

Table 4.16.J - Illustration of Percent Changes for Combination of Alternatives Versus Individual Alternatives (Alt 1b in the HCLE corridor and Alt 1 in the WT corridor) for Western Riverside County

	VMT	VHT	Speed (mph)
2025 Base (No Build)	54,299,000	1,629,100	33.3
Alt 1b HCLE % change	1.5%	-1.3%	2.9%
Alt 1 WT % change	0.3%	-0.4%	0.7%
Sum of % change for each	1.8%	-1.7%	3.6%
% change for combination (modeled HCLE Alternative 1b and WT Alternative 1 together)	1.6%	-1.4%	3.1%

4.16.8.3 Consideration of Land Use Changes

Another issue that arises with respect to cumulative effects is the extent to which land uses may change over time with the selection of a particular alternative. For the transportation analysis of individual alternatives, no change in land use was assumed based on the presence or absence of the alternative. The SCAG 2025 data was used for the analysis of the 2025 no-build condition and alternatives. The proposed General Plan land use was used for the no-build condition at build out. It is recognized that localized variations in land use are possible in association with individual alternatives. However, the exact nature of the change is the subject of conjecture. No studies definitively suggest that the presence or absence of a major transportation facility would change the total amount or type of development within an entire region or subregion, such as western Riverside County. Changes are likely to be more localized, focusing along the individual facility. Several possible types of changes could be theorized:

- C The *type* of development along the corridor could change. For example, some of the planned residential development along the corridor could be converted to non-residential development, in the event that the facility is built.
- C The *amount* of development along the corridor could change. For example, development densities could be higher in the event that the facility is built.

Reasons for changes in land use and development are complex. Such changes cannot be associated merely with the presence or absence of a major transportation facility. There are many reasons why particular types of land use might be located in particular areas. The extent to which the construction of a major transportation facility will influence land uses in a particular corridor cannot be definitively analyzed. It is likely that there would be similarities in the way that land use changes occur from one alternative to another, so that the differential effect among the alternatives would be small and not likely enter into the selection of a preferred alternative. Furthermore, one must also consider that the development that does not occur in a particular corridor will likely occur elsewhere, either within or possibly even outside the region. The demand for housing or employment in the region does not simply vanish if it is not satisfied in a particular corridor.

However, to at least partially address this question analytically, two sensitivity tests were conducted to assess the transportation effects of one possible land use scenario in the WT corridor. The sensitivity test involved making the assumption that

employment-oriented uses in the build out analysis of the alternatives would revert back to single family residential uses if the alternative were not constructed. In effect, this represents an alternative base condition for the build out analysis. More specifically, the primary employment-oriented areas that Alternative 1 of the WT Corridor was designed to serve were converted to single family residential uses. This involved not just the employment along a single alternative, but the employment for which accessibility could be improved for the entire corridor. Based on typical densities for residential and non-residential areas, each employee reduced was replaced by 0.20 dwelling unit (or one dwelling unit added for each five employees eliminated). This is a rather dramatic shift, and it is likely that the actual changes in land use would be substantially less dramatic than those shown here. It should be viewed as a sensitivity test of what would occur *if* such land use changes were to take place. It is not intended to be a prediction of what would actually occur. The key results of the sensitivity test for the WT Corridor are listed below:

- C The sensitivity test involved a reduction of 40,000 employees in the WT Corridor in the build out scenario. This represents approximately three percent of the employment in western Riverside County at build out. This was replaced by an additional 8,000 dwelling units, representing slightly over one percent of the dwelling units in western Riverside County at build out.
- C The VMT in western Riverside County for this alternate base condition was reduced by approximately 1.4 percent compared to the base condition that did not include these changes. The VMT is likely the measure that comes closest to quantifying a potential “growth inducing effect” on travel within western Riverside County. But it must be reiterated that the assumptions made in this hypothetical sensitivity test are more extreme than would likely occur.
- C The traffic demand on the highly congested SR-91 corridor was increased by slightly over one percent. This is because the reduced employment in western Riverside County causes residents of the County to seek employment elsewhere, such as in Orange County. This result that is opposite to what Riverside County is trying to achieve – a better jobs-to-housing balance. It increases traffic pressures on the SR-91 corridor, rather than reducing them.
- C The 1.4 percent reduction in VMT in western Riverside County is counter-balanced by an increase in VMT outside the County. The magnitude of the change outside the county was not quantified. The same would be true of the results for emissions.
- C Traffic demands on a number of the internal County roadways were reduced. For example, traffic on I-215 between Perris and Temecula was reduced by about ten percent for the alternate build out scenario compared to the original build out scenario. Traffic on I-15 in Temecula was reduced by about two percent.

In summary, this sensitivity test, which is considerably more dramatic than would likely occur, provides no indication that there would be a differential effect among alternatives that would influence the selection of one alternative over another.