

6.1 INTRODUCTION

CEQA REQUIREMENTS

Section 15126.6(a) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project, or a range of reasonable alternatives to the location of the Project, that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the Project. An EIR does not need to consider every conceivable alternative project, but it does need to consider a “reasonable range” of potentially feasible alternatives that facilitate informed decision-making and public participation.

The range of feasible alternatives is selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making. Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives (as described in CEQA Section 15126.6(f)) are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent could reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site. An EIR need not consider an alternative if its effects cannot be reasonably identified, its implementation is remote or speculative, or if it would not achieve most of the basic Project objectives.

In accordance with Section 15126.6(a) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, the discussion must focus on alternatives that would avoid or substantially reduce any significant effects of the Project, even if the alternatives would be more costly or hinder to some degree the attainment of the Project objectives. The “No Project” alternative must be evaluated and must discuss the existing conditions and what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project is not approved.

The range of alternatives required is governed by a “rule of reason.” Thus, the EIR should evaluate only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives should be limited to only those that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project, or to only those locations that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects of the Project.

The alternatives identified below, with exception of the mandatory No Project Alternative, were selected due to their potential to at least partially meet most of the basic Project objectives, and to lessen or avoid particular environmental effects resulting from implementation of the Project. A number of the more significant impacts of the Project, such as traffic, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, growth-inducing impacts, and noise, relate to the size of the Project, therefore, reducing the size of the Project within reason was an important criterion in the selection of alternatives.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Section 15124(b) of the *CEQA Guidelines* indicates that an EIR should include “a statement of objectives sought by the proposed Project.” The Project is intended to achieve the following Project objectives, which are also described in Section 3.0 of this Draft EIR:

- To preserve and enhance the Wine Country region’s viticulture potential, rural lifestyle and equestrian activities.
- To continue to allow for an appropriate level of commercial tourist activities that is incidental to

viticulture activities.

- To coordinate where, and under what circumstances, future growth should be accommodated.
- To develop provisions to ensure that future growth is balanced and coordinated with the appropriate public services, infrastructure and other basic necessities for a healthy, livable community.

6.2 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

While the mitigation measures listed throughout Section 4 would reduce the level of many significant impacts to a less than significant level, the Draft EIR identified the areas listed below where, after implementation of feasible mitigation, the Project may nonetheless result in impacts which cannot be fully mitigated (“unavoidable significant impacts”).

Various benefits would accrue from implementation of the Project, which must be weighed against the potential adverse effects of Project implementation in deciding whether to approve the Project. These potential benefits will be set forth in a “Statement of Overriding Considerations”, which is required by CEQA prior to approving a project with unavoidable significant impacts.

PROJECT IMPACTS

Agricultural and Forestry Resources

While the proposed zoning and policies would increase the acreage of designated Agricultural land uses and may in turn increase the acreage of agricultural uses, it is possible that implementing project sites could be located on Prime Farmland (or another designation indicating agricultural suitability) and would allow development of up to 25 percent of the total Project area based on 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. Therefore, the Project could convert agriculturally suitable farmland, such as Prime Farmland, and active agricultural land to non-agricultural uses. As such, this potential conversion would generate a significant, unavoidable impact on agricultural resources.

Air Quality

Unavoidable significant impacts have been identified for Project-level and cumulative air quality impacts related to construction and operations activities (i.e., stationary and mobile source emissions) as well as air quality impacts on sensitive receptors. 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.

Greenhouse Gasses

Implementation and compliance with the County’s policies will ensure that impacts from GHG emissions are minimized. However, construction and operation of implementing projects would create an increase in GHG emissions that are above SCAQMD’s draft mass emission thresholds and CARB’s per

capita threshold. 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.

Noise

Given that it is not possible to predict the specific nature, frequency or location of all of the wineries or all of the special events, some stationary source activity may still represent unacceptable noise exposure within the Wine Country, particularly for existing sensitive receptors. This unavoidable impact will be reduced through compliance with policies, ordinances and Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-6 noted above, and will be implemented by the County on a project-by-project basis.

In addition, due to the amount of traffic trips that would be generated in association with the proposed permitted land uses, mobile source noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Public Services and Utilities

Fire Protection Services

Implementation of the Project would have a cumulative adverse impact on the Fire Department's ability to provide an acceptable level of service. Impacts include an increased number of emergency and public service calls and a decreased level of service due to the increased presence of structures, traffic, and population (including transient tourists).

The availability of sufficient funding to equip and staff new facilities may not be available over the long term and the ability of the Department to negotiate for adequate funding for either construction or long-term staffing with individual developers is uncertain. Accordingly, even with the implementation of the proposed mitigation, the Project could result in an indirect, cumulatively considerable contribution to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

Libraries

Based on the current Riverside County standard, there are insufficient library facilities available to provide the targeted level of service to the Project area and the balance of the service area of the two existing libraries in the Temecula area. Therefore, implementing projects within the Project area would make an indirect but cumulatively considerable contribution to that existing deficiency, resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impact on library facilities and services.

Traffic

The Project would generally improve operations compared to the adopted General Plan; however, long-term operational traffic resulting from operation of the Project would still contribute to a potentially significant and unavoidable impact related to degradation of levels of service in the Project area.

The Project would contribute a fair share contribution toward improving affected roadway segments and intersections through a Community Facilities District (CFD) financing plan, as well as a fair share contribution, which would allow the segments and intersections to operate at acceptable levels of

service. However, since some segments and/or intersections are controlled by the City of Temecula, the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians and/or Caltrans, the County cannot guarantee implementation of the identified improvements. In addition, remaining funding outside the CFD has not been guaranteed and there is limited right-of-way to facilitate freeway and ramp expansion. Therefore, the levels of service impacts are considered potentially significant and unavoidable.

Growth-inducing Impact

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 could also result 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.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Air Quality

Unavoidable significant impacts have been identified for Project-level and cumulative air quality impacts related to construction and operations activities (i.e., stationary and mobile source emissions) as well as air quality impacts on sensitive receptors. 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.

Greenhouse Gases

Implementation and compliance with the County's policies will ensure that impacts from GHG emissions are minimized. However, construction and operation of implementing projects would create an increase in GHG emissions that are above SCAQMD's draft mass emission thresholds and CARB's per capita threshold. 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, policies, 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.

Noise

Buildout of the Project would result in potential cumulative noise level increases along major roadways. 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.

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. The Project

may result in significant stationary source impacts, even with implementation of mitigation measures and applicable policies and ordinances.

Public Services and Utilities

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 and library services.

Traffic

The Project may, in combination with existing conditions and other future implementing projects, result in a conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system and level of service degradation to unacceptable levels. The Project may result in significant traffic-related impacts, even with implementation of mitigation measures and applicable policies and ordinances.

6.3 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED WINE COUNTRY COMMUNITY PLAN

As noted previously, the *CEQA Guidelines* (Section 15126.6(e)(2)) require that the alternatives discussion analyze the “No Project Alternative.” Pursuant to CEQA, the No Project Alternative refers to the analysis of existing conditions (i.e., implementation of current plans and consistency with available infrastructure and community services) and what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project is not approved. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(A), when the project is the revision of existing land use plans or zoning regulations, the no project alternative is the continuation of the existing plan and regulations into the future, and the EIR’s discussion compares the projected impacts of the change that would result from approval of the project with the impacts that would occur under existing plans and requirements.

Potential environmental impacts of three separate alternatives are compared below to impacts from the Project. These alternatives were selected based upon their ability to avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects of the Project, while still achieving the primary Project objectives.

For the purpose of this analysis, the alternatives are analyzed in comparison to the proposed Project. The analysis for each of the Project alternatives identified below includes the following:

- Description of the alternative.
- Analysis of environmental impacts and comparison to the Project. Pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines*, if an alternative would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the Project as proposed, the significant effects of the alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the Project as proposed.
- Assessment of the ability of the alternative to meet the Project objectives (previously identified in Section 6.1).

The Project alternatives considered in EIR No. 524 are:

- No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative
- Reduced Density (25% Reduction) Alternative

Alternatives rejected from further consideration:



6.0 Alternatives To The Proposed Action

- Pending General Plan Amendments Approval Alternative (“Pending Amendments Alternative”)
- Alternative Location Alternative
- One Policy Area / One Zone Alternative
- No Build Scenario/Existing Condition Alternative

CEQA states that the specific alternative of “No Project” shall be evaluated along with its impact (Section 15126.6(e)(1)). If the environmentally superior alternative is the “No Project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (15126.6(e)(2)). A comparison of the proposed alternatives to the Project is presented in Table 6.0-2, *Comparison of Impacts Resulting from Project Alternatives as Compared to the Project*. An indication of whether the impacts resulting with each alternative would be lesser, greater, or similar to the Project is given.

6.4 ALTERNATIVES REJECTED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

An EIR must briefly describe the rationale for selection and rejection of alternatives. The lead agency may make an initial determination as to which alternatives are feasible and therefore merit in-depth consideration, and which are infeasible. Alternatives that are remote or speculative, or the effects of which cannot be reasonably predicted, need not be considered (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(f)(3)). This section identifies alternatives considered, but rejected as infeasible, and provides a brief explanation of the reasons for their exclusion. Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR if they fail to meet most of the Project objectives, are infeasible, or do not avoid any significant environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(c)). Alternatives considered that failed to meet the basic objectives of the Project, or were deemed infeasible, and were thus eliminated from further consideration, are discussed below.

PENDING GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS APPROVAL ALTERNATIVE (PENDING AMENDMENTS ALTERNATIVE)

The Pending Amendments Alternative assumes that the Project would not occur, and the Project site would be subject to the existing General Plan, Policy Areas, and Zoning Ordinance. Additionally, the Design Guidelines and the proposed changes to the General Plan circulation and trail networks would not occur. The existing Policy Areas would continue to allow incidental commercial uses in the proposed Winery District on a minimum of 10 acres, instead of the 20-acre minimum proposed under the Project.

There are currently some 60 pending applications on file with the County for various types of development, including a senior housing project, medium density residential project, etc. This alternative assumes that all of these GPAs on file would be processed and reviewed under the current County General Plan, Policy Areas and Zoning. While these applications would be required to comply with existing plans, policies and regulations, this would allow for a more intense and less cohesive development of the Project area based on the smaller lot size requirements and the absence of the proposed Design Guidelines.

The Pending Amendments Alternative does not meet any of the basic Project objectives, because it does not implement a comprehensive and cohesive plan for the physical and economic development of the area, does not ensure that future growth is balanced and coordinated with the appropriate public services, infrastructure and other basic necessities, and does not preserve and/or enhance the rural lifestyle and equestrian activities in the Project area.



This alternative does not provide enhanced trail amenities nor does it establish a circulation plan that would provide adequate levels-of-service on Project area and adjacent roadway segments and intersections. This alternative allows for a more intensive development pattern throughout the Project area which would increase groundwater quality impacts compared to Project, as well as impacts related to air quality, noise, and traffic. For these reasons, this alternative has been rejected from further consideration.

ALTERNATIVE LOCATION ALTERNATIVE

The Alternative Location Alternative proposes that the proposed Project be planned for an alternative location within the County of Riverside; however, there are no other available recognized subregions within the County that currently possess the amount of planted vineyards and equestrian facilities as the Project area. No other subregions have the amount of existing viniculture-related tourist activity and auxiliary opportunities (such as wine tasting rooms, tour guides, hospitality accommodation, restaurants, and specific facilities for weddings or other events) and national and international equestrian-related competition events as the Project area. The Project area is recognized as currently possessing these features and is located in relatively close proximity to Interstate 15.

Currently, there are no other large-scale planning efforts underway that would create an alternative winery and/or equestrian destination, and available land within this western portion of the County is for the most part physically incapable of accommodating the unique uses of the Project. Furthermore, this alternative would not achieve the following Project objectives: (1) preserving and enhancing the Wine Country region's existing viniculture potential, rural lifestyle and equestrian activities; (2) continuing to allow for an appropriate level of commercial tourist activities within the Temecula Valley Wine Country area; (3) coordinating where and under what circumstances future growth should be accommodated; and (4) ensuring that future growth is balanced and coordinated with the appropriate public services, infrastructure and other basic necessities. For the above reasons, the Alternative Location Alternative was rejected from further consideration.

ONE POLICY AREA/ONE ZONE ALTERNATIVE

The One Policy Area/One Zone Alternative proposes that the entire Project area be designated as one zone, for example Mixed Use, and would establish one Policy Area covering the entire Project area. The one zone would allow for development of wineries and equestrian uses, including their incidental commercial uses (such as wine tasting rooms, lodging facilities, restaurants, equestrian activities, rodeo arenas, animal hospitals, special occasion facilities for weddings or other events, etc.), in addition to low-density residential uses, throughout the entire Project area. The one Policy Area would establish policies that would apply uniformly over all future implementing projects throughout the Project area. This alternative could potentially apply the same policies as the Project; however, it would not direct the equestrian, winery, and residential uses to their currently proposed respective districts.

The One Policy Area/One Zone Alternative does not meet the basic Project objectives, because it does not ensure that future growth is balanced and coordinated with the appropriate uses and does not preserve and/or enhance the rural lifestyle and equestrian activities in the Project area. The most-salient deficiency of this alternative is that it would increase the occurrence of land use conflicts throughout the Project area. This would include conflicts primarily resulting from noise and traffic generated by the winery and equestrian uses and special events on residential uses. For instance, under

this alternative, a winery sites could be developed around a residential tract, or a major equestrian event facility could be developed next to low-density residential uses.

Similar to the Project, this alternative could potentially provide enhanced trail amenities or could potentially establish a circulation plan that would provide adequate levels-of-service improvements on Project area and adjacent roadway segments and intersections. However, compared to the Project, this alternative would not coordinate growth in an effective manner so as to maximize the function of the trail and roadway networks. For instance, with the Project many of the anticipated large-scale wineries would be focused along major roadway corridors (e.g., Rancho California Road). However, under a one policy area/one zone system, lower traffic-generating uses (e.g., rural residential uses) could be developed along these corridors, decreasing the efficiency and proper coordination of any proposed roadway improvements.

In sum, this alternative would result in increased land use conflicts as described above and would generate increased impacts related to noise and traffic. For these reasons, this alternative has been rejected from further consideration.

NO BUILD SCENARIO/EXISTING CONDITION ALTERNATIVE

The No Build Scenario/Existing Condition Alternative (“No Build Scenario”) assumes that the future implementing projects envisioned under the Project would not occur, and the Project site would remain in its existing condition. This alternative assumes the breakdown of land use acreages listed in Table 3.0-1, *Existing Land Use Acreages*, provided in the Project Description. Essentially, this alternative assumes that only the existing development that is presently on the ground would occupy the Project site into the future.

No additional implementing projects would be considered/approved/developed with the Project site. The existing wineries, residential, equestrian and vacant, open space would remain, and property owners may continues to utilize their parcel as they are currently being used. It is important to note that this alternative does not reflect the future growth envisioned in the Southwest Area Plan, existing Citrus Vineyard Policy Area, or the Project objectives. The site is currently designated for development in a manner relatively similar to the Project (albeit with more development intensity and density and more incompatibility in land uses). The County’s General Plan reflects this designation, and there have been no indications by County staff, elected officials or the public through the EIR scoping process that there is a desire to preserve the site in its current state and without additional infrastructure support.

The No Build Alternative does not meet many of the basic Project objectives because it does not implement a comprehensive and cohesive plan for the physical and economic development of the Project area, does not enhance the Wine Country region’s viniculture potential, rural lifestyle and equestrian activities, does not continue to allow for an appropriate level of commercial tourist activities, does not coordinate where and under what circumstances future growth should be accommodated, and does not develop provisions to ensure that future growth is balanced and coordinated with appropriate public services, infrastructure and other basic necessities for a healthy, livable community.

It does not provide for adequate water distribution, sewer, flood control, circulation, and water quality improvements. The No Build Alternative would also be inconsistent with the County General Plan, does not respect current property rights and pending development applications, would fail to provide increased revenue, employment and entertainment opportunities within the County, and would not



provide the various infrastructure and service improvements associated with the Project

6.5 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED FOR DETAILED EVALUATION

NO PROJECT/EXISTING GENERAL PLAN POLICIES AND ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS ALTERNATIVE

Description of Alternative

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines, the No Project Alternative for a project on an identifiable property or set of properties consists of the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Section 15126.6(e)(3)(A) of the Guidelines states that, “when the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy or ongoing operation, the ‘no project’ alternative will be the continuation of the existing plan...” For purposes of this analysis, the No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative (“No Project Alternative”) assumes this condition. Accordingly, the No Project Alternative assumes that development of implementing projects as allowed under the Project would not occur, and that the Project site would instead remain subject to the provisions contained within the current, non-amended General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Each parcel within the site would be subject to the requirements of its corresponding General Plan land use designation for those properties outside of the Citrus/Vineyard Policy Area and Valle de Los Caballos Policy Area. For parcels within these Policy Areas, the General Plan land use designation would apply in conjunction with the applicable zoning classifications. This alternative also assumes that most of the entitlements applications currently on file with the County would be approved and constructed as proposed within the Project site.

The existing General Plan and Policy Areas (i.e., No Project Alternative) in their current state are anticipated to provide a mix of uses which would include a larger number of acres within the Rural and Rural Community Foundation Components (as displayed in Table 3.0-3). However, with these existing regulations, the build-out of the Project area is anticipated to include less acres under the Agriculture and Open Space Foundation Components. The existing General Plan would not establish the proposed three Districts (i.e., Winery, Residential, and Equestrian) as proposed under the Project and, thus, would not ensure to the same degree the long-term viability of the wine industry and would not serve to protect the community’s equestrian and rural lifestyle.

The existing General Plan in its current state (i.e., pursuant to the existing Citrus/Vineyard Policy Area) would require incidental commercial uses for wineries on a minimum of 10 acres. The Project would require a minimum of 10 acres only for these uses on existing wineries identified in the SWAP (Figure 4a). For all other wineries incidental commercial uses a 20-acre minimum lot size would be required.

Based on the existing land uses designation and Policy Areas within the Project area, this alternative is estimated to result in a 58.4% increase in dwelling units and population, while generating a 25.4% increase in employment/other (which is the category used to quantify the number of employees and tourists anticipated to visit the Project area) compared to the Project.

The existing General Plan would not include the circulation improvements identified in the traffic study prepared for the Project (i.e., roundabouts, traffic signalization, re-striping, number of lanes, dedication of lanes, creation of intersections, creation of new roadway linkages, etc.). While nothing in the existing General Plan or zoning would preclude these improvements from developing at a later date with the appropriate permits and approvals (e.g., GPA), this alternative does not propose or plan for these updates to the circulation network. The General Plan, Trails and Bicycle System map (Figure 8) would



6.0 Alternatives To The Proposed Action

also remain as is, meaning compared to the Project, the Project area would not provide the same level of pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle circulation options.

In addition, a detailed quantitative comparison of the No Project Alternative with the proposed Project is provided below in Table 6.0-1 of this Draft EIR, and in Appendix J of this Draft EIR.

Table 6.0-1
Comparison of Land Uses between the No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative and the Project¹

Land Use Designation by Foundation Component	No Project Alternative				Proposed Wine Country Land Uses			
	Acres	DU	Popn	Emp ²	Acres	DU	Popn	Emp / Others
AGRICULTURE FOUNDATION COMPONENT								
Agriculture (AG)	6167	308	929	308	9,644	482	1,452	482
Agriculture Foundation Sub-Total:	6167	308	929	308	9,644	482	1,452	482
RURAL FOUNDATION COMPONENT								
Rural Residential (RR)	6,457	969	2,917	NA	3,102	465	1,401	NA
Rural Mountainous (RM)	589	29	89	NA	370	19	56	NA
Rural Desert (RD)	0	0	0	NA	0	0	0	NA
Rural Foundation Sub-Total:	7,046	998	3,005	0	3,472	484	1,457	0
RURAL COMMUNITY FOUNDATION COMPONENT								
Estate Density Residential (RC-EDR)	3,287	1,150	3,465	NA	2,714	950	2,861	NA
Very Low Density Residential (RC-VLDR)	0	0	0	NA	0	0	0	NA
Low Density Residential (RC-LDR)	0	0	0	NA	0	0	0	NA
Rural Community Foundation Sub-Total:	3,287	1,150	3,465	0	2,714	950	2,861	0
OPEN SPACE FOUNDATION COMPONENT								
Open Space-Conservation (OS-C)	0	NA	NA	NA	0	NA	NA	NA
Open Space-Conservation Habitat (OS-CH)	444	NA	NA	NA	985	NA	NA	NA
Open Space-Water (OS-W)	0	NA	NA	NA	0	NA	NA	NA
Open Space-Recreation (OS-R)	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0
Open Space-Rural (OS-RUR)	0	0	0	NA	0	0	0	NA
Open Space-Mineral Resources (OS-MIN)	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0



6.0 Alternatives To The Proposed Action

Land Use Designation by Foundation Component	No Project Alternative				Proposed Wine Country Land Uses			
	Open Space Foundation Sub-Total:	444	0	0	0	985	0	0
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION COMPONENT								
Estate Density Residential (EDR)	0	0	0	NA	0	0	0	NA
Very Low Density Residential (VLDR)	6	5	14	NA	0	0	0	NA
Low Density Residential (LDR)	0	0	0	NA	0	0	0	NA
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	164	574	1,729	NA	0	0	0	NA
Medium-High Density Residential (MHDR)	0	0	0	NA	0	0	0	NA
High Density Residential (HDR)	0	0	0	NA	0	0	0	NA
Very High Density Residential (VHDR)	0	0	0	NA	0	0	0	NA
Highest Density Residential (HHDR)	0	0	0	NA	0	0	0	NA
Commercial Retail2 (CR)	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0
Commercial Tourist (CT)	1,876	NA	NA	54,889	2,175	NA	NA	43,522
Commercial Office (CO)	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0
Light Industrial (LI)	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0
Heavy Industrial (HI)	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0
Business Park (BP)	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0
Public Facilities (PF)	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0
Community Center (CC)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mixed Use Planning Area (MUPA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CD Foundation Sub-Total:	2,046	579	1,742	54,899	2,175	0	0	43,522
Sub-total for All Foundation Uses	18,990	3,035	9,141	55,207	18,990	1,916	5,770	44,004
Notes: DU – dwelling units Popn – Population Emp/Others – Employment/Others (category used to quantify the number of employees and tourists anticipated to visit the Project area) [1] No Project Alternative scenario in Winery District assumes business as usual development pattern, thus converting AG into CTs while other land use designations reflect current General Plan land use designations. [2] No Project Alternative does not take into account the tourist generated by this alternative as does the Project’s figures. Source: Draft EIR Appendix J, General Plan Land Use Build-Out Analysis								

Impacts Compared to the Project

Aesthetics, Light and Glare

With the No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative, development of implementing projects would occur in the Project area as permitted by the 2003 Riverside County *General Plan* and subject to applicable design regulations. Due to existing regulations, impacts from the No Project Alternative would be similar to the Project although slightly greater due to more intense development.

Agriculture

The No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative would allow the continued agricultural production on 6,167 acres compared to the 9,644 acres planned under the Project as shown in Table 6.0-1 *Comparison of Land Uses between the No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative and the Project*. This Alternative would not require the same level of agriculture preservation for winery and equestrian developments. Impacts to agricultural resources from the No Project Alternative would be greater than the Project.

Air Quality

The No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative would have substantially greater air quality impacts commensurate with the increased traffic and land use density.

Biological Resources

With the No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative, development of implementing projects would occur in the Project area as permitted by the 2003 Riverside County *General Plan*. Impacts from development of implementing projects would be subject to applicable MSHCPs, county, state and federal regulatory processes. Therefore, impacts from the No Project Alternative would be similar to the impacts resulting from the Project, although slightly greater due to more intense development.

Cultural Resources

With the No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative, the development of implementing projects would continue in the Project area as permitted by the 2003 Riverside County *General Plan*. Future residential implementing projects under the No Project Alternative would be at a greater density than would be allowed under the Project. The No Project Alternative would allow a total of 3,035 dwelling units, which is 1,119 more dwelling units than would be permitted under the Project. However, the Project would include an increase in the number of acres available to grow wine grapes. Grading for residential construction and tilling for crops would share similar potential of disturbing land which could potentially contain cultural resources. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have similar, but slightly greater, impacts to cultural resources as the Project.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

With the No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative, development of implementing projects would continue in the Project area as permitted by the 2003 Riverside County *General Plan*. Because this alternative allows more residential development compared to the Project, exposure to potential seismic, geologic, or slope stability impacts would be greater with the No Project Alternative than the Project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative would have substantially greater greenhouse gas emission impacts commensurate with the increased traffic and land use density.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

With the No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative, development of implementing projects would continue in the Project area as permitted by the 2003 Riverside County *General Plan*. Because this alternative allows more development compared to what is allowed under the Project, potential hazardous material impacts would be slightly greater with the No Project Alternative.

Hydrology

With the No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative, development would continue in the Project area as permitted by the 2003 Riverside County *General Plan*. All applicable local, State, and federal policies and regulations pertaining to surface water and groundwater resources would remain in effect in for this area. The No Project Alternative would allow for more dense development than would be allowed under the Project; as a result, the number of impervious surfaces in the Project area would increase. Therefore, stormwater runoff would increase along with potential impacts to water quality. Impacts to hydrology and water quality would be slightly greater with the No Project Alternative than the Project.

Land Use and Relevant Planning

Under the No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative, development of implementing projects would continue in the Project area as permitted by the 2003 Riverside County *General Plan* and would not change any zoning or land use designations. As shown in Table 6.0-1 *Comparison of Land Uses between the No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative and the Project* a total of 3,035 dwelling units are projected under the No Project Alternative. Implementation of the Project would lower the potential number of dwelling units to 1,916. Impacts associated with the No Project Alternative would be greater than the Project.

Mineral Resources

Under the No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative, mineral resource impacts would be similar to the Project, although slightly greater due to more intense development and less open space preservation.

Noise

Under the No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative, the Project area would be developed with a increased number of residential dwelling units and an greater intensity of commercial development, including wineries. Thus, this alternative would result in more vehicular average daily trips. The mobile source noise generated by this alternative would be increased compared to the Project due to the increase in average daily vehicular trips on Project area and adjacent roadways. The proposed Districts (under the Project) would not be established and thus land use conflicts may arise from noise-generating uses (e.g., special events) on nearby residential uses.

Public Services, Recreation and Utilities

Under the No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative, the demand for public services, utilities and recreation facilities would be substantially greater than the Project due

to more intense development.

Traffic and Circulation

The No Project/Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative would generally result in more trips being generated by the Wine Country area. As stated in Section 4.14 (Impact 4.14-1), when comparing this alternative to the Project, this alternative would increase weekday and weekend trip generation by approximately 11,000 and 30,000 daily trips, respectively. In addition, the No Project Alternative does not establish a circulation plan that would provide adequate levels-of-service on Project area and adjacent roadway segments and intersections. Under this alternative, however, it is assumed that future improvements would also be made to intersection lane configurations and controls based on traffic demand and roadway segment improvements. It also assumed that notable roadways in the Project area would be improved as four-lane Secondary Highways and Major Highways. As such, these roadways would not reflect the rural nature of the area. However, in terms of roadway levels-of-service, the No Project Alternative would have substantially increased impacts to traffic compared to the Project due to increased development (refer to Tables 8 and 9 of the *Traffic Impact Study*, Appendix I).

REDUCED DENSITY (25% REDUCTION) ALTERNATIVE

Description of Alternative

The purpose of the Reduced Density Alternative is to reduce impacts from the Project related to the number of units developed and the intensity of commercial development, including wineries. Under this Alternative, the total number of residential dwelling units anticipated is assumed to be reduced from 1,916 to 1,437 representing a reduction of 479 units, or approximately 25%. In addition, it is anticipated that commercial square footage would be reduced by 25% under this alternative.

This reduced density alternative may not have the same design features as the Project, and therefore, the impacts of this alternative could be greater than or less than the impacts of the Project with regard to specific issue areas. As a variation of this alternative, the site could be developed with higher density product in a “cluster development” fashion, leaving increased natural open space and reducing the extent and cost of infrastructure improvements and site grading.

The Reduced Density Alternative may not require the same level of circulation, water, sewer, flood control and other infrastructure improvement based on a reduction in population, employment, and tourists within the Project site (due to the lower allowable intensity of use in the Project site).

This Alternative may accomplish the objectives enumerated for the Project. However, the future growth of the Project area would be reduced compared to the Project. The level of commercial tourist activities envisioned under the current General Plan and Project would not be reached through implementation of this Alternative.

It should be noted that the Project itself is a reduced density development as compared to what is allowed under the existing General Plan and Policy Areas.

Impacts Compared to the Project

Aesthetics, Light and Glare

The Reduced Density Alternative would reduce the number of residential dwelling units developed and

the intensity of commercial development, including wineries by 25%. Thus, the potential impacts related to aesthetics and light and glare would be reduced when compared with the Project. The Reduced Density Alternative would be subject to the same mitigation measures and regulations concerning aesthetics and, light and glare which would ensure less than significant impacts on visual quality. Impacts from this alternative would be similar or slightly less when compared with the Project.

Agriculture

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the Project area would be developed with a reduced number of residential dwelling units and a reduced intensity of commercial development, including wineries. Impacts to agricultural resources would be similar, although potentially slightly reduced, as compared to the Project.

Air Quality

This Alternative would have substantially reduced air quality impacts due to the reduced land use density.

Biological Resources

The Reduced Density Alternative would reduce the number of residential dwelling units developed and the intensity of commercial development, including wineries by 25%. Thus, the potential impacts related to biological resources would be reduced when compared with the Project. As with the Project, the Reduced Density Alternative would comply with the MSHCP, in addition to state and federal requirements. Impacts to biological resources from the Reduced Density Alternative would be less than significant, the same as the Project.

Cultural Resources

The Reduced Density Alternative would still result in grading and clearance in the Project area; however, the area of the proposed grading would be reduced. The Reduced Density Alternative would be subject to the same mitigation measures and regulations concerning cultural resources as the Project and therefore would result in similar impacts, although slightly reduced due to the overall reduced land use density.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The Reduced Density Alternative would result in the same geologic hazards as identified for the Project. The geological formation, seismic, and soils conditions potentially affecting of implementing projects under the Reduced Density Alternative would be essentially the same as for the Project. All geological related impacts would be the same as the Project. This alternative would have similar impacts as the Project and would require the same mitigation measures.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

This Alternative would have substantially reduced greenhouse gas emissions due to the reduced land use density.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Reduced Density Alternative would reduce the number of residential dwelling units developed and the intensity of commercial development, including wineries by 25%. Under the Reduced Density Alternative, hazardous materials would still be used on both a short-term basis (during construction activities) and on a long-term basis (use of pesticides and fertilizers). The Reduced Density Alternative would be subject to the same mitigation measures and regulations concerning hazards and hazardous

materials which would ensure less than significant impacts.

Hydrology

The Reduced Density Alternative would result in less impervious surface area as compared to the Project, because the density of implementing projects would be reduced by 25%. The configuration and drainage of implementing projects would remain largely unchanged. Impacts to hydrology would be similar or slightly less than the Project.

Land Use and Relevant Planning

The Reduced Density Alternative, like the Project, would propose a general plan amendment and zone change. The Reduced Density Alternative would amend the County Zoning Ordinance No. 348, delete the Citrus Vineyard Policy Area and the Valle de Los Caballos Policy Area, add the Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area, revise the existing Citrus Vineyard Policy Area Design Guidelines, and approve the Temecula Valley Wine Country Design Guidelines. The Reduced Density Alternative would have the same less than significant impact with regard to land use. Overall, impacts would be similar as compared to the Project although slightly less due to reduced density.

Mineral Resources

The Reduced Density Alternative would reduce the number of residential dwelling units developed and the intensity of commercial development, including wineries by 25%. Thus, the project footprint affecting mineral resources would also be reduced. The Reduced Density Alternative would be subject to the same mitigation measures and regulations concerning mineral resources which would ensure less than significant impacts. Impacts from this alternative would be similar to the Project, although slightly reduced due to the increased open space

Noise

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the Project area would be developed with a reduced number of residential dwelling units and a reduced intensity of commercial development, including wineries. The same Districts would be established through the approval of the proposed Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area. However, the mobile source noise generated by this alternative would be slightly decreased compared to the Project due to the decrease in average daily vehicular trips on Project area and adjacent roadways.

Public Services, Recreation and Utilities

As with the Project, the Reduced Density Alternative would result in the increased use of public services, recreational facilities, and utilities, but the demand would be slightly less. The Reduced Density Alternative would be subject to the same mitigation measures and regulations. Impacts from the Reduced Density Alternative would be similar or slightly less than the Project.

Traffic and Circulation

The Reduced Density Alternative would generally result in fewer trips being generated by the Wine Country area. When comparing this alternative to the Project, this alternative would decrease weekday and weekend trip generation. In addition, the Reduced Density Alternative could establish a circulation plan that would provide improved levels-of-service on Project area and adjacent roadway segments and intersections. However, issues related to jurisdictional control, funding, and right-of-way requirements identified in Section 4.14 (Impacts 4.14-1 and 4.14-2) for the Project would remain under this alternative. As such, in terms of roadway levels-of-service, the Reduced Density Alternative would have similar, although slightly decreased, impacts to traffic compared to the Project.

6.6 SUMMARY OF COMPARATIVE EFFECTS OF THE ALTERNATIVES

Table 6.0-2, *Comparison of Impacts Resulting from Project Alternatives as Compared to the Project*, compares the potential impacts of the Project with each of the alternatives evaluated in Section 6.5 of this EIR. The Project had significant unavoidable adverse Project-level impacts related to agricultural resources, air quality, GHG emissions, noise, fire protection services, libraries, traffic, and growth inducing impacts and cumulative impacts related to air quality GHG emissions, noise and traffic. A side-by-side comparison of the issues as evaluated in the EIR is provided in Table 6.0-2 for each of the following Project alternatives.

Table 6.0-2
Comparison of Impacts Resulting from Project Alternatives as Compared to the Project

Environmental Issue	No Build Scenario/ Existing Condition Alternative	No Project/ Existing General Plan Policies and Zoning Classifications Alternative	Reduced Density (25%) Alternative
Aesthetics	Less	Same/Slightly Greater	Same/Slightly Less
Agriculture and Forestry Resources	Less	Greater	Same/Slightly Less
Air Quality	Less	Greater	Less
Biological Resources	Less	Same/Slightly Greater	Same
Cultural Resources	Less	Same/Slightly Greater	Same/Slightly Less
Geology/Soils	Less	Slightly Greater	Same
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Less	Slightly Greater	Less
Hazardous Materials	Less	Greater	Same
Hydrology	Less	Greater	Same/Slightly Less
Land Use	Greater	Greater	Same/Slightly Less
Mineral Resources	Same	Same/Slightly Greater	Same/Slightly Less
Noise	Less	Greater	Same/Slightly Less
Public Services, Recreation & Utilities	Less	Greater	Same/Slightly Less
Transportation/Circulation	Less	Greater	Same/Slightly Less

6.7 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Section 15126(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines indicates that an analysis of alternatives to the Project shall identify one alternative to the project as the environmentally superior alternative. Table 6.0-2 above provides a summary matrix that compares the impacts associated with the Project with the impacts of each of the proposed alternatives. Of the alternatives analyzed in this EIR, the Reduced Density (25%) Alternative is considered environmentally superior overall.



6.0 Alternatives To The Proposed Action

Although superior in reducing environmental impacts (refer to Section 6.5, subsection “Reduced Density (25%) Alternative”, above for analysis of impacts regarding relevant CEQA topical areas, it would still have the same types of significant and unavoidable impacts. Even with a 25% reduction, there would still be significant and unavoidable project impacts associated with air, greenhouse gas emissions, agricultural resources, noise, traffic, and growth-inducing impacts. Also, by reducing the density of the project by approximately 25%, the reduced density would not fulfill certain Project goals and objectives to the same degree as the Project (e.g., maximization of the area’s viticulture and related uses).