3.4 Community Impacts

The information in this section is based on the Community Impact Assessment (CIA) (LSA Associates, Inc., 2008) and the Draft Relocation Impact Report (DRIR) (Epic Land Solutions, June 2007).

3.4.1 Community Character and Cohesion

3.4.1.1 Regulatory Setting

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 as amended (NEPA), established that the federal government use all practicable means to ensure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings [42 U.S.C. 4331(b)(2)]. The Federal Highway Administration in its implementation of NEPA [23 U.S.C. 109(h)] directs that final decisions regarding projects are to be made in the best overall public interest. This requires taking into account adverse environmental impacts, such as, destruction or disruption of human-made resources, community cohesion and the availability of public facilities and services.

Under the California Environmental Quality Act, an economic or social change by itself is not to be considered a significant effect on the environment. However, if a social or economic change is related to a physical change, then social or economic change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant. Since this project would result in physical change to the environment, it is appropriate to consider changes to community character and cohesion in assessing the significance of the project’s effects.

3.4.1.2 Affected Environment

Study Area Communities

Riverside County (Unincorporated Area)
Much of the MCP study area is located in unincorporated portions of Riverside County. These areas are described from west to east below. A full discussion and description of the communities within the MCP study area are provided in Section 3.1, Land Use.

Temescal Canyon Area
Located at the western end of the MCP study area, this area is undergoing rapid development, with both residential and mixed-use (commercial, industrial, etc.)
projects that have been recently completed or are still under construction. Several large mining and rock quarry operations are in this area.

**Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area**
The majority of the Lake Mathews/Woodcrest area is predominantly open space. 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 on large lots. West of Lake Mathews are widely spaced residences. A mix of commercial and residential structures is located at the southwest corner of Cajalco Road and Gavilan Road. The community of Victoria Grove is located on the north side of El Sobrante Road, between La Sierra Avenue and McAlister Street.

**Mead Valley Area**
As described in the Mead Valley Area Plan component of the Riverside County General Plan (October 2003), the Mead Valley Area includes many unique communities that are defined by their rural and semirural character. Mead Valley communities within the MCP study area include Mead Valley itself, Gavilan Hills, and Old Elsinore Road. Overall, the Mead Valley Area Plan land use plan provides for a predominantly rural community character with an equestrian focus.

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. An elementary and a middle school are also located in this area. A high level of pedestrian traffic through this community along Cajalco Road was noted during field observation.

Located along Cajalco Road between Brown Street and Interstate 215 (I-215) are 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.

Most of these rural residential properties have been in place for decades, and it is expected that the community cohesion within this segment is the highest of any of the segments, based on tenure of the residents, the presence of small community retail businesses, and the high level of pedestrian activity in the area.
Lakeview/Nuevo Area
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. A liquor store and several buildings are located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Hansen Avenue/Davis Road and the Ramona Expressway. The Lakeview Community Church and Jesus Center Christian School are located on the corner of Magnolia Avenue and Reservoir Road.

San Jacinto Valley Area
The portions of the San Jacinto Valley within the MCP study area are mostly agricultural (dairy) land.

City of Corona
The city of Corona is located at the western terminus of the MCP study area. The surrounding area is comprised of open space/agricultural land and 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 Interstate 15 (I-15) up to Ontario Avenue. There is an industrial area located west of I-15 at the intersection of Compton Avenue and Ontario Road.

The area adjacent to the I-15/Cajalco Road interchange is mostly retail commercial in all quadrants except the southwest quadrant, which is currently in an agricultural use. The community in the immediate area is relatively new, with much of it having been developed in the last 5–10 years.

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. Commercial/industrial uses surround the I-15, while the area along the Ramona Expressway is a combination of commercial, industrial, and residential. Residential development is occurring eastward of the I-15. The Perris area is undergoing change from a rural/semirural community to a more urbanized area as a result of ongoing land development.

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 State Route 79 (SR-79).
Study Area Demographics

As shown in Figures 3.4.1a and 3.4.1b, the MCP study area was covered by 10 Census Tracts in the 1990 Census and by 31 Census Tracts from the 2000 Census that are located directly adjacent to the project limits in which the direct impacts and many of the indirect impacts of the project may occur. (The difference in the number of Census Tracts used for the 1990 and 2000 Censuses is due to the increased number of Census Tracts as a result of population growth in the area by 2000.) The MCP study area includes an area much larger than that directly affected by project construction and right of way acquisitions, but it provides a broader picture of the area affected by the MCP Build Alternatives than the city and county demographics alone can provide. Census Tracts were used because they are the most complete demographic data set available for analysis. For context and comparison, information is also provided at city and county levels for certain topics.

Community cohesion is the degree to which residents have a sense of belonging to their neighborhood, their level of commitment to the community, or a strong attachment to neighbors, groups, and institutions, usually as a result of continued association over time (Community Impact Assessment Handbook, Caltrans, June 1997). The demographic characteristics for the MCP study area provided within this assessment were obtained from a combination of sources, including the United States Census Bureau, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), and the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG).

Elements of community cohesion can be found in demographic data used to profile communities from the 2000 Census. Typical indicators of community cohesion are described below, followed by a specific discussion of these indicators within the MCP study area.

- **Age:** Elderly and stay-at-home parents tend to be more active in their community. They have time to become involved. The transit-dependent population is comprised of the population under age 18 and age 65 and older.
- **Ethnicity:** Ethnic homogeneity is associated with a higher degree of community cohesion.
- **Household Size:** Households of two or more people tend to correlate with a higher degree of community cohesion.
Study Area Census Tracts 1990

Legend
- MCP Study Area
- Study Area Census Tracts (1990)
- MCP Right-of-Way (All Alternatives)
- Census Tracts outside of Study Area (1990)
- Community Impact Assessment Study Area (Based on 1990 Census Tracts)
- City Boundary

SOURCE: TBM 2006, Census 2000, Jacobs Engineering (02/07)

Figure 3.4.1a
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- MCP Study Area
- MCP Right-of-Way (All Alternatives)
- Census Tracts outside of Study Area (2000)
- Community Impact Assessment Study Area (Based on 1990 Census Tracts)
- City Boundary

* The extent of 2000 Census Tracts may differ from the 1990 version and exceed the CIA Study Area.

Figure 3.4.1b

Study Area Census Tracts 2000
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• **Transit-Dependent Population:** Residents who tend to walk or use public transportation for travel tend to correlate with a higher degree of community cohesion.

**Age**
In 2000, the population under 18 comprised 30.3 percent of the county’s population, while the population under 18 in the MCP study area was slightly higher, at 30.5 percent. The MCP study area had a higher proportion of residents age 65 and over than the county. The number of residents in the MCP study area age 65 and over was 19.1 percent in 2000, but comprised only 12.7 percent of the total county population (195,964) in 2000. In 2000, Census Tract 435.10 in the MCP study area had the highest percentage of persons age 65 or over (25.8 percent).

**Ethnicity**
Table 3.4.A shows the ethnic composition of the county, individual cities, and the MCP study area in 1990 and 2000. Figure 3.4.2 illustrates ethnic characteristics of Census Tracts within the MCP study area, and Figure 3.4.3 illustrates the percentage of Hispanic population within the MCP study area.

Based on the 2000 Census, the largest racial category in the county, Corona, Perris, and San Jacinto was White (65.6, 62.0, 41.2, and 69.3 percent of the population, respectively). Between 1990 and 2000, the population of Whites has declined by 10.8 percent in the county, 13.0 percent in Corona, 29.3 percent in Perris, and 5.3 percent in San Jacinto. Hispanics of any race comprised 36.2 percent of the population in the county in 2000, up from 26.3 percent in 1990.¹ A large portion of the cities of Corona, Perris, and San Jacinto was also comprised of Hispanics (35.7, 56.2, and 40.3 percent, respectively). The largest racial group of the study area, according to the 2000 Census, was White (60.7 percent of the population), while Hispanics of any race comprised 37.6 percent of the study area population.

**Household Size**
In 2000, the average household size within the county was 2.98 persons per household, according to the Census. Among the cities located within the MCP study area, Perris has the highest average household size, with 3.73 persons, while San Jacinto has the smallest average household size, with 2.84 persons. Within the MCP

¹ Persons of Hispanic or Latino heritage may be considered members of other racial classifications.
# Table 3.4.A Ethnic Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>American Indian/Native Alaskan</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>894,767 (76.4%)</td>
<td>63,591 (5.4%)</td>
<td>11,494 (1.0%)</td>
<td>41,591 (3.6%)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>158,970 (13.6%)</td>
<td>307,514 (26.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>1,013,478 (65.6%)</td>
<td>96,421 (6.2%)</td>
<td>18,168 (1.2%)</td>
<td>56,954 (3.7%)</td>
<td>3,902 (0.3%)</td>
<td>288,868 (18.7%)</td>
<td>559,575 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Corona</td>
<td>57,744 (75.9%)</td>
<td>2,102 (2.8%)</td>
<td>634 (0.8%)</td>
<td>5,399 (7.1%)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>10,261 (13.4%)</td>
<td>23,101 (30.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Corona</td>
<td>77,514 (62%)</td>
<td>8,031 (6.4%)</td>
<td>1,086 (0.9%)</td>
<td>9,425 (7.5%)</td>
<td>387 (0.3%)</td>
<td>21,894 (17.5%)</td>
<td>44,569 (35.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Perris</td>
<td>15,119 (70.5%)</td>
<td>2,788 (13.0%)</td>
<td>218 (1.0%)</td>
<td>713 (3.3%)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>2,622 (12.2%)</td>
<td>7,704 (35.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Perris</td>
<td>14,909 (41.2%)</td>
<td>5,748 (15.9%)</td>
<td>529 (1.5%)</td>
<td>995 (2.7%)</td>
<td>121 (0.3%)</td>
<td>11,781 (32.6%)</td>
<td>20,322 (56.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>San Jacinto</td>
<td>12,099 (74.6%)</td>
<td>193 (1.2%)</td>
<td>342 (2.1%)</td>
<td>156 (1.0%)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>3,420 (21.1%)</td>
<td>5,455 (33.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>San Jacinto</td>
<td>16,488 (69.3%)</td>
<td>630 (2.6%)</td>
<td>556 (2.3%)</td>
<td>267 (1.1%)</td>
<td>38 (0.2%)</td>
<td>4,641 (19.5%)</td>
<td>9,583 (40.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1. Percentages do not add to 100 percent because the White, Black, American Indian and Alaska Native, Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, and Other categories include persons identified with one race only; the Hispanic category overlaps with other categories.

2. In 1990, the Asian population included Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islanders; in 2000, the Asian population did not include Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islanders.

3. In the 1990 Census, the Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islanders race was included with the Asian population.
Non-White Population 1990 and 2000

Average Percentage of Non-White Population by City -
Corona - 24.1%
Perris - 29.5%
San Jacinto - 25.4%

Average Percentage of Non-White Population in Riverside County - 23.6%
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Community Impact Assessment Study Area (Based on 1990 Census Tracts)


Figure 3.4.2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>1990: Hispanic Population in Riverside County</th>
<th>2000: Hispanic Population per Affected City</th>
<th>2000: Average Percentage of Hispanic Population per Affected City</th>
<th>Average Percentage of Hispanic Population in Riverside County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corona</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perris</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jacinto</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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study area, the average household size is greater, totaling approximately 3.35 persons per household, while the individual study area Census Tracts of 420.1 and 429.04 had the highest individual average household sizes, at 3.77 and 3.75 persons per household, respectively.

**Housing**
Riverside County has some of the most affordable housing in southern California. As a result, the cities in Riverside have some of the highest rates of homeownership in metropolitan areas in California. As shown in Table 3.4.B, in 2000, the three study area cities had higher percentages of owner-occupied and renter-occupied units than the county average; this is due, in part, to the higher vacancy rate in the County compared to the three cities.

**Table 3.4.B Housing Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Study Area Cities</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>Corona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>584,674</td>
<td>39,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units, Occupied</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied Units</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied Units</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Units</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: United States Census Bureau, Census 2000, factfinder.census.gov.

**Housing Tenure**
The United States Census Bureau conducts the American Housing Survey (AHS) to provide up-to-date housing statistics for the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The data collected provides information about a general sample of a metropolitan (Riverside-San Bernardino) area of a greater size than the MCP study area. Nevertheless, the AHS is useful as a rough indicator of neighborhood stability and is based on the assumption that the longer people live in a community, the more committed they become to it, and the more cohesive the community becomes as a result. The AHS is only one tool that is coupled with direct surveys of the community and other demographics to determine the level of community cohesion present in the MCP study area.

The AHS for the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario Metropolitan Area: 2000 was issued in July 2003, and the sample was from surveys conducted in Riverside County and the cities of Riverside and San Bernardino. According to the AHS, 7,081 of the
10,839 households in the sample (or 65.3 percent of households) have lived in their unit since 1999 or earlier.

**Transit-Dependent Population**

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) defines transit-dependent persons as those who are without private transportation, elderly (over age 65), youths (under age 18), or below poverty or median income levels as defined by the United States Census Bureau. The cities of Corona and San Jacinto reported similar proportions of persons under 18 years of age (33.4 percent and 31.3 percent, respectively) compared to the county average (30.3 percent). The city of Perris reported nearly 40 percent of its population as under 18 years of age.

The cities of Corona and Perris reported significantly lower percentages of the population over age 65 (5.8 percent and 6.2 percent, respectively) compared to the county average of 12.7 percent. However, the city of San Jacinto reports that over 17 percent of its population is age 65 or older. This is approximately 35 percent higher than the county average. Compared to the County, which reports 43 percent of its population as transit dependent, of the three cities, San Jacinto has the highest percentage of transit-dependent persons, with 48.5 percent. Perris has 45.8 percent, and Corona has 39.2 percent.

**Community Facilities**

In addition to parks and recreation areas discussed in Section 3.1.3 and public safety facilities discussed in Section 3.5 of this EIR/EIS, other community facilities such as schools, libraries, post offices, and community centers within the MCP study area are discussed below.

**Schools**

*County of Riverside*

While the County does not have its own school districts, the County Office of Education is a service agency linking the County’s 23 school districts to the California Department of Education. The Nuview Union School District is located in the unincorporated community of Nuevo. The following Nuview Union School District schools are located in the MCP study area:

- Mountain Shadow Middle School: 30402 Reservoir Road
- Nuview Elementary School: 29680 Lakeview Avenue
- Valley View Elementary School: 21200 Maurice Street
City of Corona

The City of Corona is served primarily by the Corona-Norco Unified School District, with the exception of the northeastern portion of the city, which is served by the Alvord Unified School District. The following school, part of the Corona-Norco Unified School District, is located in the MCP study area:

- El Cerrito Middle School: 7610 El Cerrito Road

City of Perris

The City of Perris is served primarily by the Perris Union High School District and the Val Verde Unified School District. The Perris Union High School District does not have any schools within the MCP study area. The following schools, part of the Val Verde Unified School District, are located in the MCP study area:

- Avalon Elementary School: 1815 East Rider Street
- Citrus Hill High School: 18150 Wood Road
- Columbia Elementary School: 21350 Rider Street
- Glen View Preschool: 21-200 Oleander Avenue
- Lakeside Middle School: 27720 Walnut Avenue
- Manuel L. Real Elementary School: 19150 Clark Street
- Mead Valley Elementary School: 21-100 Oleander Avenue
- Sierra Vista Elementary School: 20300 Sherman Road
- Tomas Rivera Middle School: 21675 Martin Street
- Triple Crown Elementary School: 530 Orange Avenue
- Val Verde Elementary School: 2656 Indiana Avenue
- Val Verde High School: 972 West Morgan Street

Two proposed schools, part of the Val Verde Unified School District, are in the MCP study area:

- May Ranch Elementary School: 900 East Morgan Avenue
- Southwest High School: 1400 Orange Avenue

City of San Jacinto

The San Jacinto Unified School District serves the City of San Jacinto. No schools of the San Jacinto Unified School District are located within the MCP study area.
Other Community Facilities (Libraries, City Halls, etc.)

Libraries
There is one library located within the MCP study area:

- Community of Nuevo: Nuview Library, 29990 Lakeview Avenue

Post Offices
There are two post offices within the MCP study area:

- City of Corona: 1941 California Avenue
- Community of Nuevo: 29245 Lakeview Avenue

Community/Senior Centers
There is one Community/Senior Center located within the MCP study area:

- Mead Valley Senior/Community Center: 21091 Rider Street

Community Cohesion Summary
According to the indicators of community cohesion described above (including ethnic homogeneity, a high percentage of persons aged 65 and over, and the large number of residents who meet the FTA definition of transit-dependent persons), it can be concluded that there is a high degree of community cohesion throughout the MCP study area, particularly in the Lake Mathews, Mead Valley, Gavilan Hills, Perris, Lakeview/Nuevo, and San Jacinto Valley areas.

Economics
The employed civilian populations in the study area cities in Riverside County are summarized in Table 3.4.C. As shown, the educational services/health care/social assistance, manufacturing, and retail trade sectors have the highest levels of employment in the study area cities and the county overall.

Commuting Patterns
Traffic congestion and long commutes have a negative impact on personal perceptions of quality of life and on regional air quality. As employment and population continue to increase in the region, hours of traffic delays and daily vehicle miles traveled per person are projected to increase as well. One major transportation and mobility issue that the Inland Empire as a whole faces is that many residents work in neighboring counties. While this has become slightly less pronounced over time, the 2000 United States Census showed that nearly 61 percent of Riverside County residents were employed outside their cities of residence and only 21 percent
were employed in their cities of residence. Table 3.4.D illustrates travel patterns for the study area cities and the county overall. As shown, the majority of residents in Corona, Perris, and San Jacinto work outside their cities of residence.

Table 3.4.C Employment in the Study Area Cities and the County Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Sector</th>
<th>Employed Civilian Population (16 and over)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4,125 (7.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>10,569 (18.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>6,950 (12.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance</td>
<td>3,924 (6.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Technical Services</td>
<td>4,785 (8.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational, Health, Social Services</td>
<td>9,973 (17.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging, Food Service</td>
<td>3,814 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Sectors</td>
<td>13,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57,276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: United States Census Bureau, Census 2000, factfinder.census.gov.

Table 3.4.D Travel Patterns (2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked outside place of residence</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Affected Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>Corona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked outside place of residence</td>
<td>359,575 (61%)</td>
<td>40,760 (72.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in place of residence</td>
<td>155,136 (21%)</td>
<td>15,503 (27.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time in Minutes</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>433,644 (73.4%)</td>
<td>42,524 (75.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>104,195 (17.6%)</td>
<td>9,223 (16.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>8,143 (1.4%)</td>
<td>662 (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>11,217 (1.9%)</td>
<td>892 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: United States Census Bureau, Census 2000, factfinder.census.gov.

3.4.1.3 Environmental Consequences

*Permanent Impacts*

Build Alternatives

**Alternatives 4 and 5**

Alternatives 4 and 5, like all MCP Build Alternatives, would result in a physical change that would permanently alter the character of the existing community. As previously described, Alternatives 4 and 5 would construct a six- to eight-lane parkway for most of their length. The new parkway, once complete, would be a
much wider roadway facility than currently exists within the affected communities and would result in a reconfiguration of existing adjacent roadways, sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and driveways. On local streets affected by the parkway, sidewalks and crosswalks familiar to the residents would be relocated and/or replaced with new sidewalks and crosswalks. Existing routes that are used to travel from one part of the community to another and are familiar to residents would be redesigned to accommodate the new parkway, associated interchanges, and area roadway improvements. Property acquisition would result in the relocation of residents and established businesses and places of employment to other parts of the MCP study area and outside the MCP study area.

Although a temporary disruption of community character and cohesion would occur as a result of construction of Alternatives 4 and 5, the ultimate mobility improvements provided would also benefit these communities by providing an improved connection to other parts of the MCP study area, western Riverside County, and the region as a whole. Community services within the MCP study area, such as fire, police protection, and other emergency responders would be more readily available with Alternatives 4 and 5 since mobility within the MCP study area would improve over existing conditions. Effects on community cohesion are discussed below for specific communities.

**Temescal Canyon Area**
In the Temescal Canyon area, Alternatives 4 and 5 have been aligned to avoid both existing and developing (e.g., Dos Lagos) communities; therefore, these alternatives would not impact community cohesion in this area. Implementing Alternatives 4 and 5 would cause rerouting and/or closing portions of Knabe Road (west of I-15) and Temescal Canyon Road (east of I-15), which would have a slightly adverse effect on access and travel time for residents living within the vicinity of these improvements.

**Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area**
Permanent community character and cohesion impacts would be minimal within this area since Alternatives 4 and 5 will be located within existing Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency (RCHCA) or Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan) habitat reserve lands that do not allow for urban development. Alternatives 4 and 5 would cause rerouting and/or closing portions of Cajalco Road, Lake Mathews Drive, Gavilan Hills Road, and several other roadways that would intersect the MCP.
To meet the consistency requirements of the western Riverside County MSHCP (see Section 3.17 of this EIR/EIS for a detailed discussion of MSHCP consistency), the implementation of the MCP could also include the closure of Cajalco Road from the area just east of La Sierra Avenue to the area just west of Lake Mathews Road. This closure would reroute existing and future traffic that would otherwise use this segment of Cajalco Road for through travel and local access. From an overall roadway capacity point of view, the closure of Cajalco Road will delete a roadway with the capacity to carry approximately 15,000 vehicles per day. However, the opening of the MCP will provide a roadway with the capacity to carry approximately 75,000 vehicles per day, thereby greatly increasing the west-east roadway capacity available in the MCP study area.

For Alternatives 4 and 5, the possible closure of Cajalco Road will affect travel times for residences located along Cajalco Road in the area west of Lake Mathews Road. This area is estimated to include approximately 20 residences with possible future growth to approximately 100 residences by 2035, the horizon year for the MCP traffic analysis. The additional travel time (between 5 and 10 minutes) will vary depending on the travel destination. For access to destinations in the I-15/Cajalco Road area, a Cajalco Road closure will require travel east to the MCP/Lake Mathews Drive interchange, resulting in an increased travel time of approximately 5 minutes. For access to destinations in the El Sobrante Road/La Sierra Avenue area, a Cajalco Road closure will require travel east to El Sobrante Road and then west to La Sierra Avenue, resulting in travel time increases of approximately 10 minutes. As described in Section 3.5, Utilities and Emergency Services, there are no fire stations or law enforcement stations along the section of Cajalco Road that would be impacted by a road closure.

**Mead Valley Area**

Implementing Alternatives 4 and 5 through this area would result in a high concentration of property acquisitions that would remove a large number of the rural residential properties in this community. The acquisition of existing properties coupled with the implementation of the parkway would serve to permanently alter the community character of Mead Valley from that of a semirural community to a more urbanized area. In addition, residents of the community who travel on foot would encounter a physical barrier in crossing the proposed parkway where none exists today along existing Cajalco Road.
The ability to cross the MCP project would be limited to overcrossings and interchanges spaced every 0.8–1.6 kilometers (km) (0.5–1.0 mile [mi]). Vehicular traffic within the Mead Valley community would also be affected by these access changes and would reduce the mobility of area residents. However, moderate increases from traveling less direct routes would be compensated for by the overall decrease in travel times as a result of traveling on the higher-speed facility.

**Perris Area**

The acquisition of existing properties coupled with the implementation of the parkway would serve to change the community character of this area from a semirural community to a more urbanized area. Construction of Alternatives 4 and 5 would change the character of the Perris area by introducing a major transportation facility where none was planned before, but would not impair community cohesion since it is routed along the edges of existing communities.

As a result of constructing the MCP/I-215 systems interchange, Alternatives 4 and 5 would result in a direct physical impact to 78,095 square feet (sf) of portable classrooms of Val Verde High School and 70,452 sf of the Val Verde Unified School District Administration and Facilities Operation Building (Right of Way Data, Epic Land Solutions, 2006).

**Lakeview/Nuevo Area**

A small number of properties and a community retail/convenience store would be acquired along Reservoir Road between Lakeview Avenue and Hansen Avenue. The community retail/convenience store appears to be the only store within several miles of the adjacent community. The permanent closure of this convenience store, the only store within the immediate vicinity, would result in the removal of an important retail resource to the residents in the vicinity, thus impacting community cohesion. The acquisitions of the rural residential properties would contribute to a change in the community character by displacing and relocating existing residents.

**San Jacinto Valley Area**

The portion of the San Jacinto Valley impacted by Alternatives 4 and 5 is primarily dairy land, with few businesses or residences affected; therefore, there would be no community cohesion impacts in this area.
Alternatives 6 and 7
Alternatives 6 and 7, like all MCP Build Alternatives, would result in a physical change that would permanently alter the character of the existing community. East of El Sobrante Road and in the I-15 area, Alternatives 6 and 7 would result in impacts similar to those resulting from Alternatives 4 and 5 since the MCP project follows the same alignments in these areas. The differences in impacts between Alternatives 4 and 5 and Alternatives 6 and 7 west of El Sobrante Road to Temescal Canyon Road are discussed below.

Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area
Portions of Alternatives 6 and 7 will be located within existing RCHCA or Metropolitan lands that do not allow for urban development. However, property acquisitions along El Sobrante Road between La Sierra Avenue and Palm Street would occur. Since these are on the outskirts of the community areas, no adverse impacts to community cohesion would occur.

Alternative 9
Alternative 9, like all MCP Build Alternatives, would result in a physical change that would permanently alter the character of the existing community. Alternative 9 would result in a four- to eight-lane parkway throughout the MCP study area and would cause impacts to community character and cohesion similar to those caused by Alternatives 4 through 7, particularly the Temescal Canyon Area, Lakeview/Nuevo Area, and San Jacinto Valley Area where Alternative 9 follows the same alignment as Alternatives 4 through 7. Impacts of Alternative 9 in other areas are discussed below.

Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area
For Alternative 9, the possible closure of parts of Cajalco Road will affect travel times for existing and future residences and businesses along Cajalco Road from the area west of Lake Mathews Road to the area west of Clark Street. In this area, access to the I-15/Cajalco Road area and points beyond would be gained by traveling south to the MCP and then west to the I-15/Cajalco Road area, rather than directly to the west along Cajalco Road. The increase in travel time by traveling in a less direct route would be partly offset by the decrease in travel times provided by traveling on a higher speed facility (i.e., MCP versus Cajalco Road). The maximum increase in travel distance is estimated to be 5 miles and the maximum increase in travel time is estimated to be 10 minutes. Depending on the individual origin and destination, some
travelers may choose alternative routes such as I-215, Mockingbird Canyon Road, El Sobrante Road, and La Sierra Avenue as a result of the Cajalco Road closure. The diverse number of origins, destinations, and travel routes makes a detailed comparison difficult. However, comparison of traffic forecasts from the MCP No Build scenarios with the MCP Alternative 9 scenario does not indicate any substantial change in travel patterns along any particular travel route.

With regard to community cohesion, Alternative 9 is anticipated to have little effect on the cohesiveness of the Lake Mathews Estates community since the alignment is routed around the southerly edge of this community, displacing only a few residential properties in this area. However, some change to community character would result through introduction of a highway in a semirural area where no such facility was previously planned.

**Mead Valley Area**

Unlike Alternatives 4 through 7, implementing the MCP through this area would reduce acquisitions of rural residential properties in the Mead Valley community since the property acquisitions would occur in the less populated Gavilan Hills area rather than along Cajalco Road. Although fewer in number than under Alternatives 4 through 7, many of these rural residential properties have existed for decades, and the community cohesion within this area is the highest of any of the communities within the MCP study area, based on tenure of the residents and the high value that the residents place on their rural quality of life. The removal of existing properties and the implementation of the parkway would serve to permanently alter the rural community character of the portion of the Gavilan Hills area traversed by the parkway.

**Perris Area**

In the city of Perris, Alternative 9 is routed along Placentia Avenue on an alignment below existing grade (i.e., below existing ground level). Alternative 9 will require the acquisition of numerous residential parcels south of Placentia Avenue between Perris Boulevard and Wilson Avenue. Alternative 9 will adversely impact the character of the community by introducing a 6- to 8-lane, limited-access parkway where an urban arterial was previously planned. Alternative 9 will also impact community cohesion by removing many long-term residents (the area was developed in the 1970s) as
well as removing large portions of and facilities within Paragon Park, a community park serving this area.

These impacts would be more severe under the Placentia Avenue/Perris Boulevard Elevated Grade (PP-E) Design Variation, which would construct the parkway on an elevated alignment along Placentia Avenue, resulting in increased property acquisitions as well as the visual impact of an elevated facility.

Under the Rider Street (RD) Design Variation of Alternative 9, the impact to community character and cohesion would be similar to Alternatives 5 and 7, which follow the same alignment along Rider Street within the Perris area.

**Design Variations**

With the exception of the TWS Design Variation, none of the design variations for the MCP Build Alternatives would result in any change in effects on community character and cohesion beyond those described above.

In the Temescal Canyon Area, the community surrounding the I-15/El Cerrito Road interchange will experience both beneficial and adverse effects as a result of the northbound off-ramp and southbound on-ramp being closed under the TWS Design Variation.

Under the TWS Design Variation, the closure of the I-15 northbound off-ramp and the southbound on-ramp at El Cerrito will result in a reduction of access options to the areas served by the interchange. Traffic that would have otherwise used these ramps would be diverted to the I-15/Ontario Avenue and I-15/Cajalco Road interchanges. A traffic analysis was performed to determine what facilities would experience traffic increases or decreases as a result of these ramp closures (Mid County Parkway Traffic Analysis of I-15/El Cerrito Half Diamond Interchange, VRPA Technologies, Inc., January, 2007). Figures 3.4.4a and 3.4.4b show the estimated diversion of daily traffic due to these ramp closures. Traffic is forecast to decrease on El Cerrito Road, but will increase on Cajalco Road, Ontario Avenue/Temescal Canyon Road, and on California Avenue due to the ramp closures. While the loss of access is considered an adverse community impact, the reduction of traffic on El Cerrito Road will be a beneficial effect for residences along El Cerrito Road.
Figure 3.4.4a

I-15/El Cerrito Interchange 2035–Change in Average Daily Traffic with Closure of Southbound On-Ramp and Northbound Off-Ramp

SOURCE: VRPA Technologies, Inc.
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Commute Patterns of I-15 / El Cerrito Road


Figure 3.4.4b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract 419.09</th>
<th>Block Group # 1</th>
<th>Block Group # 2*</th>
<th>Block Group # 3*</th>
<th>Block Group # 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work in County of Residence</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work outside County of Residence</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Highest Percentage of Population with Travel Time > 60 Minutes
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The traffic analysis also projected that travel times would increase for trips using the two ramps as follows: northbound trips from the I-15/Cajalco Road interchange to the I-15/El Cerrito Road interchange would increase from 1.0 minute to 4.6 minutes, and southbound trips from the I-15/El Cerrito Road interchange to the I-15/Cajalco Road interchange would increase from 1.0 minute to 2.6 minutes.

No Build Alternatives
Under the MCP No Build Alternatives, the specific permanent impacts to community cohesion discussed above for the MCP Build Alternatives would not occur as a result of the MCP project itself. Impacts to these communities could result from other transportation improvement projects included in the No Build Alternatives, specifically future improvements to I-15 and I-215 as well as the SR-79 realignment project. Alternative 1B would implement the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element improvements on Cajalco Road and Ramona Expressway, and would therefore not be expected to result in community cohesion impacts since those improvements are consistent with the long-term transportation and land use plans for the area.

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 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 the potential impacts on population, housing, and employment. The MSHCP EIR/EIS concluded that implementation of the MSHCP would likely cause dwelling units and employment facilities previously planned for development within the Criteria Area to be shifted into areas that would not be conserved. However, implementation of the MSHCP would not change (either reduce or increase) the amount of development (dwelling units and/or employment facilities) allowed pursuant to local land use controls. In addition, the MSHCP would not displace substantial numbers of housing units or persons; implementation would only restrict where future development could occur. The MSHCP EIR/EIS concluded that, for the reasons listed above, the MSHCP would not have a substantial direct impact on population, housing, and employment.

Based on the analysis of impacts of the MCP related to population, housing, and employment, which is 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 on population, housing, and employment beyond that previously analyzed.

**Temporary Impacts**

**Build Alternatives**

Construction of any of the MCP Build Alternatives would temporarily affect local communities. Temporary construction impacts would include: disruption of local traffic patterns (traffic diversions due to local road, temporary ramp and mainline lane closures) and access to residences, businesses, and community facilities; increased traffic congestion; and increased noise, vibration, and dust. Although some businesses may 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. To minimize disruptions due to closures, the MCP project would be constructed in stages, particularly at the MCP/I-15 and MCP/I-215 interchanges. Construction staging at these interchanges is described in detail in the *Draft Project Report* (Jacobs Civil Engineering, 2007).
A Traffic Management Plan (TMP), as described in Section 3.6, will be implemented for the MCP project in a cost-efficient and timely manner with minimal interference to the traveling public. The TMP, when implemented, will minimize construction-related traffic delay by the effective application of traditional traffic mitigation strategies and innovative combinations of public and motorist information, demand management, incident management, system management, alternative route strategies, construction strategies, and other strategies.

**No Build Alternatives**

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 community impacts along these roadways under Alternative 1A.

Under Alternative 1B, the planned street network would be developed according to the Circulation Element of the Riverside County General Plan. Under Alternative 1B, 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.

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

The MCP Build Alternatives have been routed to avoid existing and planned communities as much as possible. Overcrossings and undercrossings are provided as project design features to maintain some connectivity within the communities bisected by the MCP project.

Mitigation Measure LU-1 described in Section 3.1 would reduce impacts of all MCP Build Alternatives to community cohesiveness during construction by ensuring that vehicle, bicycle, equestrian, and pedestrian circulation and access were maintained during construction. Mitigation Measure LU-4 described in Section 3.1 would reduce impacts to long-term community cohesiveness of Alternative 9 in the Perris Area by providing replacement park acreage and facilities to offset the loss of acreage and facilities within Paragon Park.

For all MCP Build Alternatives, Mitigation Measure TR-2, which provides for a Traffic Management Plan during construction and is described in Section 3.6, would reduce temporary construction-related impacts to communities.
3.4.2 Relocations

3.4.2.1 Regulatory Setting
The Department’s Relocation Assistance Program (RAP) is based on the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (as amended) and Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 24. The purpose of RAP is to ensure that persons displaced as a result of a transportation project are treated fairly, consistently, and equitably so that such persons will not suffer disproportionate injuries as a result of projects designed for the benefit of the public as a whole. Please see Appendix D for a summary of the RAP.

All relocation services and benefits are administered without regard to race, color, national origin, or sex in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (42 U.S.C. 2000d, et seq.). Please see Appendix C for a copy of the Department’s Title VI Policy Statement.

3.4.2.2 Affected Environment
All of the communities within the MCP study area described in Section 3.1 could be affected by displacements and partial acquisitions of residential and nonresidential property, including mobile homes. Nonresidential properties include retail trade, finance, insurance, services, government/nonprofit, and other types of nonresidential property uses. A full acquisition of a property is defined as an area within which occupants of residential and nonresidential units would be displaced by the project and would be expected to relocate. A partial acquisition is when a small area of a property is acquired, but full use of the property and dwelling structures, including multifamily units, would remain. Generally, partial acquisitions consist of portions of a back, side, or front yard, landscaping, or parking. Partial acquisitions for areas containing multifamily residences may not affect all units on the parcel. Additionally, if loss of parking is substantial, a full acquisition of the parcel may be required. Another form of a partial acquisition is a temporary construction easement, which describes acquisition of a portion of a property only during project construction.

The severity of property acquisition impacts varies greatly with the population involved. If the community is stable and cohesive and residents have been in their homes for many years, many of the displaced persons may have a difficult time adjusting to new homes and neighborhoods because they have a strong attachment to their existing home and neighborhood.
3.4.2.3 Environmental Consequences

Permanent Impacts

Build Alternatives

Acquisitions

The MCP Build Alternatives would result in the acquisition of nonresidential (dairies, agricultural, sod-farms, open storage, big box distribution, manufacturing, and retail), residential (mobile homes, single-family, multifamily), and municipal (fire station, police station, school district offices, and a high school) properties. Estimated totals of acquired parcels and displacees are tabulated in Table 3.4.E. Acquisitions required under the other MCP Build Alternatives range from 396 to 672 parcels.¹

All property acquisition and relocation will be handled in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (Uniform Act) of 1970 (Public Law 91-646, 84 Stat. 1894). The Uniform Act mandates that certain relocation services and payments by RCTC be made available to eligible residents, businesses, and nonprofit organizations displaced by its projects. The Uniform Act provides for uniform and equitable treatment by federal or federally assisted programs of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms, and establishes uniform and equitable land acquisition policies. Design refinements to avoid or minimize impacts to existing land uses related to the temporary use and/or permanent acquisition of property will be incorporated in the final design of the selected alternative.

Business and Employee Displacements and Relocations

Full acquisitions of nonresidential properties (businesses) for the MCP Build Alternatives would require relocation of employees and businesses to other locations. The partial acquisitions and Temporary Construction Easements (TCEs) would not require the relocation of businesses or employees.

¹ This information was obtained from the Draft Relocation Impact Report (Epic Land Solutions, June 2007). Detailed maps and tables showing the locations of full and partial acquisitions are shown in Figures P1–P25 and Table P in Appendix P of this EIR/EIS.
Table 3.4.E Full and Partial Displacements by Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alt. 4 Base Case</th>
<th>Alt. 4 SJN DV</th>
<th>Alt. 4 TWS DV</th>
<th>Alt. 5 Base Case</th>
<th>Alt. 5 SJN DV</th>
<th>Alt. 5 TWS DV</th>
<th>Alt. 6 Base Case</th>
<th>Alt. 6 SJN DV</th>
<th>Alt. 6 TWS DV</th>
<th>Alt. 7 Base Case</th>
<th>Alt. 7 SJN DV</th>
<th>Alt. 7 TWS DV</th>
<th>Alt. 8 Base Case</th>
<th>Alt. 8 RD DV</th>
<th>Alt. 9 PP-E DV</th>
<th>Alt. 9 SJN DV</th>
<th>Alt. 9 TWS DV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacements</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidential</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacements</td>
<td>1,799</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>1,753</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>1,051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Alt = Alternative  
DV = Design Variation  
PP-E = Placentia Avenue/Perris Boulevard Elevated Grade  
RD = Rider Street  
SJN = San Jacinto North  
TWS = Temescal Wash Area
Table 3.4.F summarizes the numbers of displaced employees by for each MCP Build Alternative and design variation. Information from the Draft Relocation Impact Report (Epic Land Solutions, 2007) for the MCP was used to identify businesses requiring relocation under each MCP Build Alternative. The numbers of employees displaced as a result of full property acquisitions under each Build Alternative were estimated based on employee generation factors in the SCAG Employee Density Study Summary Report (Natelson Company, Inc., 2001). Those factors include the type of nonresidential use and the total square footage of each type of use.

### Table 3.4.F  Number of Displaced Employees by Alternative and Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Corona</th>
<th>Perris</th>
<th>San Jacinto</th>
<th>Unincorporated Riverside County</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 4 Base Case</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 4 SJN DV</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 4 TWS DV</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 5 Base Case</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 5 SJN DV</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 5 TWS DV</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 6 Base Case</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 6 SJN DV</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 6 TWS DV</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 7 Base Case</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 7 SJN DV</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 7 TWS DV</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 8 Base Case</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 RD DV</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 PP-E DV</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 SJN DV</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 TWS DV</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Alt. = Alternative
DV = Design Variation
RD = Rider Street
PP-E = Placentia Avenue/Perris Boulevard Elevated
SJN = San Jacinto North
TWS = Temescal Wash Area

In summary, the total number of nonresidential uses displaced by each Build Alternative, and the numbers of employees in those businesses, summarized from Table 3.4.F are:

- **Alternative 4 and the Alternative 4 Design Variations:** Alternative 4 will require the relocation of 205 businesses in the three study area cities and unincorporated Riverside County, resulting in the displacement of 267 employees. Alternative 4 SJN DV (San Jacinto North Design Variation) will require the relocation of 202 businesses, resulting in the displacement of 267...
employees. Alternative 4 TWS DV will result in the relocation of 199 businesses, resulting in the displacement of 272 employees.

- **Alternative 5 and the Alternative 5 Design Variations:** Alternative 5 will require the relocation of 217 businesses in the three study area cities and unincorporated Riverside County, resulting in the displacement of 290 employees. Alternative 5 SJN DV will require the relocation of 214 businesses, resulting in the displacement of 290 employees. Alternative 5 TWS DV will require the relocation of 211 businesses, resulting in the displacement of 294 employees.

- **Alternative 6 and the Alternative 6 Design Variations:** Alternative 6 will require the relocation of 278 businesses, resulting in the displacement of 314 employees in the three study area cities and unincorporated Riverside County. Alternative 6 SJN DV will require the relocation of 275 businesses, resulting in the displacement of 314 employees. Alternative 6 TWS DV will require the relocation of 272 businesses, resulting in the displacement of 319 employees.

- **Alternative 7 and the Alternative 7 Design Variations:** Alternative 7 will require the relocation of 290 businesses, resulting in the displacement of 337 employees from the three study area cities and unincorporated Riverside County. Alternative 7 SJN DV will require the relocation of 287 businesses, resulting in the displacement of 337 employees. Alternative 7 TWS DV will require the relocation of 284 businesses, resulting in the displacement of 341 employees.

- **Alternative 9 and the Alternative 9 Design Variations:** Alternative 9 and Alternative 9 SJN DV will require the relocation of 131 and 128 businesses, respectively, resulting in the displacement of 119 and 118 employees, respectively, from the three study area cities and unincorporated Riverside County. Alternative 9 PP-E DV (Placentia Avenue/Perris Boulevard Elevated Grade Design Variation) will require the relocation of 115 businesses, resulting in the displacement of 117 employees. Alternative 9 RD DV (Rider Street Design Variation) will require the relocation of 162 businesses, resulting in the displacement of 323 employees. Alternative 9 TWS DV will require the relocation of 125 businesses, resulting in the displacement of 122 employees.

**Property Taxes**

Property taxes are levied on the assessed value of privately owned property. Property taxes in the study area are collected by Riverside County and
apportioned to the unincorporated communities in the county and to all incorporated cities, including the cities of Corona, Perris, and San Jacinto. The amount levied is approximately 1 percent of the assessed property value. The amount of property tax paid by parcel was recorded based on property taxes paid to the Riverside County Office of the Assessor in 2005. The amounts of property taxes paid were obtained from the County’s Extended Roll Fixed Tax Amounts for 2005. For this analysis, the property tax revenue was assumed to be the total property tax amount collected by the Assessor’s Office from each city and the unincorporated communities in Riverside County before it is redistributed to the cities and the county for revenue purposes. The reported property tax collected totaled $183,786,037 in the City of Corona, $54,898,179 in the City of Perris, $36,246,838 in the City of San Jacinto, and $630,394,324 in unincorporated Riverside County in 2005.

The property tax revenues associated with full parcels acquired for the MCP Build Alternatives were divided by the total property tax collected by city/unincorporated to reach the percentage of the total property tax revenue loss by jurisdiction. The only parcels included in the calculations for property tax loss were the full-parcel acquisitions under the Build Alternatives.

Table 3.4.G summarizes the losses of property taxes in the three study area cities and unincorporated Riverside County for each of the MCP Build Alternatives. In summary, the total property tax revenue losses for each Build Alternative are:

- **Alternative 4 and the Alternative 4 Design Variations:** Alternative 4 will require the acquisition of 586 parcels, resulting in an annual loss in property tax revenues in the three cities and unincorporated Riverside County of $1,094,340. Alternative 4 SJN DV will result in the acquisition of 583 parcels, resulting in an annual loss of property tax revenues of $1,074,135. Alternative 4 TWS DV will result in the acquisition of 512 parcels, resulting in an annual loss in property tax revenues of $941,223.

- **Alternative 5 and the Alternative 5 Design Variations:** Alternative 5 will require the acquisition of 565 parcels in the study area, resulting in an annual loss of property tax revenues of $1,037,102. Alternative 5 SJN DV will require the acquisition of 562 parcels, resulting in an annual loss of property tax revenues of $1,016,897. Alternative 5 TWS DV will result in the acquisition of 491 parcels, resulting in an annual loss in property tax revenues of $883,985.
### Table 3.4.G Property Tax Revenue Losses by Alternative and Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Corona</th>
<th>Perris</th>
<th>San Jacinto</th>
<th>Unincorporated Riverside County</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 4 Base Case</td>
<td>$143,923 (0.08%)</td>
<td>$178,726 (0.33%)</td>
<td>$78,150 (0.22%)</td>
<td>$693,540 (0.11%)</td>
<td>$1,094,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 4 SJN DV</td>
<td>$143,923 (0.08%)</td>
<td>$178,726 (0.33%)</td>
<td>$57,945 (0.16%)</td>
<td>$693,540 (0.11%)</td>
<td>$1,074,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 4 TWS DV</td>
<td>$151,287 (0.08%)</td>
<td>$178,726 (0.33%)</td>
<td>$78,150 (0.22%)</td>
<td>$533,059 (0.08%)</td>
<td>$941,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 5 Base Case</td>
<td>$143,923 (0.08%)</td>
<td>$172,185 (0.31%)</td>
<td>$78,150 (0.22%)</td>
<td>$642,843 (0.10%)</td>
<td>$1,037,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 5 SJN DV</td>
<td>$143,923 (0.08%)</td>
<td>$172,185 (0.31%)</td>
<td>$57,945 (0.16%)</td>
<td>$642,843 (0.10%)</td>
<td>$1,016,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 5 TWS DV</td>
<td>$151,287 (0.08%)</td>
<td>$172,185 (0.31%)</td>
<td>$78,150 (0.22%)</td>
<td>$483,362 (0.08%)</td>
<td>$883,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 6 Base Case</td>
<td>$175,239 (0.10%)</td>
<td>$178,726 (0.33%)</td>
<td>$78,150 (0.22%)</td>
<td>$658,731 (0.10%)</td>
<td>$1,090,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 6 SJN DV</td>
<td>$175,239 (0.10%)</td>
<td>$178,726 (0.33%)</td>
<td>$57,945 (0.16%)</td>
<td>$658,731 (0.10%)</td>
<td>$1,070,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 6 TWS DV</td>
<td>$182,603 (0.10%)</td>
<td>$178,726 (0.33%)</td>
<td>$78,150 (0.22%)</td>
<td>$498,250 (0.08%)</td>
<td>$937,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 7 Base Case</td>
<td>$175,239 (0.10%)</td>
<td>$172,185 (0.31%)</td>
<td>$78,150 (0.22%)</td>
<td>$608,034 (0.10%)</td>
<td>$1,033,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 7 SJN DV</td>
<td>$175,239 (0.10%)</td>
<td>$172,185 (0.31%)</td>
<td>$57,945 (0.16%)</td>
<td>$608,034 (0.10%)</td>
<td>$1,013,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 7 TWS DV</td>
<td>$182,603 (0.10%)</td>
<td>$172,185 (0.31%)</td>
<td>$78,150 (0.22%)</td>
<td>$447,553 (0.07%)</td>
<td>$880,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 Base Case</td>
<td>$143,923 (0.08%)</td>
<td>$424,593 (0.77%)</td>
<td>$78,150 (0.22%)</td>
<td>$360,032 (0.06%)</td>
<td>$1,006,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 RD DV</td>
<td>$143,923 (0.08%)</td>
<td>$172,185 (0.31%)</td>
<td>$78,150 (0.22%)</td>
<td>$395,231 (0.06%)</td>
<td>$789,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 PP-E DV</td>
<td>$143,923 (0.08%)</td>
<td>$318,360 (0.56%)</td>
<td>$78,150 (0.22%)</td>
<td>$340,100 (0.05%)</td>
<td>$880,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 SJN DV</td>
<td>$143,923 (0.08%)</td>
<td>$424,593 (0.77%)</td>
<td>$57,945 (0.16%)</td>
<td>$360,032 (0.06%)</td>
<td>$986,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 TWS DV</td>
<td>$151,287 (0.08%)</td>
<td>$424,593 (0.77%)</td>
<td>$78,150 (0.22%)</td>
<td>$199,551 (0.03%)</td>
<td>$853,581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alt. = Alternative  
DV = Design Variation  
RD = Rider Street  
PP-E = Placentia Avenue/Perris Boulevard Elevated Grade  
SJN = San Jacinto North  
TWS = Temescal Wash Area
• **Alternative 6 and the Alternative 6 Design Variations:** Alternative 6 would require the acquisition of 665 parcels, resulting in an annual loss of property tax revenues of $1,090,846. Alternative 6 SJN DV will require the acquisition of 662 parcels, resulting in an annual loss of property tax revenues of $1,070,641. Alternative 6 TWS DV would require the acquisition of 591 parcels, resulting in an annual loss of property tax revenues of $937,729.

• **Alternative 7 and the Alternative 7 Design Variations:** Alternative 7 will result in the acquisition of 644 parcels, resulting in an annual loss in property tax revenues of $1,033,608. Alternative 7 SJN DV will require the acquisition of 641 parcels, resulting in an annual loss in property tax revenues of $1,013,403. Alternative 7 TWS DV will require the acquisition of 570 parcels, resulting in an annual loss in property tax revenues of $880,491.

• **Alternative 9 and the Alternative 9 Design Variations:** Alternative 9 will require the acquisition of 393 parcels, resulting in an annual loss in property tax revenues of $1,006,698. Alternative 9 RD DV will require the acquisition of 351 parcels, resulting in an annual loss in property tax revenues of $789,489. Alternative 9 PP-E DV will require the acquisition of 377 parcels, resulting in an annual loss of property tax revenues of $880,553. Alternative 9 SJN DV will require the acquisition of 390 parcels, resulting in an annual loss of property tax revenues of $986,493. Alternative 9 TWS DV will require the acquisition of 319 parcels, resulting in an annual loss of property tax revenues of $853,581.

**Sales Taxes**

This analysis estimates the annual sales tax revenue losses to city, county, and state governments as a result of the acquisition of nonresidential parcels for the proposed MCP Build Alternatives. The sales tax rate in Riverside County and the cities of Corona, Perris, and San Jacinto is 7.75 percent, of which 6.25 percent is distributed to the State, 1.0 percent to the local jurisdiction, and 0.5 percent for highway projects in Riverside County (RCTC’s Measure A). In the Taxable Sales in California (Sales and Use Tax) Report, the State Board tabulates sales tax revenues by business and jurisdictions on a quarterly basis. Due to privacy laws, the Board does not disclose sales tax revenues generated by individual businesses; therefore, the taxable sales for the individual businesses that would be acquired for each MCP Build Alternative is not available. The potential losses in sales tax revenues were estimated using total taxable sales in county unincorporated areas and the cities of Corona, Perris, and San Jacinto.
Table 3.4.H summarizes the loss of sales taxes in the three study area cities and unincorporated Riverside County for each of the MCP Build Alternatives. Based on the estimates provided in Table 3.4.H, the total estimated annual sales tax revenue losses to the cities, county, RCTC, and state by MCP Build Alternative are provided below.

Table 3.4.H Revenue Losses by Alternative and Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Corona</th>
<th>Perris</th>
<th>San Jacinto</th>
<th>Unincorporated Riverside County</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 4 Base Case</td>
<td>$1,683,687</td>
<td>$2,789,563</td>
<td>$88,196</td>
<td>$5,892,893</td>
<td>$10,454,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 4 SJN DV</td>
<td>$1,683,687</td>
<td>$2,789,563</td>
<td>$35,278</td>
<td>$5,892,893</td>
<td>$10,401,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 4 TWS DV</td>
<td>$1,279,602</td>
<td>$2,789,653</td>
<td>$88,196</td>
<td>$7,143,674</td>
<td>$11,301,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 5 Base Case</td>
<td>$1,683,687</td>
<td>$3,785,835</td>
<td>$88,196</td>
<td>$5,496,732</td>
<td>$11,054,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 5 SJN DV</td>
<td>$1,683,687</td>
<td>$3,785,835</td>
<td>$35,278</td>
<td>$5,496,732</td>
<td>$11,001,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 5 TWS DV</td>
<td>$1,279,602</td>
<td>$3,785,835</td>
<td>$88,196</td>
<td>$5,712,384</td>
<td>$10,866,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 6 Base Case</td>
<td>$1,818,382</td>
<td>$2,789,563</td>
<td>$88,196</td>
<td>$9,408,820</td>
<td>$14,104,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 6 SJN DV</td>
<td>$1,818,382</td>
<td>$2,789,563</td>
<td>$35,278</td>
<td>$9,408,820</td>
<td>$14,052,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 6 TWS DV</td>
<td>$1,414,297</td>
<td>$2,789,563</td>
<td>$88,196</td>
<td>$9,408,820</td>
<td>$13,700,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 7 Base Case</td>
<td>$1,818,382</td>
<td>$3,785,835</td>
<td>$88,196</td>
<td>$9,012,659</td>
<td>$14,705,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 7 SJN DV</td>
<td>$1,818,382</td>
<td>$3,785,835</td>
<td>$35,278</td>
<td>$9,012,659</td>
<td>$14,652,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 7 TWS DV</td>
<td>$1,414,297</td>
<td>$3,785,835</td>
<td>$88,196</td>
<td>$9,012,659</td>
<td>$14,300,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 Base Case</td>
<td>$1,683,687</td>
<td>$2,640,122</td>
<td>$88,196</td>
<td>$2,376,965</td>
<td>$6,878,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 RD DV</td>
<td>$1,683,687</td>
<td>$3,785,835</td>
<td>$88,196</td>
<td>$2,773,126</td>
<td>$8,330,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 PP-E DV</td>
<td>$1,683,687</td>
<td>$2,042,358</td>
<td>$88,196</td>
<td>$2,178,884</td>
<td>$5,993,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 SJN DV</td>
<td>$1,683,687</td>
<td>$2,640,122</td>
<td>$35,278</td>
<td>$2,376,965</td>
<td>$6,736,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 9 TWS DV</td>
<td>$1,279,602</td>
<td>$2,640,122</td>
<td>$88,196</td>
<td>$2,376,965</td>
<td>$6,384,885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alt. = Alternative
DV = Design Variation
RD = Rider Street
PP-E = Placentia Avenue/Perris Boulevard Elevated Grade
SJN = San Jacinto North
TWS = Temescal Wash Area

Alternative 4 and the Alternative 4 design variations:

- City of Corona: $217,250 (Alternatives 4 and 4 SJN DV);
  $165,110 (Alternative 4 TWS DV)
- City of Perris: $359,944 (Alternative 4 and all design variations)
- City of San Jacinto: $11,380 (Alternatives 4 and 4 TWS DV);
  $4,552 (Alternative 4 SJN DV)
- County of Riverside: $760,373 (Alternatives 4, 4 SJN DV, and 4 TWS DV)
- RCTC: $751,150 (Alternative 4);
  $747,736 (Alternative 4 SJN DV);
  $741,054 (Alternative 4 TWS DV)
• State of California: $9,389,371 (Alternative 4);
  $9,346,696 (Alternative 4 SJN DV);
  $9,263,174 (Alternative 4 TWS DV)

Alternative 5 and the Alternative 5 design variations:

• City of Corona: $217,250 (Alternatives 5 and 5 SJN DV);
  $165,110 (Alternative 5 TWS DV)
• City of Perris: $488,495 (Alternative 5 and all design variations)
• City of San Jacinto: $11,380 (Alternatives 5 and 5 TWS DV);
  $4,552 (Alternative 5 SJN DV)
• County of Riverside: $709,256 (Alternatives 5, 5 SJN DV, and
  5 TWS DV)
• RCTC: $713,190 (Alternative 5);
  $709,776 (Alternative 5 SJN DV);
  $703,095 (Alternative 5 TWS DV)
• State of California: $8,914,878 (Alternative 5);
  $8,872,203 (Alternative 5 SJN DV);
  $8,788,862 (Alternative 5 TWS DV)

Alternative 6 and the Alternative 6 design variations:

• City of Corona: $234,630 (Alternatives 6 and 6 SJN DV);
  $182,490 (Alternative 6 TWS DV)
• City of Perris: $359,944 (Alternative 6 and all design variations)
• City of San Jacinto: $11,380 (Alternatives 6 and 6 TWS DV);
  $4,552 (Alternative 6 SJN DV)
• County of Riverside: $1,214,041 (Alternatives 6, 6 SJN DV, and
  6 TWS DV)
• RCTC: $909,997 (Alternative 6);
  $906,583 (Alternative 6 SJN DV);
  $883,927 (Alternative 6 TWS DV)
• State of California: $11,374,968 (Alternative 6);
  $11,332,292 (Alternative 6 SJN DV);
  $11,049,093 (Alternative 6 TWS DV)
Alternative 7 and the Alternative 7 design variations:

- City of Corona: $234,630 (Alternatives 7 and 7 SJN DV); $182,490 (Alternative 7 TWS DV)
- City of Perris: $488,495 (Alternative 7 and all design variations)
- City of San Jacinto: $11,380 (Alternatives 7 and 7 TWS DV); $4,552 (Alternative 7 SJN DV)
- County of Riverside: $1,162,924 (Alternative 7 and all design variations)
- RCTC: $948,714 (Alternative 7); $945,300 (Alternative 7 SJN DV); $922,644 (Alternative 7 TWS DV)
- State of California: $11,858,929 (Alternative 7); $11,816,253 (Alternative 7 SJN DV); $11,533,054 (Alternative 7 TWS DV)

Alternative 9 and the Alternative 9 design variations:

- City of Corona: $217,250 (Alternatives 9, 9 RD DV, 9 PP-E DV, and 9 SJN DV); $165,110 (Alternative 9 TWS DV)
- City of Perris: $340,661 (Alternatives 9, 9 SJN DV, and 9 TWS DV); $488,495 (Alternative 9 RD DV); $263,530 (Alternative 9 PP-E DV)
- City of San Jacinto: $11,380 (Alternatives 9, 9 RD DV, 9 PP-E DV, and 9 TWS DV); $4,552 (Alternative 9 SJN DV)
- County of Riverside: $306,705 (Alternatives 9, 9 SJN DV, and 9 TWS DV); $357,823 (Alternative 9 RD DV); $281,146 (Alternative 9 PP-E DV)
- RCTC: $437,998 (Alternative 9); $537,474 (Alternative 9 RD DV); $386,653 (Alternative 9 PP-E DV); $434,584 (Alternative 9 SJN DV); $411,928 (Alternative 9 TWS DV)
Chapter 3  Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures

- State of California:  
  $ 5,474,975 (Alternative 9);  
  $ 6,718,422 (Alternative 9 RD DV);  
  $ 4,883,166 (Alternative 9 PP-E DV);  
  $ 5,432,300 (Alternative 9 SJN DV);  
  $ 5,149,101 (Alternative 9 TWS DV)

No Build Alternatives
Under the MCP No Build Alternatives, the property acquisitions and relocations discussed above for the MCP Build Alternatives would not occur as a result of the MCP project itself, but similar impacts to these communities would result from some of the other transportation improvement projects included in the No Build Alternatives, specifically the widening of I-15 and I-215, and the SR-79 realignment project. Alternative 1B would implement the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element improvements on Cajalco Road and Ramona Expressway. This widening would result in both full and partial acquisitions along these two roadways, but these impacts would be less than what would occur under the MCP Build Alternatives.

Discussion of Impacts Relative to MSHCP Amendment
As previously discussed, the analysis in the MSHCP EIR/EIS included consideration of the potential impacts on population, housing, and employment. In addition, the MSHCP would not displace substantial numbers of housing units or persons; implementation would only restrict where future development could occur. The MSHCP EIR/EIS concluded that the MSHCP would not have a substantial direct impact on population, housing, and employment. 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 (the Locally Preferred Alternative) would not result in impacts on population, housing, and employment beyond that previously analyzed.

Temporary Impacts
Build Alternatives
Temporary construction impacts would occur under all MCP Build Alternatives and would occur for property owners whose properties are fully acquired and require relocation. These property owners would be temporarily impacted during the relocation process. As discussed in section 3.4.2.4, design refinements to avoid or minimize impacts due to temporary construction easements have been incorporated into the project.
No Build Alternatives
Under the MCP No Build Alternatives, the temporary adverse effects resulting from property acquisitions discussed above for the MCP Build Alternatives would not occur for the MCP project itself, but would occur as a result of some of the other transportation improvement projects included in the No Build Alternatives, specifically the widening of I-15 and I-215, and the SR-79 realignment project. Alternative 1B would implement the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element improvements on Cajalco Road and Ramona Expressway, and would therefore result in some of the same temporary property acquisition impacts along these two roadways discussed above for the MCP Build Alternatives.

3.4.2.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
Considering the abundant housing stock developed in recent years within the MCP study area, as well as numerous other planned residential land development projects, a sufficient number of “comparable replacement dwellings” meeting decent, safe, and sanitary standards exist within the impacted or neighboring communities. It is anticipated that finding replacement housing for owner or tenant-occupied residences will not present any unusual problems. Recent foreclosures in the area will increase the number of properties available for residential relocations. The exception is those displaced from mobile homes. The current inventory for mobile home unit sales and rentals is scarce, and the area lacks in-kind mobile home replacement housing suitable as decent, safe, and sanitary. One option is for mobile home displacees to relocate into slightly larger single-family residences, resulting in a housing-of-last-resort entitlement under the Uniform Act. “Last Resort Housing” payments by RCTC combined with additional resources in finding suitable single-family or multifamily residential replacement housing is anticipated to minimize impacts during relocations. Additional information regarding mobile home relocation is provided in Appendix D of this EIR/EIS. At this time, it is not known whether any property acquisitions will necessitate construction for housing. Compliance with the Uniform Act offsets any potential impacts to communities due to relocations; therefore, no mitigation is required.

3.4.3 Environmental Justice

3.4.3.1 Regulatory Setting
All projects involving a federal action (funding, permit, or land) must comply with Executive Order (EO) 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in
Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, signed by President Clinton on February 11, 1994. This Executive Order directs federal agencies to take the appropriate and necessary steps to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse effects of federal projects on the health or environment of minority and low-income populations to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law. Low income is defined based on the Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines. For 2000 (the reference year), this was $17,050 for a family of four.

All considerations under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes have also been included in this project. The Department’s commitment to upholding the mandates of Title VI is evidenced by its Title VI Policy Statement, signed by the Director, which can be found in Appendix C of this document.

3.4.3.2 Affected Environment

The environmental justice analysis was conducted using Census Tract-level information from the 2000 Census for the reference populations of Riverside County and the cities of Corona, Perris, and San Jacinto. Data from all of the MCP study area Census Tracts were included in the following discussion. The following analysis provides a comparison of four measures with which to evaluate environmental justice:

- Percentage of non-White residents
- Percentage of Hispanic residents (the Census Bureau considers Hispanic or Latino ethnicity distinct from racial background)
- Percentage of population below poverty level
- Median household income

Non-White Population

Between 1990 and 2000, total population in Riverside County grew by 32 percent, and the percentage of non-White residents also increased. In Riverside County in 1990, the non-White population comprised 23.6 percent of the total population. In 2000, the non-White population comprised 34.4 percent of the total population. In 1990, the non-White population in Corona comprised 24.1 percent of the population; in 2000, 38 percent. In 1990, the non-White population in Perris comprised 29.5 percent of the population; in 2000, 58.8 percent. In 1990, the non-White population in San Jacinto comprised 25.4 percent of population; in 2000, 30.7 percent. Other ethnic groups increased both in the county and in all affected...
communities, with the exception of the Asian population in Perris, which decreased from 3.3 percent of the total population in 1990 to 2.7 percent in 2000.

As mentioned previously, Figure 3.4.2 illustrates the percentage of non-White residents within the MCP study area Census Tracts. According to the 2000 Census, the non-White population was comprised of 63,892 persons or 39 percent of population within the MCP study area Census Tracts, with Census Tract 414.1 having the highest percentage of non-Whites (40.7 percent).

**Hispanic Population**
Hispanics comprise a large percentage of the population in the MCP study area. Countywide, the Hispanic population increased 82 percent between 1990 and 2000. In the City of Corona, the Hispanic population increased nearly 93 percent between 1990 and 2000. San Jacinto reported a nearly 76 percent increase between 1990 and 2000, and Perris reported a 164 percent increase. The largest number of Hispanics resided in the city of Perris, with 56 percent of the residents identified as Hispanic.

Almost 38 percent of the MCP study area population was identified by the 2000 Census as Hispanic, with Census Tract 414.1 having the highest percentage of Hispanics at almost 93 percent. As shown previously on Figure 3.4.3, a high concentration of Hispanics is located within Mead Valley and areas to the south.

**Poverty Level**
The percentage of persons living below the poverty level in 2000 was higher in the cities of Perris and San Jacinto (20.4 and 20.3 percent, respectively) than the county (14.2 percent), while the City of Corona has a lower percentage (8.3 percent). As shown on Figure 3.4.5, the percentage of persons living below the poverty level in 2000 in the MCP study area was lower than the county at 13.6 percent, with Census Tract 429.04 having the highest percentage at 32.3 percent.

**Median Household Income**
The median household income in the cities of Perris and San Jacinto ($35,522 and $30,627, respectively) was lower than the county ($42,887) in 2000, while the median household income in the city of Corona was higher ($59,615). The median household income of the MCP study area was $49,530, with Census Tract 419.07 having the
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highest household income at $88,716 and Census Tract 429.04 having the lowest household income at $28,431.

The percentage of persons living below the poverty level in 2000 was higher in the cities of Perris and San Jacinto (20.4 and 20.3 percent, respectively) than in the County (14.2 percent), while the city of Corona had a lower percentage (8.3 percent). As shown on Figure 3.4.6, the percentage of persons living below the poverty level in 2000 in the MCP study area was lower than in the County at 13.6 percent, with Census Tract 429.04 having the highest percentage at 32.3 percent.

**3.4.3.3 Environmental Consequences**

The following four measures were used to evaluate environmental justice impacts for the MCP Build Alternatives: percentage of non-White residents, percentage of Hispanic residents, percentage of population below the poverty line, and median household income. Minority and low-income populations could be impacted in several ways. Residences and businesses could be directly displaced or portions of property affected that would require relocation. The MCP project could also divide an ethnic or low-income neighborhood. However, the MCP project also could provide benefits to minority and low-income populations if transportation efficiency improves or if transit services are made more accessible or convenient.

In the Department Desk Guide, *Environmental Justice in Transportation Planning and Investments* (Caltrans, January 2003), no definitive guidelines are given for determining what impacts should be considered disproportionately high or adverse. However, two general issues are weighed for environmental justice analysis for transportation projects:

- Whether the adverse impact(s) of the proposed project will be predominantly borne by a minority or low-income population group; or
- Whether the adverse impact(s) of the proposed project will be appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than the adverse impacts to nonminority and/or non-low-income population groups even after mitigation measures and offsetting project benefits are considered.

“Low-income” and “minority populations” are defined as any readily identifiable group of low-income or minority persons who live in geographically adjacent areas, or groups of geographically dispersed or transient persons who would be similarly affected by a proposed FHWA program, policy, or activity. Transportation agencies
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Average Median Household Income by City -
- Corona - $43,555
- Perris - $28,611
- San Jacinto - $20,810

Average Median Household Income in Riverside County - $33,081
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such as Caltrans and RCTC must collect and evaluate data on minority and income characteristics, increase public participation in decision making, and provide mitigation measures to avoid or minimize the adverse effects of the federal action.

As discussed above in Section 3.4.3.2, Affected Environment, in the reference populations of Riverside County, the non-White population comprises 30 percent of the population while the Hispanic population is 36 percent. In the reference population of the cities of Corona, Perris and San Jacinto, the non-White population comprises 33, 53, and 26 percent of the total population, respectively. In these same cities, the Hispanic population comprises 36, 56, and 40 percent of the total population, respectively.

For 2000, the United States Department of Health and Human Services defines poverty guidelines for a family of four at $17,050. In 2000, the reference population of Riverside County had 14 percent of the population living below poverty. The city of Corona had slightly more than 8 percent of its population below poverty, while Perris and San Jacinto each had approximately 20 percent.

The median household income for the reference population of Riverside County was nearly $43,000. The city of Corona median household income was over $59,000, while the cities of Perris and San Jacinto reported $35,000 and $30,000, respectively.

Table 3.4.I shows the census tract data for each MCP Build Alternative along with the reference population data for comparison with the four environmental justice criteria.

### Table 3.4.I Environmental Justice Considerations by Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alternatives 4 and 6</th>
<th>Alternatives 5 and 7</th>
<th>Alternative 9</th>
<th>Riverside County</th>
<th>City of Corona</th>
<th>City of Perris</th>
<th>City of San Jacinto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Non-White</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Hispanic</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Below Poverty</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$51,479</td>
<td>$51,200</td>
<td>$50,803</td>
<td>$42,887</td>
<td>$59,615</td>
<td>$35,522</td>
<td>$30,627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permanent Impacts

Build Alternatives

All MCP Build Alternatives would benefit most MCP study area residents, including minority and low-income populations, by improving mobility and circulation throughout the MCP study area and the western Riverside County region. However, the MCP Build Alternatives will involve the establishment of a parkway through the Mead Valley and Perris communities. Some Census Tracts within these communities have a higher percentage of non-White persons, a higher percentage of Hispanic population, a higher percentage of persons below the poverty line, and a lower median income than the county and the cities within the MCP study area. Implementation of the MCP project will result in property acquisitions, temporary construction detours, temporary and permanent air and noise impacts, permanent aesthetic impacts, and temporary and permanent changes in travel patterns throughout the MCP study area, including the Mead Valley and Perris areas.

All MCP Build Alternatives would impact minority and low-income populations, primarily from displacements/relocations and from impacts to community character and cohesion. When comparing the Alternatives, Alternatives 4 through 7 have a greater impact on Environmental Justice populations within the MCP study area than Alternative 9 due to their direct impact to low-income and minority populations along Cajalco Road. Alternative 9 does displace some homes in the southern portion of Mead Valley (within the Old Elsinore Road and Gavilan Hills communities), but the total number is lower than that for Alternatives 4 through 7. Therefore, while the impacts from Alternatives 4 through 7 are not disproportionately high to minority and low-income populations, Alternative 9 has a lesser impact on these populations. Mitigation measures have been developed to reduce these impacts. However, alternatives that would avoid or reduce these adverse effects on the low-income and minority populations are not practicable as it is not possible to route the MCP alignments around these populations. That is, for the project to meet its purpose of providing effective and efficient movement between and through Corona, Perris, and San Jacinto, it is not possible to completely avoid those Census Tracts with higher percentages of minority and low-income populations.

No Build Alternatives

Under the MCP No Build Alternatives, the permanent adverse effects to minority and low-income populations discussed above for the MCP Build Alternatives would not occur as a result of the MCP project. Other transportation improvement projects included in the No Build Alternatives are not expected to result in disproportionate
impacts to minority or low-income populations within the MCP study area since these other projects primarily involve widening of existing highways. Alternative 1B would implement the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element improvements on Cajalco Road and Ramona Expressway, and would therefore result in similar permanent impacts to minority and low-income populations discussed above for the MCP Build Alternatives, particularly in the Mead Valley area.

**Discussion of Impacts Relative to MSHCP Amendment**

Environmental justice was determined not to be a topic of concern and therefore was not analyzed in the MSHCP EIR/EIS. However, as previously mentioned, the analysis in the MSHCP EIR/EIS included consideration of the potential impacts on population, housing, and employment. An amendment to the MSHCP to provide coverage for Alternative 9 TWS DV (the Locally Preferred Alternative) would not change the conclusion of the MSHCP EIR/EIS related to environmental justice.

**Temporary Impacts**

**Build Alternatives**

Construction activities would temporarily affect environmental justice populations. Temporary construction impacts would include disruption of local traffic patterns and access to residences and businesses, increased traffic congestions, and increased noise, vibration and dust. However, construction activities would provide jobs, which would benefit local economies, including minority and low-income populations.

**No Build Alternatives**

Under the MCP No Build Alternatives, the temporary adverse effects to minority and low-income populations discussed above for the MCP Build Alternatives would not occur as a result of the MCP project. These populations also would not gain any economic benefit from construction activities. Alternative 1B would implement the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element improvements on Cajalco Road and Ramona Expressway, and would therefore result in some of the same temporary impacts (both adverse and beneficial) to minority and low-income populations discussed above for the MCP Build Alternatives, particularly in the Mead Valley area.

**3.4.3.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures**

Based on the above discussion and analysis, the MCP Build Alternatives will not cause disproportionately high and adverse effects on any minority or low-income populations as per EO 12898 regarding environmental justice. Therefore, no
avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required. Mitigation measures stipulated in other sections of this EIR/EIS (land use, air quality, visual, noise, etc.) will reduce impacts to all affected populations, including environmental justice populations.