

CHAPTER 6 – ALTERNATIVES

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines require an evaluation of alternatives to the proposed action. The purpose of the alternatives evaluation under CEQA is to determine whether one or more feasible alternatives is capable of reducing potentially significant impacts of a preferred project to a less than significant level. The applicable text in the State CEQA Guidelines occurs in Section 15126 as follows:

Section 15126.6 (a): Alternatives to the Proposed Project. An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation.

Section 15126.6 (b) Purpose. Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1), the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly.

The Project objectives are defined in Chapter 4, *Project Description*. These objectives have been developed based on the mandated spatial requirements of the Calvary Chapel Association, which requires an average distance of approximately 10 miles between existing and proposed facilities. There is an established etiquette for locating Bible fellowships in relation to other fellowships. There are existing fellowships in Temecula, Murrieta, French Valley, Menifee and Wildomar. The Project serves the need of the rural community in Wine Country. The fellowship started as a “Bible Study” in a residence in Wine Country. The fellowship grew and was purposely sited in its current location.

The Project’s objectives are as follows:

- Develop a master-planned special event and church facility.
- Develop a “complex” of facilities that function as a whole, in one location for all ages of fellowship members.
- Provide an affordable opportunity for parishioners to hold special events, including weddings, in the Wine Country, which has its unique ambience.
- Provide a controlled environment for spiritual events, not readily available because of the secular nature of the majority of uses in Wine Country.
- Develop in a manner to be compatible and respectful to existing and proposed uses.
- Meet the needs of the religious community of the area.
- Conserve agricultural land through cultivation of 75% of the site in vineyard, in a manner consistent with the surrounding area.
- Allow for special event and church uses that are consistent with existing and proposed uses in the area.

- Develop a Project that is visually attractive and efficiently and effectively organized, including a pleasing landscape palette.
- Develop a Project that maintains the rural character of the C/V Zone through implementation of a Project that is visually attractive, energy efficient, water efficient, and environmentally friendly.

One of the alternatives that must be evaluated is the “no project alternative,” regardless of whether it is a feasible alternative to the proposed Project, i.e. would meet the Project objectives or requirements. Under this alternative, the environmental impacts that would occur if the Project is not approved and implemented are identified.

In addition to the No Project Alternative, a Reduced Project Intensity Alternative will be analyzed. No Alternate Location Alternative will be analyzed, as Scenario #2 provides ample alternative locations. Under Scenario #2, should the Project be approved, and the WCCP does not remain in full effect, development of similar projects may occur in the Citrus Vineyard (C/V) Zone. As contained in the Chapter 4, Project Description, ten (10) parcels have been identified as being similar in character to the parcel in Scenario #1. While the potential exists for all 10 parcels to be developed with a similar use, the potential also exists for less potential developments of this nature, or perhaps, even more. The DEIR analyzed these ten (10) parcels at a programmatic level; therefore, this analysis will suffice as the Alternate Location Alternative. This alternative has been deemed infeasible for the following reasons:

1. The applicant does not own any of these parcels;
2. As described in the Project Objectives, an adjacent parcel is required to allow for the development of a “complex” of facilities that function as a whole, in one location for all ages of fellowship members. None of the alternate locations are adjacent to the existing church facility; and
3. The Alternate Location Alternative does not meet the Project Objectives.

No other alternatives to the Project are given consideration or evaluated in this Chapter due to them either being impractical or infeasible. Per the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6(c)), factors that may be considered when addressing the feasibility of alternatives include failure to meet most of the stated project objectives, and infeasibility, or inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. The following development scenarios were considered and rejected as potential alternatives to implementation of the proposed Project:

- 1 Parcels not Located on a General Plan Circulation Element Roadway.
- 2 Parcels that are not vacant.

Thus, the alternatives considered in this Chapter include:

- 1 No Project Alternative (NPA); and
- 2 Reduced Project Intensity Alternative (RPIA).

The following evaluation also includes identification of an environmentally superior alternative as required by the State CEQA Guidelines. No other plausible alternatives were identified during the review process for consideration in this DEIR.

The following sources were used for the analysis in this Chapter:

- County of Riverside General Plan
- County of Riverside General Plan EIR
- Plot Plan No. 24883
- Change of Zone No. 7882

6.2 NO PROJECT

6.2.1 Overview of No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative (NPA) is required under CEQA to evaluate the environmental effects associated with no action on the part of the Lead Agency. Pursuant to CEQA (§15126.6[e][2]), the NPA should discuss what would reasonably be expected to occur, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services, in the foreseeable future. The NPA includes continued use of the site(s) in their undeveloped states, under both Scenario #1 and Scenario #2, and no additional changes to the existing land uses. This alternative evaluates the environmental impacts resulting from a hypothetical continuance of the existing land uses. The Project site(s) are currently unutilized.

Aesthetic Resources

The NPA would not result in any change to the current aesthetics of the Project site(s). Under Scenario #1 and/or Scenario #2 of the proposed Project, development of the Project will contribute to the change of the general area with an intensification of development in addition to that which presently occurs on the site (vacant) or in the Project vicinity. There will be an associated change in views, both to and from the Project site. The existing visual settings will be altered; however, because of nature and scale of existing and proposed land uses, these views will be similar to what is anticipated in the area. Because the Project serves to implement the Citrus Vineyard provisions within the General Pan, and will be compatible with the WCCP vision in terms of scale, aesthetics (including 75% vineyard planting), the scope of this visual transition is not considered to be a cumulative significant adverse visual impact and the Project will not result in any unavoidable significant impacts. Nonetheless, aesthetic impacts from the NPA would be less than those of the Project.

Agricultural Resources - Agriculture

The NPA would not change the current agricultural status of the Project site(s). According to the analysis contained in Sections 5.3.1 through 5.3.4, and the required standard conditions and mitigation measures contained in Section 5.3.3, implementation of the Project will not exceed the established thresholds for agricultural resources. Since the Project impacts are below these thresholds, implementation of the Project will not have a cumulative impact that would convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use; conflict with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural use or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve; cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm"); or, involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use. With 75% planting of the PP24883 site and other potential

sites, and the general pesticide use conditions (Project mitigation measures), implementation of the Project is not considered to be a significant unavoidable adverse impact to the agricultural resources of Wine Country, and the County of Riverside. With implementation of the Project, it can be assured that 75% of the site(s) will be planted. Under the NPA, will not have any impact on the farmlands discussed above. However, the NPA will not put any land into cultivation. Based on this information, impacts Project would be less than the NPA.

Air Quality/Greenhouse Gasses

Since no construction activity would occur, the NPA would not have any short-term impacts on air quality/greenhouse gasses, as the site(s) are currently vacant. Also, no new, long-term sources of air pollution would result from increased traffic; or increased use of energy resources.

Development of the Project under Scenario #1 will contribute air quality emissions during construction and during operation as well as greenhouse gas emissions. According to the analysis above, with adherence to standard conditions, Project emissions will not exceed established thresholds for any pollutants. Odors will also remain below thresholds. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Since the Project is below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the CV Zone will contribute air quality emissions during construction and during operation as well as greenhouse gas emissions. It can be inferred that these projects will perform their respective analyses above, and be required to adhere to standard conditions. These standard conditions ensured that project emissions did not exceed established thresholds for any pollutants. The same conclusions would apply to odors, as they would also remain below thresholds. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Regardless, similar impacts related to air quality emissions for construction and operations would be anticipated, and impacts would likely be less than significant, since similar intensity of development would be expected to occur. Should any impacts exceed the Project in Scenario #1, the duration of construction can be increased to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, since it is anticipated that future project will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

No change from existing levels in carbon dioxide or other emissions related to global warming would result from the No Project Alternative. Overall, air quality impacts and cumulative greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the NPA would be less than those of the Project.

Biological Resources

The NPA would not result in a change to the existing biology of the Project site(s).

Under Scenario #1, development of the Project will contribute to the change of the general area with an intensification of development substantially greater than that which presently occurs on the site or in the surrounding vicinity. With the incorporation of mitigation and standard conditions, the Project will not cause adverse cumulative effects related to the

reduction of sensitive vegetation communities present in western Riverside County because there are no such species located within the Project area and the Project can be implemented consistent with the criteria identified in the MSHCP. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the CV Zone will have an impact to biological resources. It can be inferred that these projects will perform their respective analyses above, and be required to adhere to standard conditions and be subject to project-specific mitigation (if applicable). These standard conditions will ensure that project impacts will not exceed established thresholds for any biological resources and ensure consistency with the MSHCP. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Regardless, similar biological resources impacts would be anticipated. Impacts would likely be less than significant since similar intensity of development would be expected to occur. Should any impacts exceed the Project in Scenario #1, the avoidance and mitigation can be incorporated to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Therefore, based on this information, even though any impacts will be fully mitigated, the NPA would have lesser impacts on biological resources as those of the Project.

Cultural Resources

The NPA would not have any grading or land disturbance; therefore, it would not result in a change to the existing cultural resources of the Project site(s).

Under Scenario #1, implementation of the Project will not result in cultural resource impacts (including paleontological resources) that will exceed the established thresholds of significance. Because the implementation of the Project is not forecast to cause any direct, significant adverse impact to cultural resources (including paleontological resources), with implementation of identified mitigation measures, the Project has no potential to make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cultural resource impacts (including paleontological resources), in the Project area or Riverside County in general. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the CV Zone will have an impact to cultural and paleontological resources. It can be inferred that these projects will perform their respective analyses above, and be required to adhere to standard conditions and project specific mitigation measures. These standard conditions and mitigation measures will ensure that project impacts did not exceed established thresholds for any cultural and paleontological resources. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative and paleontological impacts.

It is anticipated that any impacts will be addressed and potentially mitigated on a project-by-project basis. According to the RCIT analysis (see Subchapter 9.4), all ten (10) parcels have a 'high potential' for archaeological resources. These Projects would have to conduct Native American Consultation, review literature, conduct site inspections, identify potential resources, avoid and/or fully mitigate any impacts in order to develop their respective sites. These are the options available to address historical and cultural resources. Under the current regulations,

any impacts would be considered less than significant. No additional mitigation is required.

According to the RCIT analysis (see Subchapter 9.4), all ten (10) parcels have a ‘high potential’ for paleontological resources. Impacts related to paleontological resources would be anticipated during construction and would be anticipated to be of similar intensity to that of Scenario # 1 (similar intensity of development would be expected to occur). Like Scenario #1, these impacts would likely be less than significant with the incorporation of a Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP).

Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Therefore, based on this information, even though any impacts will be fully mitigated, cultural resources impacts from the NPA would be less than those of the Project.

Geology and Soils Resources

The NPA would not involve structural development on the site(s); therefore, few/much fewer people are subject to geological issues.

Development under either Scenario #1 or Scenario #2 will be affected by geotechnical constraints. None of the future Project-related activities are forecast to cause changes in geology or soils or constraints that cannot be fully mitigated, primarily through standard conditions of approval. Geologic hazards are typically site-specific impacts and would not be anticipated to result in cumulative impacts. Therefore, the Project has no potential to make a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant geology or soils impact. The Project can be implemented without causing or experiencing significant unavoidable geology or soil impacts.

Therefore, based on this information, even though any impacts will be fully mitigated, geology and soils resources impacts from the NPA would be less than those of the Project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The NPA would not involve structural development on the site(s); therefore, few/much fewer people are subject to hazards and hazardous materials issues.

Under Scenario #1, development of the Project may result in releases of hazards and hazardous materials. According to the analysis above, with adherence to standard conditions, and mitigation measures, Project impacts will not exceed established thresholds for hazards and hazardous materials. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Since the Project is below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. On the other hand as the County grows, the demand for public service resources to respond to hazard and hazardous material grows incrementally. The Project will add to the cumulative demand for such resources. As stated in Section 5.13.2.5, the Project will have an incremental impact to the County Fire Department's ability to provide an acceptable level of service. These impacts are forecast to include an increased number of emergency and public service calls due to the increased presence of structures and population.

Each project proponent shall participate in the Development Impact Fee Program as adopted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors to mitigate a portion of these impacts. This will provide funding for capital improvements such as land, equipment purchases and fire station construction. The Project will contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts related to the need to reduce cumulative effects on Fire Services.

The Project's potentially significant or cumulative considerable impacts to FPER Services can be reduced to less than significant and payment of fees by all cumulative projects can effectively reduce the overall cumulative impacts to such services. Therefore, cumulative impacts are considered less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the CV Zone will have an impact to hazards and hazardous materials resources. It can be inferred that these projects will perform their respective analyses above, and be required to adhere to standard conditions and project specific mitigation measures. These standard conditions and mitigation measures will ensure that project impacts did not exceed established thresholds for any hazards or hazardous materials. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Regardless, similar impacts related to hazardous materials on sites, and impacts would likely be less than significant, since similar intensity of development would be expected to occur. Should any impacts exceed the Project in Scenario #1, the level of analysis and remediation can be increased to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Therefore, based on this information, even though any impacts will be fully mitigated, hazards and hazardous materials resources impacts from the NPA would be less than those of the Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality Resources

Under the NPA, the existing vacant site would remain and the site(s) would not be developed. The current hydrology would remain the same.

Under Scenario #1, development of the Project will have an impact to hydrology and water quality resources. According to the 2011 Hydrology and Hydraulics Report and 2011 WQMP, with adherence to standard conditions, Project emissions will not exceed established thresholds for hydrology or water quality resources. The total flow rates leaving the Project in the post-project condition are less than the pre-Project condition. Therefore the Project does not adversely impact downstream properties. The Project mitigates increased runoff for the Project site utilizing the extended detention basin. The flows within the porous landscape detention basin are not mitigated; however, the total flows leaving the Project site do not exceed the total flows in the pre-project condition. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. With implementation of the proposed stormwater management design, as outlined in the 2011 Hydrology and Hydraulics Report and 2011 WQMP, (Volume 2) and the above standard conditions, future stormwater runoff after development of the Project is not forecast to make a cumulatively considerable contribution to downstream flood hazards and water quality resources. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the CV Zone will have

an impact to hydrology and water quality resources. It can be inferred that these projects will perform their respective analyses above, and be required to adhere to standard conditions. These standard conditions ensured that project impacts did not exceed established thresholds for any pollutants. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Regardless, similar impacts related to hydrology and water quality resources for construction and operations would be anticipated, and impacts would likely be less than significant, since similar intensity of development would be expected to occur. Should any impacts exceed the Project in Scenario #1, project design modifications can be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Hydrology/water quality resources (primarily water quality) impacts from the NPA would be less than those of the Project.

Land Use and Planning

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing vacant site would remain and the site(s) would not be developed. These existing uses are consistent with the existing General Plan and zoning underlying the Project site.

The Project sites are located within the Southwest Area Plan (SWAP) of the General Plan and has a General Plan Land Use Designation of AG (Agriculture). The Projects are within the Agriculture Foundation Component. Development of the Project will not contribute to the change of the general area, even though it will result in development on the site (vacant). The proposed Project is consistent with the existing and proposed physical arrangement of the established community and is consistent with the General Plan land use designations. Wine Country is an established and burgeoning community in Riverside County. The existing setting in Wine Country, in the vicinity of the Project includes wineries, vineyards, inns, bed and breakfasts, resorts, and restaurants. Many of the wineries also provide facilities for concerts and special events (i.e., weddings, etc.). The scale of the proposed Project will be consistent with the existing and proposed physical arrangement of the established Wine Country.

The proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan. No General Plan Amendment is proposed as part of the Project. A Change of Zone application is included as part of the application. Change of Zone No. 07782 (CZ 7782) and its associated amendment to Ordinance No. 348 proposes to amend Riverside County Ordinance No. 348, Section 14.73 subsection b. to include churches, temples and other places of religious worship as a conditionally permitted use in the Citrus/Vineyard Zone (C/V Zone), and amend Section 14.74 of Ordinance No. 348 to include development standards for churches, temples and other places of religious worship in the C/V Zone.

Under either Scenario, the proposed Change of Zone will not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area. County application materials, site-specific analysis, 75% vineyard planting requirement, architectural compatibility, aesthetic consistency, landscaping and plant palette quantity and quality, and conditions of approval will ensure that project specific impacts to these resources are fully addressed.

As discussed in Subchapter 5.10.5, implementation of the Project will not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area; affect land use within a city sphere of

influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries; be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning; be compatible with existing surrounding zoning; be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses; be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan); or, disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low- income or minority community).

Based on this information, implementation of the Project will not present any significant cumulative impacts. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Therefore, land use and planning resources impacts from the NPA would be less than those of the Project.

Mineral Resources

The NPA would not result in a change to the existing mineral resources potential of the Project site(s).

The Project site(s) are designated MRZ-3a (areas where the available geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist, however, the significance of the deposits is undetermined). Since the Project sites are designated MRZ-3a, implementation of the Project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. According to Figure OS-5, Mineral Resources, of the General Plan, the Project site is not located in a "State Designated Aggregate Resource Area." Based on a review of the USGS Mineral Resources Data System: <http://mrddata.usgs.gov/mineral-resources/mrds-us.html>, no mines are located in the areas of the Project. There will be no cumulative impacts to mineral resources due to implementation of the Project. There will be no unavoidable significant adverse impacts to mineral resources due to implementation of the Project.

Therefore, mineral resources impacts from the NPA would be less than those of the Project.

Noise

Since no construction, or project use activity would occur, the NPA would not have any short- or long-term noise impacts.

Under Scenario #1, development of the Project will result in increases to noise. As discussed in Subchapters 5.12-1 through 5.12-4, development of the Project will result in increases to noise. According to the analysis, with adherence to standard conditions, and mitigation measures (referenced in Subchapter 5.12.6), project impacts will not exceed established thresholds for noise resources. The thresholds have been established to address Project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Since the Project is below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the C/V Zone will have an impact to noise resources. It can be inferred that these projects will perform their respective analyses above, and be required to adhere to standard conditions and project specific mitigation measures. These standard conditions and mitigation measures will ensure that project impacts

did not exceed established thresholds for any noise. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Regardless, similar impacts related to noise resources for construction and operations would be anticipated, and impacts would likely be less than significant, since similar intensity of development would be expected to occur. Should any impacts exceed the Project in Scenario #1, project design modifications can be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Because of the far lesser amount of development, noise resources impacts from the NPA would be less than those of the Project.

Public Services

Fire and Sheriff Services

The NPA would not result in the creation of additional demand for sheriff and fire department services. Sheriff Department and Fire Department response times would remain unchanged.

The Project will have an incremental impact to the County Fire Department's ability to provide an acceptable level of service. These impacts are forecast to include an increased number of emergency and public service calls due to the increased presence of structures and population.

Each Project proponent shall participate in the Development Impact Fee Program as adopted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors to mitigate a portion of these impacts. This will provide funding for capital improvements such as land, equipment purchases and fire station construction. The Project will contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts related to the need to reduce cumulative effects on Fire Services.

The Project's potentially significant or cumulative considerable impacts to FPER Services can be reduced to less than significant and payment of fees by all cumulative projects can effectively reduce the overall cumulative impacts to such services. Therefore, cumulative impacts are considered less than significant.

The Project contributes a relatively small, incremental increase to the need for Sheriff Services. Thus, the Project will contribute to a cumulative adverse impact to the County Sheriff Department's ability to provide an acceptable level of service without mitigation. These impacts are forecast to include an increased number of emergency and public service calls due to the increased presence of urban/suburban uses and population.

Each Project proponent shall participate in the Development Impact Fee Program as adopted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors to mitigate a portion of these impacts. This will provide funding for capital improvements such as land, equipment purchases and fire station construction. The Project will contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts related to the need to reduce cumulative effects on Sheriff Services.

The Project's potentially significant or cumulative considerable impacts to Sheriff Services can be reduced to less than significant and payment of fees by all cumulative projects can effectively reduce the overall cumulative impacts to such services. Therefore, cumulative impacts are

considered less than significant.

Since existing response times are adequate to meet the needs and standards for rural areas, this impact would be less than those of the Project.

Therefore, based on this information, even though any impacts will be fully mitigated, fire and sheriff services resources impacts from the NPA would be less than those of the Project.

Libraries

The NPA would not create any additional demand upon existing library services within the Project area. No Riverside County development impact fees for libraries would occur for the Project either. Based on this information, the impacts from the NPA would be the same as those of the Project.

Schools

The NPA would not generate additional students for the existing school districts, thereby not creating an impact upon existing schools. Due to the nature of the Project, no impacts to schools would occur. Based on this information, the impacts from the NPA would be the same as those of the Project.

Health Services

The NPA would not generate additional need for health services. The Project, under either Scenario, in conjunction with other projects anticipated within the SWAP will generate a population that is anticipated to incrementally increase the need for Health Service facilities. The County has established a structure to expand health service facilities based on future identified demand. Because the Project only presents a temporary shift in population, any impacts to Health Services will be incrementally cumulative and less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated. Therefore, health services resources impacts from the NPA would be less than those of the Project.

Transportation / Traffic

The NPA would not increase site-generated traffic above current levels and therefore, would not contribute to the need for area-wide off-site road improvements. The Project will contribute to the generation of additional traffic on local and regional roadways.

Development of the Project will result in impacts that would conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit; conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

Implementation of the Project will not result in a cumulative change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial

safety risks; alter waterborne, rail or air traffic; substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment); cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads; cause an effect upon circulation during the Project's construction; result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses; conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities; or, bike trails.

According to the analysis above, with adherence to standard conditions, and incorporation of mitigation measures, the Project will still exceed thresholds for facilities that are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, and the joint jurisdiction of the City of Temecula and the County. Any potential improvements to mitigate these impacts cannot be guaranteed by the lead agency (County). Therefore, these impacts are considered significant and unavoidable and will require a statement of overriding consideration for the proposed Project. Since the Project is above the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will be significant.

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the CV Zone will contribute to traffic in the area. It can be inferred that these projects will perform their respective analyses, and be required to adhere to standard conditions and project-specific mitigation measures. It is also assumed that the scope and scale of the projects under Scenario #2 will be similar to that under Scenario #1; therefore, impacts are anticipated to be similar in scale and intensity. It is anticipated that these project-specific traffic analyses will include the same methodologies for analysis; a similar cumulative project list, and similar roadway and intersection configurations (existing setting). Since the projects under Scenario #2 will be similar in nature to the Project under Scenario #1, trip assignment, trip distribution and trip generation rates would be comparable. It is anticipated that impacts will be similar, and that the similar standard conditions will apply. Mitigation, unique to each project may be required. At a minimum, since there will be similar impacts, and there are improvements that are beyond the control of the lead agency (County), it is anticipated that any potential improvements to mitigate these impacts cannot be guaranteed by the lead agency (County). Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be above the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will be significant.

In 2002, the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) program was initiated in Western Riverside County. Under the TUMF, developers of residential, industrial and commercial property are required to pay a development fee to fund regional transportation projects, which mitigates cumulative impacts to the roadway segments and intersections included in the TUMF program. The TUMF funds both local and regional arterial projects. The applicant shall participate in the funding or construction of off-site improvements, including traffic signals that are needed to serve cumulative traffic conditions through the payment of required Western Riverside County TUMF, in addition to the County of Riverside Development Impact Fee (DIF) and other fair share contributions as directed by the County, including any future Road Bridge Building District.

Therefore, transportation/traffic resources impacts from the NPA would be less than those of the Project.

Utilities and Service Systems

Water and Sewer

The site is currently vacant; therefore, the NPA would not increase the use of water on the Project. According to RCWD, and EMWD, there is an adequate water supply and sewer capacity, respectively, to meet the demand of the Project(s). Based on the analysis in this DEIR and the referenced documentation, the water, wastewater management systems are capable of meeting the cumulative demand for these systems. Recycled water is available in the RCWD system, but is not available to the Project site(s). Thus, the Project will not cause cumulatively considerable significant adverse impacts on these systems. Therefore, utilities – water and sewer resources impacts from the NPA would be less than those of the Project.

Natural Gas and Electricity

The NPA would not create an increased need in the amount of natural gas and electricity services. The Project sites are served by propane. There are no impacts to natural gas.

Development under Scenario #1, or, Scenario #2 would result in a permanent and continued use of electricity resources. Sufficient power and distribution capabilities exist to provide electrical services to the Project.

Commission authorized energy efficiency programs. Since the project would constitute a small incremental increase of the current customer base and the Project has been required to install Energy Star-rated models of appliances and be served by existing service and transmission lines within and around the Project area, this Project's cumulative energy impacts are concluded to a less than significant cumulative impact.

Therefore, utilities – electric resources impacts from the NPA would be less than those of the Project.

Solid Waste

The NPA would not create an increase in the amount of solid waste generated on the Project sites, as they are currently vacant. Implementation of either Scenario #1 or Scenario #2 of the Project will result in the additional generation of construction and operational solid waste. Mitigation measures address construction debris recycling and reuse to achieve a reduction in waste beyond the County requirement of a 50 percent reduction by weight. Implementation of this measure would reduce the construction waste from the Project at a higher level than required by the County. The Project will comply with County Conditions of Approval and will exceed those requirements with implementation of mitigation measures outlined above.

Cumulative impacts to landfill capacity will be less than significant due to the Project construction debris and operational waste representing a less than substantial cumulative increment with mitigation. Therefore, due to available capacity and implementation of the above mitigation measures, which provide for recycling on site to reduce Project operational waste, cumulative impacts to the existing landfills resulting from waste generated by the Project during operations are considered less than significant. The overall impacts will be greater than the NPA.

Maintenance of Public Facilities and Other Governmental Services

The NPA would not create an increase in the Maintenance of Public Facilities and Other Governmental Services, as they are currently vacant. Maintenance of public facilities was addressed in Section 5.13 (Public Facilities) and 5.14 (Transportation/Traffic). The proposed Project will not have an impact on other governmental services not discussed in other Sections of this DEIR. No significant cumulative impacts are anticipated. No mitigation will be required. Overall impacts of the Project will be the same as the NPA.

Adopted Energy Conservation Plans

The NPA would not conflict with Adopted Energy Conservation Plans, as they are currently vacant. The Project will comply with all Title 24 energy conservation requirements. No conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans would occur if the proposed Project is implemented. Implementation of the proposed Project will serve to implement energy conservation plans. No impacts are anticipated. No significant cumulative impacts are anticipated. No mitigation is required. Overall Project impacts will be greater than the NPA.

6.2.2 Summary of No Project Alternative

With respect to the NPA, Project objectives are not attained because no development is included as a part of the NPA. It is also unlikely that the NPA is feasible, since change, in one form or another, is inevitable in this area, as envisioned by the General Plan, the SWAP, and potentially, the WCCP.

The NPA will have fewer impacts than the Project to the following resources:

- Aesthetic Resources
- Air Quality/Greenhouse Gasses Resources
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials Resources
- Hydrology/Water Quality Resources
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise Resources
- Public Services Resources
 - Fire and Sheriff Services
 - Health Services
- Transportation/Traffic Resources
- Utilities Resources
 - Water and Sewer
 - Natural Gas and Electricity
 - Solid Waste
 - Maintenance of Public Facilities and Other Governmental Services
 - Adopted Energy Conservation Plans

The NPA will have similar impacts than the Project to the following resources:

- Public Services Resources
 - Libraries
 - Schools
- Utilities Resources
 - Maintenance of Public Facilities and Other Governmental Services

The NPA will have greater impacts than the Project to the following resources:

- Agricultural Resources – Agriculture

6.3 REDUCED PROJECT INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

6.3.1 Overview of Reduced Project Intensity Alternative

A Reduced Project Intensity Alternative (RPIA) was chosen to address significant unavoidable impacts associated with implementation of the Project. Plot Plan No. 24833 (PP 24883) consists of the construction of a 2,480 square foot special occasions facility and restroom building, a 68,389 square foot open air wedding ceremony assembly area, a 768 square foot residence, a 31,496 square foot church building comprised of classrooms, offices, assembly areas, and porches, and a 49,379 square foot church building for the sanctuary, offices, restrooms, and porches. For purposes of analysis, it will be assumed that one-half (½) of the Project square footage would be constructed and operated under the RPIA.

Aesthetic Resources

The RPIA will still result in a change to the current aesthetics of the Project site(s). The Project development overall footprint may be assumed to decrease. Under Scenario #1 and/or Scenario #2, development of the Project will contribute to the change of the general area with an intensification of development in addition to than that which presently occurs on the site (vacant) or in the Project vicinity. There will be an associated change in views, both to and from the Project site. The existing visual settings will be altered; however, because of nature and scale of existing and proposed land uses, these views will be similar to what is anticipated in the area. Because the Project serves to implement the Citrus Vineyard provisions within the General Plan, and will be compatible with the WCCP vision in terms of scale, aesthetics (including 75% vineyard planting), the scope of this visual transition is not considered to be a cumulative significant adverse visual impact and the Project will not result in any unavoidable significant impacts. Taking all of these factors into consideration, aesthetic impacts from the RPIA would be slightly less, but similar to, that of the Project.

Agricultural Resources - Agriculture

The RPIA will result in a change to the current agricultural resources - agriculture of the Project site(s). According to the analysis contained in Sections 5.3.1 through 5.3.4 and the required standard conditions and mitigation measures contained in Section 5.3.3, implementation of the Project will not exceed the established thresholds for agricultural resources. Since the Project impacts are below these thresholds, implementation of the Project will not have a cumulative impact that would convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and

Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use; conflict with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural use or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve; cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm"); or, involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use. With 75% planting of the PP24883 site and other potential sites, and the general pesticide use conditions (Project mitigation measures), implementation of the Project is not considered to be a significant unavoidable adverse impact to the agricultural resources of Wine Country, and the County of Riverside. With implementation of the Project, it can be assured that 75% of the site will be planted. The same would apply to the RPIA. Agricultural resources impacts from the RPIA would be similar to that of the Project.

Air Quality/Greenhouse Gasses

The RPIA will result in a change to the current air quality/greenhouse gasses of the Project site(s). Development of the Project under Scenario #1 will contribute air quality emissions during construction and during operation as well as greenhouse gas emissions. According to the analysis above, with adherence to standard conditions, Project emissions will not exceed established thresholds for any pollutants. Odors will also remain below thresholds. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Since the Project is below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the CV Zone will contribute air quality emissions during construction and during operation as well as greenhouse gas emissions. It can be inferred that these projects will perform their respective analyses above, and be required to adhere to standard conditions. These standard conditions ensured that project emissions did not exceed established thresholds for any pollutants. The same conclusions would apply to odors, as they would also remain below thresholds. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Regardless, similar impacts related to air quality emissions for construction and operations would be anticipated, and impacts would likely be less than significant, since similar intensity of development would be expected to occur. Should any impacts exceed the Project in Scenario #1, the duration of construction can be increased to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, since it is anticipated that future project will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Because the RPIA is smaller in size than the Project, air quality impacts and cumulative greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the RPIA would be less than that of the Project.

Biological Resources

The RPIA will result in a change to the current biological resources of the Project site(s). Under Scenario #1, development of the Project will contribute to the change of the general area with an intensification of development substantially greater than that which presently occurs on the site or in the surrounding vicinity. With the incorporation of mitigation and standard conditions, the Project will not cause adverse cumulative effects related to the reduction of

sensitive vegetation communities present in western Riverside County because there are no such species located within the Project area and the Project can be implemented consistent with the criteria identified in the MSHCP. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the CV Zone will have an impact to biological resources. It can be inferred that these projects will perform their respective analyses above, and be required to adhere to standard conditions and be subject to project-specific mitigation (if applicable). These standard conditions will ensure that project impacts will not exceed established thresholds for any biological resources and ensure consistency with the MSHCP. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Regardless, similar biological resources impacts would be anticipated. Impacts would likely be less than significant since similar intensity of development would be expected to occur. Should any impacts exceed the Project in Scenario #1, the avoidance and mitigation can be incorporated to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Because the RPIA is smaller in size than the Project, the RPIA alternative might slightly reduce potential biological resource impacts. With implementation of MSHCP the impacts would be approximately the same.

Cultural Resources

The RPIA will result in a change to the cultural resources of the Project site(s). Under Scenario #1, implementation of the Project will not result in cultural resource impacts (including paleontological resources) that will exceed the established thresholds of significance. Because the implementation of the Project is not forecast to cause any direct, significant adverse impact to cultural resources (including paleontological resources), with implementation of identified mitigation measures, the Project has no potential to make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cultural resource impacts (including paleontological resources), in the Project area or Riverside County in general. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the CV Zone will have an impact to cultural and paleontological resources. It can be inferred that these projects will perform their respective analyses above, and be required to adhere to standard conditions and project specific mitigation measures. These standard conditions and mitigation measures will ensure that project impacts did not exceed established thresholds for any cultural and paleontological resources. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative and paleontological impacts.

It is anticipated that any impacts will be addressed and potentially mitigated on a project-by-project basis. According to the RCIT analysis (see Subchapter 9.4), all ten (10) parcels have a "high potential" for archaeological resources. These Projects would have to conduct Native American Consultation, review literature, conduct site inspections, identify potential resources, avoid and/or fully mitigate any impacts in order to develop their respective sites. These are the options available to address historical and cultural resources. Under the current regulations, any impacts would be considered less than significant. No additional mitigation is required.

According to the RCIT analysis (see Subchapter 9.4), all ten (10) parcels have a ‘high potential’ for paleontological resources. Impacts related to paleontological resources would be anticipated during construction and would be anticipated to be of similar intensity to that of Scenario # 1 (similar intensity of development would be expected to occur). Like Scenario #1, these impacts would likely be less than significant with the incorporation of a Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP).

Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

A lesser amount area will be disturbed and developed under the RPIA than the Project; however, 75% of the site will still need to be planted in vineyard. Impacts would be similar and the standard conditions and mitigation measures will still be applicable. Cultural resources effects would be slightly less under the RPIA.

Geology and Soils Resources

The RPIA will result in a change to the current geology and soils resources of the Project site(s). Development under either Scenario #1 or Scenario #2 will be affected by geotechnical constraints. None of the future Project-related activities are forecast to cause changes in geology or soils or the constraints that cannot be fully mitigated, primarily through standard conditions of approval. Therefore, the Project has no potential to make a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant geology or soils impact. The Project can be implemented without causing or experiencing significant unavoidable geology or soil impacts.

Because the RPIA is smaller in size than the Project, geology and soils resources impacts from the RPIA would be similar to the Project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The RPIA will result in a change to the current hazards and hazardous materials of the Project site(s). Under Scenario #1, development of the Project may result in releases of hazards and hazardous materials. According to the analysis above, with adherence to standard conditions, and mitigation measures, Project impacts will not exceed established thresholds for hazards and hazardous materials. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Since the Project is below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. On the other hand, as the County grows, the demand for public service resources to respond to hazard and hazardous material grows incrementally. The Project will add to the cumulative demand for such resources. As stated in Section 5.13.2.5, the Project will have an incremental impact to the County Fire Department’s ability to provide an acceptable level of service. These impacts are forecast to include an increased number of emergency and public service calls due to the increased presence of structures and population.

Each project proponent shall participate in the Development Impact Fee Program as adopted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors to mitigate a portion of these impacts. This will provide funding for capital improvements such as land, equipment purchases and fire station construction. The Project will contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts related to the need to reduce cumulative effects on Fire Services.

The Project's potentially significant or cumulative considerable impacts to FPER Services can be reduced to less than significant and payment of fees by all cumulative projects can effectively reduce the overall cumulative impacts to such services. Therefore, cumulative impacts are considered less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the CV Zone will have an impact to hazards and hazardous materials resources. It can be inferred that these projects will perform their respective analyses above, and be required to adhere to standard conditions and project specific mitigation measures. These standard conditions and mitigation measures will ensure that project impacts did not exceed established thresholds for any hazards or hazardous materials. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Regardless, similar impacts related to hazardous materials on sites, and impacts would likely be less than significant, since similar intensity of development would be expected to occur. Should any impacts exceed the Project in Scenario #1, the level of analysis and remediation can be increased to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Because the RPIA is smaller in size than the Project, hazards and hazardous materials resources impacts from the RPIA would be less than the Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality Resources

The RPIA will result in a change to the current hydrology and water quality resources of the Project site(s). Under Scenario #1, development of the Project will have an impact to hydrology and water quality resources. According to the 2011 Hydrology and Hydraulics Report and 2011 WQMP, with adherence to standard conditions, Project emissions will not exceed established thresholds for hydrology or water quality resources. The total flow rates leaving the Project in the post-project condition are less than the pre-Project condition. Therefore, the Project does not adversely impact downstream properties. The Project mitigates increased runoff for the Project site utilizing the extended detention basin. The flows within the porous landscape detention basin are not mitigated; however, the total flows leaving the Project site do not exceed the total flows in the pre-project condition. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. With implementation of the proposed stormwater management design, as outlined in the 2011 Hydrology and Hydraulics Report and 2011 WQMP, (Volume 2) and the above standard conditions, future stormwater runoff after development of the Project is not forecast to make a cumulatively considerable contribution to downstream flood hazards and water quality resources. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the CV Zone will have an impact to hydrology and water quality resources. It can be inferred that these projects will perform their respective analyses above, and be required to adhere to standard conditions. These standard conditions ensured that project impacts did not exceed established thresholds for any pollutants. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Regardless, similar impacts related to hydrology and water quality resources for construction and operations would be anticipated, and impacts would likely be less than significant, since similar intensity of development would be expected to occur. Should any impacts exceed the Project in Scenario #1, project design

modifications can be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

The RPIA would be required to implement the same requirements. Therefore, hydrology/water quality resources (primarily water quality) impacts from the RPIA would be similar to those of the Project.

Land Use and Planning

The Project sites are located within the Southwest Area Plan (SWAP) of the General Plan and has a General Plan Land Use Designation of AG (Agriculture). The Projects are within the Agriculture Foundation Component. Development of the Project will not contribute to the change of the general area, even though it will result in development on the site (vacant). The proposed Project is consistent with the existing and proposed physical arrangement of the established community and is consistent with the General Plan land use designations. Wine Country is an established and burgeoning community in Riverside County. The existing setting in Wine Country, in the vicinity of the Project includes wineries, vineyards, inns, bed and breakfasts, resorts, and restaurants. Many of the wineries also provide facilities for concerts and special events (i.e., weddings, etc.). The scale of the proposed Project will be consistent with the existing and proposed physical arrangement of the established Wine Country.

The proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan. No General Plan Amendment is proposed as part of the Project. A Change of Zone application is included as part of the application. Change of Zone No. 07782 (CZ 7782) and its associated amendment to Ordinance No. 348 proposes to amend Riverside County Ordinance No. 348, Section 14.73 subsection b. to include churches, temples and other places of religious worship as a conditionally permitted use in the Citrus/Vineyard Zone (C/V Zone), and amend Section 14.74 of Ordinance No. 348 to include development standards for churches, temples and other places of religious worship in the C/V Zone.

Under either Scenario, the proposed Change of Zone will not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area. County application materials, site-specific analysis, 75% vineyard planting requirement, architectural compatibility, aesthetic consistency, landscaping and plant palette quantity and quality, and conditions of approval will ensure that project specific impacts to these resources are fully addressed.

As discussed in Subchapter 5.10.5, implementation of the Project will not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area; affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries; be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning; be compatible with existing surrounding zoning; be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses; be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan); or, disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low- income or minority community).

Based on this information, implementation of the Project will not present any significant cumulative impacts. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Land use and planning resources impacts resources impacts from the RPIA would be similar to

that of the Project.

Mineral Resources

The Project site(s) are designated MRZ-3a (areas where the available geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist, however, the significance of the deposits is undetermined). Since the Project sites are designated MRZ-3a, implementation of the Project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. According to Figure OS-5, Mineral Resources, of the General Plan, the Project site is not located in a "State Designated Aggregate Resource Area." Based on a review of the USGS Mineral Resources Data System: <http://mrdata.usgs.gov/mineral-resources/mrds-us.html>, no mines are located in the areas of the Project. There will be no cumulative impacts to mineral resources due to implementation of the Project. There will be no unavoidable significant adverse impacts to mineral resources due to implementation of the Project.

The same conclusions would apply to the RPIA. Therefore, mineral resources impacts from the RPIA would be less than those of the Project.

Noise

The RPIA will result in a change to the current noise resources of the Project site(s). Under Scenario #1, development of the Project will result in increases to noise. As discussed in Subchapters 5.12-1 through 5.12-4, development of the Project will result in increases to noise. According to the analysis, with adherence to standard conditions, and mitigation measures (referenced in Subchapter 5.12.6), project impacts will not exceed established thresholds for noise resources. The thresholds have been established to address Project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Since the Project is below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the C/V Zone will have an impact to noise resources. It can be inferred that these projects will perform their respective analyses above, and be required to adhere to standard conditions and project specific mitigation measures. These standard conditions and mitigation measures will ensure that project impacts did not exceed established thresholds for any noise. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Regardless, similar impacts related to noise resources for construction and operations would be anticipated, and impacts would likely be less than significant, since similar intensity of development would be expected to occur. Should any impacts exceed the Project in Scenario #1, project design modifications can be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated.

Under the RPIA, these impacts would occur, but they would be reduced, due to the reduction in the overall Project development. Therefore, noise resources impacts from the RPIA would be less than that of the Project.

Public Services

Fire and Sheriff Services

The RPIA would result in the creation of additional demand for sheriff and fire department services. Sheriff Department and Fire Department response times would remain unchanged. The payment of Riverside County-established development impact fees for sheriff and fire department facilities would occur under this RPIA, but due to the reduction in Project intensity, these amounts would be less than the proposed Project. Fire and sheriff services resources impacts from the RPIA would be less than those of the Project.

Libraries

No Riverside County development impact fees for libraries would occur for the Project either. Based on this information, the impacts from the RPIA would be the same as those of the Project.

Schools

Due to the nature of the Project, no impacts to schools would occur. Based on this information, the impacts from the RPIA would be the same as those of the Project.

Health Services

The Project, under either Scenario, in conjunction with other projects anticipated within the SWAP will generate a population that is anticipated to incrementally increase the need for Health Service facilities. The County has established a structure to expand health service facilities based on future identified demand. Because the Project only presents a temporary shift in population, any impacts to Health Services will be incrementally cumulative and less than significant. No unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated. Because the RPIA is smaller in size than the Project, utilities – health services resources impacts from the RPIA would be less than those of the Project.

Transportation / Traffic

The RPIA will result in a change to the current transportation / traffic resources of the Project site(s). Development of the Project will result in impacts that would conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit; conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

Implementation of the Project will not result in a cumulative change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks; alter waterborne, rail or air traffic; substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment); cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads; cause an

effect upon circulation during the Project's construction; result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses; conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities; or, bike trails.

According to the analysis above, with adherence to standard conditions, and incorporation of mitigation measures, the Project will still exceed thresholds for facilities that are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, and the joint jurisdiction of the City of Temecula and the County. Any potential improvements to mitigate these impacts cannot be guaranteed by the lead agency (County). Therefore, these impacts are considered significant and unavoidable and will require a statement of overriding consideration for the proposed Project. Since the Project is above the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will be significant.

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the CV Zone will contribute to traffic in the area. It can be inferred that these projects will perform their respective analyses, and be required to adhere to standard conditions and project-specific mitigation measures. It is also assumed that the scope and scale of the projects under Scenario #2 will be similar to that under Scenario #1; therefore, impacts are anticipated to be similar in scale and intensity. It is anticipated that these project-specific traffic analyses will include the same methodologies for analysis; a similar cumulative project list, and similar roadway and intersection configurations (existing setting). Since the projects under Scenario #2 will be similar in nature to the Project under Scenario #1, trip assignment, trip distribution and trip generation rates would be comparable. It is anticipated that impacts will be similar, and that the similar standard conditions will apply. Mitigation, unique to each project may be required. At a minimum, since there will be similar impacts, and there are improvements that are beyond the control of the lead agency (County), it is anticipated that any potential improvements to mitigate these impacts cannot be guaranteed by the lead agency (County). Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be above the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will be significant.

In 2002, the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) program was initiated in Western Riverside County. Under the TUMF, developers of residential, industrial and commercial property are required to pay a development fee to fund regional transportation projects, which mitigates cumulative impacts to the roadway segments and intersections included in the TUMF program. The TUMF funds both local and regional arterial projects. The applicant shall participate in the funding or construction of off-site improvements, including traffic signals that are needed to serve cumulative traffic conditions through the payment of required Western Riverside County TUMF, in addition to the County of Riverside Development Impact Fee (DIF) and other fair share contributions as directed by the County, including any future Road Bridge Building District.

Because the RPIA is smaller in size than the Project, transportation/traffic resources impacts from the RPIA would be less than that of the Project.

Utilities and Service Systems

Water and Sewer

According to RCWD, and EMWD, there is an adequate water supply and sewer capacity, respectively, to meet the demand of the Project(s). Based on the analysis in this DEIR and the

referenced documentation, the water, wastewater management systems are capable of meeting the cumulative demand for these systems. Recycled water is available in the RCWD system, but is not available to the Project site(s). Thus, the Project will not cause cumulatively considerable significant adverse impacts on these systems. Under the RPIA, these impacts would occur, but they would be reduced, due to the reduction in the overall Project development. Therefore, utilities – water and sewer resources impacts from the RPIA would be less than that of the Project.

Natural Gas and Electricity

The Project sites are served by propane. There are no impacts to natural gas.

Development under Scenario #1, or, Scenario #2 would result in a permanent and continued use of electricity resources. Sufficient power and distribution capabilities exist to provide electrical services to the Project.

Commission authorized energy efficiency programs. Since the project would constitute a small incremental increase of the current customer base and the Project has been required to install Energy Star-rated models of appliances and be served by existing service and transmission lines within and around the Project area, this Project's cumulative energy impacts are concluded to a less than significant cumulative impact.

These impacts would occur, but they would be reduced, due to the reduction in the overall Project development intensity. Therefore, utilities – natural gas and electricity impacts from the RPIA would be less than that of the Project.

Solid Waste

Implementation of either Scenario #1 or Scenario #2 of the Project will result in the additional generation of construction and operational solid waste. Mitigation measures address construction debris recycling and reuse to achieve a reduction in waste beyond the County requirement of a 50 percent reduction by weight. Implementation of this measure would reduce the construction waste from the Project at a higher level than required by the County. The Project will comply with County Conditions of Approval and will exceed those requirements with implementation of mitigation measures outlined above.

Cumulative impacts to landfill capacity will be less than significant due to the Project construction debris and operational waste representing a less than substantial cumulative increment with mitigation. Therefore, due to available capacity and implementation of the above mitigation measures, which provide for recycling on site to reduce Project operational waste, cumulative impacts to the existing landfills resulting from waste generated by the Project during operations are considered less than significant.

Under the RPIA, these impacts would occur, but they would be reduced, due to the reduction in the overall Project development. Therefore, utilities - solid waste resources impacts from the RPIA would be less than that of the Project.

Maintenance of Public Facilities and Other Governmental Services

Maintenance of public facilities was addressed in Section 5.13 (Public Facilities) and 5.14 (Transportation/Traffic). The proposed Project will not have an impact on other governmental services not discussed in other Sections of this DEIR. No significant cumulative impacts are

anticipated. No mitigation will be required. Under the RPIA, these impacts would occur, but they would be reduced, due to the reduction in the overall Project development.

Adopted Energy Conservation Plans

The Project will comply with all Title 24 energy conservation requirements. No conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans would occur if the proposed Project is implemented. Implementation of the proposed Project will serve to implement energy conservation plans. No impacts are anticipated. No significant cumulative impacts are anticipated. No mitigation is required. Under the RPIA, these impacts would occur, but they would be reduced, due to the reduction in the overall Project development.

6.3.2 Summary of Reduced Project Intensity Alternative

With respect to the RPIA, the reduction of the Project size has a comparable negative effect on the ability of the Project to meet Project costs, i.e., development feasibility and certain Project objectives may not be attained because certain infrastructure improvements may not be feasible.

The RPIA will have fewer impacts than the Project to the following resources:

- Aesthetic Resources
- Air Quality/Greenhouse Gasses Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Noise Resources
- Public Services Resources
 - Fire and Sheriff Services
- Transportation/Traffic Resources
- Utilities Resources
 - Water and Sewer
 - Natural Gas and Electricity
 - Solid Waste
 - Maintenance of Public Facilities and Other Governmental Services
 - Adopted Energy Conservation Plans

The RPIA will have similar impacts than the Project to the following resources:

- Agricultural Resources
- Biological Resources
- Geology and Soils Resources
- Hydrology/Water Quality Resources
- Land Use/Planning
- Public Services Resources
 - Libraries
 - Schools
 - Health Services

The RPIA will have greater impacts than the Project to the following resources:

- None

It should be noted that less fees and funding would be provided through the RPIA to upgrade regional transportation infrastructure; public services and utilities.

6.4 DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

Of the two (2) alternatives considered, the Reduced Project Intensity Alternative (RPIA) has been determined to be the environmentally superior alternative. Section 15126.6(e)(2) indicates that where the no project alternative is environmentally superior, “the DEIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.” The RPIA has been evaluated as not being a feasible alternative because it does not meet the majority of the Project objectives discussed in Subchapter 4.2 of this document and summarized above. With respect to the RPIA, the reduced development has a comparable negative effect on the ability of the Project to meet project costs, i.e., development feasibility and essential Project objectives may not be attained because certain on-site improvements and other infrastructure improvements may not be feasible.

The No Project Alternative (NPA) was evaluated and was also determined ~~not~~ to be an environmentally superior alternative. It is also unlikely that the NPA is feasible, since it would not meet the Project objectives and would not implement the General Plan. Under the NPA no fees and funding would be provided to upgrade regional transportation infrastructure; public services and utilities.

As stated prior, no Alternate Location Alternative will be analyzed, as Scenario #2 provides ample alternative locations. Under Scenario #2, CZ 7882 would apply to all parcels with the C/V Designation. For the purposed of the analysis of this DEIR, ten (10) parcels have been identified as being similar in character as the parcel in Scenario #1. The DEIR analyzed these ten (10) parcels at a programmatic level; therefore, this analysis will suffice as the Alternate Location Alternative. This alternative has been deemed infeasible for the following reasons:

1. The applicant does not own any of these parcels;
2. As described in the Project Objectives, an adjacent parcel is required to allow for the development of a “complex” of facilities that function as a whole, in one location for all ages of fellowship members. None of the alternate locations are adjacent to the existing church facility; and
3. The Alternate Location Alternative does not meet the Project Objectives.

No other alternatives to the Project are given consideration or evaluated in this Chapter due to them either being impractical or infeasible.