

Resource	Section 4(f)/National Register Eligibility	Use?
Site RIV-3993 Habitation Complex	May be eligible	Likely. Several apparently related sites are within bandwidth of Alternatives 6a and 6b.
Site RIV-4158	May be eligible	Possible. Within bandwidth of Alternatives 1a and 1b.
Site RIV-4035	May be eligible	Possible. Located within the middle of the bandwidth of Alternative 5b.
Site RIV-4110	May be eligible	Possible. Located within bandwidth of Alternatives 4c, 5c, and 5e.
Site JK-10-S-12 (Traditional Cultural Property)	May be eligible	Likely. Site is located in the middle of Alternative 5b bandwidth.
Site RIV-2097	May be eligible	Possible. Located within bandwidth of Alternative H3.

5.3.3 Wildlife Refuge Resources

Portions of the existing Lake Mathews/Estelle Mountain Reserve on the eastern side of Lake Mathews and portions of the MSHCP criteria area that would connect to the reserve on the eastern side of the lake are transected by Alternatives H1, H3, 1a, and 1b. The Lake Mathews/Estelle Mountain Reserve is a dedicated preserve managed for an endangered species, and is owned by a public agency. Therefore, it is a protected Section 4(f) resource.

The portion of the existing Lake Mathews/Estelle Mountain Reserve that is transected by Alternatives H1, 1a, and 1b would be directly impacted by implementation of any of these alternatives. This impact cannot be avoided. Mitigation measures would be implemented to maintain habitat connectivity and to allow for the movement of wildlife in accordance with the conservation goals as defined by the MSHCP.

The bandwidths for Alternatives 1a and 1b along Ramona Expressway were designed to allow for widening on the south side of the existing right-of-way to minimize potential impacts to the existing San Jacinto Wildlife Reserve. Therefore, potential direct impacts to the San Jacinto Wildlife Reserve are almost completely avoided. A small portion of the wildlife area overlaps the bandwidth for Alternatives 1a and 1b. Portions of the proposed MSHCP criteria area would connect to the Wildlife Reserve, and are transected by these alternatives. However, the criteria area is not a protected Section 4(f) resource, since it is privately owned and jointly planned with the contemplated transportation improvements.

Table 5.3.D - Wildlife Refuge Resources

Resource	Section 4(f) Eligibility	Use?
Lake Mathews/Estelle Mountain Reserve	Yes. Publicly managed wildlife reserve for protection of endangered species.	Yes. Alternatives H1, H3, 1a, and 1b transect.
San Jacinto Wildlife Reserve	Yes. Publicly owned wildlife area.	Yes. Alternatives 1a and 1b.

Riverside County, along with other local governments and landowners, has participated in regional planning efforts, including the development of the proposed MSHCP, to reduce and mitigate the impacts of development on sensitive species and their habitats. The MSHCP will result in the preservation of up to 61,965 ha (153,000 ac) of habitat. These efforts have been coordinated with regional planning of development to meet housing and employment goals, and the infrastructure needed to support those goals. USFWS and CDFG acknowledge that they have reviewed the location of planned roadways with regard to their effects on the habitats of identified species and on criteria habitat. The local governments acknowledge that the coordinated regional planning efforts include the cooperative planning of public parks and open space and transportation improvements set forth in the County’s proposed General Plan, including the Circulation Element and County Master Plan of Arterial Highways, in a manner consistent with the cooperative planning provision of Section 4(f) (re-codified 49 U.S.C. 303) of the Department of Transportation Act and associated regulations. The MSHCP is integrated with regional open space planning that has already taken place to identify and ensure appropriate mitigation for impacts on fish and wildlife and to promote the conservation of broad-based natural communities and species diversity. Therefore, while the MSHCP is a wildlife management resource, the requirements of Section 4(f) do not apply to the subsequent highway construction on reserved right-of-way previously (or jointly) planned (FHWA Section 4(f) Policy Paper). Also, most of the lands identified for inclusion in the MSHCP that are not already preserve areas are currently privately owned, and as such do not warrant Section 4(f) status.

5.4 Resource Avoidance

If a transportation project requires the use of publicly owned land of a public park, recreation area or wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or land of an historic site of national, State, or local significance, opportunities to avoid impacts to the resource must be identified and, if avoidance is not feasible and there are no prudent and feasible alternatives to using the land, measures to minimize harm to the resource must be identified. The opportunities to site the right-of-way within the bandwidth in such a way as to avoid identified 4(f) resources were assessed. Opportunities to shift the location of bandwidths were also examined where appropriate. The results of this review are summarized in Table 5.4.A.

Feasible and prudent locations or alternatives for the action to avoid the use of Section 4(f) land will be further considered in the Tier 2 analysis. Emphasis will be placed on alternative locations within the preserved bandwidth to avoid Section 4(f) resources.