

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT**

### 3.1 Land Use


#### 3.1.1 Existing and Future Land Use

Land use is addressed in terms of existing and planned land uses. Existing land uses are defined as those uses within the Mid County Parkway (MCP) study area as well as in adjacent areas when scoping was initiated in November 2004. Since then, some land uses have changed in response to ongoing land development occurring at a rapid pace within the MCP study area. However, the baseline used for analysis has remained the same. Existing land uses were determined through aerial photograph interpretation and field reconnaissance.

Planned land uses are those that will occur as a result of land use designations and policies contained in various applicable land planning documents. The applicable land planning documents include the City of Corona General Plan (March 2004), City of Perris General Plan (2004/2005), City of San Jacinto Draft General Plan (January 2006), and County of Riverside General Plan (October 2003).

#### 3.1.1.1 Affected Environment

The MCP study area consists of a mixture of urbanized, residential, rural residential, agricultural, industrial/commercial, and open space land uses (including existing wildlife reserves and lands that may be acquired for conservation under the western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan [MSHCP]). Section 3.4, Community Impacts, of this EIR/EIS has additional information regarding schools, businesses, etc. Figure 3.1.1 shows existing land uses in the MCP study area within the proposed right of way for all the MCP Build Alternatives. The following describes existing land uses by jurisdictions and geographic/community area.
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Riverside County (Unincorporated Area)

Much of the MCP study area is located within unincorporated portions of Riverside County. These areas are described from west to east below.

Temescal Canyon Area

The unincorporated portions of Temescal Canyon, located at the western end of the MCP study area, are undergoing rapid development, with both residential and mixed-use projects (such as the Dos Lagos development located southeast of the Interstate 15 [I-15]/Cajalco Road interchange) that have been recently completed or are still under construction. Several large mining and rock quarry operations are in this area, including the Harlow Rock Quarry on the south side of Cajalco Road just west of Temescal Canyon Road and several large mining operations west of Eagle Canyon Road and north of Cajalco Road.

Lake Mathews/Woodcrest

Much of the terrain in the Lake Mathews/Woodcrest area is hilly, with scattered gentle rolling foothills. There are many rugged rock outcroppings throughout the Gavilan Hills area. Lake Mathews provides an open space resource and visual amenity for the area. Open space is the dominant land use in this area. Southeast of the intersection of Cajalco Road and Lake Mathews Drive is the community of Lake Mathews Estates, a rural residential community characterized by large single-family residences.

East of Lake Mathews, land uses at the intersection of Cajalco Road and Wood Road consist of a Christmas tree farm, a residential development, and a detention basin. A mix of commercial and residential structures is located at the southwest corner of Cajalco Road and Gavilan Road. Residences are located between Harley John Road and Gustin Lane (north and south sides of Cajalco Road). Residences are located on the south side of Cajalco Road, just east of Gustin Lane. Clusters of residences are located on the north side of Cajalco Road. While residences are located on the north side of Cajalco Road at Extravaganza Lane, open space and agricultural land comprise the area east from Extravaganza Lane to Wood Road.

At the intersection of Cajalco Road and El Sobrante Road, the Colorado River Aqueduct and the Val Verde Channel are visible at the northeast corner. The land uses along El Sobrante Road north of Lake Mathews are mostly open space, interspersed with scattered residences and agricultural land. The community of Victoria Grove is located on the north side of El Sobrante Road, between La Sierra
Avenue and McAlister Street. In addition, residential development is underway on the west side of La Sierra Avenue at the intersection with El Sobrante Road. South along La Sierra Avenue from the intersection with El Sobrante Road is primarily open space.

In the southeastern portion of the Lake Mathews/Woodcrest area are the Gavilan Hills. The area is rural in character, with very-low-density residential, agricultural, vacant land, and open space reserve (Harford Springs Wildlife Reserve) being the predominant land uses. As shown in the Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan, future land use planned for the area would maintain this rural character (Riverside County General Plan, 2003).

**Mead Valley**
Cajalco Road is the key arterial highway serving the community of Mead Valley. It also functions as a major link between Interstate 215 (I-215) and I-15. South of Cajalco Road is a mixture of equestrian estate homes set among rolling hills and large stands of eucalyptus. A community center and a fire station are located in Mead Valley. The area north of Cajalco Road is predominantly a grid-like pattern of 0.2 hectare (ha) (0.5 acre [ac]) and larger residential lots. Manuel L. Real Elementary School and Tomas Rivera Middle School are also located in this area.

Land uses along Cajalco Road between Brown Street and I-215 consist of commercial properties, single-family residences, vacant land, manufactured housing, motels, roadside businesses, residential/commercial scrap yards, a light industrial building, abandoned homes, a church, a nursery, a government repository, a construction equipment yard, a lumberyard, and a gas station.

Rural residential areas exist between Gold Valley Road and Juniper Road, and a developed area between Headly Road and Brown Street consists of scattered manufactured housing, mobile homes, and a few single-family residences.

**Lakeview/Nuevo**
The Lakeview/Nuevo area is within a wide valley formed by the San Jacinto River east of Lake Perris. Agriculture is the primary land use, including both farmland and uses supporting agricultural operations. The Bernasconi Hills create a border in the northwest, while the Lakeview Mountains form the eastern boundary of this area. The San Jacinto Wildlife Area is located at the foot of the Bernasconi Hills. The Colorado River Aqueduct runs underground in an east-to-west orientation. A liquor store and several buildings are located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Hansen
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Avenue/Davis Road and the Ramona Expressway. Mobile homes are southwest of the intersection. Four small homes are located northeast of the intersection along Davis Road. A small community composed of rural residential uses is located south of the Ramona Expressway and west of Hansen Avenue. Reservoir Road parallels Ramona Expressway to the south. The Lakeview Community Church and Jesus Center Christian School are located on the corner of Magnolia Avenue and Reservoir Road.

Much of the land in the Lakeview/Nuevo area is planned for residential and mixed-use development in accordance with the Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Riverside County General Plan, 2003).

San Jacinto Valley
Located within the eastern portion of the MCP study area, the San Jacinto Valley lies between the Lakeview Mountains in the northwest, the Dawson Mountains in the southwest, and the San Jacinto Mountains along its northeastern flank (also a portion of the San Bernardino National Forest). The portions of the San Jacinto Valley within the MCP study area are mostly agricultural (dairy) land. The San Jacinto Valley Area Plan (Riverside County General Plan, 2003) designates this area for agricultural and open space (conservative) uses.

City of Corona
The city of Corona is located at the western terminus of the MCP study area. West of the I-15/Cajalco Road interchange is open space/agricultural land. The area north of Bedford Canyon Road/Eagle Glen Parkway is high-density residential, comprising single-family residences. Single-family residences are the predominant feature on the north end of the MCP study area, on both sides of the I-15 up to Ontario Avenue. There is an industrial area located west of I-15 at the intersection of Compton Avenue and Ontario Avenue.

The area adjacent to the I-15/Cajalco Road interchange consists of mostly retail commercial uses in the northwest quadrant, a large agricultural field in the southwest quadrant (planned for future development), a major retail center (the Crossings) in the northeast quadrant, and vacant space in the southeast quadrant. Land uses at the Cajalco Road/Temescal Canyon Road intersection include industrial uses such as a recycling center and a granary in the southwest quadrant of the intersection; a fenced site consisting of bulk construction supplies in the southeast quadrant; and a tanker truck storage area, a fire station, and a site under construction located in the northeast quadrant.
City of Perris
The city of Perris is in the central portion of the MCP study area, extending easterly from I-215. Much of the area within Perris is developing with both residential and nonresidential land uses. Specific areas within the Perris portion of the MCP study area are described in more detail below.

Along I-215 within Perris, the predominant land uses are commercial/industrial. Some land is still in agricultural production, but these areas are converting rapidly to commercial/industrial uses.

Along Ramona Expressway from I-215 easterly to Rider Street are a variety of land uses, including agricultural, commercial/retail, and residential. Prominent land uses are the Lake Perris State Fairgrounds located north of Ramona Expressway and east of the Perris Valley Storm Drain, and a large warehouse distribution facility located at the southwest corner of Ramona Expressway and Indian Avenue.

Along the Perris Valley Storm Drain, existing land uses are residential and vacant land (much of which is undergoing or will soon be undergoing development).

Existing land uses along Rider Street from I-215 easterly to Perris Boulevard are primarily commercial/industrial, including two large warehouse distribution facilities. Other land in this area currently in agricultural production is planned for additional commercial uses, including more warehouse distribution facilities. East of Perris Boulevard, existing land uses are a mix of residential, commercial, and vacant parcels.

Existing land use along Placentia Avenue from Dunlap Drive to just southwest of Rider Street along the Ramona Expressway is mostly vacant land that is rapidly developing. Rural residential uses, an elementary school (Val Verde Elementary School), and large vacant properties are on the east side of I-215. Single-family residences on large parcels are located to the southeast of Placentia Avenue near the intersection with Patterson Avenue. To the northwest are single-family manufactured/mobile homes on large parcels. Continuing east along Placentia Avenue, there is predominantly open space and agricultural land around Indian Avenue. At the intersection of Placentia Avenue and Perris Boulevard, there is predominantly agricultural land, except for a large industrial building at the southwest corner. Between Perris Boulevard and Redlands Avenue, there is an area of single-family residences on the south side of Placentia Avenue. Paragon Park is located between
Spectacular Bid Street and Redlands Avenue. Between Redlands Avenue and Wilson Avenue, there are single-family residences on the south side of Placentia Avenue.

**City of San Jacinto**
Within the easterly portion of the MCP study area in the city of San Jacinto, agriculture and open space with scattered homes dominate the landscape along the Ramona Expressway from the San Jacinto River easterly to SR-79.

**Reserves and Habitat Conservation Plans**
Habitat Conservation Plans prepared under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) and the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) are the primary planning and regulatory tools that guide the preservation of natural biological communities. While Habitat Conservation Plans are not prepared under CESA, the state process of issuing an incidental take permit under CESA complements the federal Habitat Conservation Plan process and usually includes the same or similar species, depending on their status.

The following Reserves and Habitat Conservation Areas (HCAs) are located within the MCP study area:

- Western Riverside County MSHCP
- Lake Mathews MSHCP
- El Sobrante Landfill MSHCP
- Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency (RCHCA) area
- Lake Mathews-Estelle Mountain Reserve
- Habitat Conservation Plan for the Stephens’ Kangaroo Rat Reserve
- Harford Springs Wildlife Reserve
- Motte-Rimrock Reserve

A detailed description of these reserves and HCAs, as well as a discussion of impacts to these reserves and HCAs as a result of the MCP are provided in Section 3.17, Natural Communities.

### 3.1.1.2 Environmental Consequences

**Permanent Impacts**

**Build Alternatives**
As shown in Table 3.1.A, all of the MCP Build Alternatives would impact existing residential, commercial (retail/office), industrial, transportation (existing roadways), agricultural, and open space (habitat reserves/parklands/undeveloped lands) land uses.
Alternative 9 and its design variations have the lowest impact to agricultural, residential, and commercial land uses due primarily to its routing south of Mead Valley through the Gavilan Hills area. Alternatives 4 and 6 have the highest impact to commercial land uses due primarily to the routing of the parkway alignment through some of the commercial areas in the northern portion of the city of Perris as well as Mead Valley. Alternative 9 and its design variations have the highest impact to industrial land uses due to its routing along Placentia Avenue.

With regard to overall land use compatibility, those segments of all MCP Build Alternatives that follow existing El Sobrante Road, Cajalco Road, or Ramona Expressway are generally compatible with adjacent land uses, as these areas have been planned in consideration of future construction of either a Community and Environmental Transportation Acceptability Process (CETAP) corridor or a General Plan roadway (expressway or urban arterial) in these areas. In areas where the MCP Build Alternatives are located off of the alignments of El Sobrante Road, Cajalco Road, or Ramona Expressway, there are some conflicts with land use compatibility. Specific areas include:

- **South of Lake Mathews (Lake Mathews South [LMS] Segment in Alternatives 4, 5, and 9; Lake Mathews South General Plan [LMS-GP] and Lake Mathews North General Plan [LMN-GP] Segments in Alternatives 6 and 7):** In this area, the existing land use is primarily habitat reserve, with some low-density residential and rural residential uses. Constructing an MCP Alternative in these areas would introduce a major highway in these areas and its associated effects such as noise, vehicle emissions, and barriers to wildlife movement.

- **Gavilan Hills (Far South [FS] Segment in Alternative 9):** In this area, the existing land use is primarily low-density residential and rural residential, as well as some agriculture. Constructing Alternative 9 would introduce a major highway facility and its associated effects such as noise, vehicle emissions, and lighting in the Gavilan Hills, which would impact the rural quality of this area.
### Table 3.1.A Existing Land Use Impacts by Alternative per Hectare (Acre)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Public Facilities</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 4 Base Case</td>
<td>409.2 (1,011.1)</td>
<td>20.7 (51.1)</td>
<td>18.2 (45.1)</td>
<td>168.7 (416.8)</td>
<td>281.1 (694.6)</td>
<td>4.1 (10.1)</td>
<td>79.7 (196.9)</td>
<td>146.0 (360.7)</td>
<td>1,127.6 (2,786.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 4 SJN DV</td>
<td>414.0 (1,023.1)</td>
<td>20.7 (51.2)</td>
<td>17.4 (42.9)</td>
<td>168.7 (416.8)</td>
<td>274.4 (678.1)</td>
<td>4.1 (10.1)</td>
<td>81.4 (201.2)</td>
<td>146.0 (360.7)</td>
<td>1,126.7 (2,784.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 4 TWS DV</td>
<td>408.9 (1,010.3)</td>
<td>21.8 (53.8)</td>
<td>15.2 (37.5)</td>
<td>168.7 (416.8)</td>
<td>276.4 (682.9)</td>
<td>3.7 (9.2)</td>
<td>69.7 (172.2)</td>
<td>145.4 (359.3)</td>
<td>1,109.7 (2,742.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 5 Base Case</td>
<td>388.8 (960.8)</td>
<td>12.9 (31.9)</td>
<td>17.6 (43.4)</td>
<td>168.2 (415.6)</td>
<td>294.9 (728.7)</td>
<td>5.8 (14.4)</td>
<td>79.8 (197.3)</td>
<td>126.2 (311.9)</td>
<td>1,094.3 (2,704.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 5 SJN DV</td>
<td>393.7 (972.9)</td>
<td>13.0 (32.0)</td>
<td>16.7 (41.3)</td>
<td>168.2 (415.6)</td>
<td>288.2 (712.2)</td>
<td>5.8 (14.4)</td>
<td>81.6 (201.6)</td>
<td>126.2 (311.9)</td>
<td>1,093.4 (2,701.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 5 TWS DV</td>
<td>388.5 (960.1)</td>
<td>14.0 (34.6)</td>
<td>14.5 (35.9)</td>
<td>168.2 (415.6)</td>
<td>290.2 (717.1)</td>
<td>5.5 (13.5)</td>
<td>69.8 (172.6)</td>
<td>125.7 (310.5)</td>
<td>1,076.4 (2,659.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 6 Base Case</td>
<td>427.1 (1,055.3)</td>
<td>21.5 (53.0)</td>
<td>24.1 (59.5)</td>
<td>219.4 (542.0)</td>
<td>403.2 (996.2)</td>
<td>4.1 (10.1)</td>
<td>84.2 (208.2)</td>
<td>147.6 (364.7)</td>
<td>1,311.1 (3,289.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 6 SJN DV</td>
<td>431.9 (1,067.4)</td>
<td>21.5 (53.2)</td>
<td>23.2 (57.4)</td>
<td>219.4 (542.0)</td>
<td>396.5 (979.7)</td>
<td>4.1 (10.1)</td>
<td>85.9 (212.5)</td>
<td>147.6 (364.7)</td>
<td>1,330.2 (3,286.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 6 TWS DV</td>
<td>426.8 (1,054.6)</td>
<td>22.6 (55.8)</td>
<td>21.0 (52.0)</td>
<td>219.4 (542.0)</td>
<td>398.4 (984.5)</td>
<td>3.7 (9.2)</td>
<td>74.2 (183.5)</td>
<td>147.0 (363.3)</td>
<td>1,313.2 (3,244.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 7 Base Case</td>
<td>406.8 (1,005.1)</td>
<td>13.7 (33.9)</td>
<td>23.4 (57.9)</td>
<td>218.9 (540.9)</td>
<td>417.0 (1,030.3)</td>
<td>5.8 (14.4)</td>
<td>84.4 (208.6)</td>
<td>127.8 (315.9)</td>
<td>1,297.8 (3,206.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 7 SJN DV</td>
<td>411.6 (1,017.1)</td>
<td>13.8 (34.0)</td>
<td>22.6 (55.7)</td>
<td>218.9 (540.9)</td>
<td>410.3 (1,013.8)</td>
<td>5.8 (14.4)</td>
<td>86.2 (212.9)</td>
<td>127.8 (315.9)</td>
<td>1,296.9 (3,204.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 7 TWS DV</td>
<td>406.5 (1,004.4)</td>
<td>14.8 (36.6)</td>
<td>20.4 (50.3)</td>
<td>218.9 (540.9)</td>
<td>412.2 (1,018.7)</td>
<td>5.5 (13.5)</td>
<td>74.4 (183.9)</td>
<td>127.3 (314.5)</td>
<td>1,279.9 (3,162.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 Base Case</td>
<td>355.3 (878.0)</td>
<td>9.7 (24.0)</td>
<td>26.5 (65.4)</td>
<td>71.9 (177.7)</td>
<td>425.2 (1,050.6)</td>
<td>1.6 (4.0)</td>
<td>56.8 (140.3)</td>
<td>120.2 (296.9)</td>
<td>1,067.1 (2,636.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 RD DV</td>
<td>390.3 (964.4)</td>
<td>12.9 (31.9)</td>
<td>18.4 (45.4)</td>
<td>68.5 (169.2)</td>
<td>421.6 (1,041.8)</td>
<td>5.3 (13.2)</td>
<td>46.9 (115.9)</td>
<td>125.8 (310.8)</td>
<td>1,089.6 (2,692.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 PP-E DV</td>
<td>355.8 (879.3)</td>
<td>9.8 (24.1)</td>
<td>27.3 (67.6)</td>
<td>71.9 (177.8)</td>
<td>423.0 (1,045.3)</td>
<td>1.6 (4.0)</td>
<td>56.3 (139.1)</td>
<td>120.1 (296.8)</td>
<td>1,065.9 (2,634.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 SJN DV</td>
<td>360.2 (890.1)</td>
<td>9.8 (24.2)</td>
<td>25.6 (63.2)</td>
<td>71.9 (177.7)</td>
<td>418.5 (1,034.1)</td>
<td>1.6 (4.0)</td>
<td>58.5 (144.6)</td>
<td>120.1 (296.9)</td>
<td>1,066.2 (2,634.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 TWS DV</td>
<td>355.0 (877.3)</td>
<td>10.8 (26.8)</td>
<td>23.4 (57.8)</td>
<td>71.9 (177.7)</td>
<td>420.4 (1,038.9)</td>
<td>1.3 (3.1)</td>
<td>46.8 (115.6)</td>
<td>119.6 (295.5)</td>
<td>1,049.2 (2,592.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DV = Design Variation
PP-E = Placentia Avenue/Perris Boulevard Elevated Grade
RD = Rider Street
SJN = San Jacinto North
TWS = Temescal Wash Area
• **Perris Area:** In this area, compatibility with existing land uses is low since the MCP Build Alternatives traverse areas where there is a variety of existing residential, commercial, and industrial land uses. Between I-215 and where the MCP Build Alternatives connect to Ramona Expressway south of Lake Perris, the MCP Build Alternatives are routed through areas where either no roadway exists or was previously planned, or where the existing or planned roadways are 2- to 6-lane arterials (e.g., Placentia Avenue and Rider Street) rather than the 6- to 8-lane, limited-access parkway proposed for the MCP project.

**No Build Alternative**

Under the MCP No Build Alternatives, the permanent impacts discussed above for the MCP Build Alternatives would not occur. Alternative 1B would implement the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element improvements on Cajalco Road and Ramona Expressway, and would therefore be compatible with existing and planned land uses.

**Discussions of Impacts Relative to MSHCP Amendment**

The EIR/EIS for the MSHCP found that direct and indirect impacts on sensitive vegetation communities and covered species are reduced through implementation of the MSHCP, which includes assembly of an approximately 202,340 ha (500,000 ac) reserve system, adaptive management and monitoring, as well as other protection measures.

The MSHCP includes coverage of a regional transportation corridor upon which the project alternatives for the MCP have been developed. An amendment to the MSHCP would be required to provide coverage to a modified alignment for the transportation corridor. This discussion is provided as a supplemental environmental analysis to provide supporting documentation under CEQA and NEPA for such an amendment to the MSHCP. It should be noted that this discussion pertains specifically to the analysis of consistency for Alternative 9 Temescal Wash Area Design Variation (TWS DV), which has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative. If a different alternative were to be pursued for coverage, additional CEQA/NEPA analysis may be needed.

Section 3.17 contains a detailed analysis of the effects of providing coverage of Alternative 9 TWS DV under the MSHCP, pursuant to the specific criteria identified in the MSHCP to demonstrate consistency. As noted in Section 3.17, a consistency determination is not being made at this time. However, the analysis contained in
Section 3.17 provides a framework for consistency and identifies the environmental effects of MSHCP coverage for Alternative 9 TWS DV.

Land use was not specifically analyzed in the MSHCP EIR/EIS. However, the introduction of the MSHCP EIR/EIS states that long-term implementation of the MSHCP would result in changes to the regional pattern of land use, with possible increased development pressure and intensification of development outside the criteria areas. Community division was, however, determined not to be a topic of concern and therefore was not analyzed in the MSHCP EIR/EIS.

Based on the analysis of impacts of the MCP related to land use discussed above in this document, the impacts of the MCP would not affect the conclusions of the MSHCP EIR/EIS. Therefore, an amendment to the MSHCP to provide coverage for Alternative 9 TWS DV would not result in impacts to land uses beyond that previously analyzed.

**Temporary Impacts**

**Build Alternatives**

Construction would temporarily affect nearby land uses. Temporary construction impacts would include disruption of local traffic patterns and access to residences and businesses; increased traffic congestion; and increased noise, vibration, and dust. Although some businesses could close or relocate during a prolonged construction period, this impact would be localized and would not likely result in long-term changes in land use.

**No Build Alternatives**

The two No Build Alternatives would not result in temporary land use impacts from construction of the MCP project, but there would be temporary impacts resulting from other planned transportation improvements in the MCP study area.

Under Alternative 1A, the planned street network would be constructed, except for improvements to Cajalco Road and Ramona Expressway. Because Cajalco Road and Ramona Expressway would remain as they are today, there would be no temporary land use impacts along these roadways under Alternative 1A. Therefore, temporary land use impacts in the vicinity of Cajalco Road and Ramona Expressway would be less for Alternative 1A than under the MCP Build Alternatives.

Under Alternative 1B, the planned street network would be developed according to the Circulation Element of the Riverside County General Plan. Under Alternative 1B,
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3.1-20 Draft Mid County Parkway EIR/EIS and Section 4(f) Evaluation

Temporary land use impacts would be expected to be less than the MCP Build Alternatives since it would widen Cajalco Road and Ramona Expressway. Between I-15 and El Sobrante Road, the impacts of Alternative 1B would be the same as MCP Build Alternatives 6 and 7, since these alternatives implement the General Plan roadway alignments in this area.

3.1.1.3 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

As previously discussed in this section, the MCP Build Alternatives would result in physical changes to communities, including temporary physical divisions of established areas as a result of the reconfiguration of existing roads, sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and driveways during construction. Mitigation measures have been identified below to reduce impacts to the existing land uses and communities during construction. While these measures would reduce impacts during construction, they would not completely eliminate the impacts. These measures would apply to all MCP Build Alternatives.

In addition, as part of the Traffic Management Plan specified in Mitigation Measure TR-2 in Section 3.6 (Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities) of this EIR/EIS, a plan to maintain business access shall also be provided. Specific avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures that address impacts to open space are also provided in Section 3.17, Natural Communities.

LU-1 During construction, the construction contractor shall be required by the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) to maintain pedestrian access to adjacent land uses in the construction area throughout the construction period. If existing access points are disrupted, alternative access will be provided. Appropriate signage and temporary sidewalks will be provided as needed throughout construction, and the construction contractor shall provide and maintain appropriate signage to direct both pedestrian and vehicular traffic to businesses via alternate routes. Disabled access, consistent with the requirements of the American with Disabilities Act, shall also be maintained during construction.

LU-2 During construction, the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) shall require one or more public information field office(s) near the construction site(s) be established. The field office(s) will serve the following purposes:
• Provide the community and businesses with a physical location where information pertaining to construction can be obtained in both English and Spanish
• Enable RCTC staff to facilitate communication between RCTC staff and residents and business operators
• Notify property owners, residents, and businesses of major construction activities (e.g., utility relocation/disruption, rerouting of delivery trucks) at least 14 days prior to the disruption
• Respond to phone inquiries
• Coordinate business outreach programs

3.1.2 Consistency with State, Regional, and Local Plans

3.1.2.1 Affected Environment
The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), along with the General Plans of the affected communities (County of Riverside and Cities of Corona, Perris, and San Jacinto), were reviewed in order to identify the regional planning goals, land use-related goals, and specific policies of the local jurisdictions that should be considered in evaluating the MCP project.

**SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan–Growth Management Chapter Policies**

3.03 The timing, financing, and location of public facilities, utility systems, and transportation systems shall be used by SCAG to implement the region’s growth policies.

3.20 Support the protection of vital resources such as wetlands, groundwater recharge areas, woodlands, production lands, and land containing unique and endangered plants and animals.

3.21 Encourage the implementation of measures aimed at the preservation and protection of recorded and unrecorded cultural resources and archaeological sites.

**SCAG Regional Transportation Plan Goals**

• Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region.
• Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region.
• Preserve and ensure a sustainable regional transportation system.
• Maximize the productivity of our transportation system.
• Protect the environment, improve air quality, and promote energy efficiency.
• Encourage land use and growth patterns that complement our transportation investments.

**Transportation Policies**

• Transportation investments shall be based on SCAG’s adopted Regional Performance Indicators, which include mobility, accessibility, reliability, safety, cost effectiveness, productivity, sustainability, preservation, environmental and environmental justice.
• Ensuring safety, adequate maintenance, and efficiency of operations on the existing multimodal transportation system will be RTP priorities and will be balanced against the need for system expansion investments.
• RTP land use and growth strategies that differ from currently expected trends will require a collaborative implementation program that identifies required actions and policies by all affected agencies and subregions.

**Air Quality Policies**

• Determine specific programs and associated actions needed (e.g., indirect source rules, enhanced use of telecommunications, provision of community-based shuttle services, provision of demand management-based programs, or vehicle-miles traveled/emission fees) so that options to command and control regulations can be assessed.
• Through the environmental document review process, ensure that plans at all levels of government (regional, air basin, County, subregional and local) consist of air quality, land use, transportation and economic relationships to ensure consistency and minimize conflicts.

**Riverside County General Plan**

Adopted in 2003, the Riverside County General Plan sets the direction for Riverside County’s land use and development, as well as the development of its economic base, the framework of its transportation system, and the preservation of the natural and cultural resources it contains.
Circulation Element Policies
C 1.1 Design the transportation system to respond to concentrations of population and employment activities, as designated by the Land Use Element and in accordance with the Circulation Plan.

C 1.3 Support the development of transit connections that link the community centers located throughout the county and as identified in the Land Use Element and in the individual area plans.

C 1.4 Utilize existing infrastructure and utilities to the maximum extent practicable and provide for the logical, timely, and economically efficient extension of infrastructure and services.

C 1.5 Evaluate the planned circulation system as needed to enhance the arterial highway network.

C 1.6 Cooperate with local, regional, state, and federal agencies to establish an efficient circulation system.

Land Use Element Policies
LU 1.5 The County shall participate in regional efforts to address issues of mobility, transportation, traffic congestion, economic development, air and water quality, and watershed and habitat management with Cities, local and regional agencies, stakeholders, Indian nations, and surrounding jurisdictions.


Air Quality Element Policies
AQ 14.4 Preserve transportation corridors with the potential of high demand or of regional significance for future expansion to meet project demand.

Riverside County Area Plans
Recognizing the unique character of Riverside County’s different communities, Area Plans were developed as part of the Riverside County General Plan to guide development in specific locations. Area Plans are components of the General Plan that address issues and development policies in greater detail than the parent document. Each Area Plan is considered an element of the General Plan. Area Plans
serve as a guide for land use, zoning, transportation improvements, open space, and other capital improvements while preserving the uniqueness of the surrounding communities. The Area Plans within the MCP study area include Temescal Canyon, Lake Mathews/Woodcrest, Mead Valley, Lakeview/Nuevo, and San Jacinto Valley. The following policies relevant to the MCP project are common to all of these Area Plans:

- Design and develop the vehicular roadway system in accordance with the Functional Classifications and Standards section in the General Plan Circulation Element.
- Maintain the County’s roadway Level of Service standards as described in the Level of Service section of the General Plan Circulation Element.

City of Corona General Plan
Adopted in 2004, the General Plan for the city of Corona presents a vision for its future and a strategy to make that vision a reality. The General Plan provides a framework for Corona’s physical, economic, social, and environmental development and addresses all geographic areas in the city as well as those surrounding areas that may be served by the city in the future. It is long range, looking ahead to 2025, while at the same time presenting policies to guide day-to-day decisions. The following goals and policies are relevant to the MCP project.

Land Use Element

Goal 1.3
A development pattern that retains and complements the city’s important residential neighborhoods, commercial and industrial districts, and open spaces.

Policies

1.4.8 Require that development occur only when the public infrastructure and services needed to support that development are available, will be provided concurrently, or are committed to be provided within a reasonable time frame where this would not incur adverse impacts on current infrastructure and services, to the extent permitted by State law.

1.12.1 Provide for the continuation of existing and development of new manufacturing, research and development, professional office, and similar uses in accordance with the Land Use Plan’s designations and applicable density standards and design and development policies.
Circulation Element

Goal 6.2
Support development of a network of regional roadway facilities which ensure the safe and efficient movement of people and goods from within the city to areas outside its boundaries, and which accommodate the regional travel demands of developing areas outside the city.

Policies
6.2.3 Coordinate impacts of new roadway connections with adjacent Cities and Riverside County to ensure consistency in design and operations of the new facilities and connections.
6.2.4 Participate in programs to mitigate regional traffic congestion.
6.2.7 Consider the implementation of intercity/intraregional connections to improve regional and local mobility.

City of Perris General Plan

Circulation Element
Goal I
A comprehensive transportation system that will serve projected future travel demand, minimize congestion, achieve the shortest feasible travel times and distances, and address future growth and development in the city.

Policies
I.A Design and develop the transportation system to respond to concentrations of population and employment activities, as designated by the Land Use Element and in accordance with the designated Transportation System.
I.C Cooperate with local, regional, State, and federal agencies to establish an efficient multimodal circulation system.
Goal II
A well planned, designed, constructed and maintained street and highway system that facilitates the movement of vehicles and provides safe and convenient access to surrounding developments.

Policies
II.A LOS “D” along all City-maintained roads (including intersections) and LOS “D” along I-215 and SR-74 (including intersections with local streets and roads). An exception to the local road standard is LOS “E”, at intersections of any Arterials and Expressways with SR-74, the Ramona-Cajalco Expressway or at I-215 freeway ramps.

II.B Maintain the existing transportation network while providing for future expansion and improvement based on travel demand, and the development of alternative travel modes.

Goal VII
A transportation system that maintains a high level of environmental quality.

Policies
VII.A Implement the Transportation System in a manner consistent with federal, State, and local environmental quality standards and regulations.

Goal VIII
Enhanced traffic flow, reduced travel delay, reduced reliance on single-occupant vehicles, and improved safety along the City and State roadway system.

City of San Jacinto General Plan
The City of San Jacinto General Plan is the primary long-range planning document that guides growth and development within San Jacinto. The General Plan establishes the community’s vision for the future and includes goals, policies, and programs to achieve that vision. San Jacinto is primarily a residential community and will continue to have a substantial portion of its land devoted to housing. A draft General Plan update and supporting EIR were completed in January 2006 (www.ci.san-jacinto.ca.us/maps_guidelines.htm, accessed October 15, 2007).
Land Use Element

Goal 4
Promote high quality development that ensures compatibility with surrounding land uses and major transportation corridors.

Policies
4.3 Maximize commercial, retail, and employment opportunities along the city’s major corridors and intersections, including the SR-79, the Ramona Expressway, Sanderson, and Cottonwood.

Circulation Element

Goal C-1
Provide a circulation system that meets the needs of existing and future land uses.

Policies
1.3 Coordinate with other major transportation improvement programs and agencies such as Caltrans and the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) to implement roadway improvements that promote the safe and efficient flow of traffic through San Jacinto.

Goal C-2
Achieve a circulation system that is integrated with the larger regional transportation system to ensure the economic well-being of the community.

Policies
2.1 Coordinate planning and construction of local circulation improvements, public transit systems and regional highway facilities with adjacent jurisdictions and regional transportation agencies.

2.5 Work with regional and State transportation agencies to ensure that the construction of regional roadways minimally disrupts access to existing business and employment centers.

2.6 Acquire adequate right of way prior to development occurring to allow for the ultimate alignment of the future regional roadways and interchanges identified in the Circulation Plan.

Goal C-4
To reduce expenditure, improve design, and minimize traffic disruption, work with Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), Caltrans, South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and other regional agencies...
to coordinate local street improvements with major transportation system improvement projects such as improvements to SR-79. The City will also continue to participate in proposed roadway modifications (including SR-79) and revise the General Plan circulation system is necessary, to reflect changes in these modification. In addition, the impacts of discretionary development projects and major transportation projects will be monitored and mitigation may be required.

**Reserves and Habitat Conservation Plans**
As discussed above in Section 3.1.1.1, Affected Environment, there are several reserves and Habitat Conservation Agencies in the MCP study area. Habitat Conservation Plans, as prepared under FESA and CESA, are the primary planning and regulatory tools that guide the preservation of natural biological communities. While Habitat Conservation Plans are not prepared under CESA, the State process of issuing an incidental take permit under CESA complements the federal Habitat Conservation Plan process and usually includes the same or similar species, depending on their status. A detailed description and discussion of the affected reserves and Habitat Conservation Plans are provided in Section 3.17.

### 3.1.2.2 Environmental Consequences
There are no temporary impacts related to consistency with State, regional, and local plans; therefore, this section only discusses permanent impacts.

**Build Alternatives**
*SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Regional Comprehensive Plan*
Implementation of the MCP project would be consistent with the RTP, as the MCP project is included as a future transportation corridor in the RTP.

Implementation of the MCP project would be consistent with and help further the goals of the RCP as follows:

- The MCP project would provide transportation infrastructure in support of regional growth plans and policies (RCP Policy 3.03).
- The MCP project supports protection of vital resources such as wetlands and habitat for endangered plants and animals. Although these resources are impacted to some degree by each MCP Alternative, each Alternative has been developed with the intent to achieve maximum avoidance of such resources first, then consider minimization and mitigation opportunities (RCP Policy 3.20).
- The MCP project would also help support implementation of measures aimed at the preservation and protection of recorded and unrecorded cultural resources and
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archaeological sites. Although these resources are impacted to some degree by each MCP Alternative, each Alternative has been developed with the intent to achieve maximum avoidance of such resources first, then consider minimization and mitigation opportunities (RCP Policy 3.21).

City and County General Plans
With regard to overall General Plan consistency, adoption of any MCP Build Alternative would require the County of Riverside and the Cities of Corona, Perris, and San Jacinto to amend their General Plan Land Use and Circulation Elements to reflect the final MCP alignment, interchange locations, and elimination of any land uses that may need to be acquired for the project. A discussion of each alternative is provided below.

Alternative 4

Riverside County
The Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element shows a CETAP corridor on an alignment starting in the east at SR-79 that follows existing Ramona Expressway, Cajalco Road, and El Sobrante Road (north of Lake Mathews), and then terminates at I-15 on the west. Within unincorporated portions of the county, MCP Alternative 4 generally follows this alignment except for the portion south of Lake Mathews.

Alternative 4 generally complies with relevant General Plan policies and goals, as discussed in Section 3.1.2.1. However, this alternative would directly impact almost 400 ha (1,000 ac) of agricultural land, most of which is in unincorporated county area. This impact would be inconsistent with Land Use Policy LU 16.4, which encourages conservation of agricultural lands.

Alternative 4 would also directly impact 79.7 ha (196.9 ac) of residential land uses. This is inconsistent with Land Use Policy MVAP 1.1 of the Mead Valley Area Plan, which promotes maintenance of a minimum lot size of 0.2 ha (0.5 ac). Some of the proposed partial right of way acquisitions in Mead Valley would reduce lot size below 0.2 ha (0.5 ac).

City of Corona
Alternative 4 is generally consistent with the goals and policies of the City’s General Plan, as listed in Section 3.1.2.1. However, due to this alternative’s impacts to designated commercial and industrial land uses within the city of Corona, there is a conflict with Policy 1.12.1, which provides for the
continuation of existing and development of new, manufacturing, research and development, and professional office uses.

City of Perris
Alternative 4 is generally consistent with the goals and policies of the City’s General Plan, as discussed in Section 3.1.2.1, which promote provision of a transportation system to support planned land use within the city. However, since Alternative 4 does not follow the original CETAP corridor alignment along Ramona Expressway, this alternative is inconsistent with the designated roadways and land uses (residential, commercial, and industrial) shown in the General Plan.

City of San Jacinto
Alternative 4 is generally consistent with the goals and policies of the City’s General Plan, as listed in Section 3.1.2.1, which promote providing a circulation system that meets the needs of existing and future land uses. However, since Alternative 4 does not follow the original CETAP corridor alignment along Ramona Expressway, this alternative is inconsistent with the designated roadways and land uses (residential, commercial, and industrial) shown in the General Plan.

Alternative 5
With regard to consistency with City and County General Plans, Alternative 5 is the same as Alternative 4. Although Alternative 5 follows a different alignment through Perris, it is still inconsistent with the City’s General Plan, as it follows an alignment along Placentia Avenue and Rider Street instead of Ramona Expressway.

Alternative 6
With regard to consistency with City and County General Plans, Alternative 6 is the same as Alternative 4 except in the area surrounding Lake Mathews between I-15 and El Sobrante Road. In this area, the project includes a four-lane urban arterial north of Lake Mathews and a four-lane, access-controlled expressway south of Lake Mathews. The proposed arterial street improvements north and south of Lake Mathews are consistent with the Riverside County General Plan.

---

1 The General Plan provides for up to six lanes in this location; however, traffic forecast modeling indicates that four lanes will meet projected demand.
Circulation Element and generally follow the alignments shown in the General Plan.

**Alternative 7**

With regard to General Plan consistency, Alternative 7 is the same as Alternative 6. Although Alternative 7 follows a different alignment through Perris, it is still inconsistent with the City’s General Plan, as it follows an alignment along Placentia Avenue and Rider Street instead of along Ramona Expressway.

**Alternative 9**

Alternative 9 generally complies with the relevant County General Plan policies and goals, as listed in Section 3.1.2.1. Similar to Alternatives 4–7, since Alternative 9 would impact 355 ha (878 ac) of designated agricultural land, it is inconsistent with Land Use Policy 16.4, which encourages conservation of agricultural land. Alternative 9 is inconsistent with both the Mead Valley and Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plans, as it traverses areas designated for very-low-density and rural residential uses. Under Alternative 9, these land use designations would change for properties and portions of properties directly affected by Alternative 9.

In Corona, Alternative 9 is the same as Alternatives 4–7 with regard to consistency with the goals and policies of the City’s General Plan.

In Perris, Alternative 9 is similar to Alternatives 4–7 with regard to general consistency with the goals and policies of the City’s General Plan, but is inconsistent with the designated roadways and land uses in the General Plan. For Alternative 9, these inconsistencies are focused along Placentia Avenue.

In San Jacinto, Alternative 9 is the same as Alternatives 4–7 with regard to consistency with the goals and policies of the City’s General Plan.

**Reserves and Habitat Conservation Plans**

As summarized below, the MCP Build Alternatives would impact four Habitat Conservation Plans. A detailed discussion of the impacts to specific reserves and Habitat Conservation Plans is provided in Section 3.17, Natural Communities.
Western Riverside County MSHCP

The MSHCP allows participating jurisdictions (United States Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS] and California Department of Fish and Game [CDFG]) to authorize the “take” of both federal and/or state listed species identified in the MSHCP and found during surveys within the boundaries of the MSHCP Plan Area. All MCP Build Alternatives would impact portions of MSHCP Criteria Area. Specific discussion of MSHCP Cores and Linkages impacted is provided in Section 3.17 of this EIR/EIS. RCTC would prepare a consistency analysis to demonstrate the MCP project’s consistency with the MSHCP.

Lake Mathews Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Area

Alternative 9 TWS DV does not pass through the Lake Mathews MSHCP area; however, the proposed alignments of Alternatives 4 through 7 and their design variations do pass through conserved lands within the Lake Mathews MSHCP area. Currently there is no process in place to amend the Lake Mathews MSHCP to allow development by other parties on these conservation lands, including the proposed MCP project; however, there is no language in the Lake Mathews MSHCP prohibiting an amendment. Amending the Lake Mathews MSHCP would require the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan), as the permittee, to agree to initiate an amendment. Approval from the CDFG and USFWS would be required, and mitigation would likely consist of a purchase of land for conserving habitat with similar values for covered species that would be impacted.

El Sobrante Landfill Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan

Alternatives 6 and 7 do not impact the El Sobrante Landfill MSHCP, but Alternatives 4, 5, and 9, including Alternative 9 TWS DV, do impact it. These alternatives impact more than 5 percent conserved El Sobrante Landfill MSHCP land; therefore, a standard amendment to the plan would be required if one of these alternatives is chosen. Such an amendment would be subject to the same environmental documentation, public review, and agency approval requirements that apply to all Habitat Conservation Plans. Mitigation would likely consist of a purchase of land for conserving habitat, with similar values for covered species that would be impacted.
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Habitat Conservation Plan for the Stephens’ Kangaroo Rat in Western Riverside County

There are four reserves established through implementation of the Habitat Conservation Plan for the Stephens’ kangaroo rat location within the area of the proposed MCP project. These include the Lake Mathews-Estelle Mountain Reserve, Steele Peak Reserve, Motte-Rimrock Reserve, and San Jacinto-Lake Perris Reserve. Only the Lake Mathews-Estelle Mountain Reserve would be impacted by the MCP project. Alternatives 6 and 7 would result in the greatest impact, and Alternative 9 would result in the least.

Mitigation for the impacts of Alternative 9 TWS DV to Habitat Conservation Plans will be achieved through compliance with provisions of the MSHCP, the El Sobrante Landfill MSHCP, and the Habitat Conservation Plan for the Stephens’ kangaroo rat. The MSHCP was conceived and developed and is being implemented specifically to address the direct, indirect, cumulative, and growth-related effects on species and habitats in western Riverside County resulting from activities covered by the MSHCP, including the MCP project.

No Build Alternatives

Planned improvements in the regional and local circulation system other than the MCP project are accounted for in the adopted Riverside County General Plan, the RCTC’s Measure A program, and other adopted plans and policies, and would not impact any adopted state, regional, or local plans and policies.

Under Alternative 1A, the planned street network would be constructed with the exception of improvements to Cajalco Road and Ramona Expressway. Not improving either Cajalco Road or Ramona Expressway would be inconsistent with the County and City General Plans.

Under Alternative 1B, the planned street network would be developed according to the Circulation Element of the Riverside County General Plan; therefore, this alternative is considered to be consistent with the County and City General Plans.

Discussions of Impacts Relative to MSHCP Amendment

The EIR/EIS for the MSHCP found that direct and indirect impacts on sensitive vegetation communities and covered species are reduced through implementation of the MSHCP, which includes assembly of an approximately 202,340 ha (500,000 ac) reserve system, adaptive management and monitoring, as well as other protection measures.
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The MSHCP includes coverage of a regional transportation corridor upon which the project alternatives for the MCP have been developed. An amendment to the MSHCP would be required to provide coverage to a modified alignment for the transportation corridor. This discussion is provided as a supplemental environmental analysis to provide supporting documentation under CEQA and NEPA for such an amendment to the MSHCP. It should be noted that this discussion pertains specifically to the analysis of consistency for Alternative 9 TWS DV, which has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative. If a different alternative were to be pursued for coverage, additional CEQA/NEPA analysis may be needed.

Section 3.17 contains a detailed analysis of the effects of providing coverage of Alternative 9 TWS DV under the MSHCP, pursuant to the specific criteria identified in the MSHCP to demonstrate consistency. As noted in Section 3.17, a consistency determination is not being made at this time. However, the analysis contained in Section 3.17 provides a framework for consistency and identifies the environmental effects of MSHCP coverage for Alternative 9 TWS DV.

As discussed previously, land use was not specifically analyzed in the MSHCP EIR/EIS. However, the introduction of the MSHCP EIR/EIS states that long-term implementation of the MSHCP would result in changes to the regional pattern of land use, with possible increased development pressure and intensification of development outside the criteria areas. Habitat Conservation Plan conflicts and conflicts with General Plans were, however, determined not to be a topic of concern and therefore were not analyzed in the MSHCP EIR/EIS.

Based on the analysis of impacts of the MCP related to land use discussed above in this document, the impacts of the MCP would not affect the conclusions of the MSHCP EIR/EIS. Therefore, an amendment to the MSHCP to provide coverage for Alternative 9 TWS DV would not result in impacts to land uses beyond that previously analyzed.

3.1.2.3  Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

As discussed previously in this section, the MCP Build Alternatives will require amendments to the County and City General Plans to reflect the final MCP alignment, interchange locations, and to change the land use designations on property that would be acquired for the project to a transportation or public use designation. Mitigation has been identified below that is applicable to all MCP Build Alternatives to reduce
impacts from these required plan amendments. With implementation of Mitigation Measure LU-3, no residual impact would result relative to plan consistency.

**LU-3**  Following approval of the Mid County Parkway (MCP) project, the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) shall request that the County of Riverside and the Cities of Corona, Perris, and San Jacinto amend their respective General Plans to reflect the final MCP alignment, interchange locations, and modification of land use designations for property that will be acquired for the project.

### 3.1.3 Parks and Recreational Facilities

#### 3.1.3.1 Affected Environment

Parks and recreational facilities that meet the definition of Section 4(f) properties are described in detail in the *Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation* (LSA Associates, Inc., 2008) provided in Appendix B. Recreation resources that are not Section 4(f) properties are also discussed in the *Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation*. The Section 4(f) properties and the recreation resources are shown on Figure 3.1.2. The locations of the Section 4(f) historic sites are not shown on the figure in order to protect those sites from unauthorized artifact collecting or vandalism.

The parks and recreation resources in the MCP study area are:

- El Cerrito Sports Park (planned; under construction in 2008);
- Paragon Park;
- Play and sports fields at El Cerrito Middle School, Manuel Real Elementary School, Tomas Rivera Middle School, Val Verde High School, Val Verde Elementary School, Lakeside Middle school, Sierra Vista Elementary School, and Mountain Shadows Middle School;
- Eagle Glen Golf Course;
- Dos Lagos Golf Course;
- Morgan Park;
- Basin Park; and
- Lake Perris State Recreation Area.
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3.1.3.2 Environmental Consequences
As described in detail in Chapter 2.0 (Alternatives) the MCP Build Alternative right of way was defined to include the permanent right of way needed for each MCP Build Alternative and the anticipated disturbance limits for construction of the alternatives. Therefore, no temporary construction easements (TCEs) or other temporary uses of land outside the defined footprints/right of way are anticipated. As a result, no evaluation of temporary impacts to park and recreational facilities was required. The park and recreational facilities in the MCP study area were also assessed to determine whether any indirect traffic, noise, air quality, visual and aesthetics, water quality, biological resources, or community impacts of the MCP Alternatives could result in impacts that would substantially impair the activities, features, and/or attributes of the park or recreational facility.

The Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation, provided in Appendix B, evaluated the identified Section 4(f) properties to assess whether the MCP Build Alternatives would result in a use of property from those resources. Use impacts were evaluated based on overlaying the alternative footprints/right of way limits on the geographic information system (GIS) mapping of the boundaries of the Section 4(f) properties, including recreational facilities. Locations where the footprints/right of way for the MCP Build Alternatives would result in the acquisition of land from these Section 4(f) properties were identified.

Build Alternatives
Table 3.1.B lists the use impacts to parks and recreational facilities by the MCP Build Alternatives. Two parks would be impacted: the proposed El Cerrito Sports Park and the existing Paragon Park.

Not all uses of Section 4(f) properties (including parks and recreational facilities) have the same magnitude of impact, and not all Section 4(f) properties have the same quality. A qualitative analysis of the use of Section 4(f) properties by the MCP Build Alternatives is provided to assist in understanding the net impact of each MCP Build Alternative on Section 4(f) properties. This analysis considers the impacts of the MCP Build Alternatives on Section 4(f) properties after implementation of the project avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures described in Section 3.1.3.4 below. The comparison of alternatives and the net harm analysis considered:
Table 3.1.B Park and Recreational Facility Use Impacts and Consideration of Net Harm after Mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Use Impacts by Alternative</th>
<th>Net Harm after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Cerrito Sports Park</td>
<td>Alternatives 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9: 0.95 ha (2.36 ac)</td>
<td>All the MCP Build Alternatives would use the same amount of property from this park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All the MCP Build Alternatives would use the same amount of property from this park.</td>
<td>The alternatives with the Temescal Wash Area Design Variation would not use property from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The alternatives with the Temescal Wash Area Design Variation would not use property from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this park.</td>
<td>this park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternatives 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9 with the Temescal Wash Area Design Variation: No use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragon Park</td>
<td>Alternatives 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9 with Rider Street Design Variation: No use</td>
<td>Alternatives 4, 5, 6, 7, and Alternative 9 with the Rider Street Design Variation would not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 9 and Alternative 9 with Elevated Grade Design Variation would result in</td>
<td>use property from this park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approximately the same use of this park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 9 and Alternative 9 with the Elevated Grade Design Variation would result in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approximately the same use of this park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 9 with the Elevated Grade Design Variation: 3.73 ha (9.21 ac)</td>
<td>ac = acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ha = hectare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The size of the property used in comparison to the overall size of the property;
- The effect of using (acquiring) property at an edge of a property versus use through the middle of the property;
- The key features and attributes of the Section 4(f) property and how those features and the property are affected; and
- The level of use of the affected part of the property (less used versus more highly used sections).

As shown in Table 3.1.B, all five MCP Build Alternatives would use 0.95 ha (2.36 ac) from the planned El Cerrito Sports Park. Because this is a planned but not yet constructed park, it is anticipated that the sports fields used by the Build Alternatives could be shifted to the east, outside the footprint/right of way of this Alternative. In summary, the net harm of the use of El Cerrito Sports Park by the five MCP Build Alternatives can be minimized.

As shown in Table 3.1.B and Figure 3.1.3, Alternative 9 and Alternative 9 TWS DV would result in the use of property from Paragon Park in the city of Perris. This part of the park includes tennis courts, a basketball court, four handball courts, and a playground. This use of Paragon Park includes a narrow strip on the north side of the
MCP alignment that would not be used by the MCP project but that would be segmented from the rest of this park by the MCP project. There is also a City-owned 0.43 ha (1.07 ac) parcel on the northwest part of this area that is currently occupied by a fire station. The part of the park to the south, which would not be impacted by Alternative 9 TWS DV, contains open grass fields and picnic tables.

As described in Section 2.6.2, a unique project design feature of Alternative 9 TWS DV includes a detention basin on the north side of the MCP alignment, east of Redlands Avenue. To ensure compliance with the California Public Parks Preservation Act and to avoid net losses in parklands, part of the area occupied by that detention basin would be developed in active and passive recreation uses and landscaping to replace the impacted area and facilities at Paragon Park under Alternative 9 TWS DV. Pedestrian access between Paragon Park and the park facilities at the detention basin site would be provided across the MCP alignment east of Redlands Avenue to ensure that park patrons could safely walk or ride bicycles between the two facilities. Additional park space would be provided on the south side of the MCP project, east of Redlands Avenue, using remnants of existing residential parcels that would be acquired for the MCP project. Figure 3.1.3 shows the areas at Paragon Park anticipated to be displaced by Alternative 9 TWS DV and the proposed replacement park areas on the east side of Redlands Avenue, north and south of the MCP alignment. The total net increase in park land with implementation of this alternative is 0.65 ha (1.57 ac).

Figure 3.1.4 shows the impacts to Paragon Park under Alternative 9 TWS DV with the PP-E Design Variation, similar to Alternative 9 TWS DV. Alternative 9 TWS DV with the PP-E Design Variation also includes the provision of replacement parkland and a replacement site for the fire station.

Alternatives 4, 5, 6, and 7 would not use any land from Paragon Park.

As shown on Figure 3.1.2, other recreation resources in the area are outside the right of way for the MCP Build Alternatives; therefore, no property would be acquired. These recreation resources are not anticipated to be affected by indirect impacts due to their distances from the MCP Build Alternatives.
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Figure 3.1.3

Alternative 9 with the Depressed Grade Design at Paragon Park
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Figure 3.1.4
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No Build Alternatives

Alternative 1A proposes no MCP improvements; therefore, Alternative 1A would not result in the use of Section 4(f) properties or the acquisition of property from, or indirect impacts on, recreational resources.

Alternative 1B proposes no MCP improvements. Alternative 1B assumes Cajalco Road and the Ramona Expressway would be constructed to their ultimate widths and alignments as shown in the Riverside County General Plan. As a result, Alternative 1B could result in the use of Section 4(f) properties and in the acquisition of property from recreation uses, depending on the actual alignments and widths of the road facilities under this Alternative, similar to the impacts of Alternatives 6 and 7 west of El Sobrante Road because those alternatives follow the General Plan road alignments in this area. In addition, depending on the distance of road facilities to area recreation resources, Alternative 1B could result in indirect impacts on recreation resources.

Discussion of Impacts Relative to MSHCP Amendment

The EIR/EIS for the MSHCP found that direct and indirect impacts on sensitive vegetation communities and covered species are reduced through implementation of the MSHCP, which includes assembly of an approximately 202,340 ha (500,000 ac) reserve system, adaptive management and monitoring, as well as other protection measures.

The MSHCP includes coverage of a regional transportation corridor upon which the project alternatives for the MCP have been developed. An amendment to the MSHCP would be required to provide coverage to a modified alignment for the transportation corridor. This discussion is provided as a supplemental environmental analysis to provide supporting documentation under CEQA and NEPA for such an amendment to the MSHCP. It should be noted that this discussion pertains specifically to the analysis of consistency for Alternative 9 TWS DV, which has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative. If a different alternative were to be pursued for coverage, additional CEQA/NEPA analysis may be needed.

Section 3.17 contains a detailed analysis of the effects of providing coverage of Alternative 9 TWS DV under the MSHCP, pursuant to the specific criteria identified in the MSHCP to demonstrate consistency. As noted in Section 3.17, a consistency determination is not being made at this time. However, the analysis contained in
Section 3.17 provides a framework for consistency and identifies the environmental effects of MSHCP coverage for Alternative 9 TWS DV.

As discussed previously, the analysis in the MSHCP EIR/EIS did include consideration of impacts to park facilities under the public services section. The MSHCP EIR/EIS concluded that no impact would occur to existing park facilities. In addition, the MSHCP would not require the deletion or relocation of planned parks; therefore, no impact to planned park facilities would occur.

Based on the analysis of impacts of the MCP related to land use discussed above in this document, the impacts of the MCP would not affect the conclusions of the MSHCP EIR/EIS. Therefore, an amendment to the MSHCP to provide coverage for Alternative 9 TWS DV would not result in impacts to land uses or parks beyond that previously analyzed.

3.1.3.3  Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

As discussed previously in this section and as shown in Figure 3.1.3, Alternative 9 would impact portions of Paragon Park. In order to reduce these impacts, the MCP project has been designed so that portions of Alternative 9 would be developed into active and passive recreation uses and landscaping to replace the impacted area and facilities at Paragon Park. Mitigation has been identified below to ensure implementation of the proposed replacement park project design feature that would offset impacts to Paragon Park, resulting in a net increase of parkland in the City of Perris.

LU-4  Prior to completion of final design of the Mid County Parkway (MCP) project, the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) shall require replacement of the land used from Paragon Park, providing replacement park acreage and facilities east of Redlands Avenue and immediately north and south of the MCP alignment. Pedestrian access between Paragon Park and the new park facilities would be provided across the MCP alignment east of Redlands Avenue to ensure that park patrons can safely walk or ride bicycles between the two facilities. RCTC will coordinate closely with the City of Perris during final design of the replacement park areas to include, modify, relocate, and/or expand the existing uses at Paragon Park to best meet the park and recreation needs of the community.