

Comment Letter No. 31

3:44 PM 2/2/2012 3:44 PM

---

**From:** Mehta-Cooper, Mitra  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 02, 2012 3:40 PM  
**To:** Nanthavongdouangsy, Phayvanh  
**Subject:** FW: Comments on DEIR 524 for Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan  
**Attachments:** Comments on Draft EIR 020212.docx

FYI

---

**From:** lorraine harrington [<mailto:lfh415@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 02, 2012 1:09 PM  
**To:** Mehta-Cooper, Mitra  
**Cc:** Chuck Tobin; Pat Ommert; Robert Kellerhouse; Margaret Rich  
**Subject:** Comments on DEIR 524 for Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan

Good morning, Mitra,  
Following and attached are my comments on the DEIR 524 for the Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan. Thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns.  
Lorraine

} 31.1

Feb. 2, 2012

To: Riverside Country Planning Department – Attn: Ms. Mitra Mehta-Cooper ([mmehta@rctlma.org](mailto:mmehta@rctlma.org))

From: Lorraine Harrington ([lfh415@yahoo.com](mailto:lfh415@yahoo.com))

**Re: Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan DEIR 524**

Dear Mitra,  
Following are my comments on the Draft EIR 524. In general, I think the analysis covers the areas of concern expressed in the various meetings of the Advisory Council and other public gatherings, and my thanks go to you for spearheading this important aspect of the overall Project. My comments will cover 4 areas:

- Sewers
- Noise
- Transportation/Circulation
- Project Alternative (25% Reduction Alternative)

} 31.2

Sewers

The analysis presented in Draft EIR 524 states that all implementing projects within the Project Area will be responsible for extending sewer lines from available trunk lines as a condition of approval (see section 4.13 p 34). In the discussions I heard, the Advisory Council was divided on the issue of sewers, and certainly the

} 31.3

3:44 PM 2/2/2012 3:44 PM

community seems to be. In the Equestrian Zone, for example, we heard strong opposition to the notion of bringing sewers anywhere near the Zone because of the potential that has for future development. I heard Supervisor Stone say publically that no sewer policy would be made without a vote of the public. At the very least, I would want the statement on page 34 to exclude implementing projects in the Equestrian Zone.

} 31.3  
cont

Noise

Although Draft EIR 524 seemed to cover the various topics related to noise that we heard during our meetings and public outreach, I feel that the analysis downplayed the significance of noise impact from stationery sources (in particular, special events facilities) on sensitive receptors. As the study admits, the effect of noise on humans is hard to quantify, but I believe, based on what we heard from current residents, the EIR should have proposed stronger mitigations. Just requiring noise studies is not enough. We should go further and require special events with any amplified sound to be held indoors (as one of the vintners suggested) or else limit the number of events drastically. This should be true for the Residential and Equestrian Zones especially.

} 31.4

Transportation/Circulation

I am opposed to several aspects of the transportation and circulation section. First, I oppose the many stoplights proposed for the area as NOT upholding the rural atmosphere we were trying to maintain with this Community Plan. In particular the proposed stoplights on Anza and Madera de Playa, Anza and Pauba, Anza and De Portola, and Pauba and De Portola which are in Residential or Equestrian Zone would change the character of the area.

} 31.5

I am also opposed to the widening of Anza Road to 4 lanes as it passes through or along the boundary of the Residential and Equestrian Zones. I was pleased to see that funding has not yet been identified for this expansion, and hope that the public has the opportunity to voice opposition to this, as it seems to have been a decision made prior to the beginning of the Community Plan Advisory Council process.

} 31.6

These stoplights and street expansions are urbanizing factors which many in the community do not support. The Draft EIR 524 should have suggested alternatives. Could we ask for that type of analysis now?

} 31.7

Better Alternative (25% Reduction Alternative)

Given the comments above, I see the 25% Reduction Alternative as superior. It covers all the aspects of the Project's goals, i.e., expansion while retaining the rural and equestrian qualities, but at a slightly lower intensity, which results in all the analyzed factors being slightly more favorable.

} 31.8

\* \* \*

Thank you for extending the period of public comment in consideration of the end-of-year holidays. And thank you for your attention to this memo.

} 31.9

Please keep me informed of any future meetings or public hearings on the Project or the DEIR 524. Thank you.

} 31.10

**Response No. 31**

**Lorraine Harrington**

- 31.1 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).)
- 31.2 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. This is an introductory comment. Responses to concerns are provided below. No further response is required. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15088(a) (CEQA requires that a lead agency respond to *environmental* comments).)
- 31.3 The Project area currently relies on on-site wastewater treatment systems and is not currently served by a public sewer provider. The Project area is currently under a septic moratorium due to high basin total dissolved solids, making reliability on on-site wastewater treatment systems unlikely. The existing sewer trunk line system does not have sufficient capacity to manage implementing projects and additional facilities would be required to serve the Project area, and potentially trunk lines and parallels outside of the Project area. Required sewer connection fees, which fund ongoing expansion and modification of Easter Municipal Water District's treatment facilities, as well as individual and Project level mitigation noted in Section 4.13, *Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities*, will help reduce impacts to water quality and improve sewer capacity in the Project area.
- The County Board of Supervisors have given a policy direction to County staff on April 21, 2012 (Agenda Item No. 3.3), which respond to the Commenter's concern. 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. Refer to Attachment A: *Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan Planning Commission Final Recommendations and PEIR No. 524 Determination*.
- 31.4 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 authority to condition individual implementing projects 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 EIR 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 EIR would substantially reduce traffic impacts associated with the Project. In addition, the County may consider a comprehensive revision to the existing Noise Ordinance as a County-wide measure, which would be addressed later and separately from the Project. Refer to Attachment A: *Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan Planning Commission Final Recommendations and PEIR No. 524 Determination*.

- 31.5 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. The Project has incorporated various Project Design Features specifically intended to maintain and protect the rural Wine Country character. Implementing projects will be required to adhere to the proposed Temecula Valley Wine Country Design Guidelines, as well as existing regulatory programs, including General Plan policies, County ordinances, and standard conditions or requirements currently in place. Lighting issues are addressed in the Draft PEIR on pages 4.1-17 to 4.1-21 and through Mitigation Measure AES-3. 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).)
- 31.6 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. The Draft PEIR indicates that the Project will be phased over a 20+ year period, as noted on page 3.0-15 of the Draft PEIR. Depending upon the location of implementation projects, Anza Road widening may not be necessary in the immediate future of the Project implementation. 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).)
- 31.7 Refer to Response 31.5. The Project Traffic Impact Study was prepared in accordance with CEQA and County policies, in close coordination with the City

of Temecula. CEQA requires that traffic impacts be mitigated to the extent that is feasible. It should be noted that the Project proposes to down-scale a series of four-lane roads to two-lane roads in order to retain rural character of Wine Country. In addition, the Draft PEIR provides alternatives to wider roads such as roundabouts, and alternative modes of transportation (e.g. trails, shuttle, rideshares etc.) to enhance rural character of the Project area. 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.

31.8 The Project alternatives are discussed in Section 6 of the Draft PEIR. As noted in that section, while 25% Density Reduction Alternative may reduce certain identified environmental impacts of the Project, it may result in additional impacts in the environmental areas (e.g. aesthetic, cultural resources etc.) where the Project has less than significant impacts with mitigation. 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.

31.9 The County appreciates the commenter's participation in this process and these comments. The commenter's concerns will be considered by decision-makers during Project deliberations.

31.10 The County will provide adequate notice to the public, interested parties, and relevant agencies regarding any future meetings/hearings pertaining to the Wine Country Community Plan Draft EIR per CEQA requirements. The commenter is included on the Project interest list and will receive future Project-related CEQA notices. Refer to Attachment A: *Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan Planning Commission Final Recommendations and PEIR No. 524 Determination*.