

southeast of Temecula, and increase agricultural land conversion to almost 206 ha (509 ac). Existing residential land potentially affected would total 72 ha (330 ac), most of which is along the shared alignment with 5a, but also includes scattered rural residences southeast of Temecula. This alternative could affect about 15 ha (37 ac) of existing school grounds including Vail Ranch Middle School (SR-79/Constance Road in Temecula) and Saint Jeanne De Lestonnac (east of Butterfield Stage Road south of Rancho California).

Potential impacts from Alternative 5b to future land use are also similar to those of Alternative 5a. At the southern end of the alignment, Alternative 5b would push into the orchards of Rancho California southeast of Temecula, and increase future agricultural land conversion to 67 ha (165 acs). Planned residential land affected would total 636 ha (1,570 ac), most of which is along the shared alignment with 5a, but also includes the rural residences southeast of Temecula. Alternative 5b would affect 127 ha (314 ac) planned for future commercial use, and 189 ha (467 ac) of planned recreation and natural area near Diamond Valley Lake and on the northeast edge of Temecula.

Alternative 5b affects the highest proportion of land in the corridor proposed for future agricultural (3.2 percent), residential (3.2 percent), and recreation and natural areas (2.3 percent) uses. The alternative also impacts the edge of the Pechanga Indian Reservation.

#### **4.1.2.9 Alternative 7a**

Alternative 7a could affect 274 ha (910 ac) of existing agricultural land, located throughout its entire length. The alternative could affect up to 9 ha (22 ac) of existing residential land along Craig Road near the proposed I-215 interchange.

Alternative 7a would potentially affect 430 ha (1,060 ac) of future residential land along its entire alignment, and 51 ha (126 ac) planned for commercial land, most of which is near the proposed I-215 interchange.

Alternative 7a potentially affects the second-highest proportion of land planned for use as utilities and public facilities (4.6 percent).

#### **4.1.2.10 Alternative 7b**

Alternative 7b is very similar to Alternative 7a, though its southwesterly route impacts 70 ha (173 ac) more existing agricultural land. Impacts to existing residential use total 10 ha (25 ac) of rural residences.

Future land use effects of Alternative 7b are also very similar to Alternative 7a, though its southwesterly route includes slightly more planned commercial land near I-215, and thus less residential land.

#### **4.1.2.11 Alternative H**

Alternative H could affect 16 ha (40 ac) of existing agricultural land, which is scattered along the entire length of the route. The alternative also impacts 5 ha (12 ac) of existing

residential property, near Menifee and in small parcels in Murrieta and Temecula. Alternative H potentially affects existing commercial (almost 6 ha [15 ac]) and existing industrial (26 ha or 64 ac) properties surrounding the interstate near Menifee, and in Murrieta and Temecula. Minor effects would occur to existing mobile home parks (1 ha or 3 ac). Much of the land identified as used for utilities is within the existing highway right of way.

Alternative H would affect 39 ha (96 ac) of future residential land, much of which is near Clinton Keith Road, and 190 ha (469 ac) of future commercial land scattered along the entire route. Given its alignment along existing interstate highway, Alternative H also potentially affects 281 ha (694 ac) of planned utilities and public facilities.

Alternative H affects the highest proportion of land in the corridor planned for use in the future for utilities and public facilities (31.6 percent), industrial (1.8 percent), and the second highest proportion of land designated for future commercial (7.5 percent) purposes.

### **4.1.3 Conclusion**

The selected WT Corridor alternative will contribute to the overall change in land use character in the study area. Implementation of a CETAP alternative will facilitate the proposed land uses as prescribed in the new County General Plan. In some cases this will involve the redevelopment and intensification of land already developed, and in other cases implementation of the General Plan will involve the development of lands that are currently vacant. A portion of the land currently vacant is in public ownership and committed to conservation or other non-development uses (Figure 4.16.1.) The remaining vacant lands are planned primarily for rural and low-density residential uses, with focused growth planned at activity nodes or community centers and linear concentrations of development along major transportation corridors such as I-215 and SR-79. The presence of a CETAP project could accelerate development in the vicinity of the corridor, but would not change the overall direction of the General Plan to maintain the low-density character of western Riverside County by focusing future growth and development intensities in specified areas.

The WT alternatives are consistent with the proposed Riverside County General Plan as they have been considered in the RCIP planning process. The applicable Area Plans support the implementation of the CETAP program. In addition, Alternatives 7a and 7b would connect with the Community Center planned at the I-215 and Scott Road. General Plan Amendments would be required to the Riverside County, City of Murrieta, and City of Temecula General Plans to reflect the selected WT alternative.

### **4.1.4 Potential Mitigation Measures to be Considered in Tier 2**

The proposed action would not result in adverse impacts to land use that are not addressed in other sections of this EIS/EIR. Farmland impacts are addressed in Section 4.2, displacement and community disruption impacts are addressed in Section 4.3, socioeconomic, and Environmental Justice impacts are addressed in Section 4.4.

Although there are no known adverse land use impacts at this Tier 1 level of analysis, there are opportunities to identify mitigation strategies to address impacts that may be disclosed at the Tier 2 level. Potential mitigation consideration for land use include: