Stop	9	A	9.1	A	9.1	A

Notes: Intersections operating below acceptable standards are noted in **bold.** Worst case movement delay is reported for side street stop-controlled intersections.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2018

Opening Year 2020 Plus Project: 2020 was selected as the project opening year because it represents a reasonable year for opening of the first phase of the project. A growth rate of 2% per year was applied to existing volumes to forecast the Opening Year traffic volumes. The 2% growth rate is consistent with growth in the area documented in the forecasting prepared for the WCCP Traffic Impact Analysis. The Existing plus Ambient Growth (2020) plus Project conditions during the weekday and weekend peak hours were determined by applying a growth of two percent per year to the existing traffic volumes and adding traffic from the

proposed project. The 2020 analysis includes the following lane configurations at the intersection of Butterfield Ranch Road/Rancho California Road that are expected to be completed by the end of 2020.

- Eastbound: two left-turn lanes, one through lane, one shared through/right lane
- Westbound: one left-turn lane, one through lane and one shared through/right lane
- Northbound: one left-turn lane, one through lane and one shared through/right lane
- Southbound: one left-turn lane, one through lane and one shared through/right lane

If the Rancho California Road/Butterfield State Road improvement project is not completed prior to the opening of the project, the following improvements would be required to ensure satisfactory operations of the intersection:

- Northbound: one left-turn lane and one shared through/right lane
- Southbound: one left-turn lane and one shared through/right lane
- All approaches will require protected left-turn phases and updated signal timing.
- Additionally, since Rancho California Road is a coordinated corridor, the Adaptive Traffic Signal Timing Program would need to be updated concurrent with the improvement.

The 2020 plus Project intersection operations are shown in Table T-4, which identify 5 intersections that are forecast to operate with unsatisfactory LOS in the 2020 plus Project condition. The project would cause a significant impact at 4 of the 5 deficient intersections, and as detailed below implementation of mitigation would reduce impacts to a less than significant level in the 2020 plus project Condition.

- At intersection 1, Rancho California Road/I-15 Southbound Ramp, the project would cause a significant cumulative impact in the p.m. and weekend peak hours at the Rancho California Road/I-15 Southbound Ramp. To mitigate the impact at this intersection the same measure implemented for the Existing plus Project condition is required. As described previously, signal timing at the intersection would need to be optimized and the Adaptive Traffic Signal Timing Program would need to be updated, which are included in the TUMF program. The project shall make a fair share contribution through payment of the TUMF fee, as required by Mitigation Measure TRF-1, which would reduce the impact to a less-than significant level.
- At intersection 8, Rancho California Road/Calle Contento, the project would cause a significant cumulative impact in the weekend peak hour. To mitigate the impact, the intersection would be improved to be a multi-lane roundabout with 2-lane approaches from the eastbound and westbound directions. This improvement is identified in the WCCP EIR and is included in the fee program required by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure TRF-3. Payment of the WCCP traffic fee would reduce the impact to a less-than significant level.
- At intersection 9, Rancho California Road/Anza Road, the project would cause a significant cumulative impact in the weekend peak hour. To mitigate the impact, the intersection would be improved to be a multi-lane roundabout with two lane approaches at the northbound, westbound and eastbound legs. This improvement is identified in the WCCP EIR and is included in the fee program required by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure TRF-3. Payment of the WCCP traffic fee would reduce this impact to a less-than significant level.
- At intersection 18, Anza Road/Temecula Parkway (SR-79), the project would cause a significant impact in the weekend peak hour. To mitigate the impact, improve the eastbound approach by adding one left-turn lane, which is less as intensive as the improvements identified in the WCCP. This improvement is identified in the WCCP EIR and is included in the fee program required by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure TRF-3. Payment of the WCCP traffic fee would reduce the impact to a less-than significant level.

Table T-4: 2020 Plus Project Intersection Level of Service

Intersection	Jurisdiction	Control	AM Peak		PM Peak		Weekend Peak	
			Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Rancho California Road & I-15 SB Ramp	Caltrans	Signal	34.6	C	**51.9**	**D**	**66.2**	**E**
2. Rancho California Road & I-15 NB Ramp	Caltrans	Signal	8.3	A	19.9	B	11.3	B
3. Rancho California Road & Ynez Road	Temecula	Signal	46.3	D	48.6	D	41.0	D
4. Rancho California Road & Margarita Road	Temecula	Signal	29.0	C	40.1	D	37.5	D
5. Rancho California Road & Meadow Parkway	Temecula	Signal	28.2	C	30.4	C	22.0	C
6. Rancho California Road & Butterfield Stage Road	Temecula	Signal	28.1	C	32.5	C	35.7	D
7. Rancho California Road & La Serena Way	County	Side Street Stop	12.4	B	13.9	B	28.9	D
8. Rancho California Road & Calle Contento	County	Side Street Stop	20.5	C	31.1	D	**>50.0**	**F**
9. Rancho California Road & Anza Road	County	Roundabout	5.9	A	7.0	A	**>50.0**	**F**
10. Rancho California Road & Monte De Oro Road	County	All-Way Stop	25.2	D	**44.1**	**E**	**55.5**	**F**
11. Rancho California Road & Glen Oaks Road	County	All-Way Stop	15.6	C	18.9	C	22.8	C
12. Rancho California Road & Buck Road	County	Side Street Stop	5.3	A	5.3	A	6.0	A
13. Warren Road & Benton Road/Buck Road	County	Side Street Stop	15.5	C	24.8	C	30.4	D
14. Washington Street & Benton Road	County	All-Way Stop	11.8	B	25.7	D	8.9	A
15. Washington Street/Borel Road & Auld Road	County	All-Way Stop	10.3	B	17.3	C	9.0	A
16. Anza Road & Pauba Road	County	All-Way Stop	9.1	A	10.4	A	10.8	B
17. Anza Road & De Portola Road	County	All-Way Stop	10.4	B	12.9	B	16.3	C
18. Anza Road & Temecula Parkway	Caltrans	Signal	20.3	C	24.2	C	**50.2**	**D**
19. Driveway 1 & Rancho California Road	County	Side Street Stop	13.4	B	13.4	B	14	B
20. Driveway 2 &Warren Road	County	Side Street Stop	13.2	B	14.0	B	12.5	B
21. Driveway 3 & Warren Road	County	Side Street Stop	8.6	A	8.6	A	8.6	A
22. Driveway 4 & Buck Road	County	Side Street Stop	8.8	A	8.8	A	8.6	A
23. Driveway 5 & Buck Road	County	Side Street Stop	9.0	A	9.0	A	9.1	A

Notes: Intersections operating below acceptable standards are noted in **bold**. Worst case movement delay is reported for side street stop-controlled intersections.
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2018

Cumulative 2020 Plus Project: The cumulative traffic in 2020 was determined by adding traffic from cumulative (approved and/or pending) projects to the Opening Year 2020 condition to identify the cumulative traffic condition. Five cumulative projects, all proposed wineries, were included in the analysis. The cumulative projects, along with their anticipated trip generation are shown in Table T-5.

Table T-5: Cumulative Projects Trip Generation Summary

Project	Use	AM Peak			PM Peak			Saturday Peak		
		Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
CUP3706 (Blossom Winery)[2]	Medium Winery	45	32	13	86	43	43	161	79	82
CUP3707 (Mt. Palomar Winery)[3]	Large Winery	8	5	3	123	58	65	230	106	124
PP25740 (Bella Vista Winery)[1]	Small Winery	1	1	0	12	5	7	28	13	15

PP25893 (Paulk Winery)[1]	Small Winery	1	1	0	12	5	7	28	13	15
PP26064 (Newly Submitted Winery)[1]	Large Winery	8	5	3	123	58	65	230	106	124

[1] Traffic Study for the Wine County Community Plan, Riverside County, CA, Fehr & Peers, 2011
[2] Trip Generation and Site Access Letter for Ponte Ranch, Kimley Horn, 2014
[3] Mt Palomar Winery Traffic Study, Farah Khorashadi, 2015
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2018

The Cumulative plus Project intersection operations are shown in table T-6. As shown, 7 intersections are forecast to operate with unsatisfactory LOS in the Cumulative plus Project condition. Two additional intersections would operate at unsatisfactory LOS when traffic from Cumulative projects is added. Of these intersections, the project would result in a significant cumulative impact at 5 locations in the 2020 plus Project condition. These impacts would occur because the project would cause the LOS to deteriorate from acceptable to unacceptable operation, cause an unsignalized intersection to meet the peak hour signal warrant, or add two or more seconds of delay to an intersection operating at LOS E or F in the City of Temecula. Implementation of the following measures would mitigate the impacts in the 2020 plus cumulative plus project Condition.

- At intersection 1, Rancho California Road/I-15 Southbound Ramp the project would cause a significant cumulative impact in the p.m. and weekend peak hours. To mitigate the impact, the same measure required at this intersection for the Existing Plus Project and 2020 Plus Project conditions is required. As described, signal timing at the intersection would need to be optimized and the Adaptive Traffic Signal Timing Program would need to be updated, which are included in the TUMF program. The project shall pay the TUMF fee, as required by Mitigation Measure TRF-1, which would reduce the impact to a less-than significant level.

- At intersection 8, Rancho California Road/Calle Contento, the project would cause a significant cumulative impact in the weekend peak hour. To mitigate the impact at this intersection, the same measure required for the 2020 Plus Project conditions is required. As described, the intersection would be changed to a multi-lane roundabout with 2-lane approaches from the eastbound and westbound directions, which is identified in the WCCP EIR and is included in the fee program required by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure TRF-3 and implemented by Mitigation Measure TRF-2, which would reduce the impact to a less-than significant level.

- At intersection 9, Rancho California Road/Anza Road, the project would cause a significant cumulative impact in the weekend peak hour. To mitigate the impact at this intersection, the same measure required for the 2020 Plus Project conditions is required, which is identified in the WCCP EIR and is included in the fee program required by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure TRF-3, and implemented by Mitigation Measure TRF-2, which would reduce the impact to a less-than significant level.

- At intersection 11, Rancho California Road/Glen Oaks Road, the project would cause a significant cumulative impact in the weekend peak hour. To mitigate the impact, improve the intersection to a roundabout. This improvement is identified in the WCCP EIR and is included in the fee program required by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure TRF-3, and implemented by Mitigation Measure TRF-2, which would reduce the impact to a less-than significant level.

- At intersection 18, Anza Road/Temecula Parkway (SR-79), the project would cause a significant impact in the weekend peak hour. To mitigate the impact at this intersection, the same measure for the 2020 Plus Project conditions is required, which is included in WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure TRF-3 and implemented by Mitigation Measure TRF-2 that would reduce the impact to a less-than significant level.

Table T-6: Cumulative Plus Project Intersection Level of Service

Intersection	Jurisdiction	Control	AM Peak		PM Peak		Weekend Peak	
			Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Rancho California Rd & I-15 SB Ramp	Caltrans	Signal	34.8	C	**61.8**	**E**	**89.5**	**F**
2. Rancho California Rd & I-15 NB Ramp	Caltrans	Signal	8.3	A	20.3	C	11.4	B
3. Rancho California Rd & Ynez Rd	Temecula	Signal	46.9	D	53.9	D	50.8	D
4. Rancho California Rd & Margarita Rd	Temecula	Signal	29.1	C	40.1	D	44.8	D

Intersection	Jurisdiction	Control	AM Peak		PM Peak		Weekend Peak	
5. Rancho California Rd & Meadow Pkwy	Temecula	Signal	28.2	C	34.6	C	21.8	C
6. Rancho California Rd & Butterfield Stage Rd	Temecula	Signal	27.9	C	32.5	C	37.8	D
7. Rancho California Rd & La Serena Rd	County	Side Street Stop	12.6	B	15.6	C	**40.5**	**E**
8. Rancho California Rd & Calle Contento	County	Side Street Stop	21.3	C	**39.2**	**E**	**>50.0**	**F**
9. Rancho California Rd & Anza Rd	County	Roundabout	6.2	A	9.4	A	**>50.0**	**F**
10. Rancho California Rd & Monte De Oro	County	All-Way Stop	27.0	D	**46.6**	**E**	**>50.0**	**F**
11. Rancho California Rd & Glen Oaks Rd	County	All-Way Stop	16.2	C	23.9	C	**39.6**	**E**
12. Rancho California Rd & Buck Rd	County	Roundabout	5.3	A	5.3	A	6.1	A
13. Warren Rd & East Benton Rd & Winery Driveway	County	Side Street Stop	6.0	A	6.5	A	6.6	A
14. Washington St & Benton Rd	County	All-Way Stop	12.0	B	30.1	D	9.7	A
15. Borel Rd & Auld Rd	County	All-Way Stop	10.4	B	19.1	C	9.6	A
16. Anza Rd & Pauba Rd	County	All-Way Stop	9.1	A	10.4	B	12.4	B
17. Anza Rd & De Portola Rd	County	All-Way Stop	10.6	B	14.0	B	20.5	C
18. Anza Rd & Temecula Pkwy (SR-79)	Caltrans	Signal	20.7	C	26.5	C	**66.5**	**E**
19. Rancho California Rd & Hotel Driveway	County	Side Street Stop	13.6	B	14.4	B	16	C
20. Borel Rd & Winery Estates Northern Driveway	County	Side Street Stop	13.1	B	14.3	B	13.1	B
21. Buck Rd & Residential Western Driveway	County	Side Street Stop	8.6	A	8.6	A	8.6	A
22. Buck Rd & Residential Eastern Driveway	County	Side Street Stop	8.8	A	8.8	A	8.8	A
23. Buck Rd & Winery Estates Southern Driveway	County	Side Street Stop	9.0	A	9.0	A	9.1	A

Notes: Intersections operating below acceptable standards are noted in **bold**. Worst case movement delay is reported for side street stop-controlled intersections.
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2018

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The Riverside County Congestion Management Program (CMP) identifies Interstates, Highways and Principal Arterials that make up the CMP system. Within the project study area, I-15 and SR-79 (Temecula Parkway) are designated as CMP routes. Per the CMP, the minimum level of service that is acceptable on a CMP route is LOS E. The Riverside County CMP does not require traffic impact assessments for development projects, such as the proposed project. However, the CMP does require that local agencies prepare a deficiency plan if proposed development impacts cause the LOS on a non-exempt CMP facility to fall to below the LOS E standard.

As described above, the I-15 ramp intersections at Rancho California Road, as well as the intersection of Anza Road/Temecula Parkway (SR-79) have been evaluated against the LOS standards of LOS C for Caltrans facilities and LOS D for all other intersections. Impacts have been identified and mitigated using the standard for CMP facilities. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure TRF-1, impacts to CMP designated roads or highways would be less than significant.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

No Impact. The project site is located approximately 4.5 miles northeast of the Billy Joe Airport, a private use airport. There are no public airports located within the vicinity of the project. Furthermore, the project does not include any buildings that would extend into navigable airspace. Therefore, the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.

d) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?

No Impact. There are no navigable waterbodies or rail facilities in the vicinity of the project. Thus, the project would not alter waterborne or rail traffic. In addition, as described above, the closest air facility to the project

site is the Billy Joe Airport, a private use airport located approximately 4.5 miles southwest. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not alter air traffic. Impacts to waterborne, rail or air traffic would not occur.

e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?

Less than Significant Impact. All project transportation facilities would be designed according to applicable County standards and would be reviewed by County engineering staff prior to issuance of building permits. Non-standard design features are not proposed. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature.

f) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not result in the altered need for road maintenance; however, as described above, the proposed project would generate 4,847 daily trips, which would contribute to the need for regular maintenance of roads. To provide for public facility maintenance needs, Riverside County Ordinance 659 sets forth policies, regulations, and fees related to the funding and construction of facilities necessary to address direct and cumulative environmental effects generated by new development. This includes fees for road improvements and maintenance, which are levied per every acre of new development. In addition, the taxes generated from the proposed uses on the project site would support regular road maintenance. Thus, the project would provide funding for future roadway maintenance needs, and impacts related to roadway maintenance needs would be less than significant.

g) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As analyzed in the project traffic impact analysis, the proposed project would generate 143 a.m. peak hour trips, 177 p.m. peak hour trips and 269 Saturday peak hour trips and all impacts can be mitigated through implementation of project specific Mitigation Measures TRF-1 and TRF-2. Construction of the project would require far fewer trips than operation of the project after its completion and would therefore not cause any additional LOS deficiencies within the project study area. Any increase in traffic due to construction would be temporary in nature. As a result, construction of the project would have a less than significant impact on circulation.

h) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed construction activities, including equipment and supply staging and storage, would largely occur within the project site and would not restrict access of emergency vehicles to the project site or adjacent areas. During construction of roadway improvements, a minimum of one lane would remain open to ensure adequate emergency access to the project area and vicinity, and impacts related to interference with an adopted emergency response of evacuation plan during construction activities would be less than significant.

Operation of the proposed project would also not result in inadequate emergency access. Direct access to the all areas of the project site would be provided as required through County and Fire Department review and permitting procedures. The project would also be required to design and construct internal access and provide fire suppression facilities (e.g., hydrants and sprinklers) in conformance with the County Municipal Code. The Riverside County Fire Department would review the development plans prior to approval to ensure adequate emergency access pursuant to the requirements in the Uniform Fire Code and Section 503 of the California Fire Code (Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 9). As such, the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access, and impacts would be less than significant.

i) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Less than Significant Impact. The County of Riverside Circulation Element includes the following policies that apply to future bicycle, pedestrian and transit facilities:

Planned Circulation Systems

- Policy C 1.3: Support the development of transit connections that link the community centers located throughout the County and as identified in the Land Use Element and in the individual area plans. (AI 26)
- Policy C 1.7: Encourage and support the development of projects that facilitate and enhance the use of alternative modes of transportation, including pedestrian-oriented retail and activity centers, dedicated bicycle lanes and paths, and mixed-use community centers.

Pedestrian Facilities

- Policy C 4.3: Assure pedestrian access from developments to existing and future transit routes and terminal facilities through project design. (AI 26, 45)
- Policy C 4.4: Plan for pedestrian access that is consistent with road design standards while designing street and road projects. Provisions for pedestrian paths or sidewalks and timing of traffic signals to allow safe pedestrian street crossing shall be included.
- Policy C 4.9: Coordinate with all transit operators to ensure that pedestrian facilities are provided along and/or near all transit routes, whenever feasible. New land developments may be required to provide pedestrian facilities due to existing or future planned transit routes even if demand for pedestrian facility is not otherwise warranted. (AI 45)

Public Transportation System

- Policy C 9.3: Encourage the development of a mass multi-modal transit system with reduced noise characteristics.
- Policy C 10.1: Support programs developed by transit agencies/operators to provide paratransit service. (AI 50)
- Policy C 11.2: Incorporate the potential for public transit service in the design of developments that are identified as major trip attractions (i.e., community centers, tourist and employment centers), as indicated in ordinances Regulating the Division of Land of the County of Riverside.

Non-Motorized transportation

- Policy C 15.1: Implement a two- tiered system of trails, and later expand it into an effective non-motorized transportation system.
- Policy C 15.3: Develop a trail system which connects County parks and recreation areas while providing links to open space areas, equestrian communities, local municipalities, and regional recreational facilities (including other regional trail systems).
- Policy C 16.1: Implement the County trail system as depicted in the Bikeways and Trails Plan.
- Policy C 16.2: Develop a multi-purpose recreational trail network with support facilities which provide a linkage with regional facilities. (AI 35)
- Policy C 17.1: Develop Class I Bike Paths, Class II Bike Lanes and Class I Bike Paths/Regional Trails (Combo Trails) as shown in the Trails Plan (Figure C-7), to the design standards as outlined in the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, and other County Guidelines.
- Policy 17.4: Ensure that alternative modes of motorized transportation, such as buses, trains, etc., plan and provide for transportation of recreational and commuting bicyclists and bicycles on public transportation systems.

The only existing transit route in the study area is Riverside Transit Agency Route 24, and there are no planned routes in the area. Route 24 does not provide direct service near the project site. Bicycle facilities are provided throughout the study area and one multi-use path provides direct access to the project site. Additional facilities are planned throughout the study area, but none are planned adjacent or near the project site. Throughout the study area there are existing and planned multi-use trails that provide access directly to the site. These multi-use trails are accessible for pedestrians, bicycles and equestrians.

Since the proposed project would not affect existing and planned transit service in the study area, and would provide onsite pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, it would not conflict with any alternative transportation policies or programs, and impacts would be less than significant.

Plans Programs or Policies

PPP TR-1 County Ordinance 461 (Road Improvement Standards and Specifications): This ordinance includes engineered drawings which establish roadway improvement standards and specifications for development projects within Riverside County.

PPP TR-2 Ordinance No. 659 (Establishment of Development Impact Fees): Prior to the issuance of either a certificate of occupancy or prior to building permit final inspection, the applicant shall comply with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, which requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in the Ordinance. Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 has been established to set forth policies, regulations and fees related to the funding and installation of facilities and the acquisition of open space and habitat necessary to address the direct and cumulative environmental effects generated by new development project described and defined in this Ordinance, and it establishes the authorized uses of the fees collected

PPP TR-3 County Ordinance 748 (Traffic Signal Mitigation Program Ordinance): This ordinance establishes a means of equitably assessing the costs of Traffic Signal installations needed to mitigate the cumulative environmental impacts resulting from the additional traffic generated by new development projects. The installation of warranted traffic signals and other control devices provides for improved intersection safety and efficiency, and reduces overall commuter delay, traffic congestion, air pollution, and fuel consumption. This ordinance imposes a system of regulations and fees to cover the estimated reasonable costs of installing needed signalization devices, in combination with other development requirements, to ensure that adequate mitigation of traffic-related environmental impacts will be achieved.

PPP TR-4 County Ordinance 824 (Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) within Western Riverside County): This purpose of this ordinance, which is also referred to as the Western Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee Program Ordinance of 2010, is to authorize the County's participation in the TUMF Program which establishes and sets forth policies, regulations, and authorized uses of fees collected relating to the funding for the construction of improvement and facilities to enlarge the capacity of the Regional System of Highways and Arterials in western Riverside County necessary to address the direct and cumulative environmental effects generated by new development projects.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures that are applicable to the proposed project are as follows:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure TRF-2: The County shall require wineries and equestrian facilities to prepare a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) for County's review and approval for large special events, including but not limited to weddings, concerts, festivals, and equestrian events. The TMP shall provide detail such as traffic management strategies (such as traffic coordinators, event signage, staggered arrival/departure times, etc.) for events that cause a substantial increase of vehicles entering or exiting the project during a small period of time. The TMP may also be required to include parking strategies to aid traffic management such as a drop-off/pick-up zone and/or offsite shuttle arrangements, including potential use of the City of Temecula's old town parking structure on Main Street.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure TRF-3: The County shall implement a Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Program for the project area. This Program shall collect fair share contributions toward identified mitigation measures (as outlined in the WCP Fair Share and Phasing Assessment conducted by Fehr and Peers) within the project area and within the City of Temecula, and the County shall enter into an agreement with the City of Temecula to implement the identified improvements. Implementing projects shall also make fair share contributions to revise the Adaptive Traffic Signal Timing Program through the above-mentioned TIF as well, for those intersection locations that would experience improved levels of service with implementation of this Program. In addition, implementing projects shall also make fair share contributions for the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) Program for those facilities that are eligible for improvements through the TUMF Program.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure TRF-4: All future transportation related improvements in the project area shall be consistent with the County ordinances (i.e. Ordinance No. 348, 460, 461, 499, 512, 585 etc.) and the project (i.e., revised SWAP Figure 7 – Circulation Network, development standards of the implementing zones, Temecula Valley Wine Country Design Guidelines, etc.). All implementing project designs, including site access points, turning lanes, etc. shall be reviewed by the County Transportation Department staff to determine that proposals are consistent with appropriate design standards.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure TRF-5: All implementing projects in the project area shall be reviewed by appropriate emergency services personnel to ensure adequate emergency access is provided, as part of the County's discretionary application review process.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure TRF-1: The project would cause a significant cumulative impact in the p.m. and weekend peak hours at the Rancho California Road/I-15 Southbound Ramp. To mitigate the impact, the signal timing at the intersection would need to be optimized. The traffic signal at this location is controlled by Caltrans. To mitigate the impact, the project applicant shall provide funding to Caltrans sufficient to modify the traffic signal timing at this location to attain satisfactory LOS. Alternatively, this intersection is included in the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) program. Although the specific improvement at this intersection has not been identified, payment of the TUMF fee will contribute to future improvements at the intersection. The project shall make a fair share contribution to these improvements by paying the TUMF fee. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than significant level.

Mitigation Measure TRF-2: The project would cause a significant cumulative impact at four intersections that will be included in the fee program currently being prepared for the WCCP (WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure TRF-3). The required improvement at each intersection, noted below, will be included in the WCCP traffic fee.

- Intersection 8, Rancho California Road/Calle Contento: Improve the intersection to be a multi-lane roundabout with 2-lane approaches from the eastbound and westbound directions.
- Intersection 9, Rancho California Road/Anza Road: Improve the intersection to be a multi-lane roundabout with two lane approaches at the northbound, westbound and eastbound legs.
- Intersection 10, Rancho California Road/Monte De Oro Road: Improve the intersection to a roundabout.
- Intersection 11, Rancho California Road/Glen Oaks Road: Improve the intersection to a roundabout.
- Intersection 18, Anza Road/Temecula Parkway (SR-79): Improve the eastbound approach by adding one left-turn lane.

Since the development of the funding program is ongoing, the fee program may not be in place prior to the development of the project. Therefore, to satisfy the mitigation requirement, the project shall participate in the implementation of the above-named improvements via one of the three options below:

1) The project shall pay the proportionate fair share attributable to the project prior to issuance of 50% of the building permits on the project. The project's fair share contribution has been determined based on the ratio of the project's trip generation to the total forecast trip generation of the WCCP. The project's estimated share of traffic is summarized below.

- Rancho California Road/Calle Contento – 18%
- Rancho California Road/Anza Road – 13.7%
- Rancho California Road/Monte De Oro Road – 13.7%
- Rancho California Road/Glen Oaks Road – 13.7%
- Anza Road/Temecula Parkway (SR-79) – 13.7%

Project components may be developed independently of one another. Should that be the case, then each project component would be responsible for payment of the fair share or fees as outlined below.

- Rancho California Road/Calle Contento – Winery 33%, Hotel 30%, Single Family Homes 21%, Winery Estates 16%.
- Rancho California Road/Anza Road - Winery 44%, Hotel 27%, Single Family Homes 14%, Winery Estates 15%.
- Rancho California Road/Glen Oaks Road - Winery 44%, Hotel 27%, Single Family Homes 14%, Winery Estates 15%.
- Anza Road/Temecula Parkway - Winery 44%, Hotel 27%, Single Family Homes 14%, Winery Estates 15%.

Or:

2) In the event the funding program for the WCCP is established through an update to the DIF, then the project shall pay its fees into said funding program through DIF payments in place of the fair share contribution described above; or

3) The project applicant shall construct the improvements prior to occupancy of the project.

Completed WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure:

The following WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure that is applicable to the proposed project has been completed and is included as Appendix K:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure TRF-1: Proposed implementing projects within the project area shall be required to complete a comprehensive transportation impact assessment consistent with County Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) guidelines. To be consistent with the project, all analyses shall utilize the Wine Country Traffic Demand Forecasting (TDF) model to forecast cumulative impacts associated with the implementing projects.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
44. Bike Trails	☐	☒	☐	☐

Source: Riverside County General Plan; and the WCCP EIR.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As detailed in the Project Description, the proposed project includes 95.9 acres of open space with an approximately 6.5-mile trail network that provides connectivity between the residential and Winery Resort portions of the project site. In addition, there are existing trails within the 468-acre MSHCP open space area. In addition, the WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU REC-1 requires the project to participate in any future trails phasing and financing plan, and WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU REC-2 requires the project to provide for certain trail improvements. With provision of the proposed trail facilities and implementation of the WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures, impacts related to bike trails would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

There are no mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to bike trails.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures that are applicable to the proposed project are as follows:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU REC-1: Listed previously in Recreation Response 41.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU REC-2: Listed previously in Recreation Response 41.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project				
45. Water a) Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: County Ordinance No. 859 (Water Efficient Landscape), Water Supply Assessment, prepared by Rancho California Water District, 2018 (WSA 2018), included as Appendix I; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As detailed in the Project Description, the proposed project includes implementation of an onsite water system that would connect to the existing system within Buck Road. The project would also construct a 4.8-million-gallon reservoir tank that would connect to the existing water lines within Buck Road that would provide water supply to the project. These are water conveyance systems. The project does not require construction of expansion of water treatment facilities. Water treatment is provided by the Rancho California Water District's facilities, which would be able to accommodate the project, as identified in a Will-Serve Letter. The impacts of development of the proposed water system that would convey the treated water to and through the project site are considered part of the impacts of the proposed project as a whole and are analyzed throughout the various sections of this document. Activities such as excavation, grading, and construction as required for the water lines would result in impacts that are analyzed in the Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Noise, and Transportation and Traffic. In addition, WCCP Mitigation Measure HYD-6 requires that all implementing projects, such as the proposed project, provide a plan of service to identify water distribution, fire protection connections, service pressure, and connection to the Rancho California Water District's infrastructure. Thus, with the mitigation discussed in those sections, impacts related to the need to construct or expand water treatment facilities would be less than significant.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is located within the service boundary of the Rancho California Water District, which obtains its water from the Temecula Valley Groundwater Basin and imported water from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. Historically, groundwater has supplied between 25 to 40 percent of the District's total water supply and imported water has supplied between 60 to 70 percent (WSA 2018). In 2015, the District's total potable water demand was approximately 62,325 AF, and the District's total recycled water demand was 4,013 AFY. The District's total supply in 2015 was 70,448 AF, hence, the District had ample supply to meet demand in 2015 (WSA 2018).

The District's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) details water availability to increase supplies of imported and recycled water through 2044 to meet anticipated cumulative growth within its service area based

on development pursuant to the 2003 Riverside Country General Plan. Using the District's demand factors and the General Plan build out assumption for the project site, a potable water demand of 715,490 gpd (802 AFY) was anticipated for the site within the 2015 UWMP water demand assumptions (WSA 2018).

The Water Supply Assessment for the proposed project provides a specific assessment of water demand from the proposed project that also utilizes the water demand factors from the 2015 UWMP. As shown on Table UT-1, operation of the project at build out is anticipated to require 707,877 gpd (792.92 AFY) of potable water, which is 8.3 AFY (7,409.76 gpd) less water than assumed in the projections in the 2015 WQMP.

Table UT-1: Water Demands for the Proposed Project

Land Use	Water Demand (gpd)
Residential Areas	
Winery Resort	52,710
Cottage Inns	26,460
Residential Subdivision 2.0-4.9 acre lots	92,000
Residential Subdivision 5.0-9.9 acre lots	3,000
Residential Subdivision less than 2.0 acre lots	37,265
Subtotal	***211,435***
Non-Residential Areas	
Resort Event Center	4,237
Resort Marketplace	1,939
Resort Winery	2,431
Resort Vineyards	116,637
Resort Orchards and Landscaping	13,927
Cottage Inn Wineries	33,205
Residential Vineyards	324,066
Subtotal	***496,442***
Total	**707,877**

Source: Water Supply Assessment, 2018

In addition, the Water Supply Assessment provides a comparison of total water demand and supply through 2044, including the proposed project. As shown in Table UT-2, the District would have a total water supply surplus of 3,800AFY in 2044 with implementation of the proposed project.

Table UT-2: Rancho California Water District Projected Water Demands and Supplies including the Project

	2019	2024	2029	2034	2039	2044
Water Demand Including Project	78,591	88,232	93,947	97,440	100,693	103,947
Water Supply	87,617	99,610	102,743	104,756	107,171	107,747
Total Supply Surplus	**9,026**	**11, 378**	**8,796**	**7,316**	**6,478**	**3,800**

Source: Water Supply Assessment, 2018.

These estimates do not include the water savings that would occur from implementation of the proposed sustainable water features, included by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures PSU WATER-1 through PSU WATER-3, which is anticipated to save up to 16.44 AFY of water as listed in Table UT-3. In addition, County Ordinance No. 859, included as PPP UT-1, requires compliance with the County's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. Thus, an additional surplus of water supply, beyond that identified in Table UT-2, would occur from implementation of these required sustainable features.

Table UT-3: Water Savings from Sustainable Features

Water Savings Feature	Daily Water Savings	Annual Water Savings	Potable Demand Offset
Resort Gray Water Reuse	3,341 gpd	3.74 AFY	Hotel toilet flushing
Resort Winery Process Water Reuse	2,630 gpd avg. annual (5,333 gpd during crush)	2.95 AFY	Vineyard and landscape irrigation
Class II Winery Process Water Reuse	1,380 gpd avg. annual (4,194 gpd during crush)	1.54 AFY	Vineyard and landscape irrigation

Condensate Water Reuse	3,993 gpd	4.47 AFY	Vineyard and landscape irrigation
Optional Residential Gray Water Reuse	3,342 gpd	3.74 AFY	Residential toilet flushing
Total Potential Savings	**14,686 gpd**	**16.44 AFY**	

Source: Water Supply Assessment, 2018.

Overall, the Rancho California Water District has identified water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and no new or expanded entitlements needed. Thus, impacts related to water resources would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

The mitigating plans, programs, or policies that are relevant to the proposed project includes the following:

PPP UT-1: County Ordinance No. 859. Project plans and specifications shall comply with Riverside County Ordinance No. 859, Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures that are applicable to the proposed project are as follows:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure HYD-6: All implementing projects shall provide a plan of service analysis in determining the needs for water distribution, fire protection, service pressures, and connection to the Rancho California Water District's master planned system. These plans must show requirements of off-site transmission mains to be constructed to serve certain areas of the project. It will be the responsibility of each implementing project proponent to ensure water system reliability/redundancy for domestic, irrigation, and emergency needs as determined appropriate through the County's discretionary review process and Rancho California Water District staff review.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU WATER-1: All implementing projects shall be required to use graywater as a water conserving system (Riverside County Policy OS 2.1), subject to review and approval by the SDRWQCB and incorporation of applicable Best Management Practices.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU WATER-2: All implementing projects shall be required to use California-friendly, drought-resistant landscaping and landscape irrigation improvements consistent with County Ordinance No. 859 and Riverside County Policy OS 2.3 in consideration of Rancho California Water District Budget Based Tiered Rate Program.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU WATER-3: All implementing projects shall be required to use advanced water conservation pursuant to the intent of Riverside County Policy OS 2.5 through implementation of at least the following best management practices:

- Irrigation systems shall be designed, maintained, and managed to meet or exceed an irrigation system efficiency of 80%.
- The capacity of the irrigation system shall not exceed peak system capacity to meet crop-specific water requirements, water meter capacity, and backflow preventer device capacity.
- Irrigation systems shall be designed to prevent runoff, overspray, and low-head drainage.
- Irrigation systems shall be designed to ensure the dynamic pressure at each emission device is within the manufacturers recommended pressure range for optimum performance.
- 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.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
46. Tribal Cultural Resources a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is: Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k); or,	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c). of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 for the purpose of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance to a California Native tribe.	☐	☒	☐	☐

Source: Cultural Resources Inventory, prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc, 2018 (HELIX 2018) (Appendix C); and the WCCP EIR.

Assembly Bill 52

In 2015 Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) established a new requirement under CEQA to consider "tribal cultural values, as well as scientific and archaeological values when determining impacts and mitigation." Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21074(a) defines "tribal cultural resources" (TCRs) as "[s]ites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe" that are either "[i]ncluded or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources" or "in a local register of historical resources." Additionally, defined cultural landscapes, historical resources, and archaeological resources may be considered tribal cultural resources. PRC Section 21074(b),(c). The lead agency may also in its discretion treat a resource as a TCR if it is supported with substantial evidence. AB 52 also requires lead agencies offer California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area consultation on CEQA documents in order to protect TCRs.

The Native American Heritage Commission was contacted for a Sacred Lands File search and list of tribal contacts in March 2015. The Sacred Lands File search and tribal outreach did not identify any sacred sites or tribal cultural resources in proximity to the project area. In May 2015, letters were sent to the 16 individuals and tribal entities provided by the NAHC as contacts. Responses were received from the Pauma Band of Luiseño Indians, Pala Band of Mission Indians, and Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians.

The Pauma Band of Luiseño Indians requested to be kept apprised of cultural resources studies for the project and their results. The Pala Band of Mission Indians Tribal Historic Preservation Office indicated that the project site is beyond the boundaries of the territory that the Tribe considers its Traditional Use Area (TUA) and stated,

"Therefore, we have no objection to the continuation of project activities as currently planned and we defer to the wishes of Tribes in closer proximity to the project area." The Culture Committee of the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians noted, "The Rincon Band has concerns for impacts to historic and cultural resources and the finding of items of significant cultural value that could be disturbed or destroyed and are considered culturally significant to the Luiseño people." The Rincon Culture Committee indicated that the project is within the aboriginal territory of the Luiseño people but not within Rincon's historic boundaries; therefore, Rincon defers to the Pechanga Band or the Soboba Band, who are closer to the project area.

A field survey was conducted by HELIX and a Luiseño Native American monitor from the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians in April 2015, and the principal investigator met with Pechanga Cultural Resources Department staff on June 11, 2015 to discuss the project and surrounding area. The Pechanga staff indicated that, although there is no known Luiseño place name for the project site, the area is likely associated with a rancheria located to the east and north. Numerous archaeological sites recorded east and north of the project location make up a village or rancheria, a large area of habitation. The bedrock milling sites located within and in proximity to the project area are probably outliers to this habitation area. Pechanga Cultural Resources staff recommended that any cultural resources sites identified within the project area be avoided through project design. Pechanga staff also recommended monitoring during ground-disturbing activity, due to the potential for encountering previously unknown cultural resources.

Then, in compliance with AB 52, nine Native American contacts were sent letters on August 7, 2017, requesting any information related to cultural resources or heritage sites within or adjacent to the project area. In addition, the project applicant and the principal investigator participated in a AB 52 meeting with the County and Pechanga in November 2017. By the time of this meeting, the project had been designed to avoid impacts to the known cultural resources by leaving them in open space; however, there was concern that planting and other agricultural activities could damage the cultural resources. Based on these concerns, a planting plan was developed that would avoid the cultural resource sites and provide a 50-foot buffer around each site. Deed restrictions would be placed on individual lots in order to ensure that no ground disturbing activity would occur within these buffer zones. In addition, an open space area was designated as a reburial location in the event that cultural material is recovered that the Tribe determines should be reburied. Mitigation language provided by Pechanga has been incorporated into Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-5.

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k)?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As described above, TCRs are sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either eligible or listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or local register of historical resources (PRC Section 21074). As detailed previously, the project site is considered highly sensitive for the presence of Native American resources, contains known resources that would be preserved as part of the project (as implemented by Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-5), and has a high potential for buried and surficial archaeological sites. WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure CUL-2 would be implemented along with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-5 to provide for both County and Native American archaeological monitors to ensure that any tribal cultural resources uncovered during construction activity are recovered, and that existing resources are protected. Additionally, WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure CUL-3 would protect any Native American human remains if uncovered during project construction activities. With implementation of these Mitigation Measures potential impacts related to tribal cultural resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c). of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 for the purpose of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance to a California Native tribe?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As described above, the WCCP EIR considered the significance of potential resources to a California Native tribe and included WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3 to protect potential resources. In addition, the proposed project includes Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3, which would preserve and protect the identified resources on the project site. In addition, the County completed the Native American outreach and consultation process, as required by AB 52, which resulted in identification of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-5 that would be implemented in cooperation with County and Native American tribal monitors to protect tribal cultural resources. Therefore, the lead agency has considered potential impacts to California Native tribe resources and has implemented mitigation to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

There are no mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to tribal cultural resources.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure that is applicable to the proposed project is the following:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3: Listed previously in Response 9, Archaeological Resources.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-5: Listed previously in Response 9, Archaeological Resources.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
47. Sewer a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Sewer Capacity Study, prepared by Fuscoe Engineering (Sewer 2017), provided as Appendix L; Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD 2018), accessed: https://www.emwd.org/home/showdocument?id=1426; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As detailed in the Project Description, the project includes construction of a new regional sewer line from a lift station at Wilson Creek to the project area, pursuant to the requirements of the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD). In addition, the project would construct an onsite sewer system to serve the proposed uses that would include sewers throughout the entire development, and a new lift station in the southwestern portion of the site that would serve the 76 clustered residential units. The new sewer infrastructure would accommodate flows from build out of the proposed project, as determined by the Sewer Capacity Study (Sewer 2017). Furthermore, as required by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU SEWER-2,

the proposed project would provide a fair share contribution toward regional sewer improvements, as set forth in the phasing and financing plan being developed by EMWD.

The impacts of development of the proposed sewer system are considered part of the impacts of the proposed project as a whole and are analyzed throughout the various sections of this document. Activities such as excavation, grading, and construction as required for the sewer lines would result in impacts that are analyzed in the Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Noise, and Transportation and Traffic. Thus, with the mitigation measures discussed in those sections, impacts related to the need to construct or expand sewer treatment facilities would be less than significant.

b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Less than Significant Impact. The Sewer Capacity Study identified that the proposed project would generate 67,921 gpd of wastewater at build out and full capacity, as shown in Table UT-4.

Table UT-4: Wastewater Generated by the Proposed Project

Land Use	Estimated Flow (Equivalent Dwelling Units)	Gallons Per Day Per Equivalent Dwelling Unit	Average Daily Flow (Gallons Per Day)
Residential Subdivision A	43	235	10,105
Residential Subdivision B	33	235	7,755
Cottage Inns	40	235	9,400
Community Center	2.0 acres	1,700/acre	1,275
Winery Resort			
Winery	12.5	265	2,938
Tasting Room	0.3	265	71
Restaurant	58.8	265	13,818
Hotel Rooms	77.8	265	18,283
Meeting Rooms	10.6	265	2,491
Event Center	18.2	265	4,277
Total Daily Flow			**67,921**

Source: Sewer Capacity Study, 2017.

Wastewater from the project would be conveyed by the sewer system to the Eastern Municipal Water District's Temecula Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility. The facility currently has capacity for 18 mgd of wastewater inflow and currently receives approximately 14 mgd of inflow; thus, has an existing additional capacity of 4 mgd. The project's demand at build out and full capacity would be 1.7 percent of the existing remaining capacity in the treatment plant. However, the facility is being expanded to accommodate 23 mgd, and it has an ultimate design capacity of 28 mgd (EMWD 2018). Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to wastewater treatment plant capacity. Impacts will be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

There are no mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to wastewater infrastructure.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure that is applicable to the proposed project is the following:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU SEWER-2: All implementing projects shall make a fair share contribution toward proposed sewer improvements, as set forth in the phasing and financing plan being developed by EMWD. In addition, all implementing projects shall be responsible for extending sewer lines from available trunk lines as a condition of approval for the project, and or otherwise ensuring adequate wastewater service consistent with County, Rancho California Water District, and Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements, as deemed appropriate by the County during application review, in order to meet water quality standards and comply with applicable policies and regulations adopted by the County, Rancho California Water District, and Regional Water Quality Control Board. Every future project in the project area shall have special

sewer conditions as established by the County pursuant to the "Temecula Valley Wine Country (TVWC) Draft Conditions of Approval" adopted by the Board on April 24, 2012.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
48. Solid Waste				
a) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Does the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Source: Riverside County General Plan, the WCCP EIR, and the CalRecycle Solid Waste Information System Database, accessed: http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/33-AA-0007/Detail/; the WCCP EIR

a) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As described by the WCCP EIR, Solid waste generated within the Project area would be taken to either the Perris Transfer Station located at 1706 Goetz Road in the City of Perris or the Moreno Valley Transfer Station located at 17700 Indian Street in Moreno Valley. After removal of recyclables and green waste, the remaining solid waste is disposed of in one of the following landfills.

- The Badlands Landfill is permitted to accept 4,800 tons per day of solid waste and is permitted to operate through 2021. In November 2017, the landfill averaged 2,855 tons per day; thus, having an average capacity for 1,945 additional tons of daily solid waste.
- The Lamb Canyon Landfill is permitted to accept 5,500 tons per day of solid waste and is permitted to operate through March of 2029. In November 2017, the landfill averaged 1,985 tons per day; thus, having an average capacity for 3,515 additional tons of daily solid waste.
- The El Sobrante Sanitary Landfill is permitted to accept 16,054 tons per day of solid waste and is permitted to operate through 2044. In November 2017, the landfill averaged 11,015 tons per day; thus, having an average capacity for 5,039 additional tons of daily solid waste.

As described by the WCCP EIR, the regional landfill system has adequate capacity to accommodate the solid waste generated by implementing projects, including the proposed project. As described by the County General Plan EIR, residential uses generate 0.41 tons per year of solid waste and commercial land uses generate 0.0024 tons per square foot per year. As shown in Table UT-5, the operation of the proposed project is estimated to generate approximately 11.70 tons per week of solid waste.

Table UT-5: Solid Waste Generated by the Project

Land Use	Development	Solid Waste Generation Rate	Total Solid Waste Generated
Residential	92 single-family residences	0.41 tons/unit/year	37.72 tons per year (0.73 tons per week)

Commercial	237,927 square feet	0.0024 tons/sf/year	571.02 tons per year (10.98 tons per week)
Total			**608.74 tons per year (11.70 tons per week)**

Based on the current recycling requirements, which require diversion of 50 percent of solid waste away from landfills, included as PPP PSU-1, the proposed project would result in 5.85 tons of solid waste per week. In 2020, state regulations per AB 341, included as PPP PSU-2, will become effective, which will require diversion of 75 percent of solid waste from landfills. Thus, it is anticipated that solid waste landfill disposal from operation of the project in 2020 would be reduced to approximately 2.93 tons per week. As detailed above, the landfills serving the project region have sufficient permitted capacity to serve the project, in addition to existing services. In addition, the WCCP EIR includes Mitigation Measures PSU WASTE-1 through PSU WASTE-5, which require reduce, reuse, and recycling during both construction and operational activities of the proposed project. Overall, impacts related to landfill facilities would be less than significant.

b) Does the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project would comply with all regulations related to solid waste. All solid waste-generating activities within the County are subject to the requirements set forth in AB 939, included as PPP PSU-1, that requires diversion of a minimum of 50 percent of solid waste. In addition, after 2020 all development would be required to divert 75 percent of solid waste pursuant to state regulations, included as PPP PSU-2. Implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with all state regulations. All projects in the County undergo development review prior to permit approval, which includes an analysis of project compliance with these programs. In addition, the WCCP EIR included Mitigation Measures PSU WASTE-1 through PSU WASTE-5, which require compliance with existing regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, Impacts would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

The mitigating plans, programs, or policies that are relevant to the proposed project includes the following:

PPP PSU-1: AB 939: This state law requires diversion of a minimum of 50 percent of solid waste.

PPP PSU-2: AB 341: This state law becomes effective in 2020 and will require diversion of 75 percent of solid waste from landfills.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures that are applicable to the proposed project are as follows:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU WASTE-1: All implementing project proponents shall make every effort feasible to recycle, reuse, and/or reduce the amount of construction and demolition materials (i.e., concrete, asphalt, wood, etc.) generated by implementing projects that would otherwise be taken to a landfill. This diversion of waste must exceed a 50 percent reduction by weight. The project shall complete the Riverside County Waste Management Department Construction and Demolition Waste Diversion Program Form B or and Form C process as evidence to ensure compliance. Form B (Recycling Plan) must be submitted and approved by the Riverside County Waste Management Department and provided to the Department of Building and Safety prior to the issuance of building permits. Form C (Reporting Form) must be approved by the Riverside County Waste Management Department and submitted to the Department of Building and Safety prior to the issuance of certificate of occupancy/final inspection.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU WASTE-2: All implementing project proponents shall dispose of any hazardous wastes, including paint, used during construction and grading at a licensed facility in accordance with local, state, and federal guidelines.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU WASTE-3: All implementing projects with a residential Homeowners Association (HOA) shall establish green waste recycling through its yard maintenance or waste hauling contracts.

Green waste recycling includes such things as grass recycling (where lawn clippings from a mulching-type mower are left on the lawn) and on- or off-site composting. This measure shall be implemented to reduce green waste going to landfills. If such services are not available through the yard maintenance or waste haulers in the area, the implementing project's HOA shall provide individual homeowners with information about ways to recycle green waste individually and collectively and provisions shall be included in the CC&R's.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU WASTE-4: Prior to issuance of Building Permits for any commercial or agricultural facilities, clearance from the Riverside County Waste Management Department is needed to verify compliance with California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Act of 1991 (AB 1327), which requires the local jurisdiction to require adequate areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure PSU WASTE-5: Prior to implementing project approval, applicant(s) shall submit for review and approval landscape plans that provide for the use of xeriscape landscaping to the extent feasible and consistent with the Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan Design Guidelines and provide for the use of drought tolerant low maintenance vegetation in all landscaped areas of the project.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

49. Utilities

Would the project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Electricity?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Natural gas?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Communications systems?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Storm water drainage?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Street lighting?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Other governmental services?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Drainage Study for Twelve Oaks Wine Resort Project (Appendix E), Project Plans.

Less than Significant Impact. Because the project site is vacant and undeveloped and does not currently generate a demand for utilities, implementation of the proposed project would result in an incremental increase in demand for electricity, natural gas, communication systems, street lighting, maintenance of public facilities, and potentially other governmental services. The proposed project would connect into the existing utility grid that is available adjacent to the site. The streetlights, curb, gutter, sidewalk, water, electrical, gas and telecommunication lines all already exist along roadways adjacent to the project site. As described previously, the project would install an onsite storm drain system that would accommodate the increase in storm flows from the project site, and the project would provide improvements to existing roadways. Therefore, all utilities are existing, or construction of which are included in the proposed project, and the impacts of construction are described throughout this EA/IS. Thus, the project would not result in the construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Impacts would be less than significant.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

There are no mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to utilities.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure that is applicable to the proposed project is the following:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure GHG-2: Listed previously in Response 20, Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
50. Energy Conservation a) Would the project conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Greenhouse Gas Technical Report for the 12 Oaks Winery Resort Project, prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, 2018 (GHGTR 2018), included as Appendix G; County of Riverside Climate Action Plan; and the WCCP EIR.

a) Would the project conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans?

No Impact. The applicable energy conservation plan for the project is the County of Riverside Climate Action Plan (CAP), which is described previously in Response 22. The CAP contains a menu of 47 overall measures potentially applicable to discretionary development that include energy conservation measures, which is implemented by WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure GHG-2.

As described above previously in Response 22, and listed in Tables GHG-3 and GHG-4, the project would be consistent with the applicable energy conservation measures in the CAP. In addition, the project would be required to comply with the California Energy Code and the Title 24/California Green Building Standards Code, which establish mandatory measures related to energy efficiency in new construction. With the implementation of these measures, there would be no impact related to a conflict with an adopted energy conservation plan.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

There are no mitigating plans, programs, or policies related to energy conservation.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure that is applicable to the proposed project is the following:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure GHG-2: Listed previously in Response 20, Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

51.	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self- sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Source: General Biological Resources Assessment Report, 2018, prepared by HELIX (BRA 2018) included in Appendix B; Cultural Resources Inventory, prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc, 2018 (HELIX 2018) (Appendix C); and the WCCP EIR.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As described previously in Section 7, Biological Resources, the project site is generally comprised of a mix of non-native grassland and riversidean sage scrub, the majority of which has been subject to historical agricultural uses. The project site does not contain any special status plant species, and potential impacts related to sensitive wildlife species, nesting birds, riparian habitat, and wetlands would be mitigated through conservation of the MSHCP lands pursuant to HANS No. 00408, compliance with the MSHCP, agency permitting regulations and Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-3. With implementation of the existing requirements and mitigation measures as detailed previously, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animals, and impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Also, as described in Response 8, the project site does not contain any historic resources. However, Response 9 details that the project area is considered highly sensitive for the presence of prehistoric Native American archaeological resources and has a high potential for buried and surficial archaeological sites. As a result, WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures CUL-2 and CUL-3 would be implemented along with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 to provide for archaeological monitors to ensure that any resources uncovered during construction activity are recovered, and that existing resources are protected. With implementation of these Mitigation Measures, potential impacts related to important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

The mitigating plans, programs, or policies that are relevant to the proposed project includes the following:

PPP BIO-1: Payment of MSHCP and Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Fees. As listed previously in Response 7, Biological Resources.

PPP BIO-2: Agency Permitting. As listed previously in Response 7, Biological Resources.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

The WCCP EIR Mitigation Measure that is applicable to the proposed project is the following:

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3: As listed previously in Response 9, Archaeological Resources.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-3: As listed previously in Response 7, Biological Resources.

Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3: As listed previously in Response 9, Archaeological Resources.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
52.	Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects and probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Previous Responses 1-51 and the WCCP EIR

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project consists of development of an implementing project pursuant to the WCCP. The proposed project would provide residential, retail, winery, resort and vineyard uses, which would be consistent with the land uses and zoning for the site and surrounding area. As described above, all of the potential impacts related to implementation of the project would be less than significant with implementation of WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures, project specific mitigation measures, and existing plans, programs, or policies that are imposed by the County of Riverside and effectively reduce environmental impacts. The project does not result in cumulative adverse environmental impacts that have not already been analyzed in the WCCP EIR.

The County of Riverside has identified several related projects that are located along Rancho California Road and are listed below:

1. Blossom Winery (CUP3706)
2. Mt. Palomar Winery (CUP3707)
3. Bella Vista Winery (PP25740)
4. Paulk Winery (PP25893)
5. Newly Submitted Winery (PP26064)

These projects include similar winery uses as proposed by the project. The cumulative effect of the proposed project taken into consideration with these other development projects in the area would be limited, because the project would develop the project site in consistency with the WCCP and the zoning code and would not result in substantial effects to any environmental resource topic, as described though out this document. Furthermore, the proposed project would develop an area that has been previously graded and disturbed through many years of agricultural uses. Thus, impacts to environmental resources or issue areas would not be cumulatively considerable; and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Findings of Fact: The project does not have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
53.	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Source: Previous Responses 1-52.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project would result in development of an undeveloped area. As described in the previous responses, the project would not consist of any use or any activities that would result in a substantial negative affect any persons in the vicinity. All resource topics

associated with the proposed project have been analyzed in accordance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines and were found to pose no impacts, less than significant impacts, or less than significant impacts with mitigation, as previously detailed. Consequently, the project would not result in any environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings directly or indirectly, with implementation of the existing requirements and mitigation measures that have been previously detailed.

Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies

Refer to the previously listed PPPs related to aesthetics, air quality, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, public services, recreation, and utilities. These PPPs are existing plans, programs, or policies effectively reduce potential environmental impacts.

WCCP EIR Mitigation Measures:

Refer to the previously listed WCCP EIR mitigation measures related to aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, greenhouse gasses, hazardous materials, noise, public services, recreation, traffic, and utilities. As required by the WCCP EIR, the project relevant mitigation measures from the WCCP EIR have been included in the proposed project to reduce potential environmental impacts.

Project Specific Mitigation Measures:

Refer to the previously listed mitigation measures related to biological resources, cultural resources, and hazardous materials. These mitigation measures effectively reduce potential environmental impacts to a less than significant level.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through incorporation of mitigation as conditions of approval and conditions of approval will be implemented and monitored through the Building and Safety plan check process.

VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration as per California Code of Regulations, Section 15063 (c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

Earlier Analyses Used, if any: County of Riverside General Plan Amendment No. 960 EIR No. 421 CAP and the WCCP EIR No. 524, including technical studies, certifying resolutions, and findings

Location Where Earlier Analyses are available for review: https://epdsolutions-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/p/griffin/EnwbEBu_ITdFu5Fn7D4Tk4BizdES_L8fCNsj_BHalPiLA?e=495Lgt

Location: County of Riverside Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor
Riverside, CA 92505

VII. AUTHORITIES CITED

Authorities cited: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21083.05; References: California Government Code Section 65088.4; Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095 and 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka (2007)* 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

4. Revisions to the IS/EA

This section contains revisions to the Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) No. 42692 & 43043 – which circulated for a 30-day public review period starting February 7, 2019 – based upon: (1) clarifications required to prepare a response to a specific comment; and/or (2) typographical errors. This document has been prepared in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as amended (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 et seq.) and represents the independent judgment of the Lead Agency. This document and the circulated IS/EA and Mitigated Negative Declaration together comprise the Final IS/EA.

The County of Riverside staff reviewed the comments received on the IS/EA and the revised material and determined that none of this material constitutes the type of significant new information that requires recirculation of the IS/EA for further public comment under CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5. None of this new material indicates that the project will result in a significant new environmental impact not previously disclosed in the IS/EA. Additionally, none of this material indicates that there would be a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified environmental impact that will not be mitigated, or that there would be any of the other circumstances requiring recirculation described in Section 15073.5. These changes do not result in new, different or more significant impacts than previously identified. These changes represent minor alterations that clarify and amplify information that was contained in the publicly circulated version of the IS/EA.

Changes made to the IS/EA are identified here in strikeout text to indicate deletions and in underlined text to signify additions.

4.1 Revisions and Changes to Text

The following text has been revised in response to comments received on the public review IS/EA and corrections identified by the County.

Section 3.0, Environmental Assessment Form: Initial Study/Environmental Assessment

Page 1 of 111 is revised as follows:

> An additional approximately 4~~68~~70 acres was previously offered for dedicat~~ed~~ion to the Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) for the Western Riverside Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRMSHCP) for conservation through the approved tentative tract map (TTM34466).
>
> All subsequent references to the approximately 468 acres of conservation land are changed to state that the total area is 470 acres and has been offered for dedication to the RCA for the WRMSHCP to recognize the proposed conservation area pursuant to HANS 408 and that not all of the required dedication area has been transferred to the RCA. This applies to pages including, but not limited to 10, 20, 21 and 54.

Pages 2 of 111 and 3 of 111 are revised as follows:

> **4. Safety:** The proposed project is located is high fire hazard area ~~not located~~ but not within any other special hazard zone (including FEMA flood zone, fault zone, ~~high fire hazard area,~~ dam inundation zone, area with high liquefaction potential, etc.). The proposed project has allowed for sufficient provision of emergency response services to future residents of this project through the project design and payment of development impact fees. Any building constructed shall comply with the special construction provisions contained in Riverside County Ordinance No. 787, California Fire

Code and the California Building Code. The proposed project meets with all other applicable Safety element policies.

8. Healthy Communities: The project is consistent with the policies of the Healthy Communities Element of the General Plan by creating a compact resort design that encourages pedestrian walkability throughout the resort area and connection to trails that circulate around the entire site. In addition, the project maintains the limited footprint area that allows for the dedication of approximately ~~468~~70 acres of open space.

All subsequent references to the 468 acres of conservation land are changed to state approximately ~~468~~70 acres to recognize the references to the conservation area may be rounded. This applies to pages including, but not limited to 10, 20, 21, 54, 83 and 97.

Pages 22 of 111 and 23 of 111 are revised as follows:

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Wildlife corridors are linear features that connect areas of open space and provide avenues for the migration of animals and access to additional areas of foraging. The project site consists of an open space area, which is adjacent to the ~~575~~ approximately 470-acre HANS No. 00408 MSHCP conservation area that expanded the Core 6 area. The project site does not include such a linear connective feature, nor a specific wildlife corridor. Thus, impacts related to a wildlife corridor or connective feature would not occur from implementation of the project. Conversely, the expanded core area would allow for continued movement of native resident and migratory species within the open space areas that surround the project area. It would also broaden the connection between Johnson Ranch and Lake Skinner (BRA 2018). Thus, the proposed project's impacts related to movement of native resident species would be less than significant.

e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site is generally comprised of a mix of non-native grassland and Riversidean sage scrub, the majority of which has been subject to historical agricultural uses. Impacts to the non-native grassland and Riversidean sage scrub have previously been mitigated to a less than significant level through conservation of the adjacent ~~575~~ approximately 470-acres of land pursuant to HANS No. 00408. In addition, tributaries of Santa Gertrudis Creek cross the project area at 13 locations. The project site includes 4.05 acres of streambed and riparian habitat subject to CDFW jurisdiction, which is comprised of 0.49-acre southern willow scrub, 0.69-acre southern riparian woodland (including 0.10 acre of existing disturbed area), 0.71-acre alkali marsh, 0.18-acre disturbed wetland, 1.62-acres streambed (including 1.16-acres ephemeral and 0.09-acre intermittent), and 0.36-acre round-bottom swale (Table BIO-1). No vernal pool habitat occurs in the project area (DBESP 2018).

Page 51 of 111, first paragraph, is revised as follows:

Less than Significant Impact. The project is located in a moderate to very high fire hazard area. The project shall adhere to all Fire Department requirements for projects located within very high fire hazard areas. Any building constructed within this project shall comply with the special construction provisions contained in Riverside County Ordinance No. 787, California Fire Code (CFC),

and CBC. The CFC and CBC are applicable by operation of law and are required as a standard condition of approval; therefore, no mitigation is required and impacts would be less than significant.

Appendix B: General Biological Resources Assessment Report, Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation, and Burrowing Owl Survey Report

Globally, any reference to 575-acres of land pursuant to HANS No. 00408 is hereby revised to 470- acres of land pursuant to HANS No. 00408 as described in Attachment A.

Attachment A

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
7578 El Cajon Boulevard
La Mesa, CA 91942
619.462.1515 tel
619.462.0552 fax
www.**helixepi**.com

February 27, 2019

Andrea Arcilla
E|P|D Solutions, Inc.
2030 Main St., Ste. 1200
Irvine, CA 92614

Subject: Errata to the General Biological Resources Assessment Report for the Twelve Oaks Winery & Resort Project

Dear Ms. Arcilla:

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX) has prepared this errata letter to correct typographical errors found in the General Biological Resources Assessment (GBRA) report for the Twelve Oaks Winery & Resort Project (HELIX 2018). The typographical errors concern references to acreages of Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Conservation Area that had been previously approved for the larger property that contains the project site.

These changes represent minor alterations to clarify and amplify information that was contained in the publicly circulated environmental documentation for the project. The changes do not constitute the type of significant new information that requires recirculation of the environmental documentation. None of the new material indicates that the project will result in a significant new environmental impact not previously disclosed in the environmental documentation. Additionally, none of the new material indicates that there would be a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified environmental impact that will not be mitigated, or that there would be any of the other circumstances requiring recirculation. These changes do not result in new, different or more significant impacts than previously identified.

REVISIONS AND CHANGES TO TEXT

The GBRA report for the project incorrectly references 575 acres of MSHCP Conservation Area occurring north and west of the project site as a result of previous approvals from the final Joint Project Review (JPR) for Habitat Evaluation and Acquisition Negotiation Strategy (HANS) Case No. 00408 (Attachment A). The correct acreage is 470 acres.

The GBRA report is hereby revised as follows:

Summary Page

The **Report Summary** section is revised as follows:

> Development of the project site was assessed under the approved Owner Initiated Habitat Acquisition and Negotiation Strategy (HANS) No. 00408 as part of a larger study area. The HANS determination resulted in approximately ~~575~~ 470 acres of conservation occurring north and west of the project site to contribute to the extension of proposed Core 6 of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The determination was that no part of this project site was required to be part of the ~~575~~ 470 acres of conservation.

Section 1.1 Project Location

Section 1.1 on Page 1 is revised as follows:

> Within the boundaries of the MSHCP, the project site occurs within Subunit 4, Cactus Valley/SWRC-MSR/Johnson Ranch in the Southwest Area Plan (Figure 4). The project site was assessed under the approved Owner Initiated Habitat Acquisition and Negotiation Strategy (HANS) No. 00408 as part of a larger study area. The HANS determination resulted in approximately ~~575~~ 470 acres of conservation occurring north and west of the project site to contribute to the extension of proposed Core 6, with the entirety of the project site addressed herein located within the HANS-approved development footprint (Figure 5).

Section 4.3 Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan

Section 4.3 on Page 46 is revised as follows:

> Within the boundaries of the MSHCP, the project site occurs within Subunit 4, Cactus Valley/SWRC-MSR/Johnson Ranch in the Southwest Area Plan (Figure 4). The project site was assessed under the approved HANS No. 00408 as part of a larger study area. The HANS determination resulted in approximately ~~575~~ 470 acres of conservation occurring north and west of the project site to contribute to the extension of proposed Core 6, with the entirety of the project site addressed herein located within the HANS-approved development footprint (Figure 5).

Section 4.3.1 MSHCP Conservation

Section 4.3.1 on Page 46 is revised as follows:

> This project site is within the Southwest Area Plan; Subunit 4, Cactus Valley/SWRC-MSR/Johnson Ranch and previously subject to approved HANS No. 00408 as part of Joint Project Review (JPR) 05-03-04-03, which resulted in the entirety of the project site designated within a HANS-approved development footprint, offset by approximately ~~575~~ 470 acres of Core 6 conservation occurring immediately north and west of the site. See Section 4.3.2 below and Appendix D. Therefore,