



## **1.0 Introduction**

---

---

County's residents, a community-outreach program has been at the heart of RCIP. The County gathered initial community input in the summer and fall of 1999 through public meetings and surveys asking County residents what they thought their county should look like in 20 years. Residents expressed concerns about the County's ability to retain the rural environment, to attract high-paying jobs, and to focus growth around current city centers. This initial information was compiled into a "Vision Statement" to guide development of each element of RCIP. The County also set up a website to serve as an information portal for the public to learn about the status of each plan, upcoming meetings, and read/download documents produced during the planning process. RCIP and each of its elements has been the subject of hundreds of community meetings throughout the County. Numerous regularly scheduled meetings with representatives of stakeholders took place during development of RCIP documents between the years 1999-2002. Television, radio, and newspaper were also used during this time period to inform the public. Comprehensive documentation of the public outreach effort is available at the County.

### **1.2.6 Related Documentation**

The MSHCP and CETAP are subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review and the General Plan is subject solely to CEQA review. The MSHCP's Joint Environmental Impact Report (EIR), required by CEQA, and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), required by NEPA, will be prepared in order to document the anticipated environmental consequences of implementing the MSHCP. The County is the local lead agency for CEQA, and USFWS is the federal lead agency under NEPA. While each element of RCIP will be subject to its own environmental document(s), the MSHCP will benefit from programs implemented under the General Plan and analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Although the other components of the RCIP are related through integration of the overall RCIP, the project description for the MSHCP EIR/EIS will be independent of the other two environmental documentation efforts. The MSHCP is also accompanied by an IA.

## **1.3 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

The overall goal of the MSHCP is based on the RCIP Vision Statement and supporting policy directives. The MSHCP will enhance and maintain biological diversity and ecosystem processes while allowing future economic growth. Preserving a quality of life characterized by well-managed and well-planned growth integrated with an associated open-space system is a component of the RCIP vision. The MSHCP will create an MSHCP Conservation Area in excess of 500,000 acres and

# 1.0 Introduction

---

---



focuses on Conservation of 146 species. The MSHCP Conservation Area includes approximately 347,000 acres on existing Public/Quasi-Public Lands and approximately 153,000 acres of Additional Reserve Land. The overall goals of the MSHCP are:

**Biological Goal:** In the MSHCP Plan Area, conserve Covered Species and their Habitats.

**Economic Goal:** Improve the future economic development in the County by providing an efficient, streamlined regulatory process through which Development can proceed in an efficient way. The MSHCP and the General Plan will provide the County with a clearly articulated blueprint describing where future Development should and should not occur.

**Social Goal:** Provide for permanent open space, community edges, and recreational opportunities, which contribute to maintaining the community character of Western Riverside County .

On December 19, 2000, the County Board of Supervisors provided the following specific policy direction for development and implementation of the MSHCP:

1. Prepare an MSHCP and draft IA based on Alternative 1 as identified in the October 4, 2000, MSHCP Alternatives Development Document (Dudek 2000).
2. Include a Conservation analysis that anticipates the participation of all 14 Western Riverside Cities and provides a breakdown of the Conservation analysis of the 14 Cities and the County.
3. Minimize the need for new local ordinances to ensure implementation of the MSHCP.
4. Utilize existing processes (including CEQA) to the maximum extent possible for the implementation of the MSHCP.
5. Include a range of incentives for land Conservation to facilitate assembly of the MSHCP Conservation Area.
6. Identify the number of acres of Conservation that would be accomplished by state and federal agencies (primarily USFWS, CDFG, U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and California Department of Parks and Recreation [DPR]).



## **1.0 Introduction**

---

---

7. Provide for an MSHCP Conservation Area that offers assurances that additional CESA and FESA permits will not be needed for future infrastructure Development during the term of the Permit.
8. Equitably apportion Conservation actions among local, state, and federal governments and new Development. The obligation of new Development shall be assigned in a manner that does not unnecessarily burden new housing and economic development in the Plan Area.
9. Include a process that allows farmers to be voluntarily covered for Incidental Take of Covered Species associated with their ongoing agricultural activities.
10. Include provisions that allow for the conversion of up to 10,000 acres of uncultivated lands to cultivated lands in a manner consistent with achieving the Conservation goals of the MSHCP.
11. Focus the acquisition of lands in a manner consistent with achieving the Conservation goals of the MSHCP.
12. Clearly demonstrate the linkage between Conservation, infrastructure, economic development, housing, and job creation within the County.
13. Include measurable goals, criteria, and safety nets that are easily administered by the local jurisdictions and understood by the public.
14. Include implementing mechanisms that:
  - provide incentives for landowner Conservation;
  - minimize the potential for the Wildlife Agencies to suspend or terminate the County's permit as a result of local jurisdiction action on an individual project;
  - minimize the role of the Wildlife Agencies in future decisions regarding individual projects;
  - do not imply that the program would result in regulatory takings of property or other Fifth Amendment violations of the Constitution.
15. Provide clear guidance to incorporate public use of land consistent with achieving the Conservation goals of the MSHCP.

# **1.0 Introduction**

---

---



16. Ensure that local land-use decisions are made by local jurisdictions.
17. Clearly define the process for monitoring and managing the participants as well as the associated costs.