

ERRATA

Changes to the Draft PEIR are noted below. The changes to the Draft PEIR do not affect the overall conclusions of the environmental document. These errata represent changes to the Draft PEIR to provide clarification, amplification and/or “insignificant modifications” as needed as a result of public comments on the Draft PEIR, or due to additional information received during the public review period. These clarifications and corrections do not warrant Draft PEIR recirculation pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15088.5. As set forth further below and elaborated upon in the respective Response to Comments, none of the Errata below reflect a new significant environmental impact, a “substantial increase” in the severity of an environmental impact for which mitigation is not proposed, or a new feasible alternative or mitigation measure that would clearly lessen significant environmental impacts but is not adopted. Nor do the Errata reflect a “fundamentally flawed” or “conclusory” Draft EIR.

The Planning Commission recommends additional modifications to the proposed Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan to address other outstanding matters that are discussed in Attachment A: *Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan Planning Commission Final Recommendations and PEIR No. 524 Determination*.

Changes in this Errata Section 3.0 are listed by page and where appropriate by paragraph. Added or modified text is shown by underlining (example) while deleted text is shown by striking (~~example~~).

CHAPTER 1.0, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Note: Table 1.0-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures is hereby updated to reflect changes noted below in mitigation measures. These changes will also be reflected in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, which will be considered by the Board of Supervisors as part of Project deliberations.

Page 1.0-50, Fifth Paragraph

“Descriptions of the first three rejected alternatives (i.e., Pending General Plan Amendments Approval, Alternative Location, and One Policy/One Zone Alternatives) are provided in Section 6.4 of this Draft EIR. However, a description of the No Build Scenario/Existing Condition Alternative is provided, as it describes the CEQA baseline against which the Project is analyzed (an alternative in which only existing¹ development occupies the site).”

¹ Most of the existing condition data used in this PEIR is from the NOP issuance date of December 28, 2009. County staff have updated “existing land use conditions” and “cumulative data” in an effort to more accurately reflect current and “No Build” conditions prior to issuance of the Draft PEIR on December 5, 2011. Generally, the “existing” wineries and their pertinent use data was updated by County staff by monitoring development review processes and analyzing wine industry tourism information, as shown in Exhibit 3.0-6, and in Appendix J, Land Use Buildout Assumptions and Methodology. Accordingly, PEIR sections used the best available data, which was updated following release of the NOP, but prior to the issuance of the Draft PEIR.

CHAPTER 3.0, PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Page 3.0-1, under 3.2 Project Location heading

“The Project is generally located in the Southwest Area Plan in the southwestern portion of unincorporated Riverside County, approximately three miles north of the border with San Diego County (refer to Exhibit 3.0-1, Regional Location Map). The Project covers approximately 18,990 acres of land located east of the City of Temecula, approximately one half mile north of the Pechanga Reservation, south of Lake Skinner, and northwest of Vail Lake (refer to Exhibit 3.0-2, Policy Area Map). This area contains some of Riverside County’s prime agriculture lands within the Temecula Valley.”

Page 3.0-12, second paragraph

“The traffic study prepared for the Project recommends innovative street improvements, which would minimize/reduce traffic impacts created by implementing projects allowed pursuant to the Project. These improvements include, but are not limited to:”

Page 3.0-15, Paragraph under Septic Facilities heading

“Numerous properties within the Project area currently utilize septic systems for wastewater disposal. At this time, the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) is concerned about the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems (OWTS) within the Project area due to groundwater quality concerns. In response to this, RWQCB has requested that all commercial implementing projects proposing OWTS with an average aggregate (total) wastewater flow greater than 1,200 gallons per day (gpd) must be referred to them for assessment of compliance with water quality standards.² Note that the 1,200 gallon per day standard is under review by RWQCB and may not remain in place throughout the life of the Project. Residential development projects (proposing five or more residential lots or units) will be required to connect to the sewer system once in place.^{3,4} It is possible that future implementing projects within the Project area Country may include OWTS as the wastewater solution (refer to Section 4.13, *Public Services and Utilities* for additional details).”

Page 3.0-17, under Aesthetics/Light and Glare Project Design Features heading, item numbers 4, 8 and 9

4. “The Project (revised SWAP Policy 1.5) will require a density minimum lot size of one dwelling unit per ten (10) acres for new residential tract maps and parcel maps except in

² San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board. *Temecula Valley Wine Country Memorandum*. Submitted to Mr. Steve Van Stockum, Director of Riverside County Department of Environmental Health (May 27, 2010).

³ As described further in Section 4.13, Public Services and Utilities, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors adopted the “Temecula Valley Wine Country Draft Conditions of Approval”, on February 14 2012, in order to ensure timely provision of and funding for adequate wastewater infrastructure.

⁴ Single family homes (or projects with fewer than five units) are assumed to generate less than the 1,200 gpd RWQCB threshold, based upon a typical “equivalent dwelling unit” wastewater generation of 265 gpd, per Appendix H, page 2-3 of May 2011 West Yost report entitled “Wine Country Infrastructure Study”.

the Wine Country – Residential District, which requires a minimum lot size of one dwelling unit per twenty (20) acres. This large lot size requirement will preserve and enhance the rural feel in the Project area.

8. The Project (proposed SWAP Policy 1.18 ~~1.12~~) will encourage equestrian establishments and permit incidental commercial uses that complement existing equestrian establishments on lots larger than 10 acres. This will promote the equestrian and rural nature of the Wine Country – Equestrian District.
9. The Project (proposed SWAP Policy 1.20 ~~1.15~~) will encourage residential tract and parcel maps with an overall project density yield not to exceed one dwelling unit per five (5) acres. This large lot size requirement will preserve and enhance the rural feel in the Wine Country – Residential District.”

Page 3.0-18, under Air Quality Project Design Features heading, item number 1

1. “The Project’s amendment to County Zoning Ordinance No. 348 will require that the minimum lot size for special occasion facilities be 10 acres in the WC-WE zone, 20 acres in the WC-W zone, and 100 acres in the WC-E zone ~~and a maximum of 5 guests shall be permitted per gross acre for these facilities.~~ This would greatly reduce air quality impacts on neighboring properties.”

Page 3.0-18, under Agricultural Resources Project Design Features heading, item numbers 5 and 7

5. “Within the Residential District, implementing projects which propose residential tracts or parcel maps will be ~~required~~ encouraged to cluster development in conjunction with onsite vineyards or equestrian land such that the overall project density yield does not exceed one dwelling unit per five (5) acres. At least 75% of the implementing project area will be permanently set aside as vineyards or equestrian land.
7. The proposed Wine Country – ~~Equestrian (WC-E) and Residential (WC-R)~~ zones would allow as a permitted use the grazing, keeping or boarding of horses, cattle, sheep, goats, or other farm stock, in addition to other similar agriculture-promoting uses.”

Page 3.0-18, under Biological Resources Project Design Features heading, item numbers 2 and 4

2. “The Project (revised SWAP Policy 1.5) will require a ~~minimum lot size of~~ density of one dwelling unit per ten (10) acres for new residential tract maps and parcel maps except in the Wine Country – Residential District. This large lot size requirement will preserve and enhance the rural feel in the Project area.

4. The Project (proposed SWAP Policy ~~1.18~~ 4.12) will encourage equestrian establishments and permit incidental commercial uses that complement existing equestrian establishments on lots larger than 10 acres. This will promote the equestrian and rural nature of the Wine Country – Equestrian District.”

Page 3.0-20, under Hydrology and Water Quality Project Design Features heading, item number 1

1. “The Project’s amendment to County Zoning Ordinance No. 348 will require that the minimum lot size for special occasion facilities be 10 acres in the WC-WE zone, 20 acres in the WC-W zone, and 100 acres in the WC-E zone ~~and a maximum of 5 guests shall be permitted per gross acre for these facilities.~~ This would greatly reduce air quality impacts on neighboring properties.”

Page 3.0-19, under Greenhouse Gas Emissions Project Design Features heading, item number 1

1. “The Project includes requirements to limit the intensity and density of implementing projects, including retention of at least 75% of all winery project acreage as agricultural production, and requiring minimum lot sizes in the Winery, Winery-Existing, and Equestrian ~~Zones Districts~~, thereby reducing impervious surfaces and associated stormwater runoff.”

Page 3.0-20, under Noise Project Design Features heading, item number 1

1. “The Project’s amendment to County Zoning Ordinance No. 348 will require that the minimum lot size for special occasion facilities be 10 acres in the WC-WE zone, 20 acres in the WC-W zone, and 100 acres in the WC-E zone ~~and a maximum of 5 guests shall be permitted per gross acre for these facilities.~~ This would greatly reduce noise impacts on neighboring properties.”

Page 3.0-23, Table 3.0-5

“Table 3.0-5

Potential Future Permits and Approvals

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>County of Riverside</u><ul style="list-style-type: none">• Changes of Zone Approvals (implementing projects would require a Change of Zone to comply with their respective proposed zoning classification [i.e., WC-W, WC-WE, WC-E, or WC-R])• Land Use Planning Approvals (Specific Plans, General Plan Amendments, Conditional Use Permits, Plot Plans, etc.)• Subdivision Mapping Approvals (Tentative Tract Maps, Parcel Maps, etc.)• Engineering Plan Approvals (Grading, Building and Infrastructure Plans/Permits)• <u>Resource Agencies (RCA, CDFG, USACE, USFWS)</u><ul style="list-style-type: none">• Biological Resources Permitting (MSHCP consistency analysis, Section 404 Permit, California Endangered Species Act permitting [if necessary], Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement)• <u>Regional Water Quality Control Board</u><ul style="list-style-type: none">• Water Quality Plans and Permits (Section 401 Water Quality Certification, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan [SWPPP], National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System [NPDES] permits)• <u>South Coast Air Quality Management District</u><ul style="list-style-type: none">• Air quality permits• Compliance with this Program EIR No. 524 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and related Conditions of Approval• <u>Eastern Municipal Water District</u><ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Review/approval of wastewater infrastructure plans</u>• <u>Sewer connection</u>• <u>Rancho California Water District</u><ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Review/approval of water infrastructure plans</u>• <u>Water Supply Assessment (if applicable)</u>• <u>Caltrans</u><ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Review/approval of improvements within Caltrans ROW (I-15 ramps)</u>• <u>Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District</u><ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Review/approval of regional drainage facilities</u>• <u>Utility Providers (electric, telephone, cable)</u><ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Dry utility plan approval/implementation</u>• <u>City of Temecula</u><ul style="list-style-type: none">• Roadway improvement plans at City limits”
--

CHAPTER 4.0, ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Page 4.0-4, Paragraphs Three through Five

“The cumulative impacts analyses contained in this Draft EIR uses a “blended approach” to ensure adequate analysis. Relative to the “list method”, Table 4.0-1, Cumulative Projects, provides a list of known development projects within the Project area. *This list of projects has been used to provide general context for overall cumulative conditions*, noting that the actual density, timing and nature of these projects is uncertain given the long build-out timeframe for the Project. Also, refer to Exhibit 4.0-1, Active Planning Cases, which shows the location of the land development projects listed in Table 4.0-1, Cumulative Projects.

The types of cases being reviewed include: Conditional Use Permits, General Plan Amendments, Parcel Maps, Plot Plans, and Tentative Tract Maps. These pending planning cases are in various stages of the process ranging from the initial submittal of applications to projects that have been tentatively approved and are awaiting final approval by County staff. Some of these proposed developments ~~may conflict with~~ have different land use or development standards than the proposed Project and would require special consideration have been addressed by the County on a case-by-case basis, especially if these conflicts generate impacts to surrounding uses (refer to Section 4.10, Land Use and Relevant Planning, page 4.10-34, for additional discussion).

The list of projects (shown both in table and exhibit form) are therefore intended to provide visual context of the overall near-term development potential. On a practical basis, the EIR utilizes RIVTAM traffic modeling based on the specific land use scenarios noted in Section 4.14, Traffic and Circulation and as explained further in Appendix J, Land Use Buildout Analysis. This quantitative analysis was then used as the basis for quantitative analysis of potential air quality, greenhouse gas and noise impacts. In addition, as appropriate, each impact section provides further refinement as to the cumulative impact methodology specific to the affected resource and/or geographic area. In some cases, such as biological resources, the cumulative analysis is addressed substantially through a separate planning process (the County’s Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan). In other cases, the cumulative impacts are being addressed primarily by agencies with jurisdiction over the affected resource(s), such as the Regional Water Quality Control Board and Rancho California Water District’s extensive efforts to address, regulate and mitigate impacts to groundwater quality. Where appropriate, the County has incorporated Project Design Features and/or mitigation measures to support and address the efforts being made by other agencies.

Relative to the “adopted plan” method, the Project area encompasses two Policy Areas intended to promote agricultural and equestrian uses within Southwest Area Plan (SWAP) of the County General Plan. The Citrus Vineyard Policy Area encompasses a majority of the agricultural uses within the Project area, and the Valle de los Caballos Policy Area supports an area characterized by equestrian, rural residential, and agricultural activities. The Project area also encompasses adjacent unincorporated areas with similar characteristics. The Project does not result in a

substantive change in overall density or nature compared to what is allowed as part of the General Plan SWAP. In fact, implementation of the Project would result in a reduction in overall density and intensity. Accordingly, the Project's overall density and nature of development would be consistent with regional growth projections reflected in the Riverside County General Plan and those of applicable regional, State and Federal agencies. *Therefore, on both a local and regional level, the Project's cumulative impacts have been accounted for in the Riverside County General Plan EIR No. 441, as well as in the various population-dependent regional plans adopted by such agencies as the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD)."*

CHAPTER 4.1, AESTHETICS, LIGHT & GLARE

Page 4.1-4, last paragraph under Ordinance No. 915: Regulating Outdoor Lighting heading

"The Riverside County Board of Supervisors (BOS) has initiated preparation of a County-wide Lighting Ordinance. If and when enacted, Ordinance No. 915, an Ordinance of the County Of Riverside Regulating Outdoor Lighting, would establish a County-wide standard for outdoor lighting that would generally prohibit light trespass. Existing nonconforming outdoor light fixtures that were not regulated by previously enacted development standards would be authorized for a limited amortization period. Additionally, consideration would be given to limited exceptions when appropriate (e.g., law enforcement activities).

*Adopted on 12/20/2011 effective date: 1/19/2012"

Page 4.1-7, Policy LU 6.2

~~"Policy LU 6.2 Direct public, educational, religious, and utility uses established to serve the surrounding community toward those areas designated for Community Development and Rural Community uses on the applicable Area Plan land use maps. These uses may be found consistent with any of the Community Development, Rural Community, or Rural foundation designations, including the Rural Village Overlay, as well as the Open Space – Rural and Agriculture designations, under the following conditions: (AI 1, 3)~~

- ~~a. The facility is compatible in scale and design with surrounding land uses, and does not generate excessive noise, traffic, light, fumes, or odors that might have a negative impact on adjacent neighborhoods.~~
- ~~b. The location of the proposed use would not jeopardize public health, safety, and welfare, or the facility is necessary to ensure the continual public safety and welfare."~~

Page 4.1-14, Project Design Features item numbers 8 and 9

8. "The Project (proposed SWAP Policy ~~1.18~~ 4.12) will encourage equestrian establishments and permit incidental commercial uses that compliment existing equestrian establishments on lots larger than 10 acres. This will promote the equestrian and rural nature of the Wine Country – Equestrian District.

9. The Project (proposed SWAP Policy 1.20 ~~1.15~~) will encourage residential tract and parcel maps with an overall project density yield not to exceed one dwelling unit per five (5) acres. This large lot size requirement will preserve and enhance the rural feel in the Wine Country – Residential District.”

Page 4.1-16, Mitigation Measure AES-1

“AES-1The County shall work with utility and infrastructure providers to make sure that all sewer, water, and storm drain infrastructure improvements located along the Highway 79 South corridor do not significantly detract from the scenic quality of this area, or affect the County’s ability to designate this roadway as a County Scenic Highway at a later date, consistent with applicable County General Plan policies, ordinances and EIR mitigation measures.”

Page 4.1-19, under Summary of Applicable Existing Regulations and Policies heading, items c), f), and g)

- c) “Ordinance No. 915, an Ordinance of the County Of Riverside Regulating Outdoor Lighting, ~~if and when enacted, would~~ establishes a County-wide standard for outdoor lighting that would generally prohibit light trespass.
- f) General Plan policy LU 4.1 requires that new developments be located and designed to visually enhance and not degrade the character of the surrounding area through consideration of a number of concepts, including, mitigating noise, odor, lighting and other impacts on surrounding properties.
- g) General Plan policy LU 13.6, directly addresses prohibiting off-site outdoor advertising displays that are visible from designated and eligible Scenic Highways.”

Page 4.1-20, Mitigation Measure AES-3

“AES-3All implementing projects shall provide a lighting plan for the project area prior to approval. This plan shall include the location of onsite buildings and structures, the location of existing buildings and structures within surrounding properties, the distance between existing buildings and structures and proposed light sources, and other details of the proposed lighting (i.e., type, size, wattage, lumens, shielding type, etc.) during each phase of project development. The Plan shall comply with applicable County General Plan policies, ordinances and EIR mitigation measures.”

CHAPTER 4.2, AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Page 4.2-6, new paragraph at end of Section 4.2.2

Project Area Agricultural Resources

“The Project area contains extensive lands in active agricultural production, as well as lands zoned for agricultural use, as shown in Exhibits 4.2-1, Farmland Resources, Exhibit 4.2-2, Agricultural Preserves, and in Table 4.10-2, Land Use Comparison by Foundation Component – Current General Plan.”

Page 4.2-6, second paragraph under Forest Resources heading (*note: Exhibit 4.2-3 has been added to this section of the EIR*)

“Some coniferous forests occur within Riverside County. As shown in Exhibit 4.2-3 ~~Figure 4.5.2 of the General Plan~~, however, most are located on State or federal lands. There are no State Demonstration Forests located in Riverside County. Forests extensive enough to support large-scale commercial timber operations, generally occur at the higher elevations associated with the northern Sierra Nevada Range. According to Cal Fire, there are no commercial timber operations subject to a Timber Harvesting Plan in Riverside County.⁵

“There are no existing land use designations explicitly for timber production zones or other commercial timber activities in Riverside County, although such activities could be conducted under the General Plan’s AG land use designation and subject to County review and approval. There are no commercial timber operations occurring in Riverside County that rely on existing forestry resources (i.e., existing stands of trees or “old growth”). The only commercial forestry activities in the County, roughly 30 to 60 acres of Christmas tree farms, are conducted as agricultural activities (nursery stock production), since the trees produced are planted onsite and grown from stock, rather than harvested from naturally-occurring forest. Nevertheless, there are existing stands of mature forest trees in several locations in the County that reach appropriate elevations (generally above 5,000 feet). Of these, most such forest resources are located on public or quasi-public lands, including National Forests (under U.S. Department of Forestry) and National Monuments (under federal BLM) and well as others. The relationship between forestry resources and these public lands are shown in Exhibit 4.2-3 ~~Figures 4.5.2 and 4.5.3 of the General Plan.~~”

Page 4.2-12, under Project Design Features heading, item number 5

5. “Within the Residential District, implementing projects which propose residential tracts or parcel maps will be ~~required~~ encouraged to cluster development in conjunction with onsite vineyards or equestrian land such that the overall project density yield does not exceed one dwelling unit per five (5) acres. At least 75% of the implementing project area will be permanently set aside as vineyards or equestrian land.”

⁵ CAL Fire, *Non-Industrial Timber Management Plans in California*, 2003.

Page 4.2-14, under Infrastructure Impacts (of Implementing Projects) heading, second paragraph

“However, according to California Government Code Section 53091(d), “building ordinances of a county or city shall not apply to the location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water, wastewater, or electrical energy by a local agency.” The Code (Section 53091[e]) also states, “Zoning ordinances of a county ~~country~~ or city shall not apply to the location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water...”

Page 4.2-15, under Summary of Applicable Existing Regulations and Policies heading, item a)

- a) “California Government Code Section 53091(d) identifies that building ordinances of a county or city shall not apply to the location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water, wastewater, or electrical energy by a local agency.” The Code (Section 53091[e]) also states, “Zoning ordinances of a county ~~country~~ or city shall not apply to the location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water,” which would reduce potential impacts associated with implementation of infrastructure.”

Page 4.2-16, new sentence at beginning of first paragraph

“Strictly speaking, the Project would allow development on lands zoned for agricultural use, as discussed further below. The Project proposes new zoning and related approvals that permit future development. However, the future development allowed by the Project is not considered a “significant” impact with incorporation of Project Design Features, EIR mitigation measures and existing County policies and programs. The current General Plan and zoning allow far more extensive development, as discussed at length in the No Project Alternative (pages 6.0-9 to 6.0-14). The proposed Zoning and Design Guidelines provide for better protection of agricultural lands than the current General Plan and zoning overlays, as the Project requires 75% of every winery development to be set aside for vineyards, and requires additional open space for clustered subdivisions and commercial equestrian uses. Cancellation of Williamson Act contracts could occur, but are not proposed by the Project nor are they necessary for Project implementation”.

Page 4.2-17, under Infrastructure Impacts (of Implementing Projects) heading, first paragraph

“Most infrastructure including sewer lines, domestic water transmission lines, and dry utilities will be placed underground, and therefore would not disturb existing or proposed agricultural activities. In the event that infrastructure (such as an underground transmission line) would need to traverse an area used for agricultural purposes, such a disturbance would be temporary in nature and would not permanently reduce the potential to use a particular area for agricultural uses. There is a possibility that certain infrastructure improvements (i.e., pump stations, etc.) could occur within areas designated for agricultural uses. However, according to

California Government Code Section 53091(d), “building ordinances of a county or city shall not apply to the location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water, wastewater, or electrical energy by a local agency.” The Code (Section 53091[e]) also states, “Zoning ordinances of a county ~~country~~ or city shall not apply to the location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water...”

Page 4.2-17, under Summary of applicable Existing Regulations and Policies heading, item a)

- a) “California Government Code Section 53091(d) identifies that building ordinances of a county or city shall not apply to the location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water, wastewater, or electrical energy by a local agency.” The Code (Section 53091[e]) also states, “Zoning ordinances of a county ~~country~~ or city shall not apply to the location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water,” which would reduce potential impacts associated with implementation of infrastructure.”

Page 4.2-19, under Infrastructure Impacts (of Implementing Projects) heading, first paragraph

“Most infrastructure including sewer lines, domestic water transmission lines, and dry utilities will be placed underground, and therefore would not disturb existing or proposed agricultural activities. In the event that infrastructure (such as an underground transmission line) would need to traverse an area used for agricultural purposes, such a disturbance would be temporary in nature and would not permanently reduce the potential to use a particular area for agricultural uses. There is a possibility that certain infrastructure improvements (i.e., pump stations, etc.) could occur within areas designated for agricultural uses. However, according to California Government Code Section 53091(d), “building ordinances of a county or city shall not apply to the location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water, wastewater, or electrical energy by a local agency.” The Code (Section 53091[e]) also states, “Zoning ordinances of a county ~~country~~ or city shall not apply to the location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water”

Page 4.2-20, under Summary of applicable Existing Regulations and Policies heading, item a)

- a) “California Government Code Section 53091(d) identifies that building ordinances of a county or city shall not apply to the location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water, wastewater, or electrical energy by a local agency.” The Code (Section 53091[e]) also states, “Zoning ordinances of a county ~~country~~ or city shall not apply to the location or construction of facilities for the production, generation, storage, treatment, or transmission of water,”

which would reduce potential impacts associated with implementation of infrastructure.”

Page 4.2-20, under Conclusion heading, first paragraph

“Based on the anticipated allocation of future land uses, the proposed revisions to existing SWAP policy boundaries, policies, creation of new zoning classifications and District Overlays, and adherence to existing County Country rules and regulations, the Project would result in less than significant impacts related to conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. Regarding forest land conversion, since no forestlands are located within the Project area, no impacts to forestland conversion are anticipated. In addition, adherence to the existing programs, ordinances and General Plan policies listed above would ensure that impacts associated with the Project remain less than significant.”

Page 4.2-22, Third Paragraph

“The County has applied all feasible measures to reduce potentially significant agricultural impacts to the fullest extent feasible. Agricultural land impacts were previously found as “unavoidable” in the County’s current General Plan EIR. The County has endeavored to more effectively preserve and protect agricultural resources through the proposed Project, which includes a requirement for 75% vineyard coverage on all winery projects, as well as 75% open space for clustered subdivisions and commercial equestrian uses. The Project already represents a substantial reduction in density beyond what the current General Plan and zoning overlays would allow. Further reductions in density are not considered feasible (refer to Section 6, Alternatives, for the “No Project” discussion).⁶”

CHAPTER 4.3, AIR QUALITY

Page 4.3.7, end of first paragraph, top of page

Footnote inserted as follows:

“Between April 2004 and March 2006, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) conducted the Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study III (MATES III), which is a follow-up to previous MATES I and II air toxics studies conducted in the South Coast Air Basin. The MATES III Final Report was issued in September 2008. The MATES III study, based on actual monitored data throughout the Basin, included a modeling effort to characterize carcinogenic risk across the Basin from exposure to toxic air contaminants (TACs). The MATES III study applied a 2-kilometer (1.24-mile) grid over the Basin and reported carcinogenic risk within each grid space (covering an area of 4 square kilometers or 1.54 square miles). The data

⁶ The “Project” is in itself mitigation for preserving and protecting the Wine Country’s agricultural resources. Without the Project, there would be substantially greater impacts to the Wine Country’s agricultural resources. The County does not believe that any further reduction in density, through agricultural “easements” or other means, would be feasible, as some level of development is necessary to allow commercial tourist, winery and equestrian uses sufficient land area to operate effectively, and generate sufficient revenue to fund the necessary infrastructure needed for the Project area (see “No Project” alternative in Section 6).

from the MATES III study indicates that the Project area has a lifetime (70-year exposure) background carcinogenic risk ranging from approximately 100 to 250 in one million. The average of the modeled air toxics concentrations measured at each of the monitoring stations in the Basin equates to a background cancer risk of approximately 1,200 in one million primarily attributable to diesel exhaust. Thus, the Project area has a background risk that is lower than the average risk in the Basin.

At this point in the planning process, it is speculative to determine where specific sensitive receptors will be located. Individual districts located in the policy area allow for development of residential (sensitive) uses if size and density requirements are met. However, since exact locations of future residential or sensitive land use development is not yet known, the discussion in the air quality report mentions types of possible sensitive receptors but does not include specific locations.”

Page 4.3-8, end of second paragraph under “Sensitive Receptors”

“Refer to Table 4.12-6, Sensitive Receptors, for a listing of sensitive receptors in the Project area.”

Page 4.3-20, Under Toxic Air Contaminants heading

“▪ On-site stationary sources emit carcinogenic air contaminants or TACs that individually or cumulatively exceed the maximum individual cancer risk of ten in one million or an acute or chronic hazard index of 1.0 (per SCAQMD Risk Assessment Procedures for Rules 1401 and 212, November 1998).⁶

- Hazardous materials associated with on-site stationary sources result in an accidental release of air toxic emissions or acutely hazardous materials posing a threat to public health and safety.
- The Project would be occupied primarily by sensitive individuals within 0.25 mile of any existing facility that emits air toxic contaminants which could result in a health risk for pollutants identified in District Rule 1401 (per SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Chapter 6, Determining the Air Quality Significance of a Project, 1993).⁷”

Page 4.3-20, footnote at end of first sentence

“The SCAQMD supports to the use of the California Air Resources Board (CARB) recommended siting distances to determine the potential for significant health impacts when siting new sensitive land uses or when siting common sources of TACs near existing or planned future sensitive land uses. Other environmental documents prepared for projects in the County have also relied on CARB’s recommended siting distances when assessing the potential for significant impacts. The CARB’s guidance was developed as a general screening methodology where even if implementing projects do not comply with the siting distances, project-specific dispersion modeling can be conducted to demonstrate that the SCAQMD health-based standards (e.g., an incremental increase in cancer risk of 10 in one million or a chronic and acute hazard index of 1.0) would not be exceeded. Thus, dispersion modeling is an option that the

County may exercise to demonstrate compliance with health-based standards even if the recommended siting distances are not strictly adhered to in every instance.”

Page 4.3-21, Last Paragraph

“Mass daily emissions during construction were calculated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (“CalEEMod”) version 2011.1.1, which is an emissions estimation/evaluation model developed in conjunction with SCAQMD and other California Air Districts. CalEEMod was used to assist in quantifying emissions from construction activities associated with the Project’s implementing projects for a worst-case build-out year. Construction emissions are associated with construction equipment, construction-related vehicle trips, and off-gas emissions from painting and paving. There are four major construction phases for winery, equestrian, and residential development projects: demolition, site preparation, grading, and building construction. The building construction phase can be broken down into three sub-phases: building construction, architectural painting, and asphalt paving. ~~GHG emissions~~ Criteria pollutant emissions from these construction phases are largely attributable to fuel use from construction equipment and worker commuting. For analysis purposes, it is assumed that construction of wineries will take approximately two years, with the mix of construction equipment changing based on size. The worst-case construction scenario is anticipated to occur between 2015 and 2020, when four small, five medium and five large wineries will be built. In addition, residential construction, equestrian structure construction, infrastructure (water and sewage pipes, utilities, roads) improvement and demolition of existing houses are expected to occur during this period and were included in the construction emissions analysis. The output values used in this analysis were adjusted to be project-specific, based on usage rates of construction equipment, type of fuel, and construction schedule. For a complete listing of the construction equipment by phase and construction phase duration assumptions used in this analysis is included within the CalEEMod printout sheets that are provided in Appendix C.”

Page 4.3-23, footnote added at end of fourth paragraph, under “Toxic Air Contaminant Impacts”

“Unlike criteria pollutant emissions, which are commonly emitted from land use development projects, emissions of TACs are highly dependent on the type of land uses proposed for development. Common sources of TACs include stationary sources that typically require a Permit to Construct/Operate from the SCAQMD. As was stated in the EIR section, the implementing projects are not expected to introduce substantial stationary sources of TAC emissions with the exception of diesel particulate matter (DPM) from diesel-fueled vehicles (see page 4.3-39). According to the SCAQMD MATES III study, DPM is the major contributor to air toxics risk, accounting on average for about 84 percent of the total cancer risk from air pollution in the South Coast Air Basin. Implementing projects may emit small amounts of other TACs from the use of solvents or other products; however, the risk would be substantially less than DPM due to the comparatively small quantity of these other pollutants, their regulation by CARB and SCAQMD, the relatively low traffic volumes throughout the Project area compared to urban settings, and the setbacks provided for in the Project.”

Page 4.3-24, under Project Design Features heading, item 1

1. “The Project’s amendment to County Zoning Ordinance No. 348 will require that the minimum lot size for special occasion facilities be 10 acres in the WC-WE zone, 20 acres in the WC-W zone, and 100 acres in the WC-E zone ~~and a maximum of 5 guests shall be permitted per gross acre for these facilities.~~ This would greatly reduce air quality impacts on neighboring properties.”

Page 4.3-25, footnote added at end of first sentence under “Compliance with Existing Federal, State and County Regulations”

“As discussed in the EIR section, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) provides growth forecasts that are used by the SCAQMD in the development of air quality-related land use and transportation control strategies (see page 4.3-9). The growth forecasts are incorporated into the SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which is designed to comply with the federal and state Clean Air Acts and Amendments, to accommodate growth, to reduce the high pollutant levels in the basins, to meet federal and state ambient air quality standards, and to minimize the fiscal impact that pollution control measures have on the local economy (see page 4.3-9). Implementation of the control strategies is the responsibility of the SCAQMD, which develops rules and regulations, establishes permitting requirements, inspects emissions sources, and enforces such measures through educational programs or fines, when necessary. Implementing projects are assumed to comply with existing applicable rules and regulations, and any future applicable rules and regulations that the SCAQMD may adopt. Additionally, the development allowed under the Project would be less intensive than development governed by the existing current General Plan and zoning. Therefore, the Project would not exceed the growth projections in the RCPG and AQMP. Furthermore, the Project would implement required mitigation measures that would reduce vehicle miles traveled as outlined in the EIR section, including emission and trip reduction measures provided in AQ-1 through AQ-7 (see pages 4.3-27 through -28).”

Page 4.3-27, Mitigation Measure AQ-1

“AQ-1 The County shall require new commercial and industrial implementing projects to develop a trip reduction program (TRP) that promotes commuter-choices, employer transportation management, guaranteed ride home programs and commuter assistance and outreach-type programs intended to reduce commuter vehicle miles traveled, which can be applied toward GHG-2 for operational emission reductions. The program shall be submitted as part of Project’s implementing project’s discretionary review applications, and in place prior to Certificate of Occupancy. “

Page 4.3-28, Mitigation Measures AQ-3, AQ-4, and AQ-7

“AQ-3 In addition, the County shall require implementing projects to incorporate bicycle parking areas ~~and horse hitching posts where applicable~~ at agreed upon

locations during application review (for projects having more than 10 employees or involving special events). Horse hitching posts may also be considered, for projects involving special events or wine-tasting, and in proximity to an existing or planned equestrian trail.

AQ-4 The County shall require all implementing projects that require onsite or offsite special event parking to incorporate a comprehensive parking program for private parking lots during application review ~~where applicable~~, to promote ultra-low or zero emission vehicle parking; provide larger parking spaces that can accommodate vans and limousines; include adequate passenger waiting/loading areas; and provide safe pedestrian/equestrian pathways through parking areas.”

“AQ-7 The County shall work with the Winegrowers’ Association, the Temecula Valley Convention and Visitor’s Bureau, and their partners, to promote alternative modes of transportation, such as shuttles, cable-cars, trolley, etc. In addition, where feasible, the County shall work with the local transit provider – RTA – by adding or modifying existing transit service to enhance service near the Project site. This will encourage the use of transit and therefore reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Unincorporated Riverside County hosts one Metrolink transit station; the County shall collaborate with ~~in~~ the neighboring cities to expand connections to this station as well as other Metrolink stations which will increase ridership and decrease vehicle miles traveled (VMT).”

Pages 4.3-32, Tables 4.3-3 and 4.3-4, footnote added

“The analysis includes quantification of pre-mitigated operational emissions, which are shown in the EIR in Tables 4.3-3 and 4.3-4. However, it is not possible to provide post-mitigated operational emissions because not all mitigation measures apply to all implementing projects. Applying the reductions from all mitigation measures to all implementing projects may overestimate the amount of emissions that could feasibly be reduced. Therefore, while it is acknowledged that the mitigation measures would reduce emissions, operational emissions are still considered potentially significant and unavoidable impacts.”

Page 4.3-34, Mitigation Measure AQ-10

“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 2 (or better) emission compliant construction equipment and use of alternative fueled construction equipment (natural gas) ~~if available~~ as deemed appropriate by the County during application review (see GHG-1 for criteria).

- 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, ~~where feasible~~ as deemed appropriate by the County during application review (see GHG-1 for criteria).
- 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 deemed necessary by the County to maintain acceptable levels of service and safety, 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 ARB construction fleet specifications (see GHG-1 for criteria).
- 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 (see GHG-1 for criteria).
- 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.”

Page 4.3-36, Mitigation Measure AQ-12

“AQ-12 Proponents of non-residential implementing projects, or projects larger than five 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/LST/LST.html>. This methodology is a guidance document and may be modified for site-specific implementing actions as determined appropriate by the County.”

Page 4.3-36, Under AQ-12 - New Mitigation Measure AQ-13

“AQ-13 Construction contractors supplying heavy duty diesel equipment, greater than 50 hp, will be encouraged to apply for AQMD SOON funds. Information including the AQMD website will be provided to each contractor which uses heavy duty diesel for on-site construction activities.”

Page 4.3-37, Second Paragraph

“As an example, development in the Project area would be developed on large lots, greater than 10 acres in size, zoned for uses composed of rural residential single-family lots (at least one acre), vineyards and wineries, citrus groves, equestrian uses (including residential uses with equestrian amenities). Minimum zoning standards in the Project area consist of a minimum lot size of 10 acres, with minimum setback requirements of 50 feet (except when located near certain roads a minimum of 300 feet - refer to the Project proposed zoning ordinance amendment). With larger lots and the minimum setback of 50 feet, sensitive receptors would be located at least the minimum required setback and typically at a far distance greater than 50 feet from construction activities. Because construction activity would not be continuous throughout the build-out period, impacts are not expected to occur simultaneously.”

Page 4.3-39, footnote for 2nd paragraph

“The assumption that trucks would not idle for extended periods of time is based on the 2004 CARB Airborne Toxics Control Measure (ATCM), which limits heavy-duty diesel truck idling (see page 4.3-39). The measure applies to diesel-fueled commercial vehicles with gross vehicle weight ratings greater than 10,000 pounds that are licensed to operate on highways, regardless of where they are registered. This measure does not allow diesel fueled commercial vehicles to idle for more than five minutes at any given time and location. Policy AQ 16.3 of the County of Riverside General Plan Air Quality Element states that the County will “collaborate with the SCAQMD to require and/or encourage the adoption of regulations or incentives to limit the amount of time trucks may idle.” Policy AQ 17.9 states that the County will “encourage the installation and use of electric service units at truck stops and distribution centers for heating and cooling truck cabs, and particularly for powering refrigeration trucks in lieu of idling of engines for power.” Furthermore, Mitigation Measure AQ-6 requires commercial and industrial projects to post signage at all loading docks and/or delivery areas directing drivers to shut down their trucks after five minutes of idle time and requires employers to inform their drivers of the anti-idling policy. Thus, while assumptions regarding some pollutant sources may be speculative, the assumption that trucks would not idle for long periods of time is based on compliance with state regulations, as well as compliance with General Plan policies and required mitigation measures.”

Page 4.3-39, footnote to 3rd paragraph

“This section references a 100,000 ADT threshold for land use siting guidelines. There are no Project area roadways that are at this volume, under any scenario. In the Air Quality section, the Carbon Monoxide hotspot analysis (page 4.3-38, second paragraph) cites a maximum of 108,000 trips at the Rancho California/Ynez Road intersection; however, this is the combined volume of all intersection approaches, which is different than the 100,000 ADT guideline which is for one road segment. The CO hotspot analysis shows that the Project is not exposed to exceedance of CO concentrations.”

Page 4.3-40, footnote on last paragraph

“According to Section 4.10, Land Use and Relevant Planning, of the EIR, the zoning requirements for residential developments and wineries in the Wine County (WC) zones have a minimum setback of 50 feet, which would result in a combined 100 feet of separation between residential and winery developments⁷ (see pages 4.10-21 and -22). On higher traffic volume roads, the proposed Development Standards require a 300 foot setback (page 24, Section 14.96(b)(3) of the proposed Zoning Ordinance). With respect to ozone health impacts to human populations, the EIR provides a general discussion of the health effects of ozone (see page 4.3-4). As stated in that discussion, short-term exposure to ozone at levels typically observed in

⁷ The issue is proximity of the sensitive receptor, in this case a residential use, to a land use such as a winery that could generate harmful emissions during construction or operation. Residential uses have a minimum setback of 50 feet, and sometimes 300 feet along certain major roads. Construction and operation of non-residential uses are also limited in terms of setbacks; only limited construction would occur within the 50' setback area of a non-residential use adjacent to a residential use, such as placement of fencing, landscaping, and related low intensity features that would not generate substantial emissions during construction or operation.

Southern California can result in breathing pattern changes, reduction of breathing capacity, increased susceptibility to infections, inflammation of the lung tissue, and some immunological changes. Since the South Coast Air Basin and the Project area have measured ozone levels in excess of the ambient air quality standards in recent years, these health impacts are presumed to generally occur throughout the Basin, including in the Project area. As assessed under Significance Threshold 4.3-2, the Project would result in potentially significant impacts with respect to VOC and NOX emissions, which are ozone precursors. Since the human health impacts from ozone are usually discussed in a regional context, it would be appropriate to include under Significance Threshold 4.3-2. Additionally, because ozone is a regional issue, the Project itself would not be the sole cause of adverse health impacts from ozone; however, it could potentially contribute to the already existing adverse health effects of ozone in the Basin.

Page 4.3-42, Last Paragraph

“Implementing projects would include agricultural and equestrian uses, which could be a potential for odors. However, those uses currently exist in the area and new projects will have to comply with standard practices to keep odors to a minimum during wine making, pomace storage, horse waste disposal and trash disposal. In addition, implementing projects would be grouped with like projects; wineries in the Winery District and equestrian in the Equestrian District. In addition, currently operating and future ~~agricultural or~~ equestrian facilities are required to comply with Rule 402, which limits the amount of nuisance odors. Agricultural operations, which are exempt from Rule 402, are nonetheless subject to applicable Best Management Practices, Southwest Area Plan policies, and any site-specific conditions imposed by the County. Therefore less than significant impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are necessary.”

Page 4.3-43, footnote on 1st paragraph

“The EIR section concludes that the Project would not result in objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people because the Project would not introduce new sources of odors to the area. Activities and land uses that may generate odors (i.e., use of fertilizers, wine making process, fermentation of grapes, decomposition of grape waste, equestrian waste) already occur in the area. The analysis also assumes that the implementing projects would comply with applicable regulations concerning wine making, waste disposal, etc. such that any odors from new projects would be controlled to at least to the same extent as odors from the existing activities and land uses. In addition, the analysis cites compliance with SCAQMD Rule 402 (Nuisance), which prohibits facilities from causing nuisance impacts to a substantial number of people. If nuisance odors occur that are deemed to be in violation of Rule 402, the SCAQMD may impose requirements on the offending facility, such as the development of an odor abatement plan. However, it is not anticipated that nuisance odors affecting a substantial number of people would occur because similar uses already operate in and around the Project area.”

Page 4.3-44, last paragraph

“Level of Significance After Mitigation: Unavoidable significant impacts have been identified for Project-level and cumulative air quality impacts related to construction and operational activities (i.e., stationary and mobile source emissions) as well as air quality impacts on sensitive receptors. However, the objective of the proposed Project is to implement the Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan, which includes the adoption of General Plan Amendment No. 1077, as well as the accompanying Zoning Ordinance Amendment No. 348.4729. The Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan provides direction on requirements and development standards for new development, and provides policies and actions to implement the Community Plan’s vision and goals. The Project regulates the types and intensities of development and land uses within the Plan area and seeks to preserve and enhance the Wine Country region’s viticulture potential, rural life style and equestrian activities. The Project itself does not propose the construction of any development projects nor does it provide for large-scale development of housing tracts or commercial supercenters. Given that the objective of the Project is to preserve the area’s viticulture potential, rural life style and equestrian activities, it is likely that buildout would occur primarily through individual private development. As a result, the County will not have control over the timing, amount of construction, and personal choices of private individuals residing or recreating at future implementing projects. Although the personal choices of individuals, such as driving to future recreational developments in the Project area, may not constitute new emissions in the South Coast Air Basin if trips are taken to alternative recreational locales outside of the Plan area but still within the Basin, the emissions analysis conservatively assumes that all trips are new and would generate new emissions. The proposed mitigation measures aim to minimize these potential emissions that could result from the construction and operation of the implementing projects to the extent feasible and under County control. Since the County does not have control over the timing and level of activity for the implementing projects and specific details regarding the operational characteristics of future implementing projects are unknown, it would be speculative to predict the effects of the proposed mitigation measures on them. Notwithstanding the above, to ensure the continued improvement of the region’s air quality, implementing projects would generally be required to conduct project-level analyses pursuant to the requirements of CEQA. If project-level impacts are determined to be significant and feasible project-level mitigation measures are identified, the environmental analysis will include these project-level mitigation measures to avoid and/or reduce any potentially significant impacts from the project and its contribution to cumulative air quality impacts. As impacts are considered significant and unavoidable, if ~~if~~ the County of Riverside approves the Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan Project, the County shall be required to adopt findings of fact in accordance with Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines, as well as adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations in accordance with Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines.

“The EIR section identifies potentially significant impacts for construction and operational emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), nitrogen oxides (NOX), carbon monoxide (CO), respirable particulate matter (PM10), and fine particulate matter (PM2.5). Projects that result in emissions that are below the SCAQMD threshold levels, given in pounds per day of each pollutant, are presumed to not cause or substantially contribute to an exceedance of the ambient air quality standards. The ambient air quality standards are health- and welfare-based

standards for outdoor air which identify the maximum acceptable average concentrations of air pollutants during a specified period of time. The California standards, which are generally more stringent than the federal standards, are defined by CARB as “the legal limit that specifies the maximum level and time of exposure in the outdoor air for a given air pollutant and which is protective of human health and public welfare” (see CARB, Glossary of Air Pollution Terms, <http://www.arb.ca.gov/html/gloss.htm/gloss.htm#caaq>). An exceedance of the SCAQMD threshold levels means that a project could potentially cause or substantially contribute to an exceedance of the ambient air quality standards. For the purposes of this Project, the exceedances are considered potentially significant impacts.

As discussed in the EIR section, the South Coast Air Basin, which includes the Project area, already exceeds the ambient air quality standards for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5 (see page 4.3-6). Table 4.3-1 indicates that monitoring in the Project area has registered values above the ambient air quality standards for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5. VOCs and NOX are ozone precursors and are thus relevant to the ozone standards. Therefore, the Project could potentially contribute to the adverse health effects of these pollutants (ozone, PM10, PM2.5, NOx, and VOCs), as described in the EIR (Section 4.3 pages 4.3-4 through 4.3-6 under “Health Effects of Air Pollutants”), which are presumed to already occur in the Project area from existing Basin-wide emissions. Because a substantial portion of the Project’s emissions are from mobile sources traveling throughout the region, and because the pollutants, particularly ozone, act on regional scales, it is not possible to provide numerical quantification of the Project’s contribution to adverse health impacts.

Lead is identified as a criteria pollutant. However, no ambient air quality monitors have registered exceedances of the ambient air quality standards in the South Coast Air Basin, with the exception of the central Los Angeles County region. The exceedance in this area is highly localized and the result of lead emissions from industrial lead-acid battery recycling facilities in the City of Commerce. The Project is not located in the vicinity of the battery recycling facilities in the City of Commerce. Additionally, the Project does not include any uses that would emit lead. Motor vehicles and paints used to be a source of lead emissions; however, unleaded fuels and unleaded paints have virtually eliminated lead emissions from residential and commercial land use projects. As a result, because lead emissions are not anticipated from the Project and the region does not exceed the ambient air quality standards for lead, there is no need for any further evaluation of lead emissions with respect to the Project.”

CHAPTER 4.4, BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Page 4.4-1, First and Second Paragraph under Western Riverside County’s Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP)

“The County is a permittee for the MSHCP. The County’s applicable MSHCP is a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional habitat conservation plan approved by the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The MSHCP focuses on the conservation of species and their associated habitats in Western Riverside County. Rather than deal with endangered species on a case-by-case basis, the MSHCP focuses on conservation of 146 species throughout western

Riverside County, which are covered within the Project area under the MSHCP, and will develop a reserve system of approximately 500,000 acres of which 347,000 acres are currently within public ownership and 153,000 acres are in private ownership. Any special status species that are likely to be found in the Project area are listed in the Southwest Area Plan of the MSHCP, and are summarized in the attached table. The MSHCP governs development of both private and public lands to help streamline the resources regulatory process and to support the final assemblage of the proposed Conservation Area. The MSHCP has been in place since June 17, 2003 (this list is representative of potential sensitive species in the Project area).

Table 4.4-1 - Planning Species in the Southwest Area Plan *

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| • Arroyo Chub | • White-Tailed Kite |
| • Bald Eagle | • Yellow Warbler |
| • Bell’s sage sparrow | • Yellow-Brested Chat |
| • Burrowing Owl | |
| • Cactus wren | |
| • California Horned Lark | • Bobcat |
| • Coastal California Gnatcatcher | • Mountain Lion |
| • Cooper’s Hawk | |
| • Double-crested cormorant | • Arroyo Toad |
| • Downy Woodpecker | • California Red-Legged frog |
| • Golden Eagle (nest site) | • Coast Range Newt |
| • Grasshopper Sparrow | • Western Pond Turtle |
| • Grasshopper Sparrow | |
| • Least Bell’s Vireo | |
| • Loggerhead Shrike | • Aguanga Kangaroo Rat |
| • Mountain Plover | • Los Angeles Pocket Mouse |
| • Northern Harrier | • Stephens’ Kangaroo Rat |
| • Osprey | |
| • Peregrine falcon | |
| • Prairie Falcon | • Quino Checkerspot Butterfly |
| • Purple Martin | |
| • Southern California Rufous-Crowned Sparrow | • San Diego Mountain Kingsnake |
| • Southwest Willow Flycatcher | |
| • Swainson’s Hawk | • Munz’s Onion |
| • Tree Swallow | • Nevin’s Barberry |
| • Tree Swallow | • Palmer’s Grapplinghook |
| • Tricolor blackbird | • Parry’s Spine Flower |
| • Turkey Vulture | • Slender-Horned Spine Flower |
| | • Vail Lake Ceanothus |

The MSHCP consists of 17 different Area Plans, each containing conservation goals and biological objectives developed specifically for each Area Plan. The Project area is entirely within the Southwest Area Plan (SWAP) of the MSHCP. The Project area falls within a portion of the SWAP that is relatively unconstrained by the MSHCP conservation goals and objectives. Thirty-four (34) criteria cells have been designated within the Project boundaries, primarily along the northwest and southeastern boundaries. A criteria cell is defined as a unit within the Criteria Area generally 160 acres in size, approximating one quarter section. The existence of a criteria cell does not necessarily deny development within the cell boundaries but does require that development within that cell be evaluated against the biological goals and objectives established by the MSHCP for that cell⁸ to make sure the development is consistent with the conservation requirements of the MSHCP. The process of making this determination has been labeled the Habitat Acquisition and Negotiation Strategy (HANS) process and is administered by the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA).”

⁸ Refer to Section 3 of the MSHCP.

Page 4.4-1, Third Paragraph (end, in “Project Setting”)

“Review of available County GIS data further substantiates that the Project area native habitat is dominated by grasslands and coastal sage scrub, with riparian/wetland habitat along the various washes, particularly along Temecula Creek (Riverside County TLMA GIS⁹).”

Page 4.4-5, under Outside Criteria Areas heading, seventh bullet

- “Section 6.2 Agriculture. This provisions pertains to any expansion of existing agricultural activities where endangered species take permits are required.”

Page 4.4-6, under Inside Criteria Areas heading, last paragraph

“Through implementation of these requirements and payment of MSHCP development mitigation fees, development projects inside of the Criteria Areas are ~~consist~~ consistent with the MSHCP. Impacts to Covered Species, whether candidate, sensitive, or special status species or their habitats, resulting from development projects that are consistent with the MSHCP are considered less than significant.”

Page 4.4-10, under Project Design Features heading, items 2 and 4

- 2) “The Project (revised SWAP Policy 1.5) will require a density of one dwelling unit per ~~minimum lot size of~~ ten (10) acres for new residential tract maps and parcel maps except in the Wine Country – Residential District, which requires a minimum lot size of one dwelling unit per twenty (20) acres. This large lot size requirement will preserve and enhance the rural feel in the Project area.
- 4) The Project (proposed SWAP Policy 1.18 ~~4.12~~) will encourage equestrian establishments and permit incidental commercial uses that complement existing equestrian establishments on lots larger than 10 acres. This will promote the equestrian and rural nature of the Wine Country – Equestrian District.”

Page 4.4-14 (and 4.10-31), Mitigation Measure LU-1

“LU-1 ~~All implementing projects (ministerial and discretionary)~~ All future requests for discretionary land use entitlements within the Project boundary shall ~~be required to~~ comply with the following requirements:

- Apply for and obtain a Change of Zone (CZ) to benefit from the implementing zones of the Wine Country Policy Area. As part of the review process, the County shall conduct a project-specific CEQA analysis for the CZ Application. Depending upon the location of the implementing project, Planning staff shall require the project

⁹ <http://www3.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/pa/rclis/viewer.htm>.

proponent to conduct the necessary studies (e.g., Archeology, Geology, Biology, Hydrology, etc.). Depending upon the findings of those studies, Planning staff shall recommend that a restrictive zoning classification (such as an open space zone) be placed on areas where sensitive resources require protection.

- Apply for and obtain the necessary grading permit. Such grading permit shall go through the appropriate environmental analysis and identify the necessary mitigations, if any (e.g., cultural monitoring during grading, biological restoration, etc.), prior to approval of the grading permit.
- Apply for and obtain the necessary building permit. The County shall ensure the necessary reviews of building permits by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCWCD), Environmental Programs Division (EPD), County Archeologist, County Geologist, etc.

Comply with the MSHCP and applicable resource agency regulations pertaining to the protection of biological resources and existing jurisdictional drainage features. Applicants for such implementing projects shall reference the current MHSCP criteria (biological objectives and requirements for any applicable Conservation Area/Criteria Cell or linkage), conduct an MSHCP consistency analysis, and prepare a Jurisdictional Delineation where onsite drainages exist and obtain applicable permits/approvals from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board and/or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.^{10, 11}

- Conditions of approval for all implementing projects shall be in compliance with applicable mitigation measures pursuant to the County’s General Plan EIR.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the future proposed use of the property within the Project boundary is a use that is permitted by right under both Ordinance 348.4729 and the zoning designation for the property that was in place immediately before the adoption of Ordinance 348.4729, then the future proposed use shall not be required to apply for and obtain a Change of Zone.”

¹⁰ The Project area is located within the MSHCP Criteria Area and encompasses 34 criteria cells, including Criteria Cells 5985, 5989, 5991-2, 6082-4, 6088, 6186, 6189, 6290, 6293 and 6395, which are all part of the proposed extension of existing Core 6. Criteria Cell 6154 is a stand-alone cell. A second group of Criteria Cells follow the alignment of Temecula Creek east of Redhawk Parkway and west of Pauba Road (6694, 6807-8, 6913, 6917, 7010, 7012, 7014, 7182-5 and 7134). These cells involve Constrained Linkage 24 and proposed Core 7. Other MSHCP policies and procedures apply to the Project such as the Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools policy (MSHCP Section 6.1.2 pp 6-20), Protection of Narrow Endemic Plant Species (MSHCP section 6.3.2, figure 6-4), Fuels Management (MSHCP Section 6.4, pp 6-72) and the Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban Wildlands Interface (MSHCP Section 6.1.4, pp 6-42).

¹¹ These permitting programs mitigate Project impacts through a variety of policy level and project level conditions, as described in the EIR section above (“Regulatory Framework”), and as elaborated upon in footnote 9. Measures include avoidance of sensitive habitat, provision of suitable replacement or restored habitat pursuant to the regulatory programs and the MSHCP DBESP process, construction measures such as limiting light and noise intrusion, and operational measures such as minimizing effects at the Urban Wildlands Interface.

Page 4.4-14, Last Paragraph under Conclusion

“The Project is located within the MSHCP and contains 34 criteria cells. Implementing projects within criteria cells must undergo the HANS process to determine if the development will be consistent with the conservation requirements of the MSHCP. Implementing projects outside criteria cells may still require habitat assessments and focused surveys to verify the biological resources within the area proposed for development and to ensure that these resources would not be impacted as a result of the proposed development. Since future implementing projects allowed under the Project would be required to be compliant with the MSHCP and General Plan, and these regulatory documents are intended to minimize conflicts with conservation plans, impacts associated with the Project are considered to be less than significant. It is anticipated that particular implementing project within the Project area would be allowed by right, meaning that only a ministerial action would be necessary to approve the proposed project. Ministerial actions are not considered “projects” under CEQA and are, therefore, not subject to environmental review as discussed above. ~~However, each implementing project, ministerial or discretionary, will be required to submit a Change of Zone application with the County. Through the Change of Zone development approval process, Mitigation Measure LU 1 will require that ministerial actions implementing mitigation for biological resources.~~ Implementation of the above considerations and actions ~~may~~ is anticipated to mitigate potential future impacts to biological resources from implementation projects to less than significant levels.”

Page 4.4-17, Impact 4.4-4

“Refer to the response for Impact 4.4-1 and 4.4-2, above (discussions regarding MSHCP Core Linkages and corridors). Migratory birds are regulated and protected under the MSHCP (see following table) and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, among other regulations. The MSHCP has as a major focus the identification, preservation and protection of key wildlife corridors, referred to as “linkages” or “corridors” in the MSHCP (refer to discussion above under Impacts 4.4-1 through 4.4-3). In addition, the “Project” itself is not proposing any specific development, and as such it would be speculative to provide a detailed assessment of potential site-specific effects on migratory birds or corridors. The Project does provide for extensive wildlife mitigation simply through requiring that 75% of every commercial equestrian, clustered subdivision or winery project be set aside for open space, as well as requires larger lot sizes. Less than significant impacts to migratory species would occur.”

Page 4.4-20, footnote for last paragraph

“Given the programmatic nature of the EIR, the size of the study area, and the long buildout timeframe for implementing projects, it is not practical to conduct site-specific jurisdictional delineations at this time. Exhibits 4.4-1 and 4.4-2 show “waterways” and “streams” which roughly correspond to potential jurisdictional drainages.”

Page 4.4-21, Level of Significance After Mitigation

“The impact of the Project on biological resources would be less than significant due to compliance with existing laws, regulatory programs, and General Plan policies currently in place (in addition to Mitigation Measure LU-1 referenced in this section). No additional mitigation measures would be required to reduce impacts further.”

CHAPTER 4.5, CULTURAL RESOURCES AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Page 4.5-2, First Paragraph under Prehistory Setting

“The Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians has called the Temecula Valley home for more than 10,000 years. The Luiseño history originates with the creation of all things at ‘exva Temeeku,’ the present day City of Temecula. The ancestral home village of Temeeku is located under what is now Redhawk, where Margarita Road cuts south through a bluff. The Native Americans of the Pechanga Band are one of ~~six~~ seven bands of the Luiseño, which also include the Soboba Band near San Jacinto, the Rincon Band near Valley Center, the La Jolla Band near Palomar, the Pauma Band, the San Luis Rey Band, and a vestige of the old Pala Band at the Pala Reservation. The name Luiseño comes from the Mission San Luis Rey de Francia in present-day Oceanside, which was founded in 1798 to support the ranchos in the Temecula Valley. Aboriginally, each of the Luiseño bands identified itself along village lines but acknowledged tribal identity by language, with distinctions made using the four cardinal directions. The Pechanga Band, located at the western boundary of the traditional Luiseño tribal area, distinguished themselves as the Payomkawichm, or Western People.¹² The Project area is a part of the Luiseño’s aboriginal territory as evidenced by the existence of Luiseño place names, rock art, petroglyphs, and pictographs as well as an extensive Luiseño artifact record in the vicinity of the Project and is considered highly sensitive for Luiseño-related cultural resources.¹³ The Temecula/Pechanga people had usage/gathering rights to an area extending from Rawson Canyon on the east to Lake Matthews on the northwest, down Temescal Canyon to Temecula, eastward to Aguanga, and then along the crest of the Cahuilla range back to Rawson Canyon. The Project area is located within the southeastern area of this culturally affiliated territory.”

Page 4.5-9, last paragraph

“Additional tribal consultation was conducted in response to NAHC comments on the Draft EIR (refer to Response No. 3 and Appendix B to the Comments and Responses document).”

Page 4.5-10, Table 4.5-1, footnote added

“Note: Refer to Comments and Responses Document, Response No. 3 and Appendix B to the Comments and Responses document for additional tribal consultation.”

¹² Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians, *Culture and People*, <http://www.pechanga-nsn.gov/page?pagelid=7> accessed August 12, 2011.

¹³ Pechanga Tribe Comments on the Notice of Preparation for a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and Tribal SB18 Consultation for General Plan Amendment 1077, Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan, January 21, 2010.

Page 4.5-13, Second Paragraph from the top

~~“While tribal consultation under CEQA is not required, it is recommended. Consultation with affected parties is highly encouraged and/or required in some instances. The Notice of Preparation (NOP) and the Draft EIR public review process provide an opportunity for formalized tribal consultation to occur. The County has chosen to conduct outreach with the applicable California Native American Tribes. The following Tribes received notifications for consultation regarding the Project during the NOP process (additional tribal consultation was conducted in response to NAHC comments on the Draft EIR (refer to Response No. 3 and Appendix B to the Comments and Responses document):”~~

Page 4.5-14, Fifth Paragraph

~~“There are also listed standardized conditions of approval newly updated General Plan policies pertaining to cultural resources. Based on the forgoing information, the County Archaeologist may tailor these conditions or apply additional conditions as the individual project-specific circumstances dictates and Phase 1 Cultural Resources study recommends.¹⁴ Other sources of information, including site inspections by the County Archeologist, may be factored into recommendations for mitigation and/or preservation.”~~

Page 4.5-15, Under Multipurpose Open Space (OS) Element Policies heading

~~“Policy OS 19.2 Review all proposed development for the possibility of archaeological sensitivity. The County of Riverside shall establish a cultural resources program in consultation with Tribes and the professional cultural resources consulting community. Such a program shall, at a minimum, address each of the following: application processing requirements; information database(s); confidentiality of site locations; content and review of technical studies; professional consultant qualifications and requirements; site monitoring; examples of preservation and mitigation techniques and methods; and the descendant community consultation requirements of local, state and federal law.~~

~~Policy OS 19.3 Employ procedures to protect the confidentiality and prevent inappropriate public exposure of sensitive archaeological resources when soliciting the assistance of public and volunteer organizations. Review proposed development for the possibility of cultural resources and for compliance with the cultural resources program.~~

~~Policy OS 19.4 Require a Native American Statement as part of the environmental review process on development projects with identified cultural resources. To the extent feasible, designate as open space and allocate resources and/or tax credits to prioritize the protection of cultural resources preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state.~~

¹⁴ The County Archaeologists updated “standard conditions”, based on extensive discussions with Native American tribes, were incorporated into the Project EIR mitigation measures (CUL-1 through CUL-3).

~~Policy OS 19.5 Transmit significant development proposals to the History Division of the Riverside County Regional Park and Open Space District for evaluation in relation to the destruction/preservation of potential historical sites. Prior to approval of any development proposal, feasible mitigation shall be incorporated into the design of the project and its conditions of approval. Exercise sensitivity and respect for human remains from both prehistoric and historic time periods and comply with all applicable laws concerning such remains.~~

~~Policy OS 19.6 Enforce the Historic Building Code so that historical buildings can be preserved and used without posing a hazard to public safety.~~

~~Policy OS 19.7 When possible, allocate resources and/or tax credits to prioritize retrofit of County historic structures, which are irreplaceable.”~~

Page 4.5-15, First Paragraph under 4.5.4 Significance Threshold Criteria heading

“CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 includes significance criteria relative to archaeological and historical resources. The requirements, ~~including potential mitigation measures,~~ are contained in Section 4.5.3, *Regulatory Framework*, of this Chapter and are incorporated herein.”

Page 4.5-17, Second Paragraph Under Impact 4.5-1

“While substantial historical resources exist in the vicinity of the Project area, no known historical-era resources are identified within the boundaries of the Project. The first commercial vineyards were planted in the late 1960’s and the oldest equestrian facility in the Valley de los Caballos development was built at approximately the same time.”

Page 4.5-18, Under Summary of Applicable Existing Regulations and Policies heading

- a) “Policies contained in the County’s General Plan, including LU 4.3 and OS ~~19.5 and 19.6~~ 19.2 through 19.5, are intended to ensure that development within the County does not result in the avoidable disturbance or destruction of historic resources.”

Page 4.5-22, Under Summary of Applicable Existing Regulations and Policies heading

- a) “Policies contained in the County’s General Plan, including LU 4.3 and OS ~~19.2 and 19.3~~ 19.2 through 19.5, are intended to ensure that development within the County does not result in the avoidable disturbance or destruction of historic resources.”

Page 4.5-23, Under Summary of Applicable Existing Regulations and Policies heading

- b) “Policies contained in the County’s General Plan, including OS 19.2 through 19.5, are intended to ensure that development within the County does not result in the avoidable disturbance or destruction of historic resources.”

Page 4.5-19, Mitigation Measure CUL-1

“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 ~~appropriate mitigation treatment~~ 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.
- ~~Review, and if evidence suggests the potential for sacred land or cultural places resources, contact the native American Heritage Commission.~~
- 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 other invasive mitigation. Feasibility of avoidance is 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.”

Page 4.5-20, Mitigation Measure CUL-2

“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.”

Page 4.5-23, Under Summary of Applicable Existing Regulations and Policies header

“a) Policies contained in the County’s General Plan, including OS 19.2 through 19.5 ~~and 19.3~~, are intended to ensure that development within the County does not result in the avoidable disturbance or destruction of historic resources.”

Page 4.5-24, Mitigation Measure CUL-3

“CUL-3 ~~If previously unknown cultural resources, including human remains, are identified during grading activities associated with implementing projects, a County certified qualified archaeologist shall be retained to assess the nature and significance of the~~

~~find.~~ 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 ~~prehistoric~~ 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 ~~24~~ 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.”

Page 4.5-28, under Multipurpose Open Space (OS) Element Policies

~~“Policy OS 19.8 — Whenever existing information indicates that a site proposed for development may contain biological, paleontological, or other scientific resources, a report shall be filed stating the extent and potential significance of the resources that may exist within the proposed development and appropriate measures through which the impacts of development may be mitigated.~~

Policy OS ~~19.6~~ 19.9 ~~When~~ Whenever existing information indicates that a site proposed for development ~~may contain~~ has high paleontological resources, sensitivity as shown on Figure OS-7, a paleontologist resource impact mitigation program (PRIMP) shall be filed with the County Geologist. The PRIMP specify the steps to be taken to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources. shall monitor site grading activities, with the authority to halt grading to collect uncovered paleontological resources, curate any resources collected with an appropriate repository, and file a report with the Planning Department documenting any paleontological resources that are found during the course of site grading.

Policy OS 19.7 Whenever existing information indicates that a site proposed for development has low paleontological sensitivity as shown on Figure OS-7, no direct mitigation is required unless a fossil is encountered during site development. Should a fossil be encountered, the County Geologist shall be notified and a paleontologist shall be retained by the project proponent. The paleontologist shall document the extent and potential significance of the paleontological resources on the site and establish appropriate mitigation measures for further site development.

Policy OS 19.8 Whenever existing information indicates that a site proposed for development has undetermined paleontological sensitivity as shown on Figure OS-7, a report shall be filed with the County Geologist documenting the extent and potential significance of the paleontological resources on site and identifying mitigation measures for the fossil and for impacts to significant paleontological resources.”

Page 4.5-31, under Summary of Applicable Existing Regulations and Policies, item a)

- a) “Policies contained in the County’s General Plan, including OS 19.6, 19.7 and 19.8 ~~and 19.9~~, are intended to ensure that development within the County does not result in the avoidable disturbance or destruction of paleontological resources.”

CHAPTER 4.6, GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY

Page 4.6-26, Footnote to “Conclusion” section

“Although implementation of the Project would potentially increase exposure of future development associated with implementing projects within the Project area to damage caused by hazards such as landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, blasting hazards, or collapse during an earthquake, all implementing projects would be subject to the above-described State and local regulations, ordinances, General Plan policies, standard conditions or requirements, and mitigation, which are intended to reduce damage to structures and loss of life caused by ~~an~~ hazards associated with an earthquake event. Such conformance would be adequate to ensure that potential impacts from these hazards on any habitable structure, critical facility, or other infrastructure would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation. This analysis is consistent with the requirements of a program EIR and future site-specific implementing projects proposed within the Project area will require site-specific CEQA analysis at a later date.”

Page 4.6-17, Mitigation Measure GEO-1

“**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.

GEO-1a Any development within the Project area shall consider retention of topsoil should any grading be necessary, with the intent to minimize loss of valuable topsoil for agricultural purposes. The topsoil removed from grading areas, if any, could be reapplied to areas proposed for viticultural production or other agricultural use, subject to consistency with project grading plans, other applicable regulations, and viticulture Best Management Practices as determined appropriate by the landowner."

CHAPTER 4.7, GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Page 4.7-19, Fifth Paragraph

"28.5% Below Business As Usual (BAU). Emissions from implementing projects will be calculated and compared to similar business-as-usual development; if the implementing projects achieve a reduction of at least 28.5% with incorporation of mandatory and voluntary measures, they are considered less than significant. Refer to Appendix E (§§ 3.1.2, 3.2.2.2) for a detailed discussion regarding BAU."

Page 4.7-31, After Table 4.7-4

"The following discussion is provided in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Appendix F. Additional discussion regarding Energy Conservation is provided in Section 4.3, Air Quality and Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Energy Conservation

"The proposed Project includes numerous features that address energy consumption and conservation. In compliance with proposed policies SWAP 1.10 and 1.11, implementing projects must achieve minimum required credits on the County's Option Tables, of which many options serve the purpose of reducing energy use. The building features, for which the Option Tables award points, are consistent with CalGreen and include exceeding California Energy Code requirements, based on the 2008 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, by as much as 20 percent through, but not limited to, the use of the following:

- enhanced insulation
- insulated windows
- minimizing air infiltration
- energy-efficient artificial lighting
- reducing heating/cooling distribution losses
- usage of energy-efficient appliances

Additionally, the following energy-conserving features are also available as options for implementing projects:

- thermal storage
- increased daylighting

- building orientation to optimize natural indoor climate control and lighting
- solar-readiness
- electric vehicle charging stations
- electric lawn equipment

The Project's use of energy is not in itself considered "excessive", as it will be typical of modern residential, employment and equestrian uses. In fact, the extensive existing regulations and proposed mitigation measures will ensure that energy-related emissions are substantially reduced beyond "typical" consumption levels. Energy providers (electric, gas) will provide service to the area as development progresses, with improvements funded through connection fees and/or monthly service fees. Solar power is also a permitted use, is heavily incentivized in the greenhouse gas mitigation program, and would further improve the Project's overall energy consumption. The air quality and greenhouse gas effect of Project-related energy emissions are discussion in Sections 4.3 and 4.7, respectively."

Page 4.7-9 & 4.7-10, below heading - Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)

~~"Through the SB 375 process, MPOs, such as SCAG, which includes Riverside County, and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) with jurisdiction over San Diego County, will work with local jurisdictions in the development of sustainable communities strategies (SCS) designed to integrate development patterns and the transportation network in a way that reduces GHG emissions while meeting housing needs and other regional planning objectives. SCAG's reduction target for per capita vehicular emissions is 8 percent by 2020 and 13 percent by 2035 (CARB 2010). SCAG is currently in the process of updating their RTP and completing the first SCS for the region. The agency plans to adopt the RTP, SCS, and associated PEIR in April 2012.~~

~~SANDAG and the SDAPCD began working together to reduce GHG emissions.¹⁵ SANDAG is in the process of developing its first RTP subject to provisions of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375). The 2050 RTP is scheduled for adoption by the SANDAG Board of Directors in summer 2011. GHG reduction strategies SANDAG is considering include increasing transit service; freeway improvements to reduce bottlenecks; and enhancements to programs aimed at taking more cars off the road, such as alternative work schedules and incentives for carpooling and vanpooling. CARB released its draft GHG emissions target and the San Diego region will be required to reduce GHG emissions from cars and light trucks 7 percent per capita by 2020 and 13 percent by 2035, according to targets set September 23, 2010 by the CARB. SANDAG will further refine its GHG reducing strategies accordingly.¹⁶~~

"SANDAG and the SDAPCD have collaborated in the development of the 2050 RTP and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in an effort to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG)

¹⁵ Source: http://www.sdapcd.org/homepage/cl_change_forum.html.

¹⁶ Source: <http://www.sandag.org/index.asp?newsid=666&fuseaction=news.detail>.

emissions.¹⁷ Both were adopted in October 2011. The 2050 RTP provides a blueprint for the investment of roughly \$214 billion in transportation funds in the upcoming 40 years. Transit improvements will receive the largest portion of the funding, with increases in each successive decade. Substantial funding will also be allocated toward improving highway and local road conditions, with particular focus on the addition of high occupancy vehicle lanes to existing freeways. The SCS lays out a plan for reaching state-mandated levels of GHG emission reductions for the San Diego region. Pursuant to SB 375, CARB adopted greenhouse gas reductions targets for the four largest Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) on September 23, 2012. For SANDAG, the San Diego region will be required to reduce GHG emissions from cars and light trucks by 7 percent per capita by 2020 and 13 percent per capita by 2035. Currently, the 2050 RTP/SCS is being challenged by the State Attorney General's office, which has requested a revision of the draft EIR on the RTP/SCS in order to fully satisfy the requirements of CEQA."

Page 4.7-22, After First Paragraph

"As discussed previously, SB 375 required CARB to establish regional targets for reducing passenger vehicle GHG emissions. It also mandates the adoption of an SCS jointly developed by MPOs and local jurisdictions. Accordingly, SANDAG has developed the 2050 RTP as well as SCS for the San Diego region, both of which were adopted in October 2011. Together, the RTP/SCS provide a blueprint for the growth of the region's transportation system. Under the 2050 RTP, 36 percent of available transportation funds in the first decade will be allocated toward improving transit infrastructure, followed by increases in each successive decade to a maximum of 57 percent in the last decade. Other areas of transportation also receiving substantial amounts of funding include highway and local road improvements, with particular focus on the addition of high occupancy vehicle lanes on existing freeways. The SCS lays out a plan for reaching state-mandated levels of GHG emission reductions for the San Diego region, which were adopted by CARB in September 2010. Based on CARB's targets, the San Diego region will be required to reduce GHG emissions from cars and light trucks by 7 percent per capita by 2020 and 13 percent by 2035. As mentioned, the RTP/SCS is currently being challenged by the State Attorney General's office. Once the RTP/SCS is revised to fully satisfy CEQA requirements and adopted, the County of Riverside would be consistent with SB 375.

As a general goal, the County strives to reduce residents' reliance on personal automobiles, which is consistent with the goals of SB 375. Further, the Project proposes a number of strategies to reduce GHG emissions from passenger vehicles:

a. Integrated Trails Network (Non-motorized Transportation including Pedestrian, Bike and Equestrian trails)

The County of Riverside contains multi-purpose trails that accommodate hikers, bicyclists, and equestrian users as an integral part of the County's circulation system. These facilities serve both as a means of connecting the unique communities and activity centers throughout the County and as a means of facilitating modes of transportation with no emission of air pollutants and GHGs. Within the Southwest Area Plan (SWAP),

¹⁷ Source: http://www.sdapcd.org/homepage/cl_change_forum.html

a network of trails is planned for the Wine Country region to provide pedestrians, visitors, equestrians, and bicyclists with alternative modes of travel and while providing attractive recreational opportunities. However, it does not connect all the existing wineries and other tourist destinations, such as Lake Skinner and Vail Lake, through equestrian and multi-purpose trails system. A Trails Sub-committee worked with the County Regional Parks and Open Space District and Planning Staff in the development of a trails network that was more conducive to this region’s destination places and users’ needs. As a result of their work-effort, Figure 8 (Trails and Bikeway System Map) of the SWAP was revised through GPA No. 1077 (a Project component) and the following policy was added to the Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area:

SWAP 1.7 ~~4.6~~ Develop and implement a trails network that carefully considers equestrian uses, incidental commercial activities and agricultural operations, and includes, but is not limited to, regional trails, combination trails, bike paths, open space trails, historic trails, etc.

b. Roundabouts

Through the Wine Country Community Plan process, five roundabouts are proposed along Rancho California Road to maintain rural character of this region while allowing efficient traffic calming and volume capacity. The roundabout at Rancho California Road and Anza Road will be the first of five roundabouts located at La Serena Way, Calle Contento Road, Monte De Oro Road and Glenoaks Road. These roundabouts will allow vehicular, equestrian, bicycle and pedestrian traffic to interact through the intersection more efficiently and safely while keeping its natural wine county landscape. The roundabout will accommodate the estimated 41,700 of daily vehicular traffic and a peak hour vehicular traffic of over 4,000.

c. Fair Share and Phasing Assessment

Through the Community Plan process, the County has developed a traffic impact fee program specifically to ensure timely construction of transportation improvements as outlined in the Wine Country Fair Share and Phasing Assessment. This program will collect fair share contributions toward improvements within the Wine Country Policy 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. Additionally, implementing projects within the Wine Country Policy Area will be required to prepare a focused traffic study that will assess the following to ensure consistency:

- Trip generation comparison to estimates assumed in the WCP assessment
- Parking assessment
- Site access and on-site circulation assessment
- Interaction of driveways with adjacent intersections (if appropriate)
- Additional assessment deemed appropriate by the County of Riverside Transportation Department

The following have been included as mitigation measures in Section 4.3, Air Quality, of the EIR but would also reduce the Project’s overall GHG impact:

AQ-1 The County shall require new commercial and industrial implementing projects to develop a trip reduction program that promotes commuter-choices, employer transportation management, guaranteed ride home programs and commuter assistance and outreach-type programs intended to reduce commuter vehicle miles traveled. The program shall be submitted as part of the Project’s implementation projects’ discretionary review applications, and in place prior to Certificate of Occupancy.

AQ-2 The County shall condition all implementing projects to implement the Trails and Bikeways Systems map (SWAP Figure 8) of the Project. This map is more conducive to this region’s destination places and multiple users’ (bikers, equestrian, pedestrians, visitors, etc.) needs. Hence, changing the focus of land use from automobile-centered transportation would result in a reduction in vehicle miles traveled.

AQ-3 In addition, the County shall require implementing projects to incorporate bicycle parking areas and horse hitching posts where applicable at agreed upon locations during application review (for projects having more than 10 employees or involving special events). Horse hitching posts may also be considered, for projects involving special events or wine-tasting, and in proximity to an existing or planned equestrian trail.

AQ-4 The County shall require all implementing projects that require onsite or offsite special event parking to incorporate a comprehensive parking program for private parking lots during application review where applicable, to promote ultra-low or zero emission vehicle parking; provide larger parking spaces that can accommodate vans and limousines; include adequate passenger waiting/loading areas; and provide safe pedestrian/equestrian pathways through parking areas.

AQ-5 The County shall promote the expanded use of renewable fuel and low-emission vehicles within implementing projects. Implementing projects may earn points in the GHG Mitigation Workbook Option Tables by making low-emissions or electric vehicle use more accessible by including one or both of the following project components: provide preferential parking for ultra-low emission, zero-emission, and alternative-fuel vehicles; and provide electric vehicle charging stations within the development.

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.

“AQ-7 The County shall work with the Winegrowers’ Association, the Temecula Valley Convention and Visitor’s Bureau, and their partners, to promote alternative modes of transportation, such as shuttles, cable-cars, trolley, etc. In addition, where feasible, the County shall work with the local transit provider – RTA – by adding or modifying existing transit service to enhance service near the Project site. This will encourage the use of transit and therefore reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Unincorporated Riverside County hosts one Metrolink transit station; the County shall collaborate with ~~in~~ the neighboring cities to expand connections to this station as well as other Metrolink stations which will increase ridership and decrease vehicle miles traveled (VMT).”

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, but are not limited to, use of EPA Tier 2 (or better) emission compliant construction equipment and use of alternative fueled construction equipment (natural gas) if available as deemed appropriate by the County during application review (see GHG-1 for criteria).
- 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, where feasible as deemed appropriate by the County during application review (see GHG-1 for criteria).
- 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 deemed necessary by the County to maintain acceptable levels of service and safety, 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 ARB construction fleet specifications (see GHG-1 for criteria).
- 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 (see GHG-1 for criteria).

- 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:
 - i) 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.
 - ii) 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.
 - iii) 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.
 - iv) Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.
 - v) 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.

AQ-13 Construction contractors supplying heavy duty diesel equipment, greater than 50 hp, will be encouraged to apply for AQMD SOON funds. Information including the AQMD website will be provided to each contractor which uses heavy duty diesel for on-site construction activities."

Page 4.7-26, under Project Design Features heading, item 1, 2, 3 and 4

1. "The Project's amendment to County Zoning Ordinance No. 348 will require that the minimum lot size for special occasion facilities be 10 acres in the WC-WE zone, 20 acres in the WC-W zone, and 100 acres in the WC-E zone ~~and a maximum of 5 guests shall be permitted per gross acre for these facilities.~~ This would greatly reduce air quality impacts on neighboring properties.
2. Refer to Aesthetics/Light and Glare, Project Design Features #3, 4, 7, 8, and 9 (refer to Chapter 3.0 *Project Description*), which will require large minimum lot sizes from 5 to 20 acres and a minimum vineyard planting or equestrian land requirement of 75%. This will reduce the overall land use density and intensity of the Project site, resulting in fewer average daily trips which will in turn decrease air quality impacts in the Project area and surrounding communities.
3. The Project (revised SWAP Policy 1.8) will require that pending adoption of an updated Air Quality Element and Climate Action Plan (CAP), the County will ensure that new

development selects greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction measures from the Option Tables to achieve the County’s GHG emission reduction thresholds as set forth in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Workbook (workbook). Alternatively, new developments may utilize other reduction mechanisms to achieve reduction thresholds as prescribe in the workbook.

Page 4.7-27, Under Construction-related Impacts (of implementing Projects) heading, Second Paragraph

“Emissions of GHGs were calculated for the worst-case year of Project construction in CalEEMod. For purposes of this analysis, construction emissions were calculated in five-year increments to correspond with the expected rate of build-out. Emissions for each 5-year period take into account projected policies regarding construction waste diversion and anticipated advancement in equipment technology. Results of this analysis are presented in Table 4.7-2 ~~Error! Reference source not found.~~ 7-2, Year 2035 Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions. As shown on Table 4.7-2, the average annual emissions would not likely exceed the GHG threshold of 3,000 metric tons, if an equal number of implementing projects are assumed to be constructed in each of the five-year spans. However, as the actual rate of construction cannot be accurately estimated, a plausible scenario of three times the average construction activity occurring in a single year was considered for determining potential mass emissions from construction under the Project. The GHG emissions resulting from this worst-case construction activity would exceed the SCAQMD’s threshold, and result in a potentially significant impact. Therefore, the construction of the implementing projects would result in a potentially significant impact with regard to construction GHG emissions.”

Page 4.7-28, Last Paragraph

“As shown in Table 4.7-3 ~~Error! Reference source not found.~~ Mass Emissions 2035 Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions, in 2035 annual GHG emissions resulting from vehicle, electrical, and natural gas usage associated with operation of implementing Projects were estimated to be 286,298 MT CO₂e. from those sources in the Basin and an additional 111,534 MT CO₂e from sources in the San Diego Air Basin. ~~San Diego travel emissions have been included in the analysis; however, are considered “Scope 3 GHG Emissions”; therefore it is not appropriate to be included in the total, since Riverside County lacks jurisdictional control over or input into highway projects and planning in San Diego County.~~ For this proposed Project, mobile source emissions from the San Diego Air Basin are categorized as Scope 3 GHG emissions, which are defined by CARB as “emissions resulting from the extraction and production of purchased materials and fuels, transport-related activities in vehicles not owned or controlled by the reporting entity (e.g., employee commuting and business travel), outsourced activities, waste disposal, etc.”¹⁸ Specifically, they are considered indirect GHG emissions that are a consequence of the Project activities, but occur at sources controlled by the SDAPCD. According to CARB and The Climate Registry, the reporting of Scope 3 GHG emissions is

¹⁸ Source: Local Government Operations Protocol: For the quantification and reporting of greenhouse gas emissions inventories. May 2010. CARB

optional but, more importantly, Scope 3 emissions should not be summed across entities. As mentioned previously, SANDAG developed and adopted the 2050 RTP/SCS in October 2011 to provide a blueprint for the growth of transportation infrastructure in the San Diego region for the next 40 years. Therefore, it is assumed that mobile source GHG emissions originating from the San Diego Air Basin, regardless of destination, have been accounted for in the RTP/SCS and should not be doubly counted in Riverside County’s emissions inventory. The emissions estimates are based on compliance with the County’s requirement of achieving the minimum mandated points on the GHG Option Tables. Even with these reductions, operation of implementing projects pursuant to the Project would exceed the SCAQMD screening threshold of 3,000 MT CO_{2e} per year, which is expected for a large program such as this Project, and impacts would be potentially significant, requiring further analysis.”

Page 4.7-34, under Wine Country Community Plan Overview of Programmatic Impacts heading, second paragraph

“Policies of the SWAP have been established to promote and preserve the distinctive character of the Project area. The intensity of development in the project area is expected to consist of low-density residential and commercial uses with large lot sizes, and development would be limited to preserve the intent of the Temecula Valley Wine Country. Numerous policies provide features to reduce the emissions of GHGs. For example, SWAP 1.8 ensures that GHG reduction measures would be incorporated into each implementing project to achieve reduction targets. SWAP 1.20 ~~1.15~~ encourages future residential tracts and parcel maps to cluster development in conjunction with on-site vineyards or equestrian land provided that the overall project density yield does not exceed one dwelling unit per five acres. Policies of the SWAP have been accounted for in the quantitative analysis of the Project above. These are consistent with policies under the County General Plan and consistent with State and Federal goals.”

Page 4.7-37, Last Paragraph

“Compliance with proposed County of Riverside SWAP policies will ensure consistency with the numeric GHG-reduction goals of AB 32 and be consistent with promulgated plans, polices, and regulations governing the reduction of GHG emissions. Because these features and measures would meaningfully reduce Project GHG emissions and are consistent with the state and local goals, the Project is supportive of the State’s goals regarding global climate change. However, Project impacts to global climate change, both at the Project level and cumulative level, are still potentially significant and unavoidable, due to the overall increase in emissions as compared to existing conditions. The EIR has incorporated all reasonable and feasible mitigation measures as set forth above, including a comprehensive quantitative GHG mitigation program with an Options Table. Alternatives to reduce GHG impacts are discussed in Section 6, Alternatives to the Proposed Project.”

CHAPTER 4.8, HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Page 4.8-2, Second Paragraph, First Sentence

“One hazardous material site within the Project area, Temecula Bomb Target #107, has been identified on the Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List, a planning document used by the State, local agencies and developers to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act requirements. No other hazardous materials sites are known to exist within the Project area.”

Page 4.8-15, First Paragraph under Conclusion heading

“Although implementation of the Project would potentially increase the transport, use, storage, and manufacture of hazardous materials within the Project area, these activities are highly regulated by federal, State, and local regulations. As a result all future implementing projects within the Project area would be subject to the above-described Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, federal, State, and local regulations, ordinances, General Plan policies, and standard conditions or requirements, which are intended to reduce the potential for release of hazardous materials and provide the necessary information and guidance to effectively respond and address a release of hazardous materials ensuring limited impact to the environment. Such conformance would be adequate to ensure that potential impacts from the effects of a release of hazardous materials on any habitable structure, critical facility, or other infrastructure would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation incorporated, ~~and no additional mitigation measures are required or proposed.~~”

CHAPTER 4.9, HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Page 4.9-1, End of First Paragraph Under “Regional Hydrology and Drainage”

Omit the extra period “.” at the end of the paragraph.

“...conveyance systems throughout the Project area.”

Page 4.9-2, Under Drainage Area 6 header

“A portion of the Project area, approximately the north half, is within the Murrieta Creek watershed, as shown on Exhibit 4.9-1, *Watershed Boundary Map*, ~~provided by Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCWCD)~~. As shown on this Exhibit, District 1, a majority of District 2 and the northerly most portion of District 3 fall within this area. The southerly portion of District 3, the southeasterly corner of District 2, District 4, and District 5 fall outside the limits of the Murrieta Creek watershed. All implementing projects that fall within the Murrieta Creek Area ~~Drainage Plan~~ Drainage Plan will be subject to ADP fees, as enforced by RCFCWCD. Refer to Exhibit 4.9-2, *Drainage Course Photo Map*, for a detailed view of the Project drainage.

A large portion of the Equestrian District is within a FEMA 100-year Floodplain. The limits of each floodplain type (Zone A, AE, AH, and X [shaded]) are shown on Exhibit 4.9-3, *Floodplain Areas*. Zone A designated floodplains are areas with a one-percent annual chance of flooding. Because detailed analyses are not performed by FEMA for such areas; no depths or base flood elevations are shown within these zones. Zone AE designates areas subject to inundation by the one-percent annual chance flood event determined by detailed methods. BFEs are shown in this zone. Zone AH designates areas subject to inundation by one-percent annual chance shallow flooding (usually areas of ponding) where average depths are between one and three feet. BFEs derived from detailed hydraulic analyses are shown in this zone. Zone X (shaded) floodplains are areas of moderate flood hazard, usually areas between the limits of the 100-year (1-percent annual probability) and 500-year (0.2-percent annual probability) floods. Large scale and high density subdivisions which would alter the limits of the floodplain are not anticipated within the Project area. Should such projects submit an application for development and are located in areas subject to the one-percent annual chance flood event, such developments will be required to meet the provisions of Ordinance 458 during the entitlement process. Construction of a structure within a one-percent chance floodplain is also subject to the provisions of Ordinance 458. Any project that requires fill to be placed within this area, which alters the limits of the floodplain will be required to process a Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (LOMR F) with FEMA.

Page 4.9-21, Mitigation Measure HYD-4

“HYD-4 Infiltration ~~may~~ shall be utilized by implementing projects for maintaining water quality standards as deemed appropriate by the County during application review. This determination shall be made based on 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 BMP’s. If infiltration is not feasible based on a specific site’s soils properties, ~~some form of~~ on-site detention ~~should~~ shall be ~~considered~~ utilized to mitigate any additional stormwater runoff that exceeds the existing calculated flows. In this case (when infiltration is not feasible) other BMP’s ~~should~~ shall be evaluated by the County and contractor to ensure that projects meet the water quality requirements. Maintaining the use of existing roadside swales in compliance with the current MS4 permit ~~is also recommended~~ can be utilized as deemed appropriate by the County during application review to help maintain existing drainage patterns and help with water quality.”

Page 4.9-26, Mitigation Measure HYD-8

“HYD-8 All implementing projects shall ~~consider~~ incorporate the following flood control measures ~~and shall use them~~, as applicable:

- Minimize encroachment into floodplains and watercourses to the satisfaction of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District prior to applicable plan/permit approval.

- Phase so that 100-year flood protection is ensured in all areas of development. Provide protection against flooding, erosion, siltation, and water quality impacts through interim improvements (such as temporary debris basins, earthen channels/berms, check dams, sand bag barriers, or other temporary BMPs and flood control protection measures).
- Keep building pad construction from flood hazard for the 100-year frequency storm by elevating finished floor elevations above the 100-year level of flood protection.
- Detain any incremental increase in drainage within the implementing project's boundaries in accordance with RCFCWCD requirements. ~~For the portion of the project site within the Murrieta Creek Area Drainage Plan (ADP), detain incremental increases in drainage until the Murrieta Creek ADP is fully implemented downstream of the implementing project site."~~

Page 4.9-27, Last Paragraph

~~"As previously discussed, ministerial actions are not considered "projects" under CEQA and are, therefore, not subject to environmental review as discussed above. However, each implementing project, ministerial or discretionary, will be required to submit a Change of Zone application with the County. Through the Change of Zone development approval process, Mitigation Measure LU 1 will require that ministerial actions implementing mitigation for flooding onsite and offsite, reducing potential future impacts from implementation projects to less than significant levels."~~

Page 4.9-29, Last Paragraph

~~"Low lying areas should typically be reserved for passive uses such as agriculture, rather than the placement of buildings. Implementing projects shall be required to provide their own flood protection for access and structures, as well as downstream flood mitigation. Large scale and high density subdivisions which would alter the limits of the floodplain are not anticipated within the Project area. Should such projects submit an application for development and are located in areas subject to the one-percent annual chance flood event, such developments will be required to meet the provisions of Ordinance 458 during the entitlement process. Construction of a structure within a one-percent chance floodplain is also subject to the provisions of Ordinance 458."~~

Page 4.9-33, Second to Last Paragraph

"Cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality are addressed in the Riverside County General Plan Final EIR No. 441, which is incorporated by reference into this EIR. The Project would not directly result in degradation of surface water quality, groundwater, drainage or erosion, or flooding impacts. Compliance with Federal, State, and local requirements on a project-by-project basis would reduce cumulative impacts to a less than significant level at the

time of a ~~an~~ implementing project is developed. In addition, as discussed above, cumulative impacts to surface water resources are also regulated and mitigated by regional plans, permits and programs managed by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

CHAPTER 4.10, LAND USE AND RELEVANT PLANNING

Page 4.10-14, First Paragraph, SWAP 1.4 and 1.5

“SWAP 1.4 Continue to provide for incidental commercial uses, such as retail wine sales/sampling rooms, incidental gift sales, restaurants excluding drive-through facilities, and delicatessens, ~~and bed and breakfast inns as incidental commercial uses~~ in conjunction with wineries ~~that maintain established on-site vineyards on 10 acres or more~~ provided that at least:

- 75% of the project site is planted in vineyards;
- 75% of the grapes utilized in wine production and retail wine sales are grown or raised within the county; and
- The winery facility has a capacity to produce 3,500 gallons of wine annually.

SWAP 1.5 Continue to provide for incidental commercial uses, such as bed and breakfast inns on 5 acres or more, and country inns ~~on 10 acres or more~~ and ~~may allow~~ Special Occasion Facilities on 10 or more acres, ~~provided~~ that at least 75% of the project site is planted in vineyards.”

Page 4.10-24, Fourth Paragraph

“Also, to ensure consistency with the proposed Policy Area, every ~~ministerial and~~ discretionary application within the Project boundary would be required to submit a Change of Zone (CZ) application to adopt the new applicable zone. Refer to Mitigation Measure LU-1 below which describes the Change of Zone Planning Department development review process which would ensure appropriate review of potential site-specific environmental concerns for implementing projects. As discussed below under Cumulative Impacts, applications that are in process or have recently been approved may proceed under current General Plan and zoning overlays, although County staff and the Board of Supervisors evaluate site-specific development conditions to ensure land use compatibility, consistent with the General Plan and applicable regulations.”

Page 4.10-16, First Paragraph under Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan heading

“The Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) is a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) focusing on Conservation of species and their associated Habitats in Western Riverside County. The MSHCP is intended to allow Western Riverside County and its Cities to better control local land-use decisions while addressing the requirements of the State and Federal Endangered Species Acts. The MSHCP

plan area encompasses approximately 1.26 million acres (1,966 square miles); it includes all unincorporated Riverside County land west of the crest of the San Jacinto Mountains to the Orange County line, as well as the jurisdictional areas of the Cities of Temecula, Murrieta, Lake Elsinore, Wildomar, Eastvale, Jurupa Valley, Canyon Lake, Norco, Corona, Riverside, Moreno Valley, Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Perris, Hemet, and San Jacinto.”

Page 4.10-19, Table 4.10-3

“Table 4.10-3
 Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area Districts and Zoning Classifications

New Southwest Area Plan Districts	Zoning
<u>Equestrian Winery</u>	<u>Wine Country – Equestrian (WC-E)</u> Intended to allow clustering of residential density in certain geographic areas of this policy area. Clustering of residential density shall be allowed only in conjunction with permanent preservation of vineyards or equestrian lands.
<u>Winery Equestrian</u>	<u>Wine Country – Winery Existing Winery (WC-WE) and Wine Country – Winery (WC-W)</u> Intended to support tourism related activities in certain geographic areas of this policy area for existing and future wineries. Incidental commercial uses, such as restaurants, delicatessens, hotels, resorts, and special occasion facilities, shall be permitted only when they are secondary, and directly related to, winery operations as defined in the following sections.
Residential	<u>Wine Country – Residential (WC-R)</u> Intended to support equestrian activities in certain geographic areas of this policy area. Incidental equestrian uses, such as polo-grounds, western stores, restaurants, rodeo arenas, and petting zoos, shall be permitted only when they are secondary, and directly related to a commercial equestrian establishment.

“

Page 4.10-21, First Bullet (bottom of page) through Sixth Bullet, and first paragraph after series of bullets on Page 4.10-22

- “Residential developments in the WC zones have a minimum setback of 50 feet (except when the site is adjacent to select roadways), a height limit requirement of 30 feet (with the exception of terraced building pads), and a minimum lot size requirement of twenty (20) gross acres within the WC-W Zone and five (5) ten (10) gross acres within the WC-R zone (except for existing non-conforming parcels and residential development that cluster their density in the Residential zone). The minimum lot size requirement of ten (10) gross acres applies within the WC-E zone.
- Wineries in the WC zones have a minimum setback of 50 feet (except when the site is adjacent to select roadways), a height limit requirement of 50 40 feet (with the exception of terraced building pads), and a minimum lot size requirement of ten (10) gross acres. Also, 75% of the net lot area would be planted with vineyards.
- Special Occasion Facility developments in the WC zones have a minimum setback of 100 feet (except when the site is adjacent to select roadways), a height limit requirement of

30 feet (with the exception of terraced building pads), and a minimum lot size requirement of 20 gross acres in the WC-W zone, ~~and ten (10) gross acres in the WC-WE zone, and one-hundred (100) gross acres in the WC-E zone.~~ A special occasion facility is permitted only as an incidental use to a winery in the WC-W Zone, to a vineyard in the WC-WE zone, and to a commercial equestrian establishment in the WC-E zone.

- Lodging Facility (country inn, hotel and resort) developments in the WC zones have a minimum setback of 50 feet (except when the site is adjacent to select roadways), a height limit ~~requirement~~ of 30 feet (with the exception of terraced building pads), and a minimum lot size requirement of 20 gross acres in the WC-W zone and ten (10) gross acres in the WC-WE zone. The minimum lot size for resorts is 40 gross acres in conjunction with a winery.
- Commercial Equestrian Establishments in the WC-E zone have a minimum setback of 50 feet (except when the site is adjacent to select roadways), a height requirement of 30 feet (with the exception of terraced building pads), and a minimum lot size requirement of 20 gross acres.
- Clustered Residential developments in the WC zones shall not exceed one (1) dwelling unit per five (5) gross acres ~~have an average minimum lot size of five (5) gross acres~~ in the WC-R zone and one (1) dwelling unit per ten (10) gross acres in the WC-W and WC-WE zones. The minimum lot size would be one (1) gross acre. Also, 75% of the net lot area would be set aside for planting vineyards or equestrian operations.

These proposed zoning and Policy Area requirements are intended to preserve and protect the three unique communities within the Project area, consolidating similar uses such that conflicting land uses or physical divisions within the community do not occur. Thus, it is not anticipated that implementation of the Project would create a physical divide in an established ~~community communities~~, but rather implementation of the Project would—as previously mentioned—consolidate and preserve the existing communities within the Project area.”

Page 4.10-24, Fourth Paragraph

“Also, to ensure consistency with the proposed Policy Area, every ~~ministerial and~~ discretionary application within the Project boundary would be required to submit a Change of Zone (CZ) application to adopt the new applicable zone. Refer to Mitigation Measure LU-1 below which describes the Change of Zone Planning Department development review process which would ensure appropriate review of potential site-specific environmental concerns for implementing projects. As discussed below under Cumulative Impacts, applications that are in process or have recently been approved may proceed under current General Plan and zoning overlays, although County staff and the Board of Supervisors evaluate site-specific development conditions to ensure land use compatibility, consistent with the General Plan and applicable regulations.”

Page 4.10-31 (and 4.4-14), Mitigation Measure LU-1

~~“LU-1 All implementing projects (ministerial and discretionary)~~ **All future requests for discretionary land use entitlements** within the Project boundary shall ~~be required to~~ **comply with the following requirements:**

- Apply for and obtain a Change of Zone (CZ) to benefit from the implementing zones of the Wine Country Policy Area. As part of the review process, the County shall conduct a project-specific CEQA analysis for the CZ Application. Depending upon the location of the implementing project, Planning staff shall require the project proponent to conduct the necessary studies (e.g., Archeology, Geology, Biology, Hydrology, etc.). Depending upon the findings of those studies, Planning staff shall recommend that a restrictive zoning classification (such as an open space zone) be placed on areas where sensitive resources require protection.
- Apply for and obtain the necessary grading permit. Such grading permit shall go through the appropriate environmental analysis and identify the necessary mitigations, if any (e.g., cultural monitoring during grading, biological restoration, etc.), prior to approval of the grading permit.
- Apply for and obtain the necessary building permit. The County shall ensure the necessary reviews of building permits by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCWCD), Environmental Programs Division (EPD), County Archeologist, County Geologist, etc.
- Comply with the MSHCP and applicable resource agency regulations pertaining to the protection of biological resources and existing jurisdictional drainage features. Applicants for such implementing projects shall reference the current MHSCP criteria (biological objectives and requirements for any applicable Conservation Area/Criteria Cell or linkage), conduct an MSHCP consistency analysis, and prepare a Jurisdictional Delineation where onsite drainages exist and obtain applicable permits/approvals from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board and/or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- All implementing projects shall be in compliance with applicable mitigation measures pursuant to the County’s General Plan EIR.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the future proposed use of the property within the Project boundary is a use that is permitted by right under both Ordinance 348.4729 and the zoning designation for the property that was in place immediately before the adoption of Ordinance 348.4729, then the future proposed use shall not be required to apply for and obtain a Change of Zone.”

Page 4.10-35, First Paragraph

“...the subregion and within the Project area (i.e., implementing projects), is not anticipated to result in cumulatively considerable land use impacts. If future implementing projects are

consistent with the proposed Project (including the proposed General Plan Amendment, Zoning Ordinance Amendment and revised design guidelines), their cumulative impacts would be consistent with the Project-related land use impacts identified in this Draft EIR Section and would thus be less than significant. In addition, the land use changes anticipated under the proposed Project would comply with the growth projections, goals, and vision identified by SCAG; thus significant Project-related cumulative land use impacts are not anticipated. As noted in Section 4.0, there are approximately 60 development cases in various stages of review or approval with the County. Some of these development proposals may proceed independently from the Project (if approved prior to the Project being approved), in which case they could create land use conflicts with existing for future WCCP properties. However, each development application is reviewed for land use compatibility as part of the County’s development review process, which also evaluates consistency with the General Plan, zoning and applicable regulations. These existing applications are not “proposed” as part of the Project, could occur with or without the Project, and were taken into consideration by County staff when developing the land use buildout projections shown in Appendix J.¹⁹ “

CHAPTER 4.11, MINERAL RESOURCES

Page 4.11-1, Third Paragraph

“Information given in this section is based on mineral resource information obtained from available public resources including, but not limited to, the 2003 *Riverside County General Plan* (GPA No. 618), Open Space Element, *General Plan EIR No. 441* (2003), Riverside County Ordinance No. 555, the *Southwest Area Plan*, proposed Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area (2011), Wine Country zones of Ordinance No. 348, and the Temecula Valley Wine Country Design Guidelines.”

Page 4.11-4, under Open Space – Mineral Resource (OS-MIN) heading, Policies 21.1 through 21.5

- “Policy LU 21.1: Require that surface mining activities and lands containing mineral deposits of statewide or of regional significance comply with Riverside County Ordinances and the SMARA.
- Policy LU 21.2: Protect lands designated as Open Space-Mineral Resource from encroachment of incompatible land uses through buffer zones or visual screening.
- Policy LU 21.3: Protect road access to mining activities and prevent or mitigate traffic conflicts with surrounding properties.

¹⁹ If the planning application has been approved, County staff included the associated land uses in the Project traffic modeling as part of the Wine Country buildout projections. Like existing land uses, any recently approved application will essentially operate as an “existing non-conforming use” relative to consistency with Project zoning and design guidelines, and would be required to come into compliance with Project zoning and design guidelines should the parcel(s) seek a future discretionary land use approval.

- Policy LU 21.4: Require the recycling of mineral extraction sites to open space, recreational, or other uses that are compatible with the surrounding land uses.
- Policy LU 21.5: Require an approved reuse plan prior to the issuing of a permit to operate an extraction operation.”

CHAPTER 4.12, NOISE

Page 4.12-24, under Project Design Features, item number 1 and 3

1. “The Project’s amendment to County Zoning Ordinance No. 348 will require that the minimum lot size for special occasion facilities be 10 acres in the WC-WE zone, 20 acres in the WC-W zone, and 100 acres in the WC-E zone ~~and a maximum of 5 guests shall be permitted per gross acre for these facilities~~. This would greatly reduce noise impacts on neighboring properties.
3. The Project will require special occasion facilities that propose indoor events to conduct a Noise Study prior to Plot Plan/CUP approval. Similarly, special occasion facilities that propose outdoor events will be required to conduct an Acoustical Analysis prior to Plot Plan/CUP approval.”

Page 4.12-25, under Southwest Area Plan (Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Areas), items SWAP 4 and SWAP 5

- “SWAP 1.4 Continue to provide for incidental commercial uses, such as retail wine sales/sampling rooms, incidental gift sales, restaurants excluding drive-through facilities, and delicatessens, ~~and bed and breakfast inns as incidental commercial uses~~ in conjunction with wineries ~~that maintain established on-site vineyards~~ on 10 acres or more provided that at least:
- 75% of the project site is planted in vineyards;
 - 75% of the grapes utilized in wine production and retail wine sales are grown or raised within the county; and
 - The winery facility has a capacity to produce 3,500 gallons of wine annually.
- SWAP 1.5 Continue to provide for incidental commercial uses, such as bed and breakfast inns on 5 acres or more, and country inns ~~on 10 acres or more~~ and ~~may allow~~ Special Occasion Facilities on 10 or more acres, ~~+~~ provided that at least 75% of the project site is planted in vineyards.”

Page 4.12-26, end of first full paragraph under “Construction-related Impacts”

“Actual construction noise levels vary widely depending on the specific project and site-specific features, with noise levels 50 feet from the property line sometimes exceeding 90 dBA for short

periods. These temporary construction noise impacts are usually relatively brief, typically do not overlap with over construction-related noise, and must comply with County standard conditions, Noise Ordinance requirements and EIR mitigation measures, as described further below. In addition, the Project’s required setbacks will reduce the intensity of construction-related activity along the property line and within the setback areas, which range from 50 feet to 300 feet depending on the land use and location.”

Page 4.12-27, Mitigation Measure NOI-1

“**NOI-1** All implementing projects shall comply with the following noise reduction measures during grading and building activities in order to achieve applicable County Noise Element requirements and comply with EIR mitigation measures, concurrent with Mitigation Measure LU-1:

- 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~~ shall 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.”

Page 4.12-28, Mitigation Measure NOI-2

“**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, but are not limited to, 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~~

shall 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."

Page 4.12-35, under Equestrian Uses heading

"The Equestrian District encourages equestrian uses (including residential uses with equestrian amenities such as barns, arenas, and stables) within the Project area. The Project would lay a foundation that would preserve the equestrian and rural land uses and allow for the co-existence with wineries and equestrian competition events in the area. The primary noise sources associated with equestrian uses include periodic competition events, shows, and auctions held at equestrian facilities. The proposed Southwest Area Plan Policies 1.11 ~~1.13~~ and 1.18 ~~1.15~~ promote the coexistence of winery, equestrian, and residential uses and permit incidental commercial uses such as western stores, polo grounds, or horse racing tracks, petting zoos, event grounds, horse auction facilities, horse show facilities, animal hospitals, restaurants, delicatessens, and special occasion facilities in conjunction with equestrian establishments on lots larger than 10 acres in the Wine Country – Equestrian District. Incidental commercial uses located on larger lots would increase the distances to nearby sensitive receptors, thereby reducing noise impacts. Further, events and activities occurring within the Equestrian District would generally be held on weekends during daytime hours only, and are not anticipated to exceed the noise limits of the land use compatibility guidelines."

Page 4.12-36, under Tasting Rooms heading

"Tasting rooms are typically located within indoor areas of wineries. However, tasting rooms may still generate increased noise levels at nearby uses. Noise from tasting rooms occurs from conversation and small events. Tasting rooms are generally open during daytime hours only, and typically do not produce noise capable of exceeding noise and land use compatibility standards at nearby sensitive land uses. To ensure noise from tasting rooms would not result in substantial noise increases, Mitigation Measure NOI-3 limits operations to the daytime hours of ~~8:00~~ 9:00 a.m. to ~~10:00~~ 7:00 p.m. in the Wine Country - Winery (WC-W) and Existing Winery (WC-WE) zones and 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Sunday in the Wine Country - Equestrian (WC-E) and Residential (WC-R) zones."

Page 4.12-38, Second Paragraph

"Exhibit 4.12-2 illustrates the locations of existing and anticipated wineries with special occasion facilities. There are currently 29 existing wineries with special occasion facilities and an additional 35 such wineries are anticipated to occur with implementation of the Project. However, as no specific site plan proposals are associated with the Project, the exact footprint of future wineries (particularly those with special occasion facilities) and frequency of special

events are unknown at this time. As a result, typical noise from a DJ or live music associated with special events held at wineries could conflict with the provisions of Ordinance No. 847 and exceed the County's noise and land use compatibility standards. However, the potential for exceedance would depend on the locations of existing and proposed sensitive uses, and proposed winery locations. Southwest Area Plan Policies 1.11 and ~~1.18~~ 1.13 promote the coexistence of winery, equestrian, and residential uses, and allow incidental commercial uses such as special occasion facilities, hotels, resorts, restaurants, and delicatessens on lots larger than 20 acres for Wine Country – Winery zone and on lots larger than 10 acres for Wine Country – Winery Existing zone. Winery facilities located on larger lots would increase the distances to nearby sensitive receptors, thereby reducing noise impacts."

Page 4.12-38, Third Paragraph

"However, to ensure noise from special events held at winery facilities are further reduced, Mitigation Measure ~~NOI-5~~ NOI-4 would require special occasion facilities ~~with more than 200 guests per event~~ to submit a Noise Study "Special Event Synopsis", and ~~NOI-6~~ NOI-3 and NOI-5 would require Noise Control Plans to be formulated prior to the issuance of building permits to reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure ~~NOI-6~~ NOI-5 prohibits amplified sound and special events at wineries after 10:00 p.m., restricts special event clean-up activities to no later than midnight, and identifies potential noise-attenuating features to be incorporated into future implementing projects. NOI-6 ensures proper enforcement of County noise requirements and Project conditions of approval. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures ~~NOI-5 and NOI-6~~ NOI-3 through NOI-6, noise impacts from special events at wineries would be less than significant."

Page 4.12-38, Fifth Paragraph

"Typically, a medium two-axle truck used to make deliveries can generate a maximum noise level of 75 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. These are levels generated by a truck operated by an experienced "reasonable" driver with typically applied accelerations. Higher noise levels may be generated by the excessive application of power. Lower levels may be achieved, but would not be considered representative of a normal truck operation. *General Plan* Policy N 8.4 requires loading and shipping facilities which abut residential parcels to be located and designed to minimize the potential noise impacts upon residential parcels. The shipping facilities associated with future wineries would likely be located in the rear of winery buildings; although as no specific implementing projects are proposed, the specific location of shipping areas are unknown at this time. The majority of loading and unloading would likely occur during daytime hours, and would be subject to compliance with the Ordinance No. 847. However, future implementing projects would be required to implement Mitigation Measure NOI-3 which limits operations to the daytime hours of ~~8:00- 9:00~~ 9:00 a.m. to ~~10:00~~ 7: 00 p.m. in the Wine Country - Winery (WC-W) and Existing Winery (WC-WE) zones and 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Sunday in the Wine Country - Equestrian (WC-E) and Residential (WC-R) zones and identifies potential noise-attenuating features to be incorporated into future

implementing projects. Therefore, compliance with Ordinance No. 847 and Mitigation Measure NOI-3 would minimize noise impacts from shipping facilities to a less than significant level.”

Page 4.12-39, under Summary of Applicable Existing Regulations and Policies, item c) ; note: heading should read as *Existing/Proposed*

- c) “Southwest Area Plan Proposed Policies ~~1.8~~ 1.2, 1.9 ~~1.14~~, and 1.18 ~~1.16~~ promote the coexistence of winery, equestrian, and residential uses, allow incidental commercial uses such as special occasion facilities, hotels, resorts, restaurants, and delicatessens on larger lots in the Wine Country – Winery District, and permit incidental commercial uses such as western stores, polo grounds, or horse racing tracks, petting zoos, event grounds, horse auction facilities, horse show facilities, animal hospitals, restaurants, delicatessens, and special occasion facilities on larger lots in the Wine Country – Equestrian District.

Page 4.12-39, under Summary of Applicable Existing Regulations and Policies, item e); note: heading should read as *Existing/Proposed*

- e) “Southwest Area Plan Proposed Policies ~~1.8~~ 1.2, 1.9 ~~1.14~~, and 1.18 ~~1.16~~ promote the coexistence of winery, equestrian, and residential uses, allow incidental commercial uses such as special occasion facilities, hotels, resorts, restaurants, and delicatessens on larger lots in the Wine Country – Winery District, and permit incidental commercial uses such as western stores, polo grounds, or horse racing tracks, petting zoos, event grounds, horse auction facilities, horse show facilities, animal hospitals, restaurants, delicatessens, and special occasion facilities on larger lots in the Wine Country – Equestrian District.”

Page 4.12-45, First Paragraph, additional sentence

“Blasting, if required, would be subject to the County’s standard practices and applicable conditions of approval related to geotechnical and noise studies, and will be reflected in special Mitigation Measure LU-1.”

Page 4.12-47, Last Paragraph

“Unavoidable significant impacts have been identified for Project level and cumulative noise impacts related to mobile noise sources and stationary noise. If the County of Riverside approves the Project, the County shall be required to adopt findings of fact in accordance with Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines, as well as adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations in accordance with Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines. As described above, the County has incorporated a comprehensive noise mitigation program for both construction and operational noise. County staff have proposed a Land Use plan modification that would create greater separation between existing residential uses in the Morgan Hill area and proposed wineries that could have special events, in order to further reduce the potential for

significant land use, noise and aesthetic impacts. No additional feasible mitigation is available. Refer to Section 6, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, for additional alternatives discussion.

CHAPTER 4.13, PUBLIC SERVICES, RECREATION AND UTILITIES

Page 4.13-20, Mitigation PSU Fire-1

“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 Department (RCFD).”

Page 4.13-24, Impact 4.13-5

“Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, or would the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment?”

Page 4.13-30, Second Paragraph

“In each of the projected Normal Year scenarios, RCWD supply exceeds demand by considerably more than the 10,336 afy additional demand projected for the Project. The relationship between supply and demand continues through single and multiple dry years and in all cases the RCWD has the capacity to supply the additional demand projected for the Project at full build out. Accordingly, RCWD would have sufficient supply to serve the Project and the Project’s impact would be less than significant.²⁰”

Page 4.13-31, Mitigation Measure PSU WATER-1

“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 SDRWOCB and incorporation of applicable Best Management Practices.

Page 4.13-32, Impact 4.13-7

“Would the project require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?”

OR

²⁰ Refer to Appendix H for additional discussion. Due to the policy nature of the Project (no “development” and no maps are being proposed), and considering the long buildout horizon, a formal Water Supply Assessment pursuant to SB610 was not prepared, nor is one required. However, Appendix H contains the equivalent information, indicating that there is adequate water to serve the Project area based upon anticipated buildout conditions.

Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

OR

Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?"

Page 4.13-33, Mitigation Measure PSU SEWER-2

"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 the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Every future project in the Project area 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 February 14, 2012."

Page 4.13-35, Under Impact 4.13-8 Solid Waste

"Threshold: Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

-And-

Would the project comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?"

Page 4.13-38, Last Paragraph, Bottom of Page

"The Project and related implementing projects would be required to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste as listed in the Summary of Applicable Existing Regulations and Policies on page 4.13-36. The Project and related implementation implementing projects would contribute to the cumulative amount of solid waste that is disposed of within the Riverside County landfill system. However, the Project, in conjunction with other projects within the area, would generate a total amount of waste that could be accommodated by existing landfills and would not contribute to cumulatively significant impacts to landfill capacity such that all landfills exceed their capacity. Therefore, due to available capacity and implementation of mitigation measures, which provide for recycling on

site to reduce Project operational waste, cumulative impacts to the existing landfills resulting from waste generated by the Project are considered less than significant.”

Page 4.13-39, Last Paragraph

“The Project will support new and existing rural residential, winery, and equestrian uses, as well as other commercial activities that encourage tourism. The goal of the Project is to expand development opportunities and attract tourists to the area. ~~Significant impacts to public services and utilities would remain after implementing mitigation.~~ After mitigation, significant impacts to fire protection services and library services would remain significant. This impact is a conservative finding, and due solely to the uncertainty in funding and facilities given the long build-out period of the Project. The Project itself mitigates this impact by reducing density as compared to current General Plan and zoning. In addition, the County’s existing development fees, user fees and other means of generating revenue can provide for necessary facilities as the Project area builds out. If the County deemed it necessary, the County could form a special assessment district to generate revenue to provide additional community facilities such as a library or fire station, although ongoing operational expenses may be more difficult to fund. Given that no such assessment or fee exists at this time nor has been proposed by the County or any Project stakeholders, the EIR does not assume such a fee can or will be reasonably foreseeable. No other mitigation measures are feasible. Refer to Section 6, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, for additional discussion of alternatives that could reduce or avoid these impacts (no feasible alternatives have been identified that would avoid these significant impacts).²¹”

CHAPTER 4.14, TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

Note – the majority of changes noted below are in response to the City of Temecula Comment Letter (No. 10). Although these comments were made in response to the Traffic Impact Study (Draft PEIR Appendix I), the errata below reflect corresponding modifications to the Draft PEIR Section 4.14, Traffic and Circulation, for consistency. The modifications noted below also apply to applicable portions of Appendix I, as reflected in Appendix C, TIS Modifications. Minor corrections to TIS figures are also provided in Appendix C to the Comments and Responses document. Refer to Response No. 10 for additional discussion regarding these Errata.

Page 4.14-3, Second Paragraph

“At the direction of the County of Riverside, both roadway segment and intersection analyses were performed to determine impacts to the study area. Most of the segment and intersection count data were recently collected and were available from the County and the City of Temecula. For intersections outside the City, weekend counts for the mid-day peak hour were

²¹ As set forth in *City of Hayward v. Board of Trustees of the California State University* (1st Dist. June 28, 2012), CEQA is intended to focus on impacts of a Project on the environment, not impacts upon a project, including fire protection services. The analysis of fire and other public services and utilities is provided for informational purposes.

collected.²² Roadway segment operations were evaluated by comparing the projected traffic volumes to the level of service (LOS) thresholds identified in the Riverside County Circulation Element. The Riverside County LOS thresholds for roadway segment assessment are shown in Table 4.14-2. Utilizing both road segment and intersection data is a conservative approach, since policy-level Program EIRs of this scale would typically only utilize a roadway segment analysis to assess impacts of the Project. Roadway segment assessment is typical for a program-level assessment as broad policy-level plans such as the Project usually lack sufficient detail to complete a detailed intersection assessment, as specifics related to future implementing projects have yet to be identified (i.e., such as driveway locations, actual land use, etc.). “

²² The County utilized June/July counts as these were more typical of a peak traffic day in the wine country region, where weekend peak traffic is a greater concern than weekday commuter traffic.

Page 4.14-6, Table 4.14-3

**Table 4.14-3
Roadway Segment Levels of Service: Existing Conditions**

Segment	Lanes	Weekday		Weekend	
		Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Rancho California Road West of La Serena Way	2	14,285	D	13,569	D
Rancho California Road West of Anza Road	2	N/A	N/A	13,798	D
Anza Road South of Rancho California Road	2	N/A	N/A	3,924	C or Better
Glenoaks Road South of Rancho California Road	2	N/A	N/A	4,316	C or Better
Rancho California Road East of I-15**	8	58,091	D	52,444	C or Better
Rancho California Road East of Anza Road	2	13,358	D	14,104	D
Anza Road North of De Portola Road	2	4,031	C or Better	4,235	C or Better
De Portola Road East of Anza Road	2	4,137	C or Better	5,235	C or Better
Mesa Road North of Glenoaks Road	2	3,187	C or Better	3,189	C or Better
De Portola Road East of Glenoaks Road	2	528	C or Better	654	C or Better
SR 79 (Temecula Parkway) East of I-15*	6	36,789	C or Better	35,775	C or Better
SR 79 (Temecula Parkway) West of Butterfield Stage Road	6	30,984	C or Better	32,192	C or Better
SR 79 (Temecula Parkway) East of Anza Road	2	8,300	C or Better	11,145	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road north of De Portola Road	4	11,881	C or Better	14,257	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road north of Rancho California Road	2	4,616	C or Better	5,539	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road north of Temecula Parkway	3	13,061	C or Better	15,673	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road south of Channel Street	4	10,257	C or Better	12,308	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road south of La Serena Way	2	4,391	C or Better	5,269	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road south of Pauba Road	4	9,458	C or Better	11,350	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road south of Rancho California Road	4	9,903	C or Better	11,884	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road south of Rancho Vista Road	4	10,168	C or Better	12,202	C or Better

Segment	Lanes	Weekday		Weekend	
		Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Calle Medusa south of Enfield Lane	2	3,849	C or Better	4,619	C or Better
De Portola Road east of Jedediah Smith Road	2	7,517	C or Better	9,020	C or Better
De Portola Road east of Margarita Road	4	9,223	C or Better	11,068	C or Better
De Portola Road east of Meadows Parkway	4	4,129	C or Better	4,955	C or Better
De Portola Road west of Butterfield Stage Road	4	3,980	C or Better	4,776	C or Better
Diaz Road north of Rancho California Road	3	10,132	C or Better	12,158	C or Better
La Serena Way east of Meadows Parkway	4	7,797	C or Better	9,356	C or Better
Margarita Road east of Avenida Barca	4	20,190	C or Better	24,228	C or Better
Margarita Road north of Rancho California Road	4	19,771	C or Better	23,725	C or Better
Margarita Road north of Santiago Road	4	19,334	C or Better	23,201	C or Better
Margarita Road north of Temecula Parkway	4	24,057	C or Better	28,868	D
Margarita Road south of Jedediah Smith Road	4	16,450	C or Better	19,740	C or Better
Margarita Road south of Rancho California Road*	4	19,564	C or Better	23,477	E C or Better
Margarita Road south of Rancho Vista Road*	4	20,071	C or Better	24,085	E C or Better
Meadows Parkway north of Rancho California Road	4	7,151	C or Better	8,581	C or Better
Meadows Parkway north of Temecula Parkway	4	11,715	C or Better	14,058	C or Better
Meadows Parkway south of La Serena Way	4	4,416	C or Better	5,299	C or Better
Meadows Parkway south of Leena Way	4	10,823	C or Better	12,988	C or Better
Meadows Parkway south of Pauba Road	4	11,395	C or Better	13,674	C or Better
Meadows Parkway south of Rancho California Road	4	10,466	C or Better	12,559	C or Better

Segment	Lanes	Weekday		Weekend	
		Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Meadows Parkway south of Rancho Vista Road	4	11,213	C or Better	13,456	C or Better
Meadows Parkway south of Sunny Meadows Drive	4	9,579	C or Better	11,495	C or Better
Pauba Road east of Butterfield Stage Road	2	3,954	C or Better	4,745	C or Better
Pauba Road east of Margarita Road	3	8,621	C or Better	10,345	C or Better
Pauba Road east of Meadows Parkway	2	4,745	C or Better	5,694	C or Better
Pauba Road east of Ynez Road	3	8,924	C or Better	10,709	C or Better
Pauba Road west of Margarita Road	4	8,586	C or Better	10,303	C or Better
Rainbow Canyon Road south of Pechanga Parkway	2	7,570	C or Better	9,084	C or Better
Rancho California Road east of Diaz Road	4	21,654	C or Better	25,985	C or Better
Rancho California Road east of Moraga Road	4	33,144	E	39,773	F
Rancho California Road west of Business Park Drive	2	5,937	C or Better	7,124	C or Better
Rancho California Road west of Butterfield Stage Road	4	14,132	C or Better	16,958	C or Better
Rancho California Road west of Diaz Road	4	11,993	C or Better	14,392	C or Better
Rancho California Road west of Meadows Parkway*	4	21,285	D C or Better	25,542	E C or Better
Rancho California Road west of Ynez Road**	8	54,850	C or better	65,820	E
Rancho Vista Road east of Margarita Road	4	7,289	C or Better	8,747	C or Better
Rancho Vista Road east of Ynez Road	3	8,075	C or Better	9,690	C or Better
Rancho Vista Road west of Margarita Road	4	5,632	C or Better	6,758	C or Better
Rancho Vista Road west of Meadows Parkway	3	4,791	C or Better	5,749	C or Better
Temecula Parkway east of Margarita Road	6	35,328	C or Better	42,394	C or Better
Temecula Parkway east of Meadows Parkway	6	28,426	C or Better	34,111	C or Better

Segment	Lanes	Weekday		Weekend	
		Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Temecula Parkway east of Pechanga Parkway*	6	41,564	C or Better	49,877	DE
Temecula Parkway west of Margarita Road*	6	38,199	C or Better	45,839	C or Better D
Vincent Moraga south of Rancho California Road	2	5,212	C or Better	6,254	C or Better
Walcott Lane north of Klarer Lane	2	4,332	C or Better	5,198	C or Better
Ynez Road north of Santiago Road	2	13,840	D	16,608	F
Ynez Road south of Solana Way	6	30,167	C or Better	36,200	C or Better
Ynez Road west of Jedediah Smith Road	2	9,369	C or Better	11,243	C or Better
Rainbow Canyon Road S/O Clubhouse Road (Feb.)	2	5,336	C or Better	6,403	C or Better
Rainbow Canyon Road S/O Clubhouse Road (Oct.)	2	5,206	C or Better	6,247	C or Better
Rancho California Road W/O Margarita Road (Feb.)	4	24,329	C or Better	29,195	D
Rancho California Road W/O Margarita Road (July)	4	25,055	C or Better	30,066	D
Temecula Parkway E/O Butterfield Stage Road (Feb.)	6	18,476	C or Better	22,171	C or Better
Temecula Parkway E/O Butterfield Stage Road (Oct.)	6	18,489	C or Better	22,187	C or Better
I-15 South of SR 79 (Temecula Parkway)	8	129,000	D	129,000	D
I-15 North of SR 79 (Temecula Parkway)	8	150,000	E	150,000	E
I-15 South of Rancho California Road Interchange	8	150,000	E	150,000	E
I-15 North of Rancho California Road Interchange	8	161,000	F	161,000	F
I-15 NB Off-Ramp at SR 79 (Temecula Parkway)	1	10,500	C or Better	10,819	C or Better
I-15 NB On-Ramp at SR 79 (Temecula Parkway)	1	12,000	C or Better	11,273	C or Better
I-15 SB Off-Ramp at SR 79 (Temecula Parkway)	1	12,500	C or Better	13,000	C or Better
I-15 SB On-Ramp at SR 79 (Temecula Parkway)	1	14,600	C or Better	15,050	C or Better
I-15 NB Off-Ramp at Rancho California Road	1	12,000	C or Better	11,247	C or Better
I-15 NB On-Ramp at Rancho California Road	1	14,000	C or Better	13,780	C or Better

Segment	Lanes	Weekday		Weekend	
		Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
I-15 SB Off-Ramp at Rancho California Road	1	19,000	E	18,711	E
I-15 SB On-Ramp at Rancho California Road	1	11,500	C or Better	11,883	C or Better

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2011
 N/A – Count Data Not Available
**denotes locations where City of Temecula capacities were utilized at the request of City staff.*
*** denotes locations where capacities from the City’s General Plan were utilized per City’s request.*

Page 4.14-26, Table 4.14-8

Table 4.14-8

Roadway Segment Levels of Service: Existing Plus Project Conditions

Segment	Lanes	Weekday		Weekend	
		Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Rancho California Road West of La Serena Way	2	15,870	C	18,850	E
Rancho California Road West of Anza Road	2	N/A	N/A	18,816	E
Anza Road South of Rancho California Road	2	N/A	N/A	11,749	C or Better
Glenoaks Road South of Rancho California Road	2	N/A	N/A	6,803	C or Better
Rancho California Road East of I-15	8	58,759	D	61,009	D
Rancho California Road East of Anza Road	2	14,104	C	15,183	C
Anza Road North of De Portola Road	2	4,777	C or Better	8,677	C or Better
De Portola Road East of Anza Road	2	6,999	C or Better	11,344	C or Better
Mesa Road North of Glenoaks Road	2	3,189	C or Better	3,189	C or Better
De Portola Road East of Glenoaks Road	2	1,159	C or Better	1,718	C or Better
SR 79 (Temecula Parkway) East of I-15 *	6	39,161	C or Better	44,174	C or Better
SR 79 (Temecula Parkway) West of Butterfield Stage Road	6	36,279	C or Better	42,547	C or Better
SR 79 (Temecula Parkway) East of Anza Road	2	12,030	C or Better	11,390	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road north of De Portola Road	4	11,965	C or Better	16,656	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road north of Rancho California Road	2	4,662	C or Better	5,539	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road north of Temecula Parkway	3	13,822	C or Better	17,719	D
Butterfield Stage Road south of Channel Street	4	11,092	C or Better	13,618	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road south of La Serena Way	2	4,404	C or Better	5,269	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road south of Pauba Road	4	10,367	C or Better	14,209	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road south of Rancho California Road	4	13,784	C or Better	16,022	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road south of Rancho Vista Road	4	12,817	C or	17,012	C or

Segment	Lanes	Weekday		Weekend	
		Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
			Better		Better
Calle Medusa south of Enfield Lane	2	4,152	C or Better	5,096	C or Better
De Portola Road east of Jedediah Smith Road	2	8,094	C or Better	11,288	C or Better
De Portola Road east of Margarita Road	4	11,172	C or Better	18,623	C or Better
De Portola Road east of Meadows Parkway	4	9,380	C or Better	7,243	C or Better
De Portola Road. west of Butterfield Stage Road	4	6,851	C or Better	7,044	C or Better
Diaz Road north of Rancho California Road	3	10,132	C or Better	12,158	C or Better
La Serena Way east of Meadows Parkway	4	12,235	C or Better	10,567	C or Better
Margarita Road east of Avenida Barca*	4	24,949	C or Better	31,036	ED
Margarita Road north of Rancho California Road	4	20,791	C or Better	25,604	C or Better
Margarita Road north of Santiago Road	4	25,000	C or Better	26,005	C or Better
Margarita Road north of Temecula Parkway	4	26,554	C or Better	30,359	D
Margarita Road south of Jedediah Smith Road	4	20,470	C or Better	26,480	C or Better
Margarita Road south of Rancho California Road*	4	21,077	D C or Better	28,982	F D
Margarita Road south of Rancho Vista Road*	4	22,707	D C or Better	28,820	F D
Meadows Parkway north of Rancho California Road	4	7,993	C or Better	17,870	C or Better
Meadows Parkway north of Temecula Parkway	4	12,679	C or Better	16,631	C or Better
Meadows Parkway south of La Serena Way	4	5,800	C or Better	14,151	C or Better
Meadows Parkway south of Leena Way	4	10,823	C or Better	20,203	C or Better
Meadows Parkway south of Pauba Road	4	11,395	C or Better	18,537	C or Better
Meadows Parkway south of Rancho California Road	4	10,466	C or Better	16,802	C or Better

Segment	Lanes	Weekday		Weekend	
		Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Meadows Parkway south of Rancho Vista Road	4	11,710	C or Better	17,506	C or Better
Meadows Parkway south of Sunny Meadows Drive	4	9,579	C or Better	17,323	C or Better
Pauba Road east of Butterfield Stage Road	2	6,346	C or Better	10,334	C or Better
Pauba Road east of Margarita Road	3	12,138	C or Better	12,701	C or Better
Pauba Road east of Meadows Parkway	2	5,514	C or Better	6,917	C or Better
Pauba Road east of Ynez Road	3	11,116	C or Better	12,947	C or Better
Pauba Road west of Margarita Road	4	11,208	C or Better	13,004	C or Better
Rainbow Canyon Road south of Pechanga Parkway	4	7,570	C or Better	10,761	C or Better
Rancho California Road east of Diaz Road	4	21,654	C or Better	25,985	C or Better
Rancho California Road east of Moraga Road	4	36,990	F	46,341	F
Rancho California Road west of Business Park Drive	2	5,937	C or Better	7,124	C or Better
Rancho California Road west of Butterfield Stage Road*	4	19,698	C or Better	28,146	C or Better
Rancho California Road west of Diaz Road	4	11,993	C or Better	14,682	C or Better
Rancho California Road west of Meadows Parkway*	4	23,427	C or Better	30,327	F D
Rancho California Road west of Ynez Road	6	61,165	F	74,385	F
Rancho Vista Road east of Margarita Road.	4	12,921	C or Better	12,112	C or Better
Rancho Vista Road east of Ynez Road	3	9,929	C or Better	11,742	C or Better
Rancho Vista Road west of Margarita Road	4	10,703	C or Better	8,928	C or Better
Rancho Vista Road west of Meadows Parkway	3	10,409	C or Better	9,140	C or Better
Temecula Parkway east of Margarita Road*	6	35,328	C or Better	46,892	C or Better D
Temecula Parkway east of Meadows Parkway*	6	32,513	C or Better	44,466	C or Better D
Temecula Parkway east of Pechanga Parkway*	6	47,030	C or Better	62,873	F

Segment	Lanes	Weekday		Weekend	
		Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
			Better <u>D</u>		
Temecula Parkway west of Margarita Road*	6	38,506	C or Better	52,262	D <u>E</u>
Vincent Moraga south of Rancho California Road	2	5,342	C or Better	7,509	C or Better
Walcott Lane north of Klarer Lane	2	4,661	C or Better	5,714	C or Better
Ynez Road north of Santiago Road	2	15,059	E	19,146	F
Ynez Road south of Solana Way	6	32,976	C or Better	40,606	C or Better
Ynez Road west of Jedediah Smith Road	2	9,369	C or Better	12,725	C or Better
Rainbow Canyon Road S/O Clubhouse Road (Feb.)	2	5,336	C or Better	8,080	C or Better
Rainbow Canyon Road S/O Clubhouse Road (Oct.)	2	5,206	C or Better	7,924	C or Better
Rancho California Road W/O Margarita Road (Feb.)	4	25,964	C or Better	38,524	F
Rancho California Road W/O Margarita Road (July)	4	26,690	C or Better	39,395	F
Temecula Parkway E/O Butterfield Stage Road (Feb.)	4 <u>6</u>	21,358	C or Better	29,858	C or Better
Temecula Parkway E/O Butterfield Stage Road (Oct.)	4 <u>6</u>	21,371	C or Better	29,874	C or Better
I-15 South of SR 79 (<u>Temecula Parkway</u>)	8	132,720	D	134,836	D
I-15 North of SR 79 (<u>Temecula Parkway</u>)	8	154,615	E	157,309	E
I-15 South of Rancho California Road Interchange	8	154,615	E	157,309	E
I-15 North of Rancho California Road Interchange	8	168,186	F	172,272	F
I-15 NB Off-Ramp at SR 79 (<u>Temecula Parkway</u>)	1	11,408	C or Better	12,774	C or Better
I-15 NB On-Ramp at SR 79 (<u>Temecula Parkway</u>)	1	13,274	C or Better	13,170	C or Better
I-15 SB Off-Ramp at SR 79 (<u>Temecula Parkway</u>)	1	13,985	C or Better	15,998	C or Better
I-15 SB On-Ramp at SR 79 (<u>Temecula Parkway</u>)	1	15,555	C or Better	16,516	D
I-15 NB Off-Ramp at Rancho California Road	1	12,952	C or Better	12,210	C or Better
I-15 NB On-Ramp at Rancho California Road	1	15,227	C or Better	15,656	C or Better
I-15 SB Off-Ramp at Rancho California Road	1	21,109	F	21,350	F

Segment	Lanes	Weekday		Weekend	
		Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
I-15 SB On-Ramp at Rancho California Road	1	12,404	C or Better	13,334	C or Better
<p><i>Source: Fehr & Peers, 2011</i></p> <p><i>Shaded cells indicate unacceptable operations.</i></p> <p><i>N/A – Count Data Not Available</i></p> <p><i>*denotes locations where City of Temecula capacities were utilized at the request of City staff.</i></p>					

Page 4.14-32, Table 4.14-10

Table 4.14-10

Roadway Segment Levels of Service: Future Plus Project Conditions

Segment	Lanes	Weekday		Weekend	
		Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Rancho California Road West of La Serena Way	2	14,285	C or Better	13,569	C or Better
Rancho California Road West of Anza Road	2	N/A	N/A	18,248	E
Anza Road South of Rancho California Road	4	N/A	N/A	27,672	D
Glenoaks Road South of Rancho California Road	2	N/A	N/A	5,434	C or Better
Rancho California Road East of I-15	8	59,990	D	52,444	C or Better
Rancho California Road East of Anza Road	2	13,489	C or Better	17,013	D
Anza Road North of De Portola Road	4	23,687	C or Better	25,996	C or Better
De Portola Road East of Anza Road	2	8,506	C or Better	10,439	C or Better
Mesa Road North of Glenoaks Road	2	4,718	C or Better	5,030	C or Better
De Portola Road East of Glenoaks Road	2	3,426	C or Better	5,123	C or Better
SR 79 (Temecula Parkway) East of I-15	8	36,829	C or Better	37,181	C or Better
SR 79 (Temecula Parkway) West of Butterfield Stage Road	6	46,973	C or Better	46,612	C or Better
SR 79 (Temecula Parkway) East of Anza Road	6	27,807	C or Better	32,272	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road north of De Portola Road	4	27,262	C or Better	31,021	D
Butterfield Stage Road north of Rancho California Road	4	12,704	C or Better	7,391	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road north of Temecula Parkway	4	30,463	D	33,205	E
Butterfield Stage Road south of Channel Street	4	10,257	C or Better	12,308	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road south of La Serena Way	4	12,187	C or Better	6,894	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road south of Pauba Road	4	25,220	C or Better	28,590	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road south of Rancho California Road	4	22,095	C or Better	20,453	C or Better
Butterfield Stage Road south of Rancho Vista Road	4	24,614	C or Better	25,944	C or Better

Segment	Lanes	Weekday		Weekend	
		Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Calle Medusa south of Enfield Lane	2	5,464	C or Better	5,622	C or Better
De Portola Road east of Jedediah Smith Road	4	14,104	C or Better	17,597	C or Better
De Portola Road east of Margarita Road	4	13,654	C or Better	18,371	C or Better
De Portola Road east of Meadows Parkway	4	14,838	C or Better	17,563	C or Better
De Portola Road. west of Butterfield Stage Road	4	12,949	C or Better	14,725	C or Better
Diaz Road north of Rancho California Road	4	10,132	C or Better	15,161	C or Better
La Serena Way east of Meadows Parkway	4	15,854	C or Better	17,220	C or Better
Margarita Road east of Avenida Barca	4	30,561	D	31,436	D
Margarita Road north of Rancho California Road	4	31,716	D	25,371	C or Better
Margarita Road north of Santiago Road	4	24,645	C or Better	23,201	C or Better
Margarita Road north of Temecula Parkway	4	25,986	C or Better	28,868	D
Margarita Road south of Jedediah Smith Road	4	17,699	C or Better	21,311	C or Better
Margarita Road south of Rancho California Road	4	26,164	C or Better	25,993	C or Better
Margarita Road south of Rancho Vista Road	4	29,572	D	25,998	C or Better
Meadows Parkway north of Rancho California Road	4	9,675	C or Better	9,599	C or Better
Meadows Parkway north of Temecula Parkway	4	22,245	C or Better	26,793	C or Better
Meadows Parkway south of La Serena Way	4	6,123	C or Better	6,930	C or Better
Meadows Parkway south of Leena Way	4	11,320	C or Better	23,116	C or Better
Meadows Parkway south of Pauba Road	4	17,736	C or Better	25,181	C or Better
Meadows Parkway south of Rancho California Road	4	16,003	C or Better	19,912	C or Better
Meadows Parkway south of Rancho Vista Road	4	19,547	C or Better	23,019	C or Better
Meadows Parkway south of Sunny Meadows Drive	4	15,362	C or	23,955	C or Better

Segment	Lanes	Weekday		Weekend	
		Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
			Better		
Pauba Road east of Butterfield Stage Road	2	8,907	C or Better	10,808	C or Better
Pauba Road east of Margarita Road	4	18,354	C or Better	23,617	C or Better
Pauba Road east of Meadows Parkway	4	13,125	C or Better	15,377	C or Better
Pauba Road east of Ynez Road	4	13,500	C or Better	16,669	C or Better
Pauba Road west of Margarita Road	4	13,366	C or Better	15,688	C or Better
Rainbow Canyon Road south of Pechanga Parkway	4	10,859	C or Better	12,296	C or Better
Rancho California Road east of Diaz Road	6	21,654	C or Better	25,985	C or Better
Rancho California Road east of Moraga Road*	6	40,007	C or Better	46,089	C or Better <u>D</u>
Rancho California Road west of Business Park Drive	4	6,238	C or Better	7,124	C or Better
Rancho California Road west of Butterfield Stage Road	4	17,348	C or Better	24,194	C or Better
Rancho California Road west of Diaz Road	4	19,337	C or Better	17,557	C or Better
Rancho California Road west of Meadows Parkway	4	26,583	C or Better	32,806	E
Rancho California Road west of Ynez Road	8	56,749	C or Better	65,820	E
Rancho Vista Road east of Margarita Road	4	15,745	C or Better	18,496	C or Better
Rancho Vista Road east of Ynez Road	4	23,611	C or Better	20,054	C or Better
Rancho Vista Road west of Margarita Road	4	20,824	C or Better	16,609	C or Better
Rancho Vista Road west of Meadows Parkway	4	14,269	C or Better	15,905	C or Better
Temecula Parkway east of Margarita Road*	<u>86</u>	38,227	C or Better	47,524	C or Better <u>D</u>
Temecula Parkway east of Meadows Parkway*	6	44,415	C or Better	48,531	C or Better <u>D</u>
Temecula Parkway east of Pechanga Parkway*	6	41,564	C or	49,877	D <u>E</u>

Segment	Lanes	Weekday		Weekend	
		Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
			Better		
Temecula Parkway west of Margarita Road*	6	38,199	C or Better	45,839	C or Better D
Vincent Moraga south of Rancho California Road*	2	9,380	C or Better	10,732	C or Better D
Ynez Road north of Santiago Road*	4	20,404	C or Better	23,442	C or Better D
Ynez Road south of Solana Way	6	43,952	D	44,329	D
Ynez Road west of Jedediah Smith Road*	4	20,817	C or Better	25,637	C or Better D
Rainbow Canyon Road S/O Clubhouse Road (Feb.)	4	8,625	C or Better	9,615	C or Better
Rainbow Canyon Road S/O Clubhouse Road (Oct.)	4	8,495	C or Better	9,459	C or Better
Rancho California Road W/O Margarita Road (Feb.)	6	30,416	C or Better	37,328	C or Better
Rancho California Road W/O Margarita Road (July)	6	31,142	C or Better	38,199	C or Better
Temecula Parkway E/O Butterfield Stage Road (Feb.)*	6	47,314	C or Better D	57,416	E F
Temecula Parkway E/O Butterfield Stage Road (Oct.)*	6	47,327	C or Better D	57,432	E F
I-15 South of SR 79 (Temecula Parkway)	8	187,954	E	177,322	D
I-15 North of SR 79 (Temecula Parkway)	8	207,795	F	192,487	E
I-15 South of Rancho California Road Interchange	8	207,795	F	192,487	E
I-15 North of Rancho California Road Interchange	8	217,642	F	200,190	E
I-15 NB Off-Ramp at SR 79 (Temecula Parkway)	1	16,020	C or Better	14,332	C or Better
I-15 NB On-Ramp at SR 79 (Temecula Parkway)	1	15,446	C or Better	12,041	C or Better
I-15 SB Off-Ramp at SR 79 (Temecula Parkway)	1	29,555	C or Better	24,136	C or Better
I-15 SB On-Ramp at SR 79 (Temecula Parkway)	1	30,738	C or Better	29,274	C or Better
I-15 NB Off-Ramp at Rancho California Road	1	17,251	D	14,437	C or Better
I-15 NB On-Ramp at Rancho California Road	1	17,244	D	14,493	C or Better
I-15 SB Off-Ramp at Rancho California Road	1	19,000	E	18,711	E
I-15 SB On-Ramp at Rancho California Road	1	13,311	C or Better	12,080	C or Better

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2011

Segment	Lanes	Weekday		Weekend	
		Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
<i>N/A – Count Data Not Available</i>					
<i>*denotes locations where City of Temecula capacities were utilized at the request of City staff</i>					

Page 4.14-35, Table 4.14-11

Table 4.14-11

Intersection Levels of Service: Future Plus Project Conditions

Intersection	Control	Delay	LOS
1. Winchester Road at Nicolas Road (2)	Signalized	>120 <u>52.2</u>	F <u>D</u>
2. Winchester Road at Margarita Road (2)	Signalized	53.4	D
3. Winchester Road at Ynez Road (2)	Signalized	58.8	E
4. Winchester Road at I-15 NB Ramps (1)	Signalized	>120	F
5. Winchester Road at I-15 SB Ramps (1)	Signalized	45.4	D
6. Winchester Road at Jefferson Avenue (2)	Signalized	49.2	D
7. Rancho California Road at Ynez Road (2)	Signalized	>120	F
8. Rancho California Road at I-15 NB Ramps (1)	Signalized	36.3	D
9. Rancho California Road at I-15 SB Ramps (1)	Signalized	31.3	C
10. Rancho California Road at Jefferson Avenue (2)	Signalized	36.3	D
11. Temecula Parkway at Old Town Front Street (2)	Signalized	44.4 <u>24.5</u>	D <u>C</u>
12. Temecula Parkway at I-15 SB Ramps (1)	Signalized	>120	F
13. Temecula Parkway at I-15 NB Ramps (1)	Signalized	51 <u>31.9</u>	D <u>C</u>
14. Temecula Parkway at Pechanga Parkway (2)	Signalized	28.5	C
15. Pechanga Parkway at Anza Road (2)	Signalized	30.6	C
16. Margarita Road at La Serena Way (2)	Signalized	20.5	C
17. Margarita Road at Rancho California Road (2)	Signalized	73.6 <u>55.6</u>	E
18. Margarita Road at Rancho Vista Road (2)	Signalized	60.9	E
19. Margarita Road at Pauba Road (2)	Signalized	78.7 <u>67.5</u>	E
20. Margarita Road at De Portola Road (2)	Signalized	44.3	D
21. Margarita Road at Temecula Parkway (2)	Signalized	39.3	D
22. Meadows Parkway at La Serena Way (2)	Signalized	9.6	A
23. Meadows Parkway at Rancho California Road (2)	Signalized	40.7 <u>37.8</u>	D
24. Meadows Parkway at Rancho Vista Road (2)	Signalized	22.8	C
25. Meadows Parkway at Pauba Road (2)	Signalized	43.0	D
26. Meadows Parkway at De Portola Road (2)	Signalized	22.1	C
27. Meadows Parkway at Temecula Parkway (2)	Signalized	53.4 <u>50.2</u>	D
28. Butterfield Stage Road at La Serena Way (2)	SSSC	>120	F
29. Butterfield Stage Road at Rancho California Road (2)	Signalized	>120 <u>99.9</u>	F
30. Butterfield Stage at Rancho Vista Road (2)	SSSC	>120	F
31. Butterfield Stage Road at Pauba Road (2)	Signalized	67.2 <u>30.1</u>	E <u>C</u>
32. Butterfield Stage Road at De Portola Road (2)	Signalized	33.2 <u>34.1</u>	C
33. Butterfield Stage Road at Temecula Parkway (2)	Signalized	>120 <u>79.5</u>	F <u>E</u>
34. La Serena Way at Rancho California Road	SSSC	>120	F
35. Calle Contento at Rancho California Road	SSSC	>120	F
36. Calle Contento at Madera de Playa	SSSC	14.1	B
37. Calle Contento at Pauba Road	SSSC	14.2	B
38. Calle Contento at De Portola Road	SSSC	17.4	C

39. Anza Road at Borel Road (future)	AWS	39.4	E
40. Anza Road at Buck Road (future)	AWS	72.2	F
41. Anza Road at Rancho California Road*	AWS	>120	F
42. Anza Road at Madera de Playa	SSSC	>120	F
43. Anza Road at Pauba Road	AWS	>120	F
44. Anza Road at De Portola Road	AWS	>120	F
45. Anza Road at Temecula Parkway	Signalized	>120	F
46. Rancho California Road at Camino del Vino	SSSC	31.6	D
47. Rancho California Road at Buck Road (future)	AWS	18.4	C
48. Rancho California Road at Glen Oaks Road	AWS	14.8	B
49. Rancho California Road at Monte De Oro	SSSC	>120	F
50. Los Caballos Road at Temecula Parkway	SSSC	>120	F
51. Camino del Vino at Glen Oaks Road	SSSC	32.2	D
52. Camino del Vino at Monte De Oro	SSSC	36.0	E
53. De Portola Road at Benton Road	SSSC	9.9	A
54. De Portola Road at Glen Oaks Road	SSSC	18.9	C
55. De Portola Road at Via De Oro	SSSC	13.1	B
56. De Portola Road at Monte De Oro	SSSC	16.6	C
57. De Portola Road at Camino del Vino	SSSC	12.2	B
58. De Portola Road at Pauba Road	SSSC	>120	F
59. Pauba Road at Los Caballos Road	SSSC	11.7	B
60. Pauba Road at Temecula Parkway	SSSC	59.4	F

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2011

AWS – All Way Stop, SSSC – Side Street Stop Control

* Intersection evaluated using the TRAFFIX software as Synchro cannot evaluate stop-controlled intersections with more than two lanes on any one approach.

Shaded cells indicate unacceptable operations.

Page 4.14-22, Table 4.14-6

Table 4.14-6

Impact Analysis Results – Roadway Segments

Segment	GP with Project LOS	GP Traffic Volume	Project Traffic Volume	Change in Volume
<i>Weekday</i>				
I-15 South of SR 79 (Temecula Valley Parkway)	E	192,212	187,954	-4,258
I-15 North of SR 79 (Temecula Valley Parkway)	F	213,434	207,795	-5,639
I-15 South of Rancho California Road Interchange	F	213,434	207,795	-5,639
I-15 North of Rancho California Road Interchange	F	223,344	217,642	-5,702
I-15 NB Off-Ramp at Rancho California Road	D	19,555	17,251	-2,304
I-15 NB On-Ramp at Rancho California Road	D	17,970	17,244	-726
I-15 SB Off-Ramp at Rancho California Road	E	20,354	19,000	-1,354
<i>Weekend</i>				
Rancho California Road West of Anza Road	F E	21,852	18,248	-3,604
Rancho California Road East of Anza Road	D	19,141	17,013	-2,128
Anza Road South of Rancho California Road	D	36,050	27,672	-8,378
Temecula Parkway E/O Butterfield Stage (Feb)	F	<u>65,847</u>	<u>57,416</u>	<u>-8,431</u>
Temecula Parkway E/O Butterfield Stage (Oct)	F	<u>65,863</u>	<u>57,432</u>	<u>-8,431</u>
I-15 South of SR 79 (Temecula Valley Parkway)	D	185,484	177,322	-8,162
I-15 North of SR 79 (Temecula Valley Parkway)	E	199,359	192,487	-6,872
I-15 South of Rancho California Road Interchange	E	199,359	192,487	-6,872
I-15 North of Rancho California Road Interchange	E	208,758	200,190	-8,568
I-15 SB Off-Ramp at Rancho California Road	E	18,711	18,711	0
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2011				

Page 4.14-23, Table 4.14-7

Table 4.14-7

Impact Analysis Results – Intersections

Intersection	GP with Project LOS	GP Traffic Delay	Project Traffic Delay	Change in Delay
1. Winchester Road at Nicolas Road	F	>120	>120	N/A
3. Winchester Road at Ynez Road	E	66.4	58.8	-7.6
4. Winchester Road at I-15 NB Ramps	F	>120	>120	N/A
7. Rancho California Road at Ynez Road	F	>120	>120	N/A
12. Temecula Parkway at I-15 SB Ramps	F	105.0	>120	N/A
17. Margarita Road at Rancho California Road	E	87.7 55.6	73.6 66.9	-14.1 -11.3
18. Margarita Road at Rancho Vista Road	E	86.7	60.9	-25.8
19. Margarita Road at Pauba Road	E	104.7 67.5	78.7 88.2	-26 -20.7
28. Butterfield Stage Road at La Serena Way	F	>120	>120	N/A
29. Butterfield Stage Road at Rancho California Road	F	>120 99.9	>120	N/A
30. Butterfield Stage at Rancho Vista Road	F	>120	>120	N/A
31. Butterfield Stage Road at Pauba Road	E	97.8	67.2	-30.6
33. Butterfield Stage Road at Temecula Parkway	F E	>120 79.5	>120	N/A
34. La Serena Way at Rancho California Road	F	23.5	>120	N/A
35. Calle Contento at Rancho California Road	F	11.0	>120	N/A
39. Anza Road at Borel Road (future)	E	11.5	39.4	+27.9
40. Anza Road at Buck Road (future)	F	13.6	72.2	+58.6
41. Anza Road at Rancho California Road	F	48.7	>120	N/A
42. Anza Road at Madera de Playa	F	>120	>120	N/A
43. Anza Road at Pauba Road	F	16.7	>120	N/A
44. Anza Road at De Portola Road	F	7.7	>120	N/A
45. Anza Road at Temecula Parkway	F	>120	>120	N/A
46. Rancho California Road at Camino del Vino	D	>120	31.6	N/A
49. Rancho California Road at Monte De Oro	F	12.4	>120	N/A
50. Los Caballos Road at Temecula Parkway	F	36.6	>120	N/A
51. Camino del Vino at Glen Oaks Road	D	11.1	32.2	+21.1
52. Camino del Vino at Monte De Oro	E	6.9	36.0	+29.1
58. De Portola Road at Pauba Road	F	40.4	>120	N/A
60. Pauba Road at Temecula Parkway	F	20.8	59.4	38.6
"Delay" is in seconds, as a measure of intersection congestion. Source: Fehr & Peers, 2011 N/A – Change in delay not accurately measurable				

Page 4.14-40, Mitigation Measure TRF-3 (also applies to TIS Mitigation Measure 1)

TRF-3 The County shall implement a Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Program or other funding mechanism 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.

Although participation in these Programs would reduce the impacts to most locations to a less than significant level, some measures are considered infeasible because they would either not meet rural character project objectives, the location of necessary improvement(s) would not be within the County’s jurisdictional control, there is uncertainty of funding and feasibility, or there are right-of-way constraints, and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. The specific locations, impact levels, identified improvements, and basis for those locations that would experience significant and unavoidable impacts, are described below.

The County shall work with the City of Temecula to ensure that the transition from the County’s lane configurations to the City’s planned lane configurations is provided in a safe and efficient manner.

Roadways

Impacts to the following roadways would be less than significant following implementation of the identified improvements:

- Anza Road south of Rancho California Road (widen from two to four lanes)

The following roadway segment improvements are also recommended; however, these were found to be potentially infeasible as discussed above in Impact 4.14-2, and therefore, impact levels would remain significant and unavoidable:

- Rancho California Road West of Anza (widen from two to four lanes); however, widening would be inconsistent with policy and plan direction for the Project.
- Rancho California Road East of Anza (widen from two to four lanes); however, widening would be inconsistent with policy and plan direction for the Project.

- I-15 from south of SR-79 to north of Rancho California Road (freeway expansion); however, remaining funding has not yet been identified and there is limited right-of-way in the corridor for freeway expansion.
- I-15 Freeway ramps to Rancho California (northbound on and off ramps/southbound off ramp); however, the remaining funding has not yet been identified and there is limited right-of-way in the corridor for ramp expansion.
- Under Scenario 4 (Existing Plus Project plus buildout of the General Plan outside the Project area), the Temecula Parkway east of Butterfield Stage Road roadway segment operates at LOS F, an unacceptable level. However, it should be noted that, for the segment to operate at an acceptable level under Scenario 4, it would need additional capacity beyond that of a six-lane (Principal Arterial) as well as mitigation measures outside the Project area.

Intersections

Impacts to the following intersections would be less than significant following implementation of the identified improvements:

- Winchester Road at Ynez Road (optimize cycle length and signal timing splits)
- ~~Temecula Parkway at I-15 Southbound Ramps (optimize cycle length and signal timing splits for LOS D, and add second southbound left and right turn lanes for LOS C)~~
- Margarita Road at Rancho Vista Road (~~add a second westbound through lane~~ optimize Adaptive Traffic Signal Timing program)
- Margarita Road at Pauba Road (~~add a second westbound through lane~~ a dedicated westbound right-turn lane would be needed at the intersection, providing one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane at the intersection)
- Margarita Road at Rancho California Road (optimizing the Adaptive Traffic Signal Timing Program).
- Butterfield Stage Road at La Serena Way (install a traffic signal)
- ~~Butterfield Stage Road at Rancho California Road (install a large roundabout, two to three lanes per approach with bypass right-turn lanes, or widen intersection)~~
- ~~Butterfield Stage Road at Rancho California Road (install a large roundabout, two to three lanes per approach with bypass right-turn lanes, or widen intersection)~~
- Butterfield Stage Road at Rancho California Road

The Project shall make a fair share contribution through the Project TIF toward design and construction of the intersection improvements described below:

- Northbound Approach - two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, one right-turn lane
- Southbound Approach - one left-turn lane, two through lanes, one right-turn lane
- Eastbound Approach - one left-turn lane, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane (with overlap right-turn phase)

- Westbound Approach - one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane

With these improvements, the intersection will operate at LOS C. The identified improvement would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

- Butterfield Stage Road at Rancho Vista Road (install traffic signal)
- Butterfield Stage Road at Pauba Road (optimize signal timings)
- Butterfield Stage Road at Temecula Parkway (re-stripe the southbound approach to include two left-turn lanes, add a westbound right-turn lane with overlap right-turn phase)
- La Serena Way at Rancho California Road (install a two-lane roundabout)
- Calle Contento at Rancho California Road (install a two-lane roundabout)
- Anza Road at Borel Road (future) (install a traffic signal)
- Anza Road at Buck Road (future) (install traffic signal)
- Anza Road at Rancho California Road (install a large roundabout with a minimum of two lanes on each approach)
- Anza Road at Madera de Playa (install a traffic signal and widen the intersection)
- Anza Road at Pauba Road (install a traffic signal and widen the intersection)
- Anza Road at De Portola Road (install a traffic signal and widen the intersection)
- Anza Road at Temecula Parkway (install a traffic signal and widen the intersection)
- Rancho California Road at Camino del Vino (install a traffic signal and add a southbound left-turn lane, or install a single-lane roundabout)
- Rancho California Road at Monte De Oro (install a two-lane roundabout)

The following intersection improvements are also recommended; however, these were found to be potentially infeasible as discussed above in Impact 4.14-2, and therefore, impact levels would remain significant and unavoidable:

- ~~Winchester Road at Nicolas Road (widen Winchester Road to an 8 lane facility; add a second southbound left turn lane; add a northbound and southbound dedicated right turn lane; and provide an overlap right turn phase for the northbound and westbound right turn movements); however, there is development on all four quadrants of this intersection which limits the ability to widen the roadway.~~
- **Rancho California Road at Ynez Road** (two left-turn lanes, three through lanes and a right-turn lane at the northbound approach; two left-turn lanes, three through lanes and dual right-turn lanes [with overlap right-turn phasing] at the southbound and westbound approaches; and three left-turn lanes, three through lanes and a right-turn lane [with overlap right-turn phasing] at the eastbound approach); however, there is development on all four quadrants of this intersection resulting in limited right-of-way, and the improvements would encroach onto the adjacent pond/park on the southwest quadrant.
- **Winchester Road at I-15 Northbound Ramps** (signal modifications to allow “free” westbound right-turn movement; and add a second dedicated northbound right-

- turn lane); however, the remaining funding outside of the TIF has not been guaranteed. In addition, this ramp is controlled by Caltrans and is in the City of Temecula; as such, the County cannot guarantee implementation of this improvement. It should be noted that the French Valley Parkway improvements, once fully designed and constructed, may further reduce volumes at this location (beyond that identified in this assessment), which would assist in reducing impacts at this location.
- **Winchester Road at Ynez Road.** This intersection operates at LOS E with the proposed Project, an unacceptable level. However, implementation of the Project will decrease delay at this intersection compared to the No Project condition. As such, based on the City of Temecula significance criteria described above, this impact is considered less-than-significant. The Project shall work with the City of Temecula to optimize cycle length and signal timing splits, and make a fair share contribution to revise the For the intersection to operate at an acceptable level, improvements to the Adaptive Traffic Signal Timing Program through the Project TIF would be required. With this improvement, the intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS D and the impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.
 - Margarita Road at Rancho California Road (add two left-turn lanes, two through lanes and a dedicated right-turn lane); however, this intersection is controlled by the City of Temecula and the County cannot guarantee implementation of this improvement.
 - Los Caballos Road at Temecula Parkway (install a traffic signal); however, given the rural nature of this area, this intersection will remain unsignalized in the future.
 - Camino del Vino at Glen Oaks Road (install a traffic signal); however, given the rural nature of this area, this intersection will remain unsignalized in the future.
 - Camino del Vino at Monte De Oro (install a traffic signal); however, given the rural nature of this area, this intersection will remain unsignalized in the future.
 - De Portola Road at Pauba Road (install a traffic signal); however, given the rural nature of this area, this intersection will remain unsignalized in the future.
 - Pauba Road at Temecula Parkway (install a traffic signal); however, given the rural nature of this area, this intersection will remain unsignalized in the future.

Page 4.14-44, Fifth Paragraph

“Infrastructure construction and maintenance impacts would be similar to those discussed under construction impacts. Installation of infrastructure associated with implementing projects would not result in an increase in hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses, since such features and uses would not be permitted in the Project area. Proposed roundabouts would be designed in accordance with current County road standards to ensure adequate sight distance, travel speeds and appropriate signage. Therefore, a less than significant impact is anticipated for infrastructure for implementing projects.”

Page 4.14-49, Last Paragraph

“Impacts associated with decreased performance of the circulation system and deficient levels of service on several roadway segments and intersections as noted above, have been identified as significant and unavoidable. These unavoidable impacts are due primarily either to intentionally “down-sizing” certain roadway segments to maintain the Project area’s rural nature (and therefore road widening is not feasible) or due to certain improvements being outside the jurisdiction of the County of Riverside (in Temecula, or in Caltrans jurisdiction, where the County cannot ensure the timeliness or nature of future improvements). Prior to certification of the EIR, the County of Riverside will need to adopt of Statement of Overriding Considerations regarding these impacts. All other impacts associated with Transportation and Circulation are considered less than significant following implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.”

CHAPTER 5.0, GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

Page 5.0-13, Fourth Paragraph

“In association with development of the Project, the Project will allow for various onsite and offsite infrastructure improvements that could remove impediments to growth and/or provide for additional capacity. The Project also results in direct job growth through increased employment opportunities as a result of the proposed update of the existing Southwest Area Plan (SWAP) and other elements of the General Plan. Due to its size, its incremental implementation, its impact on infrastructure, and the potential direct and indirect economic growth associated with it, the Project would be viewed as growth-inducing pursuant to CEQA.

Although the Project would reduce the anticipated number of residential units at buildout of the Project area (compared to the existing General Plan and zoning), this is not considered a significant impact relative to RHNA goals, as the County and Southwest Area Plan region are already housing rich, and the Project is not a desirable or planned location for low-income housing.”

CHAPTER 6.0, ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION

Note: Refer to Attachment D to this Comments and Responses document, which contains minor corrections to the Appendix I, Traffic Impact Study, including minor corrections to TIS Tables 8 and 9, which relate to the No Project Alternative.

Page 6.0-14, Fourth Paragraph under Reduced Density (25% Reduction) Alternative, Description of Alternative

This Alternative may accomplish some of the objectives enumerated for the Project to some extent. However, as discussed below, the Reduced Density Alternative does not meet most of the basic project objectives for the Project.

The Project Objectives are as follows:

1. To preserve and enhance viticulture potential, rural lifestyle and equestrian activities;
2. To continue to allow for an appropriate level of commercial tourist activities that are incidental to viticulture and equestrian operations;
3. To coordinate growth in a manner that avoids future land use conflicts; and
4. To ensure timely provision of appropriate public infrastructure and services that keeps up with anticipated growth.

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the future growth of the Project area would be reduced by 25% as compared to the Project. The Project has been analyzed by the County and discussed during public workshops and hearings that included input from the region's communities and stakeholders. The Project is considered an appropriate level for commercial tourist activities that would better enhance the region's economic viability by assisting in the funding of necessary infrastructure (water, waste-water, roadway improvements, etc.) to support the Plan area. The Plan area has pending development proposals and implementing projects will assist in achieving objectives within the Community Plan by being able to balance growth and allow an appropriate level of commercial tourist activities.

Both the Project and the Reduced Density Alternative would preserve and enhance the region's rural lifestyle (Objective 1) because the Project and Reduced Density Alternative would coordinate where, and under what circumstances, future growth should be accommodated (Objective 3). Both the Reduced Density Alternative and the Project enhances the region's viticulture potential and equestrian activities (Objective 1).

However, the level of commercial tourist activities envisioned under the current General Plan, by a consensus of stakeholders, and by the County Board of Supervisors, and the Project would not be reached through implementation of the Reduced Density Alternative. Therefore, the Reduced Density Alternative is rejected due to failure to meet most of the Project's basic objectives, specifically Objectives 2 and 4 above, as follows:

- * **Objective 2:** The Reduced Density Alternative allows for substantially less commercial tourist activity, such as wineries, special event centers, resorts and hotels. Considering the Project is already a substantial reduction in density compared to the existing General Plan and zoning (refer to the No Project Alternative discussion), the Reduced Density would threaten the economic viability of the winery and equestrian businesses by reducing the density and/or areas where commercial tourist uses are allowed. The Project represents a stakeholder, consensus driven process where commercial tourist density is balanced with proximity to and density of residential and equestrian uses.
- * **Objective 4:** The Reduced Density Alternative will make funding the necessary infrastructure more difficult, due to reduced density and revenue to fund relatively

fixed infrastructure costs (ie, reducing the Project area density by 25% will not result in reducing infrastructure requirements by 25%, as the wastewater pipelines and road improvements, for example, will still be required). The increased per parcel cost of infrastructure and potential delay or lack of required infrastructure will further threaten the viability of the wineries and equestrian businesses.”

CHAPTER 9.0, ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONSULTED

Page 9.0-1

Addition at the top of this section:

Note: Additional individuals and organizations were consulted informally, or participated through the County’s many workshops, Advisory Committee Meetings or the CEQA NOP consultation process.

Correction on this page:

“ . . . Mr. John Guerin, Principal Planner (ALUC), jguerin@rctlma.org
Ms. Mr. Olivia Barnes, Legislative Team Member (Supervisorial District 3)”

Page 9.0-3

“ . . . Mr. Jeff Stone, Third District Supervisor
Ms. Mr. Olivia Barnes, Legislative Assistant . . . ”

Page 9.0-4, Additional Organizations and Persons Consulted

Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians

Ms. Anna Hoover, Cultural Analyst

APPENDIX I, TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

Refer to Appendix C to this Comments and Responses document for revised TIS figures.

Paragraph 4 on TIS Page 31 has been modified to read as follows (added text identified with underlined type):

“Under this scenario, it was assumed that future improvements would also be made to intersection lane configurations and controls based on traffic demand and roadway segment improvements. For areas outside of the City, Fehr & Peers used the existing County General Plan roadway designations and standard drawings to determine the lane configurations for each study intersection. The Temecula General Plan was used for roadways within the City. Signalization was assumed for every intersection where both roads were rated as Secondary Highway or higher capacity. For Mountain Arterials, signalization was assumed

for intersections where stop-control was not viable given high traffic volumes at the intersections. Rancho California Road is assumed to become a Mountain Arterial with Roundabouts for the roadway segment assessment within the County.”

The second paragraph on under Impact Analysis on TIS Page 53 is revised as follow:

“Please note that the following mitigation measures are based on the Future With Project Condition (Scenario ~~3~~4) as it is the most appropriate condition for identifying impacts.”

APPENDIX E, INSERT

GHG Emissions Analysis: “Business As Usual”

“The CEC first adopted Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6) in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce energy consumption in the state. Although not originally intended to reduce GHG emissions, increased energy efficiency, and reduced consumption of electricity, natural gas, and other fuels would result in fewer GHG emissions from residential and nonresidential buildings subject to the standard. The standards are updated periodically to allow for the consideration and inclusion of new energy efficiency technologies and methods.

Part 11 of the Title 24 Building Standards Code is referred to as the CALGreen Code. The purpose of the CALGreen Code is to “improve public health, safety and general welfare by enhancing the design and construction of buildings through the use of building concepts having a positive environmental impact and encouraging sustainable construction practices in the following categories: (1) Planning and design; (2) Energy efficiency; (3) Water efficiency and conservation; (4) Material conservation and resource efficiency; and (5) Environmental air quality.” The CALGreen Code is not intended to substitute for or be identified as meeting the certification requirements of any green building program that is not established and adopted by the California Building Standards Commission (CBSC). Part 11 of the Title 24 Building Standards Code became effective on January 1, 2011. Unless otherwise noted in the regulation, all newly constructed buildings in California are subject to the requirements of the CALGreen Code. The CALGreen Code also contains optional measures that go beyond the basic requirements, referred to as Tier 1 and Tier 2.

In December 2009, the Natural Resources Agency adopted amendments to the CEQA Guidelines that requires Lead Agencies to assess the significance of a project’s greenhouse gas emissions. These amendments took effect in March 2010. The amendments did not adopt significance threshold levels but rather afforded Lead Agencies the discretion to establish an appropriate method, generally consistent with the existing CEQA Guidelines. Due to a lack of clear guidance in establishing a significance threshold for greenhouse gas emissions, some air quality management districts have suggested a method based on comparing a project’s greenhouse gas emissions under a BAU scenario and a scenario that incorporates emission reductions from implementation of project design features and mitigation measures. Projects

that demonstrate a reduction compared to the BAU scenario that is equivalent to the statewide goal for AB 32 would be considered less than significant for CEQA purposes. Based on the California Air Resources Board (CARB) AB 32 Climate Change Scoping Plan, the statewide goal for AB 32 is a 29 percent reduction from projected 2020 BAU emissions. In 2011, given the recent economic downturn, CARB revised its AB 32 goal to 16 percent from projected 2020 BAU emissions.

The use of this BAU threshold has been the subject of recent court cases. In 2011, the California Court of Appeals upheld the BAU method in *Citizens for Responsible Equitable Environmental Development (CREED) v. City of Chula Vista*. On May 31, 2012, the Superior Court for the County of Riverside in *Friends of the Northern San Jacinto Valley et al. v. County of Riverside* did not conclude that the BAU method was per se unlawful, but it did conclude that the EIR in question improperly used a “worst case” scenario in which to compare the project’s GHG emissions. The Court reasoned that the use of a “hypothetical ‘BAU’” that is not tied to existing conditions or reasonably likely conditions could only mislead the public and decision-makers and therefore run afoul of CEQA.

The analysis of GHG impacts that would result from the proposed Project includes significance determination based on comparison to a BAU scenario that is minimally compliant with Title 24 standards. The most current version was released in 2010. The BAU scenario used for this analysis entails the operation of implementing projects that achieve only the minimum standards in place before AB 32 and other related legislation adopted in an effort to reduce the state’s GHG emissions. In 2006, the year in which AB 32 was passed, the Year 2005 version of the Title 24 standard was in effect. CARB, which has primarily responsibility for implementing AB 32, established the state’s BAU emissions inventory based on the Title 24 standards in effect at the time, namely the Year 2005 version.. Standards that have been put into practice since then, such as the Pavley vehicle emission standards (Phase I) and the CALGreen Code, were not included in this BAU scenario. As such, the GHG emissions under the BAU scenario for the proposed Project were modeled based on building compliance with the Title 24 (2005) standards and excluding the CALGreen Code, and vehicle emissions without the Pavley vehicle emission standards (Phase I).

In order to ensure that the BAU analysis conforms to reasonably likely conditions, the size of the BAU project was modeled with the same square footage as the Project scenario. The typical residential implementing project was assumed to be a rural single family home with 1,800 square feet. As shown in Table 4.7-4, a typical commercial implementing project was assumed to be a large winery, modeled with the CalEEMod land use designation of “Industrial – Refrigerated Warehouse,” with 65,300 square feet. Electricity emissions for the residential land use were obtained from CalEEMod outputs, while those for wineries were calculate based on Southern California Edison Electricity Usage Reports. Waste and natural gas emissions were obtained from CalEEMod outputs. GHG emissions from the winery include those produced by wine fermentation, which were calculated using SBAPCD Methodology and Wine Fermentation Calculator, as well as vegetation sequestration and land use change, which were derived based on the CalEEMod User’s Guide and the IPCC protocol for vegetation. Details of the

assumptions used and results of GHG emissions calculations for the BAU scenario can be found in Appendix E of the EIR.”

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

CHAPTER 4.0, ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Page 4.0-4, Paragraphs Three through Five

“The cumulative impacts analyses contained in this Draft EIR uses a “blended approach” to ensure adequate analysis. Relative to the “list method”, Table 4.0-1, Cumulative Projects, provides a list of known development projects within the Project area. *This list of projects has been used to provide general context for overall cumulative conditions*, noting that the actual density, timing and nature of these projects is uncertain given the long build-out timeframe for the Project. Also, refer to Exhibit 4.0-1, Active Planning Cases, which shows the location of the land development projects listed in Table 4.0-1, Cumulative Projects.

The types of cases being reviewed include: Conditional Use Permits, General Plan Amendments, Parcel Maps, Plot Plans, and Tentative Tract Maps. These pending planning cases are in various stages of the process ranging from the initial submittal of applications to projects that have been tentatively approved and are awaiting final approval by County staff. Some of these proposed developments may conflict with the proposed Project and would require special consideration, especially if these conflicts generate impacts to surrounding uses.

The list of projects (shown both in table and exhibit form) are therefore intended to provide visual context of the overall near-term development potential. On a practical basis, the EIR utilizes RIVTAM traffic modeling based on the specific land use scenarios noted in Section 4.14, Traffic and Circulation and as explained further in Appendix J, Land Use Buildout Analysis. This quantitative analysis was then used as the basis for quantitative analysis of potential air quality, greenhouse gas and noise impacts. In addition, as appropriate, each impact section provides further refinement as to the cumulative impact methodology specific to the affected resource and/or geographic area. In some cases, such as biological resources, the cumulative analysis is addressed substantially through a separate planning process (the County’s Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan). In other cases, the cumulative impacts are being addressed primarily by agencies with jurisdiction over the affected resource(s), such as the Regional Water Quality Control Board and Rancho California Water District’s extensive efforts to address, regulate and mitigate impacts to groundwater quality. Where appropriate, the County has incorporated Project Design Features and/or mitigation measures to support and address the efforts being made by other agencies.

Relative to the “adopted plan” method, the Project area encompasses two Policy Areas intended to promote agricultural and equestrian uses within Southwest Area Plan (SWAP) of the County General Plan. The Citrus Vineyard Policy Area encompasses a majority of the agricultural uses within the Project area, and the Valle de los Caballos Policy Area supports an area characterized

by equestrian, rural residential, and agricultural activities. The Project area also encompasses adjacent unincorporated areas with similar characteristics. The Project does not result in a substantive change in overall density or nature compared to what is allowed as part of the General Plan SWAP. In fact, implementation of the Project would result in a reduction in overall density and intensity. Accordingly, the Project's overall density and nature of development would be consistent with regional growth projections reflected in the Riverside County General Plan and those of applicable regional, State and Federal agencies. *Therefore, on both a local and regional level, the Project's cumulative impacts have been accounted for in the Riverside County General Plan EIR No. 441, as well as in the various population-dependent regional plans adopted by such agencies as the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD)."*

Aesthetics (page 4.1-20)

Cumulative impacts to aesthetics, light, and glare are addressed in the Riverside County General Plan Final EIR No. 441, which is incorporated by reference into this EIR. Implementing projects allowed under the Project have the potential to affect the aesthetic value of the area and increase the amount of additional light and glare in the region. However, the incremental amount of light and glare from the implementing projects would be limited and would make a minimal contribution to the cumulative impact in the region due to existing regulatory programs, including General Plan policies, County ordinances, and standard conditions or requirements currently in place. The Project has incorporated various Project Design Features specifically intended to maintain and protect the rural Wine Country character, including limitations on the location, nature and allowed density of the implementing project, and requirements for all future implementing projects to adhere to the proposed Temecula Valley Wine Country Design Guidelines. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of the Project. As previously noted, there are approximately 60 pending applications within the Wine Country, each of which will require consistency determinations. These pending planning cases are in various stages of the process ranging from the initial submittal of applications to projects that have been tentatively approved and are awaiting final approval by County staff. Some of these proposed developments may conflict with the proposed Project and would require special consideration related to aesthetic, light or glare impacts, especially if these conflicts generate impacts to surrounding uses. These projects are proceeding separately from the proposed Project, and are therefore subject to their own discretionary review and CEQA compliance process. Therefore, cumulatively impacts related to aesthetics, light or glare are not considered significant.

Agricultural Resources (page 4.2-21)

Cumulative impacts to agricultural resources are addressed in the Riverside County General Plan Final EIR No. 441, which is incorporated by reference into this EIR. The Project is not anticipated to result in greater cumulative agricultural resource impacts than addressed in this EIR.

The geographic setting for this cumulative impacts analysis is Riverside County. The analysis utilizes the County of Riverside General Plan, the most-current Riverside County Agricultural Production Report (2010), and the California Department of Conservation FMMP 2008 Field Report for western Riverside County. The analysis considers the significance of the contribution of the Project to cumulative regional impacts on County agricultural land and agricultural production resulting from the conversion of farmland to urban uses. Conversion of agricultural land to urban uses is an ongoing public policy issue in California. Data from the California Department of Conservation indicate that during the 12 biennial reporting cycles since the FMMP was established (1984-2008), more than 1.3 million acres of agricultural land have been converted to non-agricultural purposes.²³ The majority of the State’s agricultural land is located in the Central Valley, which is comprised of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys.

The rate of farmland conversion depends largely on population growth; California’s population increased by 75% between 1970 and 2002. For the year 2050, the California Department of Finance projects a total State population increase that is 56 percent higher than in 2002. The County of Riverside’s population has grown by 359% since 1970. However, in spite of the incredible population growth experienced in the County and the pressures that places on agricultural land uses, the County has seen an accelerating growth in the value of its agricultural production, though certain segments of the industry have seen substantial net declines. For example, in 1995, the County ranked 7th among California counties in terms of agricultural production. In 2009, the County dropped in rankings to 13th.

The Riverside County Agricultural Commissioner’s Office, in its Agricultural Production Report estimates the number of acres of Riverside County land involved in cultivated crop production in 2010 at 201,100, down 22,700 acres from 2005’s total. According to State-mapped Farmland data for Riverside County, 128,510 acres of farmland in the County are designated as “Prime”, 37,950 acres are designated “Unique”, and 46,920 acres are designated “Farmland of Statewide Importance”. The Project site contains “Prime”, “Unique Farmland”, and “Farmland of Statewide Importance” by the State Department of Conservation. The Project site is located within a growing sub-region of the County and has experienced urban development within its vicinity. Accordingly, the Project is designed to preserve and enhance the Temecula Valley Wine Country region’s viticulture potential, while coordinating growth to reduce conflicts between agricultural and other uses.

The conversion of farmland in western Riverside County, and in the Temecula Valley in particular, may have an adverse cumulative effect on the County’s agricultural economy. However, the intent of the Project is to encourage the preservation and expansion of land designated within the Agriculture Foundation Component. While the proposed zoning and policies would increase the acreage of designated Agricultural land uses, it is possible that implementing project sites could be located on Prime Farmland (or another designation

²³ State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, 2006-2008 California Farmland Conversion Report 2006-2008, pg. 19. (January 2011).
http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/pubs/2006-2008/Documents/FCR_0608_final.pdf, accessed on July 13, 2011. pg. 19.

indicating agricultural suitability) and would allow development consistent with proposed Policy SWAP 1.2 which allows up to 25 percent of a subject site to be developed with winery and associated facilities (e.g., delicatessens, tasting rooms, special event facilities, etc.). Additionally, under the Project active agricultural land would be allowed to convert 25 percent of its land to non-agricultural uses. However this conversion is not anticipated to result in greater cumulative agricultural resource impacts than addressed in the Riverside County and City of Temecula General Plan EIRs. As a result cumulative impacts are considered less than significant. This Project site's impact on farmland would not be considered cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

Air Quality (page 4.3-44)

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

Even with compliance with existing regulations and policies, and implementation of mitigation measures, the Project would result in potentially significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts.

Biological Resources (page 4.4-21)

Cumulative impacts to biological resources are addressed in both the Riverside County General Plan Final EIR and the City of Temecula's General Plan Final EIR, which are both incorporated by reference into this EIR. A significant component of any MSHCP and, in particular the Western Riverside County MSHCP, is the recognition and advanced planning to cover potential cumulative impacts on sensitive habitats and covered species. Since implementing projects that would occur within the Project area will be in compliance with the Project policies, zoning, and guidelines and would comply with the MSHCP, cumulative impacts associated with the Project would be considered less than significant.

Cultural Resources (page 4.5-32)

While future implementing projects facilitated by the Project within the Project area boundaries would likely involve grading, tilling, subsurface excavation, and other ground-disturbing activities that could uncover paleontological resources, it is expected that existing applicable federal, State, and local laws and regulations protecting paleontological resources would be complied with and that appropriate studies would be conducted and mitigation measures implemented on a project-by-project basis to ensure that significant resources, if encountered, would be preserved through avoidance or preservation in an appropriate repository or by other

measures deemed appropriate. Accordingly, implementing projects facilitated by the proposed Project are not anticipated to result in potential cumulative impacts to paleontological resources within the region.

Geology, Soils and Seismicity (page 4.6-30)

Cumulative impacts to geology, soils, and seismicity are addressed in the Riverside County General Plan Final EIR No. 441, which is incorporated by reference into this EIR. Geologic hazards are generally localized in nature, as they are related to the soils and geologic character of a particular site. Cumulative impacts could occur related to an earthquake, depending on the magnitude of the earthquake and location of the fault(s) traversing the region. Impacts due to seismic activity would be cumulative if State and local building and development codes and regulations were not actively being implemented throughout the region.

The Project is not anticipated to result in the exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects from the rupture of a known earthquake fault or unstable soils, or soils that would become unstable as a result of the Project and potentially result in onsite or offsite landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. All implementing projects within the Project area, as well as all future development within surrounding areas, would be subject to applicable State and local building codes, ordinances, and policies, and site-specific design measures intended to reduce the potential for significant damage to occur as the result of seismic activity, landslides, and other such geologic hazards.

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

Greenhouse Gas Emissions (page 4.7-36)

In order to ensure consistency with the General Plan and SWAP goals, the County has developed the Temecula Valley Wine Country Greenhouse Gas Reduction Workbook (refer to Appendix E of this Draft EIR) to provide guidance and streamline CEQA review for implementing projects within the Project Area. This document serves to implement the GHG reduction policies and objectives of Riverside County. There are also regional and State plans, described above, including proposed AB 32 scoping plan, SCAG SB 375 targets and the State's regulatory framework.

Achieving the statewide AB 32 target of 28.5 percent is not required for individual projects to demonstrate consistency or the lack of a significant impact, as this target is statewide, and the majority of GHG emissions are generated from industrial sources (such as electrical generating plants) and mobile vehicle emissions, both of which are regulated by other state and federal agencies and are outside the control of the County of Riverside.

Executive Order S-3-05 includes a long-term goal of 80 percent GHG reduction by 2050, although the mechanisms for achieving this target have not been identified, and therefore, achievement of this goal is outside the control of the County of Riverside.

On September 23, 2010, CARB adopted Resolution 10-31, establishing SB 37524 regional targets for all MPOs in California. The SB 375 target set for SCAG is a 13 percent reduction in GHG emissions from automobiles and light duty truck exhausts by 2035 (compared to SCAG's recommended target of 8 percent). As discussed above relative to AB 32 consistency, the Project implements reasonable and feasible measures to reduce GHG from stationary, mobile and indirect sources. The SB 375 targets, although they do not have binding regulatory effects upon the Project at this time, provide further context along with AB 32 targets noted above, relative to the Project's GHG impact.

No single project would in fact hinder the ability of the State of California to achieve its desired GHG goals reflected in AB32 and SB375, considering that residential/commercial sources represent a small percentage of State, national and global GHG, with the vast majority of development-related emissions (such as energy consumption and transportation fuels) regulated by CARB, EPA, SCAQMD and agencies other than local municipalities such as the County of Riverside.²⁵ One of the largest sources of global GHG, other than fossil fuel burning (from power plants and industrial sources) and transportation emissions, is deforestation, as this removes important "carbon sinks" from Earth's surface, resulting in greater CO₂ retained in the atmosphere. In this regard, the U.S. is a global leader in maintaining and creating carbon sequestering forests.²⁶ With particular respect to the Project, the site has no "forest lands" and minimal carbon sequestering value, and this would be replaced with a large-lot rural landscape complete with extensive array of carbon sequestering trees throughout the estimated Project area.

With implementation of Project Design Features and mitigation measures the Project would be consistent with and not conflict with the statewide goals of AB 32 and regional targets under

²⁴ Senate Bill 375 (SB 375, Steinberg, Statutes of 2008) enhances California's ability to reach its AB 32 goals by promoting good planning with the goal of more sustainable communities. SB 375 requires CARB to develop regional greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for passenger vehicles. CARB is to establish targets for 2020 and 2035 for each region covered by one of the State's 18 metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs). Each of California's MPOs then prepare a "sustainable communities strategy (SCS)" that demonstrates how the region will meet its greenhouse gas reduction target through integrated land use, housing and transportation planning. Once adopted by the MPO, the SCS will be incorporated into that region's federally enforceable regional transportation plan (RTP). CARB is also required to review each final SCS to determine whether it would, if implemented, achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction target for its region. If the combination of measures in the SCS will not meet the region's target, the MPO must prepare a separate "alternative planning strategy (APS)" to meet the target. The APS is not a part of the RTP. SB 375 also establishes incentives to encourage implementation of the SCS and APS. Developers can get relief from certain environmental review requirements under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) if their new projects are consistent with a region's SCS (or APS) that meets the target (see Cal. Public Resources Code §§ 21155, 21155.1, 21155.2, 21159.28.).

²⁵ <http://climatechangeffects.info/> (accessed December 21, 2010).

²⁶ http://www.appinsys.com/GlobalWarming/GW_5GH_CO2Sources.htm (accessed December 21, 2010).

SB375. However, because measures implementing AB 32 and the SB 375 require further action by other state and federal agencies and implementation and effectiveness is not assured, as well as the continuing effects of past human-induced GHG emissions, the Project's incremental contribution to climate change would remain potentially significant and unavoidable.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials (page 4.8-22)

Cumulative impacts to hazards and hazardous materials are addressed in both the Riverside County General Plan Final EIR No. 441 and the City of Temecula's General Plan Final EIR, which are both incorporated by reference into this EIR. Hazards impacts generally occur on a project-by-project basis rather than on a cumulative level. In the case of the Project, hazards within the Project area would be addressed in accordance with their respective applicable regulations, laws, programs, and policies. Based on these existing regulations and guidance, some hazardous conditions cannot be adequately mitigated. To further reduce impacts, implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-4 are required, which reduces impacts associated with Hazards and Hazardous Materials to a less than significant level. As a result, the Project would not be expected to contribute to any new cumulative adverse impacts as a result of implementation of the Project. Cumulative impacts associated with area buildout have also been addressed in the County of Riverside General Plan EIR No. 441 and City of Temecula General Plan EIR, which are incorporated into this EIR by reference.

Hydrology and Water Quality (page 4.9-33)

Cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality are addressed in the Riverside County General Plan Final EIR No. 441, which is incorporated by reference into this EIR. The Project would not directly result in degradation of surface water quality, groundwater, drainage or erosion, or flooding impacts. Compliance with Federal, State, and local requirements on a project-by-project basis would reduce cumulative impacts to a less than significant level at the time of a implementing project is developed. In addition, as discussed above, cumulative impacts to surface water resources are also regulated and mitigated by regional plans, permits and programs managed by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers."

Land Use and Relevant Planning (page 4.10-34)

Cumulative impacts to land use are addressed in both the Riverside County General Plan Final EIR No. 441 and the City of Temecula's General Plan Final EIR, which are both incorporated by reference into this EIR. The proposed Project would not result in any adverse cumulative impacts to land use and planning within the Project area. Under current conditions, the Citrus/Vineyard Policy Area and Valle de los Caballos Policy Area plans are not guiding development in the manner that the County or its residents envision. The Project would help to guide development in a way that preserves the existing land uses and rural feel while allowing for growth consistent with the established vision. The land use Districts proposed in the Project includes Winery, Residential, and Equestrian. These are special Districts that were placed over the Temecula Valley Wine Country Area to guide development to meet the goals of the Project:

to increase viticulture potential; protect rural lifestyle and equestrian activities; allow appropriate levels of commercial tourist activities; and so that future growth is coordinated to avoid land use conflicts and provide appropriate levels of public facilities, services, and infrastructure.

Project implementation would nonetheless increase development in the future; however, it would de-intensify the land uses currently permitted under the General Plan, SWAP, Citrus/Vineyard Policy Area and Valle de los Caballos Policy Area. The analysis presented above indicates that future implementing projects consistent with the Project would have less than significant impacts on land use-related environmental issues including physical division of an established community, consistency with land use plans, policies and regulations adopted to avoid or mitigate environmental effects, and conflicts with habitat conservation plans. In this regard, cumulative impacts associated with land use are considered less than significant.

All future implementing projects under the existing County General Plan and projects located outside of the Plan boundary within the adjacent Cities of Temecula and Murrieta and adjacent County of Riverside land would also be required to mitigate land use impacts on a project-by-project basis. Therefore the incremental impact of the proposed Project, when considered in combination with development within the subregion and within the Project area (i.e., implementing projects), is not anticipated to result in cumulatively considerable land use impacts. If future implementing projects are consistent with the proposed Project (including the proposed General Plan Amendment, Zoning Ordinance Amendment and revised design guidelines), their cumulative impacts would be consistent with the Project-related land use impacts identified in this Draft EIR Section and would thus be less than significant. In addition, the land use changes anticipated under the proposed Project would comply with the growth projections, goals, and vision identified by SCAG; thus significant Project-related cumulative land use impacts are not anticipated.

Further, projects within the SCAG region that are regionally significant, as determined by SCAG, would be reviewed for conformity with regional goals for population, housing, employment, mobility and air quality, further reducing potential cumulative impacts to a less than significant level. As noted in Section 4.0, there are approximately 60 development cases in various stages of review or approval with the County. Some of these development proposals may proceed independently from the Project (if approved prior to the Project being approved), in which case they could create land use conflict with existing for future WCCP properties. However, each development application is reviewed for land use compatibility as part of the County's development review process, which also evaluates consistency with the General Plan, zoning and applicable regulations. These existing applications are not "proposed" as part of the Project, but were taken into consideration by County staff when developing the land use buildout projections shown in Appendix J."

Mineral Resources (page 4.11-8)

Cumulative impacts to mineral resources are addressed in the Riverside County General Plan Final EIR No. 441, which is incorporated by reference into this EIR. Cumulative impacts are two or more individual impacts that, when considered together, are considerable or that compound or increase other environmental impacts. The geographic scope for cumulative impacts to mineral resources includes all of Riverside County, and the broader Southern California area, since mineral resource extraction sites from throughout Southern California supply the Riverside County area.²⁷ This geographic scope of analysis is appropriate because the loss of availability of mineral resources anywhere in the County would combine with potential mineral resource impacts of the Project to result in a cumulative impact on County-wide mineral resources.

Cumulative impacts to mineral resources are addressed in the Riverside County General Plan Final EIR, which is incorporated by reference into this EIR. The Project is not anticipated to result in greater cumulative mineral resource impacts than addressed in this EIR.

Availability of mineral resources, on a regional level, is a serious issue facing Southern California. Although much of Southern California has lands capable or designated for mineral resource production, the region has insufficient permitted mineral resource areas to meet the region's projected demand (see footnote above). The Project does not have a "cumulatively considerable" significant incremental effect on this regional impact, relative to the potential impacts on the limited MRZ-3 and Unstudied lands within the Project area. As stated above, there are no known mineral resources in the Project area, the Project does not include any designated mineral extraction sites, and the County offers extensive availability of potential aggregate resources. Compliance with existing regulatory requirements and General Plan policies, along with Project Design Features and recommended mitigation measures, will reduce the Project's share of cumulative impacts to less than significant levels. Cumulative impacts to mineral resources are most effectively addressed at the State and County level through the State programs and General Plan policies noted above.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measure MIN-1, above.

Noise (page 4.12-46)

Cumulative Short-Term Construction Impacts

Cumulative impacts regarding noise are addressed in both the Riverside County General Plan Final EIR No. 441 and the City of Temecula's General Plan Final EIR, which are both incorporated by reference into this EIR. Construction activity would occur throughout the Project area, concurrently with other construction throughout the region. Short-term construction noise is a localized activity and would affect only land uses that are immediately

²⁷ California Geological Survey Map Sheet 52 notes that the Temescal Valley - Orange County "...has only 32 percent of the permitted reserves needed for the next 50 years" (*Liberty Quarry Draft EIR*, July 2009, page 1-2, accessed on September 6, 2011 at http://www.rctlma.org/planning/content/temp/liberty_quarry/feir).

adjacent to a specific project site. With implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1, NOI-2, and NOI-7, construction-related noise impacts associated with future implementing projects facilitated under the Project would be reduced to less than significant levels. It is likely that other construction projects would also have to comply with the local noise ordinance, as well as mitigation measures that may be prescribed pursuant to CEQA provisions that require significant impacts to be reduced to the extent feasible. In addition, it is unlikely that all construction projects would occur simultaneously within the City. Thus, a less than significant impact would occur.

Cumulative Long-Term Operational Impacts - Mobile Sources

Buildout of the Project would result in potential cumulative noise level increases along major roadways. Each of these noise impacts would be dealt with separately when new noise-sensitive or noise-generating implementing projects are proposed. Project implementation would result in significant cumulative noise impacts that could not be mitigated with the implementation of the proposed policies and mitigation measures. Thus, the Project would substantially contribute to cumulative mobile source noise impacts.

Cumulative Long-Term Operational Impacts - Stationary Sources

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

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-7, above.

Public Services and Utilities (page 4.13-39)

Cumulative impacts to public services, recreation and utilities are addressed in both the Riverside County General Plan Final EIR No. 441 and the City of Temecula's General Plan Final EIR, which are both incorporated by reference into this EIR. As discussed above, the Project may, in combination with existing conditions and other future implementing projects, result in unavoidable significant cumulative impacts in the areas of:

- Fire protection services
- Library services

The Project has incorporated various Project Design Features to avoid or reduce these potential impacts, which are best addressed at a regional level through the County’s General Plan and development review process.

Traffic and Circulation (page 4.14-49)

Cumulative impacts to traffic and circulation are addressed in both the Riverside County General Plan Final EIR No. 441 and the City of Temecula’s General Plan Final EIR, which are both incorporated by reference into this EIR. As discussed above, the Project may, in combination with existing conditions and other future implementing projects, result in potentially unavoidable significant cumulative impacts in the areas of:

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

The Project has incorporated various Project Design Features to avoid or reduce these potential impacts, which are best addressed at a regional level through the County’s General Plan and development review process. The Project’s traffic analysis above compares General Plan buildout under the “Project” and “No Project” scenarios, both of which show unavoidable significant impacts. The Project’s impacts, although significant and unavoidable relative to existing conditions, represent less traffic and fewer associated impacts when compared to the current General Plan and policy areas.