

courses, polo and equestrian centers and water/amusement parks (General Plan EIR, Section 4.14).

There are existing and proposed policies and regulations that address the need for additional recreational facilities as the County population continues to grow. Riverside County has adopted provisions implementing the Quimby Act by requiring dedication of three acres of parkland per 1,000 population, or payment of a fee in lieu of such dedication. The requirement is enforced through the Subdivision Ordinance. The proposed General Plan includes policies that reduce or minimize the effects of future growth on parks and recreational facilities, including the requirement that new developments comply with the Quimby Act requirements and provide implementation strategies for the funding of both active and passive parks and recreation (General Plan EIR, Section 4.14). Specific roadway projects and other infrastructural projects to be implemented in support of the growth forecast by the County, as well as incorporated areas, will be required to mitigate any effects they would cause upon recreational facilities or plans in western Riverside County.

In addition to the general Open Space and Land Use policies in the new County General Plan, the following Area Plans provide land use guidance for the HCLE Corridor area: Elsinore, Sun City/Menifee Valley, Harvest Valley/Winchester, San Jacinto Valley, Lakeview/Nuevo, Reche Canyon Badlands, Mead Valley, Lake Mathews/Woodcrest, and Temescal Canyon. The Area Plan policies recognize the major recreation areas in the areas and implement strategies on preserving recreational resources within each area. The Area Plans do not identify these areas as currently park deficient.

There are several public parks or recreation areas within the bandwidths of the HCLE Build alternatives. The bandwidths for Alternatives 4a, 4c, H1, and H3 include one or two municipal parks each. The area of existing recreation and natural areas within the HCLE alternatives, as defined by the RCIP Existing Setting Report (1999), ranges from 0 ha/ac to 11 ha (28 ac). The Land Use Element of the new General Plan calls for new development to be focused in areas suitable for development, so that portions of western Riverside County can remain as open space or at rural densities. Therefore, the area of recreation and natural areas within the alternatives increases under General Plan build out conditions. The project's contribution to the net loss of recreation and natural areas is characterized by the difference between the existing and future conditions. Alternative 5b would result in the greatest contribution to the loss of recreation and natural areas under General Plan build out conditions (192 ha [474 ac]) of recreation and natural areas. Alternative 4a would cause the smallest change with a net loss of 22 ha (54 ac) within the bandwidth. Also, the HCLE Corridor study area enjoys convenient access to regional recreation resources such as Diamond Valley Lake, Lake Skinner, and Canyon Lake. The implementation of a CETAP alternative in the HCLE Corridor, in combination with other area developments and infrastructure projects, is not expected to contribute to a cumulative loss of recreational resources in the study area.

4.16.4 Surface Water Hydrology, Floodplain Encroachment and Water Quality

With respect to surface water hydrology, floodplains, and water quality, the proposed CETAP alternatives would facilitate the conversion of some lands that are currently

“undeveloped” to a “developed” condition (from the construction of roadbed, access ramps, drainage, and other facilities). The various alternatives would cross a varying number of blue line streams, many of which occur in currently undisturbed areas. Development has the potential to bring the placement of channel improvements and a loss of continuity of the riverine corridors. Similar impacts are currently taking place elsewhere in western Riverside County, in other areas of the County, and in the surrounding counties of Southern California.

Implementation of one or more of the proposed CETAP alternatives would facilitate the conversion of undeveloped lands along existing blue line streams, increase impervious area in the affected watersheds, and result in encroachment onto the 100 year floodplain in those areas. Similar impacts to floodplain areas are currently taking place elsewhere in western Riverside County, other areas of the County, and the surrounding counties of Southern California. Improving access to rural portions of the CETAP study area will hasten floodplain encroachment in more remote areas of western Riverside County.

Implementation of one or more of the proposed CETAP alternatives would facilitate the conversion of undeveloped lands along existing blue line streams, increase impervious area and resultant nonpoint source runoff in the affected watersheds, and result in potential impairment of water quality and loss of beneficial uses in surface waters in those areas. Similar impacts to water quality are currently taking place elsewhere in western Riverside County, other areas of the County, and the surrounding counties of Southern California. Improving access to rural portions of the CETAP study area will hasten potential water quality degradation and loss of beneficial uses in more remote areas of western Riverside County.

The projected potential impacts of each alternative are discussed by criteria grouping for parameters related to surface water hydrology, floodplain encroachment, and water quality (Table 4.10.A). Quantitative data are presented for each criterion evaluation; each data table lists all of the HCLE alternatives in a comparative format. Table references in each alternative discussion relate to the following:

- C Change in Areas of “Developed” and “Undeveloped” Land Uses in Each HSA (Build Out Case) (Table 4.16.A)
- C Potential Impacts to Surface Water Hydrology (Channel Improvements) (Build Out Case) (Table 4.16.B)
- C Projected Impacts to Surface Water Hydrology (Road, Railroad, and Dam Crossings of USGS Blue Line Streams) (Build Out Case) (Table 4.16.C)
- C Potential Impacts to Surface Water Hydrology (Riverine Corridor Continuity) (Build Out Case) (Table 4.16.D)

Table 4.16.A - Change in Areas of “Developed” and “Undeveloped” Land Uses in Each HSA - Hemet-to-Corona/Lake Elsinore (HCLE) Alternatives (Build Out Case)

Table 4.16.B - Potential Impacts to Surface Water Hydrology (Channel Improvements) - Hemet-to-Corona/Lake Elsinore (HCLE) Alternatives (Build Out Case) (Table 4.16.B)

Table 4.16.C - Projected Impacts to Surface Water Hydrology (Road, Railroad, and Dam Crossings of USGS Blue Line Streams) - Hemet-to-Corona/Lake Elsinore (HCLE) Alternatives (Build Out Case)

Table 4.16.D - Potential Impacts to Surface Water Hydrology (Riverine Corridor Continuity) - Hemet-to-Corona/Lake Elsinore (HCLE) Alternatives (Build Out Case)

- C Potential Hydrologic and Floodplain Impacts of Changes in Developed Land Uses (Area Affected) (Build Out Case) (Table 4.16.E)
- C Potential Impacts to Water Quality (Designated §303(d) Impaired Segments) (Build Out Case) (Table 4.16.F)
- C Magnitude of Potential Impacts to Water Quality (In Bandwidth Area with Slope Greater than 15 Percent) (Build Out Case) (Table 4.16.G)

The potential impacts of alternative crossings on surface water hydrology, floodplain encroachment, and water quality, in conjunction with activities associated with the projected build out of the General Plan, are presented on a study area basis on Figures 4.16.3 and 4.16.4. The mapping of potential impacts is presented in three major groups reflecting the following impact criteria categories:

1. Surface water hydrology (build out case) - Figure 4.16.3
2. “Developed” areas (build out case) - Figure 4.16.4
3. Water quality (build out case) - Figure 4.16.5

Potential cumulative impacts associated with each alternative are determined by aggregating the projected effects of the alternative crossings, in conjunction with the proposed land use changes associated with the build out of the General Plan, on each HSA affected for each resource topic. The impact analysis is arranged by discussion of each impact evaluation criteria identified in Table 4.10.A. For each criterion, the potential cumulative impact for each HCLE alternative is discussed.

4.16.4.1 Criterion SWH-8 – Projected Channel Improvements Upstream of the Alternative Crossing

Crossings of streams by transportation alter natives may directly affect surface water hydrology and other environmental factors. The total length of streams remaining unaffected by the potential crossings represents the potential for avoidance of direct impacts of development on the stream system. During the build out of the General Plan, land use development can affect hydrology and water quality parameters; these effects may be exacerbated by the addition of stream crossings by the proposed HCLE Corridor alternatives.

Regulatory Concerns. The extent of channelization of USGS blue line streams in areas to be developed during build out of the General Plan and crossed by transportation alternatives may result in the following effects to surface water hydrology:

- C Effects similar to those detailed for the "existing" case for this criterion (Criterion SWH-6):
 - Effects to the hydrologic integrity of the stream system in the area of the crossing, or downstream
 - Constriction or blockage of natural streambed migration across the floodplain in response to upstream precipitation and runoff events