for each alternative. Since the precise location of future right-of-way within each alternative is not yet known, it is not possible to definitively identify those resources that would be directly or constructively used by the project. The regulations acknowledge that "an analysis required by section 4(f) may involve different levels of detail where the section 4(f) involvement is addressed in a tiered EIS." [23 CFR Ch. 1, SS 771.135(o)] Specifically, the regulations state:

> "When the first-tier, broad-scale EIS is prepared, the detailed information necessary to complete the section 4(f) evaluation may not be available at that stage in the development of the action. In such cases, an evaluation should be made on the potential impacts that a proposed action will have on section 4(f) land and whether those impacts could have a bearing on the decision to be made. A preliminary determination may be made at this time as to whether there are feasible and prudent locations or alternatives for the action to avoid the use of section 4(f) land. This preliminary determination shall consider all possible planning to minimize harm to the extent that the level of detail available at the first-tier EIS stage allows. It is recognized that such planning at this stage will normally be limited to ensuring that opportunities to minimize harm at subsequent stages in the development process have not been precluded by decisions made at the first-tier stage. This preliminary determination is then incorporated into the first-tier EIS."

5.2 Identification of Potential Section 4(f) Resources

5.2.1 Methodology for Impact Evaluation

The Section 4(f) study area is the bandwidth for each Build alternative. There is no study area for the No Build alternatives since there is no physical bandwidth associated with them. Resources within the bandwidth may be subject to either direct or constructive use. Resources outside the bandwidth may be subject to constructive use.

The identification of potential resources was based on Section 4(f) guidelines published in the Federal Highway Administration Section 4(f) Policy Paper, September 24, 1987 (Revised June 7, 1989) ("FHWA Policy Paper"). GIS mapping provided graphical representations of the alternatives within each corridor, with maps of each resource compared to the proposed alternatives. Each resource was evaluated based on its distance from the alternatives. Based on this evaluation, resources were identified for analysis as potential Section 4(f) resources and are depicted in Figure 5.1.

Recreational resources, consisting of parks, reserves, and trails were identified through research and grouped according to jurisdiction. Recreation and wildlife resources located within the study area were identified using several geographic information system (GIS) databases, including an existing land use database from the RCIP Existing Setting Report (LSA, 1999) and the Thomas Brothers Map Guide GIS database (2001). In addition, parklands, schools, and recreational trails within individual incorporated cities were identified using City General Plans and the Riverside County Regional Trails Map (1999). Since public school playgrounds may also serve public recreational purposes, existing and planned public school sites also were evaluated. Recreation and wildlife resources within the study area were mapped, specifically, resources within the

Figure 5.1: Section 4(f) Resources

bandwidth for each alternative and within one-half mile of each alternative. Reserve areas proposed as part of the MSHCP and recreational resources identified in the proposed General Plan also were addressed.

Resources that may qualify as 4(f) resources are identified in this section. Potential 4(f) resources may be subject to either direct impacts, also known as "direct use," such as resource land acquisition, or indirect impacts, also known as proximity impacts to, or "constructive use" of, the resource. A final determination of the 4(f) status of these resources, as well as a determination of direct or constructive use, will be made in the Tier 2 level environmental analysis, when a preferred alternative has been selected and a precise right-of-way has been established.

5.2.2 Recreation Resources

5.2.2.1 Parks

Existing and proposed parks, schools with public playgrounds and/or sportsfields, and trails are identified in Sections 3.6 and 4.6, Recreation. There are no Section 4(f) recreation resources within the bandwidths for the WT alternatives. Alternatives 1, 3, 5a, and 5b are located along State Route 79 adjacent to the western boundary of Diamond Valley Lake. There are currently no existing recreation resources at Diamond Valley Lake, and current, pending plans call for two museums (The Western Center for Archaeology and Paleontology, and the Southern California Water Education Center), a youth camp, and recreational water use at the eastern end of the lake. Although there are no plans approved or being developed at this time for future recreation uses for the western portion of the site, such future uses may possibly be affected by the WT Corridor project.[1] However, for the purposes of the Section 4(f) analysis, Diamond Valley Lake is a Section 4(f) resource.

5.2.2.2 Waterbodies

There are several lakes in the WT study area. Some of the lakes function as MWD reservoirs and offer a variety of recreation activities. The FHWA Section 4(f) Policy paper states that "when lakes function for park, recreation, or refuge activities, Section 4(f) would only apply to those portions of water which function primarily for those purposes." Except for Diamond Valley Lake, none of the WT alternatives transects or is within 0.4 km (0.25 mi) of any lakes.

5.2.2.3 Schools

FHWA Guidelines for 4(f) state that school playgrounds may also serve public recreational purposes and, as such, may be subject to Section 4(f) requirements, particularly if the playground is open to the public and serves either organized or recreational purposes (walk-on activity).

---

[1] Phone conversation: Mr. Leslie Barrett, Senior Engineer, MWD, June 17 and 28, 2002.