

### 4.16.3 Recreation

The County of Riverside currently maintains 35 regional parks, encompassing approximately 9,033 ha (22,317 ac). More than half of these parks are located in the western portion of the County where the population is concentrated. In addition, Joshua Tree National Park, seven state-maintained open space and recreation areas, and 215 city parks are located within Riverside County. Private recreational facilities are found primarily in planned communities and apartment complexes. There are several commercial recreation facilities within the County, including golf 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 WT Corridor area: Elsinore, Sun City/Menifee Valley, Harvest Valley/Winchester, and SWAP. 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 no public parks or recreation areas within the bandwidths of the WT Build alternatives. The RCIP Existing Setting Report (1999) found that there were natural areas and/or private recreation areas within several of the build alternatives. The bandwidths for Alternatives 7a, 7b, and H currently do not include any existing recreation or natural areas. Under build out of the General Plan, one private park in a Specific Plan Area is located in the 7a/7b alternative bandwidth. The bandwidth for Alternative H would not have any recreational areas under the build out condition. The remaining four build alternatives have a net of approximately 25 ha (62 ac) of recreation or natural areas remaining after General Plan build out. 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 cause the greatest difference, and could result in a loss of up to 162 ha (400 ac) of recreation and natural areas. Alternative 3 experiences the smallest change with a net loss of (22 ha) 54 ac within the bandwidth. It is anticipated that joint planning with MWD will ensure that any needed widening of SR-79 (Alternatives 1, 3, 5a and 5b) does not impact a future recreation area at the Diamond Valley Lake site. Also, the WT 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 WT 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 WT alternatives in a comparative format. Table references in each alternative discussion relate to the following:

- C Projected areas of “developed” and “undeveloped” land uses in each HSA (build out case) (Table 4.16.A)
- C Projected impacts to surface water hydrology (road, railroad, and dam crossings of blue line streams) (build out case) (Table 4.16.B).
- C Projected cumulative impacts of channel improvements (build out case) (Table 4.16.C)
- C Projected cumulative impacts to riverine corridor continuity (build out case) (Table 4.16.D)