

Comment Letter No. 21

5:08 PM 2/2/2012 5:08 PM

From: Mehta-Cooper, Mitra
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2012 5:04 PM
To: Nanthavongdouangsy, Phayvanh
Subject: FW: EIR Comment
Attachments: EIR Comment.doc

FYI

From: Peggy [<mailto:peggy@temeculawines.org>]
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2012 4:55 PM
To: Mehta-Cooper, Mitra
Subject: EIR Comment

Good afternoon, Mitra,

Attached is comment from this Association regarding the EIR.

} 21.1

Peggy Evans
Executive Director
Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association
P: 800.801.WINE (9463) :: F: 951.699.2353
E: peggy@temeculawines.org
www.temeculawines.org





February 2, 2012
 Via Email:
 mmehta@rctlma.org

Ms. Mitra Mehta-Cooper, Project Manager Riverside County Planning Department 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor Riverside, CA 92502

Re: Comment to Environmental Impact Report No 524 - Development Standards

Dear Ms. Mehta-Cooper:

The following comments are being made on behalf of the Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association and its members. 21.2

We have attended numerous public forums and meetings of the 2020 ad-hoc committee and generally support the purpose of the EIR which we thought was a viable means of further protecting the Citrus-Vineyard Policy Area and to provide clarity to development standards that would improve the quality of development for our existing and future Wineries. 21.3

Unfortunately, we feel this document is too broad and encourages incompatible uses to our Wine Region such as more residential. The proposed new mitigations to the EIR would increase our operating and development costs significantly and potentially would make developing a small winery impossible, with Conditions of Approval that would at least double what are already excessive regulations. 21.4

We wish to object more specifically to the following areas:

1. AES 1: Any potential new CS-149 Fees 21.5
2. AES 3: Lighting requirements that would make our wineries look like shopping centers. 21.6
3. AQ 8: Paving farm roads, or being mandated to provide extraordinary means and methods of farming. 21.7
4. AQ 10-11: Various mandates for reducing GHG 21.8
5. CU 1-4: Current Conditions of Approval are adequate. Additional conditions would be excessive. 21.9
6. GHG-2: Objected to. We would like acknowledgement that we already are required to plant 75% of land in vineyard which significantly offsets GHG 21.10
7. HAZ-4: This area is mapped by the State as Fire Hazard 2, which is Moderate. 21.11
8. HYD-1-5 and 8: Objected to. 21.12
9. PSU Sewer 2: Unacceptable. We should not be required to connect to a sewer, which may never come, when there are alternative methods which meet the Region 9 Basin Plan requirements. 21.13
10. TRF 3: Object to any new Traffic Fees such as a TIF Fee when we are already paying a TUMF Fee. 21.14
11. Object to any requirement, which limits event guests to a specific number per acre. 21.15
12. Any reference to "Prime Farmland" is objected to. 21.16
13. HYD 1-5: Objected to. 21.17

Sincerely

Peggy Evans

Peggy Evans
 Executive Director, Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association

Response No. 21

**Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association
Peggy Evans
Executive Director**

- 21.1 Responses to specific comments are provided below; no further response is required.
- 21.2 Responses to these specific comments are provided below.
- 21.3 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. This comment has been duly noted and is presented in this Comments and Responses document for decision makers to evaluate as part of their Project deliberations. No further response is required. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15088(a) (CEQA requires that a lead agency respond to *environmental* comments.))
- 21.4 The County appreciates the participation of, and these comments by, the Winegrowers Association. The County, through the Project has attempted to balance the interests of all stakeholders in the Wine Country to preserve and protect this important region while providing reasonable opportunities for other compatible land uses such as residential and equestrian. The Project represents several years of stakeholder discussions including numerous Ad Hoc Advisory Committee meetings, as described on the Project website and in the Draft PEIR Chapter 2.5. The Project represents a substantial reduction in the potential residential unit count in Wine Country compared to current planning and zoning, while allowing for a considerable increase in winery and related commercial tourist uses compared to existing conditions. Refer to Attachment A: *Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan Planning Commission Final Recommendations and PEIR No. 524 Determination*.
- The County appreciates the concern regarding the cost of required construction, operation and maintenance related mitigation and related fees. This concern will be considered by decision-makers during Project deliberations. Responses to specific mitigation concerns are provided below.
- 21.5 AES-1 does not propose any mitigation fees or assessment fees associated with it. All future CSA amendments will be processed per applicable California Laws. This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. This comment has been duly noted and

is presented in this Comments and Responses document for decision makers to evaluate as part of their Project deliberations. No further response is required. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15088(a) (CEQA requires that a lead agency respond to environmental comments).)

- 21.6 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. This comment has been duly noted and is presented in this Comments and Responses document for decision makers to evaluate as part of their Project deliberations. Mitigation measure AES-3 states that all implementing projects shall provide a lighting plan for the Project area prior to approval. The County would review and approve any lighting plans in compliance with County lighting regulations and policies summarized on page 4.1-19 in the Draft PEIR. The intention of this measure is to preserve and enhance the overall aesthetic by creating a more uniform and aesthetically appealing lighting and signage programs. It would also ensure that the lighting would be limited to that necessary for safety and security, consistent with the County's lighting ordinances (Ordinance Nos. 655 and 915) and the proposed development standards of Wine Country zones. It is intended to avoid the creation of a "shopping center" effect. No further response is required. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15088(a) (CEQA requires that a lead agency respond to environmental comments).)
- 21.7 Mitigation Measure AQ-8 addresses construction equipment access for grading associated with new development, and does not apply to existing farm roads.
- 21.8 Mitigation Measure AQ-10 is a County requirement for implementing projects to reduce air quality impacts that may be caused by construction equipment and vehicles exhaust emissions. Mitigation measure AQ-11 is a County requirement for implementing projects to apply conservation management practices for confined animal facilities. Both of these mitigation measures are required to help reduce Greenhouse Gas emissions and air quality impacts that may be caused by implementing projects. This comment will be considered by decision makers during Project deliberations.
- 21.9 These mitigation measures represent standard County development conditions of approval, as modified through consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission and local tribes. Refer to Response Nos. 3 and 22 for additional insight. This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. This comment has been duly noted and is presented in this Comments and Responses document for decision makers to evaluate as part of their Project deliberations. No further response is required. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15088(a) (CEQA requires that a

lead agency respond to environmental comments.)) This comment will be considered by decision makers during Project deliberations.

- 21.10 The County acknowledges the current and future GHG benefit of setting aside land for agricultural production. Mitigation Measure GHG-2 is intended to provide an option to implementing projects to mitigate their Greenhouse Gas impacts without requiring a Project-specific Greenhouse Gas Analysis. This measure states that individual implementing projects shall have the option to use the Option Tables or Project-specific Greenhouse Gas analysis in order to demonstrate that Greenhouse Gas emissions from the implementing project are less than significant. Per California Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), all implementing projects will be required to be consistent with the County's Greenhouse Gas reduction goals for the Project area or provide quantification of Project-specific Greenhouse Gas emissions that reduce emissions at least 28.5% below Business as Usual emissions. This suggestion will be considered by decision makers during Project deliberations.
- 21.11 Portions of the Project area are mapped as High Fire Hazard as shown on Exhibit 4.8-3, Wildfire Susceptibility.
- 21.12 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. These mitigation measures are for implementing projects requiring adherence to existing federal and state regulations in addition to Project design features to ensure that any impacts to water quality would remain less than significant. No further response is required. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15088(a) (CEQA requires that a lead agency respond to environmental comments.))
- 21.13 This issue is discussed at length in the Draft PEIR, noting that future development within the Wine Country would be limited or not possible due to current basin TDS loading. Current conditions are creating a need for mitigation of basin water quality issues. The commenter does not suggest any specific alternatives. PSU Sewer-2 requires all implementing projects shall make a fair share contribution toward proposed sewer improvements per a phasing and financing plan developed by EMWD. Implementing projects will also be required to extend sewer lines from available trunk lines.
- 21.14 Any implementing project will be required to comply with mitigation measure TRF-3 and pay fair share fees through fee programs to assist with traffic related improvements to the area to reduce traffic impacts. The TUMF fee is for regional road system improvements. The traffic fee identified in TRF-3 would be specifically for transportation infrastructure needed in the Wine Country.

Existing uses would not pay the fee –only future development proposals or requests by existing uses for future discretionary permits.

- 21.15 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. This comment has been duly noted and is presented in this Comments and Responses document for decision makers to evaluate as part of their Project deliberations. No further response is required. (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.)) This comment has been duly noted and is presented in this Comments and Responses document for decision makers to evaluate as part of their Project deliberations.
- 21.16 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. The California State Department of Conservation designates land as “Prime Farmland” and CEQA requires an analysis thereof. No further response is required. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15088(a) (CEQA requires that a lead agency respond to environmental comments.))
- 21.17 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. No reason is given for this objection. This comment has been duly noted and is presented in this Comments and Responses document for decision makers to evaluate as part of their Project deliberations. No further response is required. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15088(a) (CEQA requires that a lead agency respond to environmental comments.))