

Comment Letter No. 32

Early, Kristina

From: Mehta-Cooper, Mitra
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2012 11:26 AM
To: Early, Kristina
Cc: Nanthavongdouangsy, Phayvanh
Subject: FW: Draft EIR comments-Wine Country

Please add the attached to the Wine Country Draft EIR Comment Letters.

Mitra

From: Theresa Fogarty [<mailto:terry501@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 10:57 AM
To: Mehta-Cooper, Mitra
Subject: Draft EIR comments-Wine Country

Re: Draft EIR-Wine Country

Mitra,

The draft EIR for Wine Country states the Environmentally Superior alternative is a 25% reduction. This sounds like one of the best options. But how is that calculated? 25% less wineries than what, etc.? } 32.1

The ambient noise levels I believe were taken between 11:00 & 3:00 pm. I think if they were taken around 7:00 or 8:00 pm without any concerts or special events and then taken when a concert, etc. is going on, you would see a larger difference between ambient noise without the project vs. noise with concerts and traffic, etc. } 32.2

Also, the DEIR references the current noise ordinance. If they amend the noise ordinance will that change the DEIR's findings? } 32.3

Even the DEIR says it is hard to predict some things because no one knows how many concerts could be going on at the same time, etc. or right next to each other, etc. This is where some regulations, rules, or wineries calendaring events around each other could be helpful to avoid excessive noise and/or traffic jams. } 32.4

Also, I thought I saw something in one place about a noise study being required if over 200 guests? This DEIR doc. is so large I can't find where I might have read it. And maybe I'm totally mistaken. Can you shed some light on this? } 32.5

Thank you and hope all is well with you. Have a great day!
Theresa Fogarty
Temecula, CA
phone: 951-767-1907 until 1:00 today - Please feel free to call me or send me an email.

Response No. 32

Theresa Fogarty

- 32.1 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. The Reduced Density (25% Reduction) Alternative is calculated by reducing the number of residential units allowed for development and reducing the intensity of commercial development, including wineries. Residential units would be reduced from 1,916 to 1,437, which is a reduction of 479 residential units (approximately 25%). Commercial square footage would be reduced by 25% as well. 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.))
- 32.2 The noise measurements for the Draft PEIR were taken during off-peak hours in order to avoid any influence from traffic noise during the peak hours (i.e., 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM to 7:00 PM). The noise survey attempts to document the existing noise environment and capture the noise levels associated with typical daily operations and activities in the Project area. It establishes a “baseline”. It is correct that if noise measures were surveyed during a concert event, in existing noise readings would have recorded higher noise levels. However, this comparison can be made based upon industry standards for outdoor amplified noise, as discussed in the Draft PEIR Chapter 4.12 Noise.
- 32.3 The Project would be required to comply with the most current Noise regulations, including Noise Ordinance No. 847. 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.
- 32.4 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. It may not be practical, or legal, to prohibit concurrent special events for individual properties that are allowed to hold such events. The County has the power to condition individual properties as noted in Draft PEIR Mitigation Measure LU-1 and NOI-3 through NOI-6. Adherence to the existing Ordinance No. 847, County of Riverside General Plan policies, and mitigation measures listed in Section 4.12 Noise in the Draft PEIR would substantially reduce noise impacts associated with the Project. Coordination of wineries with special events will be implemented by the County on a project-by-project basis.

Adherence to the existing General Plan policies, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures presented in Section 4.14 Traffic and Circulation in the Draft PEIR would substantially reduce traffic impacts associated with the Project.

32.5 The Draft PEIR Chapter 4.12 Noise does indicate a 200 guest threshold for preparing a noise study (page 4.12-38, third paragraph down from the top). The paragraph is incorrect and has been superseded by NOI-3 through NOI-6 which provide more comprehensive noise mitigation. The subject sentence will be deleted in the Final PEIR, as follows:

“However, to ensure noise from special events held at winery facilities are further reduced, Mitigation Measure NOI-5 would require special occasion facilities with more than 200 guests per event to submit a “Special Event Synopsis” and NOI-6 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 NOI-3 through NOI-6 would reduce special event noise. NOI-3 requires consideration of site-specific noise attenuation measures. NOI-4 requires a noise study prior to project approval to demonstrate acceptable noise levels. Mitigation Measure NOI-65 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 includes noise ordinance enforcement provisions. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-5 and3 through NOI-6, noise impacts from special events at wineries would be less than significant.”

Refer to Attachment A: *Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan Planning Commission Final Recommendations and PEIR No. 524 Determination.*