

Comment Letter No. 8

7:13 AM 1/17/2012 7:13 AM

---

**From:** Guerin, John  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 12, 2012 5:54 PM  
**To:** Mehta-Cooper, Mitra; Nanthavongdouangsy, Phayvanh; Lee, Josh  
**Cc:** Cooper, Ed; Thielman-Braun, Cindy; Coyle, Frank; Lind, Katherine; Huff, David  
**Subject:** General Plan Amendment No. 1077 and EIR No. 524/Ordinance No. 348.4729

Thank you for your transmittal of the Notice of Availability of Draft EIR No. 524 for the Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan. ALUC staff has reviewed the proposed boundaries and hereby advises that the area located within the Community Plan boundaries lies entirely outside Airport Influence Areas. Therefore, the associated general plan amendment is not subject to ALUC review. } 8.1

While there are no public-use airports within the area in question, there may be private-use airports in the area, and I believe that there is at least one proposed or approved private heliport in the area. } 8.2

With regard to the proposed Ordinance No. 348.4729, it appears to be the intent of the County that these zones would only be applied within the boundaries of the Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan. However, a quick review of the ordinance does not reveal such a limitation (e.g., "shall only be applied within"). Would it be possible to include such a statement in the ordinance itself (perhaps in the "Intent" section)? If such a statement were included therein, we could indicate that the ordinance amendment is not subject to ALUC review. If that is not possible, then, as a change in a zoning ordinance that could potentially apply to land in Airport Influence Areas, the ordinance amendment may require ALUC review pursuant to Section 21676(b) of the California Public Utilities Code. } 8.3

**John Guerin**  
Principal Planner



**Response No. 8**

**Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)  
John Guerin  
Principal Planner**

- 8.1 This comment affirms the lack of ALUC jurisdiction for the Project. This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. Therefore, no further response is warranted. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15088(a) (CEQA requires that a lead agency respond to environmental comments).)
- 8.2 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR. The Draft PEIR identifies a private use airstrip and a private heliport, on pages 8.0-2 and 8.0-3 of the Draft PEIR. No significant impacts or conflicts are anticipated due to infrequent use and existing oversight by the County and FAA.
- 8.3 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR. (Browning-Ferris Indust. of California, Inc. v. City Council of the City of San Jose (1986) 181 Cal.App.3d 852 (where a general comment is made, a general response is sufficient).) The County will consider these suggestions during Project deliberations.