

- C Widening of I-215 to three lanes from I-15 in Temecula to Perris
- C Widening of I-15 to four lanes from Temecula to Corona
- C Extension of Newport Road eastward as a four-lane arterial to connect with Domenigoni Parkway (Scheduled for construction completion 2004, source: Riverside County Transportation Improvement Program, TIP)
- C Construction of SR-74 as a four-lane divided arterial highway from I-15 to Perris (Scheduled for construction completion 09/2003, source: Caltrans District 8 Projects List)

2.3.1.2 No Build Condition for Build Out of the Riverside County General Plan

The General Plan build out No Build alternative assumes the proposed land use plan being considered in the new Riverside County General Plan and the build out of the Circulation Element roadway system, plus an express transit system connecting community centers and concentrations of land use in the cities and unincorporated areas. The build out condition assumes no new major multimodal transportation facilities in either of the two corridors. It assumes that existing freeways are built out to their ultimate number of lanes, as defined by Caltrans. This includes, for example, 10 lanes on I-15 from Temecula to Ontario and ten lanes on I-215 from Temecula to San Bernardino. This means that the portion of the Alternative H along the I-215 will be included as part of the No Build condition in the “build out” scenario.

2.3.2 Build Alternatives

The alternatives analyzed in this Draft EIS/EIR for the HCLE Corridor are intended to ultimately accommodate a potential multimodal transportation facility that includes both highway lanes and transit. There are 14 build alternatives evaluated in this EIS/EIR for the HCLE Corridor (Figure 2.1, Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore Corridor Alternatives). These alternatives are described in detail in the Alternatives Development Report (Jacobs, 2002). The bandwidth¹ of each alternative generally ranges between 152.5 and 305 m (500 and 1,000 ft) in width, depending on constraints such as existing development and steep topography. The bandwidth is specified more narrowly for segments where the right-of-way options are limited. The bandwidth is specified more broadly for segments where the location and/or width of the ultimate right-of-way is less certain. Table 2.A describes the characteristics of the various bandwidths developed for the alternatives.

¹ The width of the alternative for the purposes of right-of-way preservation. This is also the area that defines the Tier 1 EIS/EIR study area for each alternative.

Figure 2.1 - Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore Corridor Alternatives

Table 2.A - Alternative Bandwidths

Bandwidth	Characteristics	Flexibility for Tier 2 Level Siting Decision
500 ft (152.4 m)	C Relatively level topography	C Minimize impacts to established communities
	C Alternative is located on an existing roadway alignment	C Minimize impacts to natural resources
	C Alternative is in an open area	
1,000 ft (304.8 m)	C Hilly/mountainous terrain	C Accommodate needed cut and fill
	C Level terrain	C Responsiveness to landowner concerns
		C Avoid and minimize impacts to natural resources
Minimum bandwidth 110 ft (33.5 m) to 300 ft (91.4 m)	C Alternative is located on an existing roadway facility	C Minimal flexibility, alignment location is already set

Source: Alternatives Development Report for Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore Corridor (Jacobs, 2002).

The logical termini for the HCLE alternatives is generally I-15 on the west and the future realigned SR-79 to the east. The HCLE alternatives have their own independent utility from the alternatives in the SR-79 realignment study, currently in progress by RCTC and Caltrans, and the WT Corridor Study for CETAP. With regard to interchanges, the right-of-way to be preserved in Tier 1 includes areas for potential interchange locations only where each alternative connects to existing freeways. The number and configuration of interchanges and interchange locations connecting to local roadways will be evaluated for the selected alternative in Tier 2.

Figures 2.2a and 2.2.b illustrate a typical cross-section¹ showing the typical number of lanes, medians, shoulders, and buffer zones that would occur with the construction of the ultimate potential facility for the HCLE Corridor. There could be variations of these widths within the alternative to accommodate particularly constrained areas, such as topography or other conditions, but the typical section would apply for most of the length.

For purposes of defining the right-of-way to be preserved as a result of the Tier 1 action, as well as the capacity to be used in the transportation demand modeling, the following elements are included in the design concept for the HCLE Corridor:

- C Three mixed flow lanes in each direction
- C One High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction
- C Shoulders at Caltrans standards for freeways
- C Sufficient width to accommodate Caltrans standard median widths, and an exclusive transitway,² either rail or bus
- C Buffer areas and areas for utilities
- C Interchanges at existing freeways

While Figures 2.2a and 2.2b illustrate a concept for the HCLE Corridor, it is possible that the project will be built in phases, with initial phases being built to accommodate at-grade signalized intersections and interchanges constructed at a later date as traffic demand warrants. These types of decisions will be made in the Tier 2 process. All of the build alternatives include provisions for transit service on the HOV lanes, with the potential to add an exclusive transitway at a later date. For purposes of the transportation analysis for the EIS/EIR, it was assumed that the future facility would be four lanes (three mixed-flow and one HOV lane) in each direction as shown in Figures 2.2a and 2.2b. This configuration is conceptual at this time; no decision on facility type will be made until the Tier 2 studies have been completed.

¹ The general design characteristics of a facility, including number of lanes (mixed flow and high occupancy vehicle lanes), the general width of medians, shoulders, and buffer areas, and the number of tracks, if rail is included.

² A separate right-of-way or an integrated part of a highway right-of-way that could accommodate a number of forms of transit, such as buses or light rail facilities. In the HCLE Corridor, a possible transitway is identified in the cross-section.

Figure 2.2a - Typical Cross Section

Figure 2.2b - Typical Cross Section

It is recognized that the alternatives may require rights-of-way that vary in width along the alternative. This may be due to topography, features of the natural and built environment, potential constraints that may limit the width of the ultimate right-of-way, and design requirements such as HOV enforcement areas. Figure 2.2a identifies a typical cross-section that would represent “unconstrained” conditions and a typical cross-section for the situation where frontage roads may be required to carry local traffic. Figure 2.2b represents a typical section where significant cut or fill slopes are required. Variations in these cross-sections may still be needed in certain constrained areas, such as portions of alternatives that follow existing freeways. The specifics of these variations will not be addressed until Tier 2 for the selected alternative.

All of the alternatives generally connect the areas along SR-79 in the Hemet and San Jacinto areas with I-15 in the Lake Elsinore and Corona areas. Figure 2.1 shows the alternatives graphically for each alternative. The alternatives are listed below in terms of the general routes being followed:

- C **Alternatives 1a and 1b** – Corridor preservation along the current Ramona Expressway alignment from SR-79/Sanderson Avenue to I-215 and along the current Cajalco Road alignment to El Sobrante Road, along El Sobrante Road to La Sierra Ave., and along a new alignment between the current El Sobrante/La Sierra intersection to the current Cajalco Road/I-15 interchange. The difference between Alternatives 1a and 1b is in the alignment between the El Sobrante/La Sierra intersection and the Cajalco Road/I-15 interchange. Alternative 1a follows a more northerly route between these two points. Alternative 1b follows a more direct route between these two points.
- C **Alternative 4a** – Corridor preservation along existing SR-74 from the realigned SR-79 in Hemet (assumed to be in the vicinity of Warren Road) to Ethanac Road. Continue westerly along Ethanac Road to SR-74, and along SR-74 to I-15.
- C **Alternative 4c** – Corridor preservation along existing SR-74 from the realigned SR-79 in Hemet (assumed to be in the vicinity of Warren Road) to Ethanac Road. Continue westerly along Ethanac Road to SR-74, and along SR-74 to the extension of Nichols Road and along Nichols Road to I-15.
- C **Alternative 4d** – Corridor preservation along existing SR-74 from the realigned SR-79 in Hemet (assumed to be in the vicinity of Warren Road) to Ethanac Road. Continue westerly along Ethanac Road to a route south of and generally parallel to SR-74 to a new interchange at I-15.
- C **Alternative 5a** – Corridor preservation from the intersection of Domenigoni Parkway/SR-79, continuing due west from Domenigoni Parkway and then northwesterly generally along the alignment of the San Jacinto Branch rail line to Ethanac Road, along Ethanac Road to SR-74, and along SR-74 to I-15.
- C **Alternative 5b** – Corridor preservation from Domenigoni Parkway/SR-79, continuing due west from Domenigoni Parkway and then northwesterly generally along the alignment of the San Jacinto Branch rail line to Ethanac Road, along Ethanac Road continuing due west across SR-74 along a new route to the Lake Street/I-15 interchange.
- C **Alternative 5c** – Corridor preservation from Domenigoni Parkway/SR-79, continuing due west from Domenigoni Parkway and then northwesterly generally along the alignment of the San Jacinto Branch rail line to Ethanac Road, along Ethanac Road to SR-74, along SR-74 to the extension of Nichols Road and along Nichols Road to I-15.

- C **Alternative 5d** – Corridor preservation from Domenigoni Parkway/SR-79, continuing due west from Domenigoni Parkway and then northwesterly generally along the alignment of the San Jacinto Branch rail line to Ethanac Road. Continue westerly along Ethanac Road to an alignment south of and generally parallel to SR-74 to a new interchange at I-15.
- C **Alternative 5e** – Corridor preservation from Domenigoni Parkway/SR-79, continuing due west from Domenigoni Parkway and then northwesterly generally along the alignment of the San Jacinto Branch rail line to Ethanac Road, along Ethanac Road to a new route paralleling SR-74 approximately one mile to the east, crossing SR-74 at the extension of Nichols Road, and along Nichols Road to I-15.
- C **Alternative 6a** – Corridor preservation from Domenigoni Parkway/SR-79, continuing westerly and connecting to Newport Road. Follow Newport Road to the vicinity of Railroad Canyon Road/Goetz Road, and continue along Railroad Canyon Road to I-15.
- C **Alternative 6b** – Corridor preservation from Domenigoni Parkway/SR-79, continuing westerly and connecting to Newport Road. Follow Newport Road to the vicinity of Railroad Canyon Road/Goetz Road, and continue along a new route to the south of Railroad Canyon Road bypassing the Canyon Lake area and connecting to I-15.
- C **Alternative H1** – Corridor preservation consisting of a combination of Alternative 1b west of I-215 (Cajalco Road to El Sobrante Road to I-15), following I-215 to Ethanac Road, and following the route of Alternative 5 from Ethanac Road/I-215 easterly to Domenigoni Parkway (Alternatives 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, and 5e all follow this same route east of I-215). I-215 is assumed to be widened to eight mixed flow lanes and two HOV lanes (i.e., four mixed flow lanes and one HOV lane in each direction) between Ethanac Road and Cajalco Road.
- C **Alternative H3** – Corridor preservation following Cajalco Road from I-215 to El Sobrante Road, continuing along El Sobrante Road to La Sierra Ave. and La Sierra Ave. to SR-91. On the east side of I-215, Alternative H3 would follow the route of Alternative 5 from Ethanac Road/I-215 easterly to Domenigoni Parkway (Alternatives 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, and 5e all follow this same route east of I-215). I-215 is assumed to be widened to eight mixed flow lanes and two HOV lanes (i.e., four mixed flow lanes and one HOV lane in each direction) between Ethanac Road and Cajalco Road.

2.3.3 Transportation Systems Management

RCTC, the County, and the cities within the HCLE Corridor are committed to ongoing implementation of Transportation Systems Management (TSM) strategies to maximize the efficiency of the existing transportation system. The TSM policies in the proposed Riverside County General Plan (Hearing Draft, April, 2002) include a specific emphasis on the ongoing development of HOV facilities in Riverside County. The typical section for the CETAP alternatives presented in Figures 2.2a and 2.2b includes the provision of HOV lanes as part of the preferred CETAP alternative. However, since the Tier 1 action is for right-of-way preservation only, a separate TSM alternative has not been developed since other modal and facility type details are not known at this time. In Tier 2, specific TSM measures in addition to HOV lanes will be considered in the development of various alignment and modal alternatives for the route alternative selected in Tier 1.