3.2 Growth

The information in this section is based on the *Community Impact Assessment* (LSA Associates, Inc., 2008).

3.2.1 Regulatory Setting

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, which implement the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, require evaluation of the potential environmental consequences of all proposed federal activities and programs. This provision includes a requirement to examine indirect consequences, which may occur in areas beyond the immediate influence of a proposed action and at some time in the future. The CEQ regulations, 40 CFR 1508.8, refer to these consequences as indirect impacts. Indirect impacts may include changes in land use, economic vitality, and population density, which are all elements of growth.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) also requires the analysis of a project’s potential to induce growth. CEQA guidelines, Section 15126.2(d), require that environmental documents “…discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment…”

3.2.2 Affected Environment

Growth trends within each of the affected jurisdictions are discussed below.

3.2.2.1 Riverside County

Riverside County is the 5th most populated county in California and the 15th most populated in the nation. The MCP study area is located in a subregion of the county known as western Riverside County. This subregion includes the cities of Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Canyon Lake, Corona, Hemet, Lake Elsinore, Menifee, Moreno Valley, Murrieta, Norco, Perris, Riverside, San Jacinto, Temecula, and Wildomar, as well as unincorporated areas. According to the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) 2005 indicators, this subregion’s population increased by 30 percent between 1990 and 2000, reaching a total of 1,131,981. Growth is expected to continue to more than 2.4 million residents by 2030. Most of the population growth is expected to stem from domestic migration and high birth rates. The population in
Riverside County is projected to grow at an annual rate of 3.4 percent, which is much faster than the southern California regional average rate of 1.25 percent.

### 3.2.2.2 City of Corona
Between 1990 and 2000, the population of Corona increased 64.2 percent, from 76,095 to 124,966. This increase was more than twice the percentage increase for Riverside County (32 percent). This growth has been due to the city’s accessibility and affordable housing market relative to other areas in southern California. By 2030, the population of Corona is projected to increase 37.2 percent, to over 170,000 people.

According to the 2004 General Plan, the city of Corona’s recent history has been as one of the fastest growing cities in the United States during the 1980s and 1990s. Currently, most of its land that was most suitable for development has been exhausted. As of 2002, only 16 percent of the city’s land, or 1,609 hectares (ha) (3,977 acres [ac]), remained vacant and may be considered for development. Another 243 ha (601 ac) were being used for agricultural purposes. The pace of future growth is likely to slow and occur on the limited vacant land on the periphery of the city’s existing urban development and the smaller remaining parcels within this pattern. Without annexation of surrounding properties in the city’s Sphere of Influence (SOI), any additional growth would occur as re-use of existing underutilized parcels and redevelopment of older developments. The trend in this direction was initiated through the city’s efforts to foster revitalization of its downtown area and North Main Street.

### 3.2.2.3 City of Perris
Between 1990 and 2000, the population of the city of Perris increased 45 percent, from 21,460 to 36,189. It is projected to increase 145 percent by 2030. According to the Inland Empire Quarterly Economic Report (January 2005), Perris was the 14th fastest growing city in California in 2004. The City’s adopted General Plan Land Use Element (2005) states that approximately 36 percent of the land designated for residential use in the city is developed. Therefore, 64 percent of land designated for residential use remains to be developed. Similarly, vast tracts of vacant land are designated for employment-generating uses. Therefore, the city has sufficient vacant land available for development to accommodate the city’s projected growth through 2030.
3.2.2.4 City of San Jacinto

Between 1990 and 2000, the population of the city of San Jacinto increased by 46.7 percent, from 16,210 to 23,779. It is projected to increase by 79.2 percent by 2030, to over 42,000 people. When compared to other incorporated areas in western Riverside County, the city’s population growth rate was higher than the county’s from 1990 to 2000 but lower than all of the surrounding cities except for Moreno Valley. According to the Draft General Plan (2006), approximately 29 percent of the city is designated Open Space, 48 percent Residential, 5 percent Commercial, 7 percent Industrial, and 16 percent Special Designation.

3.2.3 Environmental Consequences

Since growth-related effects represent permanent impacts of a project, there is no discussion of temporary impacts in this section.

3.2.3.1 Build Alternatives

Construction of a new transportation facility such as the MCP project could have growth-related effects by reducing or removing barriers to growth by creating conditions that attract additional residents or new economic activity or by providing a catalyst for future growth in the area.

A number of factors could influence the amount, rate, location, and direction of growth (planned or unplanned) in the MCP study area. These could include:

- Perceived quality of life;
- General economic conditions;
- Specific market conditions for housing, employment, and related services;
- Availability and condition of infrastructure, ranging from schools to transportation systems; and
- Local and regional growth management and land use policies.

Overall Growth Potential in the MCP Study Area

The first step in considering growth-related effects of the MCP project is to consider how each alternative may influence the location, amount, rate, or type of growth, and how growth could impact resources of concern. As described above, the MCP project is located in western Riverside County, which has been undergoing rapid growth since the late 1980s. This area is projected to continue to grow rapidly, with a projected annual growth rate of 3.4 percent over the next 20 years, compared to the
1.25 percent average in southern California. This pace of development within the MCP study area is projected to occur with or without the MCP project. Lack of transportation system capacity and accessibility has not been a major constraint to development in the area, as evidenced by extensive development occurring in advance of other planned major transportation improvements such as widening of the Interstate 15 (I-15) and Interstate 215 (I-215) freeways.

There are developed areas within the MCP study area, developing areas, and undeveloped land. It is this undeveloped land that is the focus of determining whether the MCP project would have any growth-related effects to environmental resources. As shown in Figure 3.2.1, much of this undeveloped land is at some stage in the development entitlement process (i.e., Specific Plan, Tentative Tract Map, etc.) with the local agency having jurisdiction over the land. The information shown in Figure 3.2.1 is current as of November 30, 2007. These lands are being developed consistent with the respective local jurisdictions’ General Plan land use maps, which designate areas for both land development and open space. On average, the MCP study area is about 50 percent “built out,” but that percentage varies from more developed areas such as Corona (where 84 percent of the area designated for development is built out) to Perris (where 36 percent of the area designated for development is built out). Since all of the local jurisdictions’ General Plans have been recently updated (2003 or later), the development that is occurring is consistent with those General Plans and in those areas planned for development. In addition, Riverside County and the cities of Corona, Perris, and San Jacinto are fulfilling their obligations as permittees under the western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) by ensuring developer compliance with the conservation criteria and goals of the MSHCP, including the dedication of lands to be preserved for inclusion in the MSHCP Reserve. The lands set aside for conservation under the MSHCP will augment existing habitat reserve lands within the MCP study area that are protected from future development, including the Lake Mathews/Estelle Mountain Reserve, the El Sobrante Landfill MSHCP Reserve, the Harford Springs Reserve, the Motte-Rimrock Reserve, and the San Jacinto Wildlife Area. These existing habitat reserve lands are classified as “Public, Quasi-Public” lands on Figure 3.2.1.

Based on the above review of land development trends within the MCP study area, implementation of the MCP project is expected to have little influence on the location, amount, rate, or type of growth in the area. The basis for this conclusion is that: (1) the area has been undergoing rapid development since well before the MCP planning (and prior Community and Environmental Transportation Acceptability
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Process [CETAP] corridor planning) had begun; (2) the MCP project has been integrated into the overall planning of the area based on the inclusion of the CETAP corridor overlay in the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element (the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR for the Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore corridor concluded that Alternatives 1A and 1B, which parallel the MCP alignments, would remove a barrier to implementation of planned land use in the area, but would not result in unplanned growth in the area); and (3) based on RCTC’s monthly meetings with the local land use authorities, there has been no indication of developers intensifying or substantially modifying their development proposals in response to the proposed MCP project. Some developers have elected to make minor adjustments to their proposed plans to limit the effects of the MCP project on their proposed development (e.g., relocating proposed buildings so they would not be within the footprint of an MCP Build Alternative).

**Comparison of Growth Potential for MCP Build Alternatives**

**Alternatives 4 through 7**

Alternatives 4 through 7 share the same alignment for much of their length; therefore, the overall growth-related impacts are similar for all four alternatives.

System interchanges are proposed for all Build Alternatives at I-15, I-215, and State Route 79 (SR-79). Currently, there are service interchanges at these locations connecting Cajalco Road/Ramona Expressway to I-15, I-215, and an at-grade intersection at SR-79. The existing service interchanges connect the highways to the arterial street system and provide access to the MCP study area. Implementation of any of the MCP Build Alternatives would involve improvement to these interchanges so that they continue to provide service-level connectivity to the study area as well as providing regional connectivity of these highways with the MCP project. The systems interchanges are proposed in locations where interchanges already exist, where development has already occurred, and where additional development is planned for in the adopted land use plans for the area. The MCP project, as connected with other highways through system interchanges, will make the study area more regionally accessible and will accommodate future growth and development in a manner consistent with that proposed in the adopted land use plans for the area.

Alternatives 4 through 7 are located in proximity to, or in some areas on the existing alignment of, Cajalco Road west of I-215 and Ramona Expressway east of I-215. The location of these MCP Build Alternatives is consistent with the CETAP corridor overlay shown in the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element, except for
the Lake Mathews South (LMS) Segment (which is located south of Lake Mathews; the CETAP corridor is shown north of Lake Mathews) and the Perris Drain (PD) Segment (where the alignment is located along the Perris Valley Storm Drain).

Service interchanges for Alternative 4 are proposed at a location approximately 2,000 meters (m) (6,560 feet [ft]) east of Temescal Canyon Road (referred to as the Estelle Mountain interchange), at Lake Mathews Drive, El Sobrante Road, Wood Road, Alexander Street, Clark Street, Perris Boulevard, Evans Road, Antelope Road, Bernasconi Road, Reservoir Road, Town Center Boulevard (proposed new arterial associated with future proposed development; this interchange would replace the previously planned CETAP corridor interchange at Bridge Road), Park Center Boulevard (proposed new arterial associated with future proposed development), and Warren Road. Service interchanges for Alternative 5 are the same as for Alternative 4 except that the Perris Boulevard interchange is located near Rider Street instead of north of Ramona Expressway.

The possibility of growth-related effects from these interchanges varies by location. Land immediately adjacent to some of the proposed interchanges is public or quasi-public land where development is not allowed. Both the Lake Mathews Drive and El Sobrante Road interchanges are located in or are adjacent to land owned by the Metropolitan Water District (Metropolitan) that is designated for habitat conservation.

The area south of the proposed El Sobrante Road interchange is private land that is designated for estate density residential development in the Riverside County General Plan. Due to the existing low-density character of the surrounding area, which is characterized by rolling topography, it is expected that the low-density nature of the area would not be altered. However, it is conceivable that there would be pressure for limited commercial service or retail uses immediately adjacent to the interchange.

The proposed interchanges at Antelope Road and Bernasconi Road are characterized by the Lake Perris State Recreation Area (SRA) north of the MCP facility and proposed residential uses to the south. The Lake Perris SRA is an established public recreation resource and includes a water reservoir for the state water project as well as adjacent habitat conservation areas. No changes are anticipated to these important state resources, with or without implementation of the MCP project. The SRA is expected to remain as public recreation area and open space and would not be subject to future development. The approved residential developments and other proposed land development projects currently under consideration in the vicinities of
these interchanges are being developed in a manner that accommodates the proposed MCP Build Alternatives and is consistent with the CETAP corridor overlay shown in the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element.

Planned and approved development plans are already being considered at other proposed interchanges, and these development plans would have to be refined in order to accommodate Alternatives 4 through 7. These include the Estelle Mountain and Wood Road interchanges. In these cases, it is expected that the proposed or approved developments would not change in overall character and density, but would alter subdivision layout or site plans as necessary to reflect the selected transportation alternatives. Similarly, the Town Center Boulevard and Park Center Boulevard interchanges (both proposed new arterials associated with future proposed development) are being planned to be compatible with the future development plans.

Other proposed interchanges are located in areas characterized primarily by private land that may be developed or redeveloped as a result of the implementation of the MCP project. These interchanges include Alexander Street and Clark Street west of I-215 and Perris Boulevard (Alternative 5), Evans Road, and Warren Road east of I-215. In addition, the proposed interchange locations at Reservoir Road and Perris Boulevard (Alternative 4) are in areas that are a combination of approved/proposed projects and other private land, some of which are vacant or in agricultural use that could be developed. Land that is private and vacant or underutilized near the interchanges is the most likely area where future development might change in type as a result of interchange access (i.e., roadway commercial uses rather than residential).

The Alexander Road interchange is located in an area designated for low-density residential and recreation open space uses. Residential development has been approved for the area northwest of the proposed interchange. Given the proximity of the Clark Street interchange, where commercial development would be more consistent with the Riverside County General Plan, no notable change to planned land uses are anticipated at Alexander Road.

The Riverside County General Plan calls for commercial uses along Cajalco Road at Clark Street. The proposed MCP alignment is slightly north of Cajalco Road. The presence of an interchange adjacent to a commercially designated or developed area could lead to requests to extend the area designated for commercial uses to include the area around the interchange.
The area around Perris Boulevard and Ramona Expressway, where an interchange is proposed for Alternative 5, is currently designated for Commercial Retail uses in the General Plan. The existing and planned land uses for the surrounding area are primarily light industrial and business park. These uses are consistent with the access that would be provided by an interchange, and no change in planned land use is expected to occur.

Similarly, the area around Evans Road and Placentia Avenue, where the Evans Road interchange is proposed, is currently planned for Commercial Retail and high-density residential uses. These relatively high-intensity uses would be compatible with the increased access that an interchange would provide, and no changes to the General Plan to allow greater land use intensity would be expected.

The proposed interchange at Warren Road is located slightly north of the existing Ramona Expressway in an area where the General Plan calls for continued agricultural use of the land. The presence of an interchange could have the effect of facilitating a change in land use designation for this area to allow more intense land uses should area landowners/developers submit development applications for the conversion of agricultural land to suburban land uses. Currently, the Riverside County General Plan includes policies supporting the continuation of agricultural uses in the county; however, there is typically pressure to convert agricultural land in areas that are experiencing population growth, such as western Riverside County. The improved access of the MCP project coupled with an interchange at Warren Road could increase these pressures. The Warren Road interchange is common to all five Build Alternatives.

Alternatives 6 and 7 involve the implementation of General Plan Circulation Element improvements between I-15 and El Sobrante Road and a new six- to eight-lane parkway east of El Sobrante Road to SR-79. Alternative 6 is the same as Alternative 4 east of El Sobrante Road, and Alternative 7 is the same as Alternative 5 east of El Sobrante Road. The proposed arterial street improvements north and south of Lake Mathews are consistent with the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element and generally follow the alignments shown in the General Plan. Because they are consistent with the recently adopted Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element, no growth-related effects beyond those described for Alternatives 4 and 5 would be expected to occur with Alternatives 6 and 7.
Alternative 9

Alternative 9 is approximately 3.2 kilometers (km) (2.0 miles [mi]) south of Cajalco Road for much of its length but shares the same connection to I-15 as Alternatives 4 through 7. Alternative 9 is unique compared to the other MCP Build Alternatives for the segments between the Lake Mathews South (LMS) Segment and Placentia/Rider Streets. In this area, Alternative 9 follows an alignment that was not considered in the Riverside County General Plan.

Service interchanges for Alternative 9 are proposed at a location approximately 2,000 m (6,560 ft) east of Temescal Canyon Road (referenced as the Estelle Mountain interchange), Lake Mathews Drive, Old Elsinore Road, Perris Boulevard, Evans Road, Ramona Expressway, Bernasconi Road, Reservoir Road, Town Center Boulevard (new arterial proposed to be added to the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element in 2008), Park Center Boulevard (new arterial proposed to be added to the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element in 2008), and Warren Road.

The planned interchange at Lake Mathews Drive in Alternative 9 is in an area that is privately owned. The topography where the interchange is located is relatively flat, but the surrounding area is characterized by fairly steep terrain. This area is planned for Rural Residential uses in the Riverside County General Plan. The planned interchange at Old Elsinore Road is in an area characterized by existing very low density residential uses. There is also a high percentage of low-income and/or minority residents in this area. This area is planned for very low density residential uses in the Riverside County General Plan. The interchanges at Lake Mathews Drive and Old Elsinore Road are outside the area originally contemplated for the west-east CETAP corridor. The provision of these two service interchanges may affect the rate, type, amount, and location of growth in this area. While the possibility of growth-related effects is constrained by steep topography, existing rural land uses (including existing reserves such as the Harford Springs Reserve, Motte-Rimrock Reserve, and Lake Mathews-Estelle Mountain Reserve), and the overall rural character of the areas, these two interchanges could hasten the build out of these areas or result in the introduction of more intense uses than were considered in the adopted Riverside County General Plan. In the area around the proposed Old Elsinore Road interchange, indirect effects to low-income or minority populations may be both adverse (pressure to redevelop rental properties to more intense uses) and beneficial (improved regional access and mobility).
Resources of Concern for Growth-Related Effects

Four key resources were identified as resources of concern for growth-related effects in the MCP study area (threatened/endangered species, aquatic resources, cultural resources, and farmlands) and are discussed below.

Threatened and Endangered Species

Biological resources of concern, such as threatened and endangered species, may be impacted due to growth-related effects of the MCP Build Alternatives. Much of the MCP study area is within or adjacent to areas identified for conservation under the western Riverside County MSHCP. The MSHCP is a comprehensive, multijurisdictional Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) (pursuant to Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Endangered Species Act [FESA] and the California Natural Communities Conservation Planning Act [NCCP Act]) that focuses on the conservation of species and their associated habitats in western Riverside County. The MSHCP is one of several large, multijurisdictional habitat-planning efforts in southern California with the overall goal of maintaining biological and ecological diversity within a rapidly urbanizing region and is discussed further in Section 3.17 of this EIR/EIS. Under the MSHCP, resource conservation is achieved on a regional habitat-based approach rather than a project-by-project approach. The MSHCP was intended to address the cumulative and indirect effects of General Plan land uses and public infrastructure projects, referred to as “Covered Activities” under the MSHCP. Both RCTC and Caltrans, as signatories of the MSHCP, are obligated to comply with the specific conditions described in Sections 13.7 and 13.8 of the MSHCP Implementation Agreement.

Much of the ecological and biological resources in the MCP study area are within existing preserves or within the MSHCP Criteria Area where development will be limited and subject to the requirements of the MSHCP. The Criteria Area of the MSHCP represents the area from which 62,000 ha (153,000 ac) of new conservation lands will be acquired to contribute toward the assembly of the overall MSHCP Reserve. The Criteria Area serves to connect habitats, maintain connectivity between habitats, and provide linkages where species can move from one area to another without being impeded by future development.

There are two primary components to be considered in determining MCP project consistency with the MSHCP: (1) how the project relates to the MSHCP Reserve Assembly (i.e., acquisition and conservation of additional reserve lands); and (2) how the project meets other requirements of the MSHCP (e.g., determination of
consistency with the MSHCP conservation objectives). As a conditionally covered activity under the MSHCP, pursuant to the provisions of Section 7.2.3 of the MSHCP (see Section 3.17.4 of this EIR/EIS for a detailed discussion of the MCP project coverage under the MSHCP), any indirect growth-related effects of the MCP project on threatened and endangered species would be covered through compliance with MSHCP criteria.

**Aquatic Resources**

Wetlands and nonwetland waters of the United States and State are resources of concern in western Riverside County. In cooperation with other federal, state, and local agencies, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is developing a Special Area Management Plan (SAMP) for both the San Jacinto River and Upper Santa Margarita watersheds. The SAMP is being developed to address anticipated development, infrastructure, and maintenance projects and aquatic resources in the watersheds of the San Jacinto River and Upper Santa Margarita River (SAMP study area). The SAMP will provide a comprehensive plan for protecting and enhancing aquatic resources while providing for the permitting of reasonable economic development and public infrastructure in coordination with local land use plans and the western Riverside County MSHCP. The SAMP will provide a framework for a long-term programmatic permitting process for projects in the watersheds subject to USACE permit authority under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. In addition, the SAMP will include a comprehensive reserve program for the protection, restoration, and management of aquatic resources within the study area. Through this regional approach to watershed management, the SAMP will address the cumulative and indirect growth-related effects of future land and infrastructure development within these watersheds.

**Cultural Resources**

Cultural resources are nonrenewable resources that include prehistoric and historic archaeological sites as well as historic buildings and other structures. As growth occurs in an area such as western Riverside County, these resources are subject to impacts from physical land development as well as from increased human activity where resources may be damaged or destroyed as a result of activities such as off-road vehicle use and vandalism. The Riverside County General Plan EIR identifies areas of sensitivity for cultural resources. The Open Space Element of the Riverside County General Plan includes policies that provide for protection of cultural resources by requiring that land development projects consider avoidance of cultural resources before consideration of minimization or mitigation. In the MCP study area,
the area between I-15 and I-215 is classified as having high sensitivity for cultural resources. Most of this area is within the jurisdiction of the County of Riverside and is subject to these General Plan policies. The County is working closely with area developers to protect cultural resources that may be affected by land development projects in the area. Since these development proposals are proceeding irrespective of the MCP project, the MCP project is not anticipated to have any growth-related effects on cultural resources.

**Farmlands**
The Riverside County General Plan identifies farmlands as an important resource throughout Riverside County, and includes policies that encourage the conservation and protection of existing farmlands and discourages the placement of incompatible land uses near industrial agricultural uses such as dairies and poultry farms. Even with these policies in place, the Riverside County General Plan EIR acknowledges that there will continue to be loss of farmlands due to development throughout Riverside County. In the MCP study area, most agricultural lands are located in the area between I-215 and SR-79. As a result of RCTC’s monthly coordination meetings with County staff and City of Perris staff regarding land development proposals in this area, much of the agricultural land that exists in the area today is expected to be converted to residential and commercial land development, which is consistent with the General Plan land use designations for these lands. These development proposals are proceeding irrespective of the MCP project; therefore, the MCP project is not anticipated to have any growth-related effects on farmlands.

**No Build Alternatives**
Under the MCP No Build Alternatives, the growth-related effects discussed above for the MCP Build Alternatives would not occur for the MCP project. However, the other transportation improvement projects included in the No Build Alternatives may result in growth-related effects already considered in the Riverside County General Plan. For example, Alternative 1B would implement the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element improvements on Cajalco Road and Ramona Expressway and would, therefore, not result in any unplanned growth-related effects.

**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, including species and habitats associated with wetlands and other waters, are reduced through implementation of the MSHCP, which includes the 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.

The analysis in the MSHCP EIR/EIS included consideration of growth inducement because of the potential for the MSHCP Conservation Area to remove an impediment to development. The MSHCP EIR/EIS concluded that while the establishment of the MSHCP Conservation Area would likely be regarded as an enhancement to western Riverside County's quality of life, the MSHCP does not contain components that would directly generate residential, commercial, or industrial development or induce population growth within the Plan Area. In addition, the MSHCP would result in the loss of developable land within western Riverside County that could redistribute growth in the region, as development demand may occur in areas where it is not currently anticipated. In addition, the MSHCP EIR/EIS concluded that the MSHCP would have an indirect growth-inducing effect, because it will accommodate and streamline the approval of future development within those areas of western Riverside County outside the limits of the MSHCP Conservation Area.

Based on the analysis of impacts of the MCP related to growth discussed above, 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 growth-related impacts beyond those previously analyzed.

### 3.2.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Because of its prior inclusion as a CETAP corridor in the overall Riverside County Integrated Project (RCIP) planning process that led to the adoption of the updated Riverside County General Plan and the western Riverside County MSHCP, the MCP project is expected to have limited possibility to result in growth-related effects. CETAP is an integral component of the RCIP and Riverside County General Plan, and the future growth as projected and planned for in the General Plan reflects the presence of a new major west-east corridor in western Riverside County. Therefore, the implementation of the west-east corridor already included and analyzed in the General Plan would not result in unplanned growth. While Alternative 9 is located in a more remote location than the other MCP Build Alternatives and may result in minor adjustments to the rate, type, amount and location of growth, growth-related effects overall would be minor because any changes would occur within the framework of the three components of the RCIP: the General Plan, the habitat preservation as included in the MSHCP, and the CETAP transportation corridors. The MCP project is implementing CETAP and accommodating both planned growth and planned open space preservation in accordance with the RCIP; therefore, no mitigation is warranted for adverse growth-related effects. Because the MCP study area contains a number of environmental resources of concern (i.e., habitat, aquatic resources, and cultural resources), RCTC is exploring the potential to acquire privately held lands in this area to meet both its overall obligations under the MSHCP as well as mitigation requirements to natural communities resulting from the MCP project, as discussed in Section 3.17, Natural Communities, of this EIR/EIS. Acquiring privately held lands in this area that may otherwise be subject to future development would help minimize growth-related effects of Alternative 9 on environmental resources of concern.