

PRELIMINARY DRAFT
DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES
WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNTY MSHCP



Prepared for:

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY

P.O. Box 1605
4080 Lemon Street
Riverside, CA 92502-1605
Contact: Richard Lashbrook

Prepared by:



605 Third Street
Encinitas, California 92024

FEBRUARY 2000

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1.0 PURPOSE	1
2.0 APPROACH	2
2.1 Study Area	2
2.2 Conceptual Conservation Scenario	2
<i>Subarea 1</i>	9
<i>Subarea 2</i>	9
<i>Subarea 3</i>	10
<i>Subarea 4</i>	10
2.3 Land Use Alternatives	11
3.0 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES	14
3.1 Alternative 1 – Existing Trends	17
<i>Subarea 1</i>	23
<i>Subarea 2</i>	24
<i>Subarea 3</i>	25
<i>Subarea 4</i>	26
3.2 Alternative 2 - Sphere of Influence Alternative	27
3.3 Alternative 3 - Vision Alternative	27
3.4 Alternative 4 - Open Space Designation Alternative	27

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Regional Location Map	3
Figure 2	Vicinity Map	4
Figure 3	Status of Land Ownership Map	6
Figure 4	Area Potentially Available for Conservation	8
Figure 5	Proposed Land Use Plan, Draft Alternative 1	18

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Subarea 1 — Alternative 1 Land Use and Vegetation Summary	19
Table 2	Subarea 2 — Alternative 1 Land Use and Vegetation Summary	20
Table 3	Subarea 3 — Alternative 1 Land Use and Vegetation Summary	21
Table 4	Subarea 4 — Alternative 1 Land Use and Vegetation Summary	22
Table 5	Alternative 4 — Vegetation and Land Use Summary	28

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



1.0 PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to provide a description of the preliminary alternatives to be analyzed as part of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The preliminary alternatives described in this document represent the range of alternatives to be analyzed as part of the MSHCP. Specific alternatives within this range will continue to be developed as the MSHCP planning process proceeds, including an alternative that may be recommended by the County's MSHCP Advisory Committee. It should be noted that the alternatives will continue to be refined as the planning process proceeds and that the ultimate alternatives to be included in the Draft MSHCP and accompanying Draft Joint Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) when those documents are distributed for public review, will likely differ from the preliminary alternatives presented in this document. Preparation of this description of preliminary alternatives at this point in the planning process is, however, useful in continuing the process of alternatives refinement and analysis. In particular, providing a preliminary alternatives description at this time assists in highlighting areas of concern and issues to be resolved with respect to development of a comprehensive and implementable MSHCP. This description of preliminary alternatives also defines the range of alternatives to be analyzed as part of the MSHCP.

As described in SECTION 2.0 of this document, much work remains to be completed in the development and refinement of MSHCP alternatives, particularly with respect to integration of the MSHCP alternatives with other components of the Riverside County Integrated Plan (RCIP)-the General Plan update and the Community Environmental Transportation Acceptability Process (CETAP). The description of preliminary alternatives presented in this document incorporates information available from the General Plan and CETAP processes available at the time this document is being prepared (January 2000). As the General Plan and CETAP processes move forward, they will continue to influence, and be influenced by, the MSHCP alternatives.

A key purpose of this document is to assist the MSHCP Advisory Committee and other stakeholders in identifying issues associated with the various alternatives, developing approaches to resolving issues, and ultimately defining a preferred plan. This process will involve both defining the geographic locations of areas potentially to be conserved as part of the MSHCP and addressing policy issues that will need to be resolved to provide for the conservation assurances that are necessary as part of the MSHCP. To assist in this process, both spatial and policy characteristics associated with the preliminary alternatives are discussed in SECTION 3.0 of this document.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



The description of preliminary alternatives presented in this document will also form the basis of the preliminary conservation analysis to be completed as part of the next MSHCP task. The preliminary conservation analysis will apply the analysis approach described in the Draft Approach to Evaluation of Reserve Alternatives for SRP Review (DUDEK, November 1999), as modified by the December 13, 1999 comments of the Scientific Review Panel (SRP) established for the MSHCP. It is understood that the preliminary conservation analysis will be refined as the MSHCP planning process proceeds and the alternatives are better defined. As with this document, however, the preliminary conservation analysis will serve as a benchmark in the ongoing identification and resolution of issues as the MSHCP planning process proceeds.

2.0 APPROACH

2.1 STUDY AREA

The description of preliminary alternatives presented in this document is based on the approximately 1.26 million-acre study area defined for the MSHCP. The regional location of the study area is depicted in FIGURE 1. To facilitate the description of preliminary alternatives, the study area has been divided into four subareas representing the four quadrants of the study area. These subareas are depicted in FIGURE 2 and are the same subareas used in the August 9, 1999 “Draft Proposal” document for the MSHCP (DUDEK, August 1999). The subareas graphic is reproduced in this document to assist the reader in reviewing the description of preliminary alternatives presented in SECTION 3.0.

2.2 CONCEPTUAL CONSERVATION SCENARIO

The August 9 “Draft Proposal” for the MSHCP described in narrative terms a conceptual conservation scenario comprising up to 510,000 acres within the 1.26 million-acre MSHCP study area that would potentially conserve up to 164 species. Comments on the conceptual conservation scenario were provided in a joint letter by the wildlife agencies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game), dated September 9, 1999.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



Figure 1 Regional Location Map

PRELIMINARY DRAFT DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



Figure 2 Vicinity Map

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



Together these documents broadly define areas desirable for conservation within the MSHCP study area. The analysis of these areas will continue to be refined as the conservation planning process proceeds.

As part of the August 9 “Draft Proposal” a preliminary assessment of public and private lands that may be desirable and/or available for conservation was provided. This was done to determine the rough conservation estimates presented in the August 9 document. The assessment was based in part on an Ownership in Western County data base developed by the RCIP consultant team and available at the time the August 9 “Draft Proposal” was prepared (depicted as Figure 4 in the August 9 “Draft Proposal” document). Since that time, the data base has been updated and is now reflected in the Land Status data base developed by the RCIP consultant team. To provide reviewers of this document the most current information regarding this topic, the updated land status map for the MSHCP study area has been included in this document as FIGURE 3.

The updated land status map has been used to further define areas potentially available for conservation within the MSHCP study area, and to compare the potentially available areas with those areas identified as desirable for conservation as part of the conceptual conservation scenario. The land status data base defined existing publicly owned and other reserve lands that may be available for conservation, recognizing that land use and management issues must continue to be researched and evaluated for these lands, both to ensure that existing and proposed activities within the existing publicly owned and other reserve lands will be permitted to continue, and to determine the extent to which the publicly owned and other reserve lands are, and will continue to be, managed for the benefit of the species to be addressed in the MSHCP. The combined lands identified as potentially available for conservation are depicted on the Land Status Map (FIGURE 3), and consist of the following categories:

- | U.S. Forest Service Land
- | Conservation Area
- | Flood Control Districts
- | Public Reserve
- | RCHCA

Figure 3 Status of Land Ownership Map

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



- | Riverside County
- | State of California
- | All other areas identified as Reserve Area

As part of the ongoing definition of lands potentially available for conservation, the land status data base was augmented to include areas within the MSHCP study area with slopes greater than 25%, based on the USGS topographic data base assembled by the RCIP consultant team, and areas within the MSHCP study area overlain by the County's existing mountainous areas designation, based on the County General Plan. (It should be noted that within the MSHCP study area, the County's mountainous lands designation does not extend into the REMAP community plan area, located in the southeast corner of the MSHCP study area.) This information regarding land status, 25% slopes, and mountainous areas designated lands was assembled and presented to the MSHCP Advisory Committee at their January 20, 2000 meeting and is depicted in FIGURE 4.

The areas depicted in FIGURE 4 represent areas potentially available for conservation based on definition of reserve areas, physical constraints such as slopes, and policy considerations such as the County's existing Mountainous Areas designation. While these areas provide important building blocks for the MSHCP, it should be noted that in some cases, the areas potentially available for conservation are somewhat discontinuous or fragmented. Such fragmentation would not be consistent with NCCP reserve design tenets that seek conservation of large blocks of interconnected habitat. For example, a reserve design that links the steep slope and mountainous areas depicted as potentially available for conservation in the Lakeview Mountains area would be more desirable than simply conserving the somewhat fragmented existing steep slope and mountainous areas. Such considerations would apply in other areas such as the Jurupa Hills, upland linkages from Lake Skinner to Lake Mathews, the San Jacinto River and the Santa Ana River.

The combined lands identified as potentially available for conservation were then compared with the areas identified as desirable for conservation in the August 9 "Draft Proposal" document and the wildlife agencies' September 9, 1999 letter of comment on that document. It was determined that the areas identified as potentially available for conservation would form substantial building blocks for the conceptual conservation scenario described in the August 9 document; gaps

Figure 4 Area Potentially Available for Conservation

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



between the areas identified as potentially available for conservation and areas identified as desirable for conservation were, however, noted and it was determined that additional conservation would be needed to achieve the levels of conservation described in the conceptual conservation scenario. These gaps and potential additional conservation needs were presented to the MSHCP Advisory Committee at their January 20, 2000 meeting.

A summary of the areas presented at that meeting is as follows:

Subarea 1

- | Connection between Lake Mathews Reserve and the Santa Ana River via Temescal Wash.
- | Connection of the following areas: Motte Rimrock Reserve, Steele Peak, Lake Mathews Reserve and Harford Springs Park. The northwesterly connection would be made through the Gavilan Hills/Gavilan Plateau area.
- | Connection of the aforementioned conservation areas to the Cleveland National Forest via Indian Canyon and a potential additional connection to the forest south of Indian Canyon in the Alberhill area.
- | An upland connection from the Lake Mathews conservation area southerly to the Sedco Hills in Subarea 3.

Subarea 2

- | Connection via San Jacinto River from San Bernardino National Forest in the east to the San Jacinto Wildlife Area/Mystic Lake, then southwest into Subarea 3.
- | Connection between the Badlands and the San Bernardino National Forest to the north via Little San Geronio Creek.
- | Satellite reserves for conservation of plants in the San Jacinto/Hemet area.
- | Confluence of the San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



Subarea 3

- | Continuation of San Jacinto River connection from Subarea 2 through Kabian Park and Canyon Lake.
- | Continuation of connection from Lake Mathews area southeasterly via Sedco Hills, Wildomar and into the Antelope Valley/French Valley area within Subarea 4.
- | Conservation of the Murietta Creek area.
- | Connection of the Santa Rosa Plateau to Murrieta Creek via Cole Canyon Creek.

Subarea 4

- | The August 9 "Draft Proposal" document identified as desirable a new core reserve in the Wilson Valley, Vail Lake, Sage/Aguanga area - connections within these areas would include Tule Creek, Kolb Creek, and Arroyo Seco Creek.
- | Connections from the conservation areas in the Diamond Valley Lake and Lake Skinner areas via Warm Springs Creek to the southwest, Tocalota Creek, and Santa Gertudis Creek, all generally converging at Murrieta Creek.
- | A connection from the Vail Lake area to Murrieta Creek via Temecula Creek
- | Connections from the Wilson Valley area to the Diamond Valley Lake/Lake Skinner area via Tocalota Creek to the south and the Mica Butte/Cactus Valley area to the north.
- | Connection to San Diego County via Pechanga Creek east of I-15.
- | Satellite reserve south of Scott Road.
- | A connection along Bautista Creek from the San Bernardino National Forest to the San Jacinto River confluence.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



In addition to these areas, some additional suggested areas to include in the analysis were discussed at the January 20 MSHCP Advisory Committee meeting. Those include the following:

- | Consider additional conservation in the French Valley area.
- | Consider San Timoteo Creek/Reche Canyon/Oak Valley areas within the core reserve area in the Badlands/Potrero area.
- | Coordinate conservation with the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan/NCCP.
- | Consider linkages west of I-15 to San Diego County.
- | Connect Kabian Park to Steele Peak Reserve across SR-74.
- | Incorporate USFWS mitigation banks.
- | Connect the Box Springs area to Sycamore Canyon.
- | Connect the Box Springs area to the Santa Ana River (possibly occurs within San Bernardino County).

2.3 LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

The MSHCP is being prepared as part of the overall Riverside County Integrated Plan (RCIP) which includes an update of the General Plan for the entire County and development of circulation proposals as part of the CETAP component of the RCIP. For purposes of this description of preliminary alternatives, the areas identified as desirable for conservation and described in SECTION 2.2 of this document, and in the August 9 “Draft Proposal” document, were compared with land use alternatives developed to date (January 2000) for the General Plan update. Land use and vegetation summaries were then compiled within areas identified as desirable for conservation for each alternative. This information is presented in SECTION 3.0 of this document. The information included in the land use alternatives is summarized below. ***(It should be noted that circulation or CETAP components of the RCIP have not yet been incorporated into the preliminary alternatives.)***

The land use alternatives incorporated in this preliminary description of alternatives are based on the three alternatives developed to date as part of the General Plan update, as presented to the

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) on January 11, 2000. These alternatives include:

Existing Trends Alternatives – This alternative represents a continuation of existing land use patterns in the County.

Spheres of Influence Alternative – This alternative reflects land use plans of the individual cities within the MSHCP study area, within their spheres of influence, and continuation of existing trends in the remainder of the unincorporated area.

Vision Alternative – This alternative is intended to incorporate concepts included in the RCIP Vision Statement adopted by the County Board of Supervisors on December 21, 1999.

At this time (January 2000), land use alternatives incorporating the three concepts summarized above have been presented to GPAC for nine of the nineteen Area Plans being evaluated for the General Plan update. For areas where alternatives have not yet been developed, existing land use designations are incorporated in the alternatives as described below. Therefore, alternative land use designations are available only within the areas of the nine Area Plans for which alternatives have been developed.

Information incorporated in the land use alternatives includes the following:

- | Land use alternatives developed by The Planning Center, a member of the RCIP consultant team, were used for the following Area Plans: Jurupa, Eastvale, Temescal Canyon, Elsinore, Lake Mathews, March Air Reserve Base, Mead Valley, Sun City/Menifee, Southwest Area Plan (SWAP).
- | For the remainder of the unincorporated area, the County General Plan Open Space and Conservation, Mountainous Areas, and REMAP designations were used.
- | Within cities, City General Plan land use designations from WRCOG were used, and categorized according to their SCAG land use codes. The City of Moreno Valley designations were not used due to data conversion problems and Moreno Valley areas are shown as missing data in the analysis summaries. SCAG land use codes were not available for the City of Banning; City land use designations were used for the summary area calculations.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



| In areas identified as desirable for conservation, where data from the sources noted above were not available, information from existing community plans or the County zoning designations were used.

The data sources noted above included numerous, sometimes overlapping, land use designations. To facilitate the analysis, land use designations were consolidated into generalized land use categories developed by The Planning Center as part of the General Plan work effort. These generalized land use designations are summarized below.

- | Agriculture - includes grazing, dry farming, orchards and commercial crops.
- | Commercial - includes commercial, industrial, business park, and mixed use
- | Mining and Mineral Resources - includes mineral extraction uses
- | Missing Data - includes areas where no land use designations were identified in the data base, including some rights-of-way, slivers between land use polygons, etc. Of particular importance are data for the City of Moreno Valley, not incorporated in the data base at this time, as described above.
- | Mountainous - includes County Mountainous Areas designation
- | Open Space- includes natural open space, recreational open space, and water bodies
- | Public Facilities - includes public and quasi-public uses (e.g., schools, government, etc.)
- | Residential - includes all categories of residential, including rural residential
- | REMAP - includes County REMAP area designation
- | Specific Plan - includes areas within Specific Plans where the database does not contain a detailed land use breakdown
- | Transportation - generally freeways, but also some local roads
- | Unknown - land use designations that were not decipherable (insignificant acreage)

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



3.0 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

This section presents a description of the five preliminary alternatives currently developed for the MSHCP. As discussed above, these five preliminary alternatives represent the range of alternatives to be evaluated as part of the MSHCP planning process but do not represent the final alternatives to be presented in the MSHCP and associated environmental documentation. Substantial refinement of the alternatives will occur as the MSHCP planning process proceeds. The five alternatives are summarized below. The land use assumptions underlying Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 are discussed previously in SECTION 2.0. It should be noted that assumptions and alternatives regarding circulation elements and CETAP corridors have not yet been refined; these features have therefore not been incorporated in the alternatives.

Alternative 1: This alternative is based on Draft Alternative Land Use Plan 1 presented at the January 11, 2000 General Plan Advisory Committee meeting. As discussed at that meeting, this alternative is intended to represent existing land use trends.

Alternative 2: This alternative is based on Draft Alternative Land Use Plan 2 presented at the January 11, 2000 General Plan Advisory Committee meeting. As discussed at that meeting, this alternative is intended to reflect land uses proposed by the individual cities in the MSHCP study area within their respective spheres of influence. ***(Analysis of this alternative is not provided in this document.)***

Alternative 3: This alternative is based on Draft Alternative Land Use Plan 3 presented at the January 11, 2000 General Plan Advisory Committee meeting. As discussed at that meeting, this alternative is intended to reflect the RCIP Vision Statement adopted by the County Board of Supervisors on December 21, 1999. ***(Analysis of this alternative is not provided in this document.)***

Alternative 4: This alternative assumes 100 percent conservation of areas identified as desirable for conservation in the August 9 "Draft Proposal" document. Therefore, under this alternative, it is assumed that the only land use designation underlying the identified conservation areas would be open

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



space. A land use alternative identifying the arrangement of land uses that might be shown on the General Plan outside the areas identified as desirable for conservation, has not been developed for this MSHCP alternative.

Alternative 5: This is the No Project alternative. It assumes no preparation, approval or implementation of the MSHCP.

As described in SECTION 2.0, for the alternatives, acreage estimates within various vegetation categories and land use designations have been developed. These estimates are presented in detail in this section. The acreage estimates are based on the areas identified as desirable for conservation as discussed in narrative form in the August 9 “Draft Proposal” document and presented to the MSHCP Advisory Committee at their January 20, 2000 meeting (see FIGURE 4), and the land use designations for the alternatives (see FIGURE 5). As discussed at the January 20, 2000 meeting, the areas identified as desirable for conservation represent an overall envelope within which planning for conservation will proceed. It is anticipated that ultimate conservation acreages will be within the range described for each MSHCP planning subarea in the August 9 “Draft Proposal.” These acreage ranges were presented at the January 20, 2000 meeting and are summarized below:

Subarea 1 (Northwest Quadrant):	69,000-88,000 acres*
Subarea 2 (Northeast Quadrant):	121,000-156,000 acres*
Subarea 3 (Southwest Quadrant):	62,000-70,000 acres*
Subarea 4 (Southeast Quadrant):	128,000-196,000 acres*

*Acreages include public and private lands.

For purposes of the preliminary alternatives descriptions and acreage estimates presented in this section, specific acreages are used rather than the acreage ranges described previously. These specific acreages represent the overall MSHCP planning envelope from which the ultimate conservation areas will be defined. The total acreage represented by the MSHCP planning envelope among the various alternatives is 517,500-519,000 acres. This is higher than the rough acreage estimates presented in the August 9 “Draft Proposal” document. This is due to the fact that the planning envelope addressed in this document includes all areas with 25% slopes or areas overlain with the Mountainous Areas designation, even areas not previously identified as desirable for conservation. For example, FIGURE 4 identifies substantial area surrounding the Santa Rosa Plateau as potentially available for conservation while the August 9 “Draft Proposal” document

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



simply identified the desirability of a linkage west of the Santa Rosa Plateau. As noted by the wildlife agencies in their September 9, 1999 letter of comment on the “Draft Proposal,” “the likelihood of covering 164 species is low at 380,000 acres but increases as the acreage increases to 510,000 acres. The County will need to set the priorities for the conservation in the plan.”

SECTION 3.1 provides land use and vegetation summaries, by subarea, for Alternative 1. The vegetation categories shown in the land use and vegetation summaries are based on the vegetation map presented in the August 9 “Draft Proposal” document. As discussed in that document, in developing rough acreage estimates for the MSHCP, it was assumed that 100% of the lands designated as **Developed, Disturbed** lands on the vegetation map would not be available for conservation and 75% of the lands designated **Agriculture** on the vegetation map would not be available for conservation. For these reasons, the **Developed, Disturbed** category is not shown on the land use and vegetation summaries in SECTION 3.1. Likewise, acreages shown for the **Agriculture** category represent only 25% of the areas designated **Agriculture** within the areas identified as desirable for conservation, consistent with the rough acreage estimates provided in the August 9 “Draft Proposal” document.

With respect to the land use categories shown on the land use and vegetation summaries presented in SECTION 3.1, they are based on generalized land use categories described in SECTION 2.0 of this document. For purposes of the summaries presented in SECTION 3.1, land use categories have been further generalized, depending upon the potential conservation value within a particular land use category, or grouping of land use categories. These land use category groupings and associated estimates of potential conservation value are presented below:

Open Space – represents the **open space** land use designation category as described in Section 2.0. Areas designated open space are assumed to have a very high potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP, recognizing that permitted uses and management issues remain to be evaluated.

Mountainous Areas – represents the **mountainous areas** land use designation category described in SECTION 2.0. Areas designated mountainous area have potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP; however, attention would need to be given to County General Plan policies for this designation.

Agriculture – represents the **agriculture** land use designation category described in Section 2.0. Areas designated agriculture have potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP; however, considerable attention would need to be given to

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



County General Plan policies for this designation.

URBAN – Represents the following: **commercial, industrial, business park, mixed use and residential** (all density categories) land use designation categories described in SECTION 2.0. Areas with these designations are assumed to have little or no potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP.

Remap – Represents the **remap** land use designation category described in SECTION 2.0. Areas designated **remap** are considered to have potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP; however, it is recognized that an assortment of land use categories may ultimately occur in this area as a result of the General Plan update effort.

Missing Data/Unknown – Represents areas for which land use or vegetation data are missing or incomplete in the data base. It should be noted that land use data for the City of Moreno Valley were not available in the data base for this draft. The potential for conservation of these areas is undetermined at this time.

Acres presented in the land use and vegetation summaries included in SECTION 3.1 are rounded to the nearest 10 acres.

It must be emphasized, as discussed in SECTION 1.0, that the analyses and estimates presented in this section are preliminary and simply provide a starting point in the development of the MSHCP. Acres and estimates will change as the MSHCP planning process proceeds.

3.1 ALTERNATIVE 1 – EXISTING TRENDS

This alternative is depicted in FIGURE 5. TABLES 1 – 4 present a land use and vegetation summary by subarea for this alternative.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



Figure 5 Proposed Land Use Plan, Draft Alternative 1

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



**TABLE 1: SUBAREA 1 — ALTERNATIVE 1
LAND USE AND VEGETATION SUMMARY**

Vegetation Type	LAND USE CATEGORIES						Total
	Open Space ¹	Mountainous ²	Agriculture ³	Urban Designations ⁴	Remap ⁵	Missing/Unknown ⁶	
Agriculture	560	60	180	1,110	0	10	
Chaparral	22,030	2,710	0	3,940	0	0	
Cismontane Alkali Marsh	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Coastal Sage Scrub	11,430	7,640	40	6,850	0	410	
Desert Scrubs	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grassland	6,810	1,120	30	6,340	0	170	
Meadows & Marshes	260	0	0	40	0	10	
Missing Vegetation	0	0	0	10	0	0	
Montane Coniferous Forest	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Peninsular Juniper & Scrub	150	50	0	410	0	0	
Playas & Vernal Pools	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Riparian Sage Scrub	5,750	140	20	630	0	360	
Riversidean Sage Scrub	720	30	0	210	0	100	
Unknown	70	0	0	0	0	0	
Water	1,720	0	0	90	0	50	
Woodlands	3,560	80	0	90	0	0	
TOTAL	53,060	11,830	270	19,720	0	1,110	85,990

- ¹ **OPEN SPACE** – represents the *open space* land use designation category as described in Section 2.0. Areas designated open space are assumed to have a very high potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP, recognizing that permitted uses and management issues remain to be evaluated.
- ² **MOUNTAINOUS AREAS** – represents the *mountainous areas* land use designation category described in Section 2.0. Areas designated mountainous area have potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP; however, attention would need to be given to County General Plan policies for this designation.
- ³ **AGRICULTURE** – represents the *agriculture* land use designation category described in Section 2.0. Areas designated agriculture have potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP; however, considerable attention would need to be given to County General Plan policies for this designation.
- ⁴ **URBAN** – Represents the following: *commercial, industrial, business park, mixed use and residential* (all density categories) land use designation categories described in Section 2.0. Areas with these designations are assumed to have little or no potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP.
- ⁵ **REMAP** – Represents the *remap* land use designation category described in Section 2.0. Areas designated *remap* are considered to have potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP; however, it is recognized that an assortment of land use categories may ultimately occur in this area as a result of the General Plan update effort.
- ⁶ **MISSING DATA/UNKNOWN** – Represents areas for which land use or vegetation data are missing or incomplete in the data base. It should be noted that land use data for the City of Moreno Valley was not available in the data base for this draft. The potential for conservation of these areas is undetermined at this time.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



**TABLE 2: SUBAREA 2 — ALTERNATIVE 1
LAND USE AND VEGETATION SUMMARY**

Vegetation Type	LAND USE CATEGORIES						Total
	Open Space ¹	Mountainous ²	Agriculture ³	Urban Designations ⁴	Remap ⁵	Missing/Unknow ⁶	
Agriculture	320	70	840	1,060	30	650	
Chaparral	44,490	22,770	120	7,070	6,650	110	
Cismontane Alkali Marsh	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Coastal Sage Scrub	5,180	13,160	20	2,380	450	1,790	
Desert Scrubs	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grassland	5,330	3,730	170	6,620	350	470	
Meadows & Marshes	80	0	60	0	50	0	
Missing Vegetation	1,010	0	0	0	0	0	
Montane Coniferous Forest	16,860	0	0	0	2,530	0	
Peninsular Juniper & Scrub	20	0	0	0	0	0	
Playas & Vernal Pools	3,210	0	620	1,450	0	780	
Riparian Sage Scrub	510	130	140	440	30	0	
Riversidean Sage Scrub	1,370	220	140	1,220	50	0	
Unknown	20	0	0	0	0	0	
Water	2,390	0	120	160	10	260	
Woodlands	7,580	260	0	90	150	0	
TOTAL	88,370	40,340	2,230	20,490	10,300	4,060	165,790

- ¹ **OPEN SPACE** – represents the *open space* land use designation category as described in Section 2.0. Areas designated open space are assumed to have a very high potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP, recognizing that permitted uses and management issues remain to be evaluated.
- ² **MOUNTAINOUS AREAS** – represents the *mountainous areas* land use designation category described in Section 2.0. Areas designated mountainous area have potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP; however, attention would need to be given to County General Plan policies for this designation.
- ³ **AGRICULTURE** – represents the *agriculture* land use designation category described in Section 2.0. Areas designated agriculture have potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP; however, considerable attention would need to be given to County General Plan policies for this designation.
- ⁴ **URBAN** – Represents the following: *commercial, industrial, business park, mixed use and residential* (all density categories) land use designation categories described in Section 2.0. Areas with these designations are assumed to have little or no potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP.
- ⁵ **REMAP** – Represents the *remap* land use designation category described in Section 2.0. Areas designated *remap* are considered to have potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP; however, it is recognized that an assortment of land use categories may ultimately occur in this area as a result of the General Plan update effort.
- ⁶ **MISSING DATA/UNKNOWN** – Represents areas for which land use or vegetation data are missing or incomplete in the data base. It should be noted that land use data for the City of Moreno Valley was not available in the data base for this draft. The potential for conservation of these areas is undetermined at this time.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



**TABLE 3: SUBAREA 3 — ALTERNATIVE 1
LAND USE AND VEGETATION SUMMARY**

Vegetation Type	LAND USE CATEGORIES						
	Open Space ¹	Mountainous ²	Agriculture ³	Urban Designations ⁴	Remap ⁵	Missing/Unknown ⁶	Total
Agriculture	30	60	0	230	0	10	
Chaparral	42,640	3,300	0	2,160	0	50	
Cismontane Alkali Marsh	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Coastal Sage Scrub	3,620	1,680	0	3,750	0	80	
Desert Scrubs	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grassland	4,620	1,990	0	3,480	0	40	
Meadows & Marshes	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Missing Vegetation	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montane Coniferous Forest	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Peninsular Juniper & Scrub	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Playas & Vernal Pools	30	0	0	0	0	0	
Riparian Sage Scrub	990	60	0	210	0	10	
Riversidean Sage Scrub	30	0	0	80	0	0	
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Water	2,380	10	0	90	0	0	
Woodlands	2,670	1,170	0	80	0	0	
TOTAL	57,010	8,270	0	10,080	0	190	75,550

- ¹ **OPEN SPACE** – represents the *open space* land use designation category as described in Section 2.0. Areas designated open space are assumed to have a very high potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP, recognizing that permitted uses and management issues remain to be evaluated.
- ² **MOUNTAINOUS AREAS** – represents the *mountainous areas* land use designation category described in Section 2.0. Areas designated mountainous area have potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP; however, attention would need to be given to County General Plan policies for this designation.
- ³ **AGRICULTURE** – represents the *agriculture* land use designation category described in Section 2.0. Areas designated agriculture have potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP; however, considerable attention would need to be given to County General Plan policies for this designation.
- ⁴ **URBAN** – Represents the following: *commercial, industrial, business park, mixed use and residential* (all density categories) land use designation categories described in Section 2.0. Areas with these designations are assumed to have little or no potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP.
- ⁵ **REMAP** – Represents the *remap* land use designation category described in Section 2.0. Areas designated *remap* are considered to have potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP; however, it is recognized that an assortment of land use categories may ultimately occur in this area as a result of the General Plan update effort.
- ⁶ **MISSING DATA/UNKNOWN** – Represents areas for which land use or vegetation data are missing or incomplete in the data base. It should be noted that land use data for the City of Moreno Valley was not available in the data base for this draft. The potential for conservation of these areas is undetermined at this time.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



**TABLE 4: SUBAREA 4 — ALTERNATIVE 1
LAND USE AND VEGETATION SUMMARY**

Vegetation Type	LAND USE CATEGORIES						Total
	Open Space ¹	Mountainous ²	Agriculture ³	Urban Designations ⁴	Remap ⁵	Missing/Unknown ⁶	
Agriculture	60	120	800	1,260	380	0	
Chaparral	60,690	23,700	1,050	4,900	25,520	10	
Cismontane Alkali Marsh	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Coastal Sage Scrub	6,860	9,700	580	4,620	7,580	20	
Desert Scrubs	200	400	0	250	3,040	0	
Grassland	4,370	2,640	1,340	6,620	2,970	10	
Meadows & Marshes	130	0	0	70	50	0	
Missing Vegetation	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montane Coniferous Forest	4,380	0	0	0	760	0	
Peninsular Juniper & Scrub	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Playas & Vernal Pools	30	0	300	500	0	0	
Riparian Sage Scrub	800	250	0	790	430	250	
Riversidean Sage Scrub	140	70	140	710	660	70	
Unknown	190	0	0	0	0	0	
Water	1,400	20	0	640	10	20	
Woodlands	6,110	960	30	520	730	960	
TOTAL	85,360	37,860	4,240	20,880	42,130	1,340	191,810

- ¹ **OPEN SPACE** – represents the *open space* land use designation category as described in Section 2.0. Areas designated open space are assumed to have a very high potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP, recognizing that permitted uses and management issues remain to be evaluated.
- ² **MOUNTAINOUS AREAS** – represents the *mountainous areas* land use designation category described in Section 2.0. Areas designated mountainous area have potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP; however, attention would need to be given to County General Plan policies for this designation.
- ³ **AGRICULTURE** – represents the *agriculture* land use designation category described in Section 2.0. Areas designated agriculture have potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP; however, considerable attention would need to be given to County General Plan policies for this designation.
- ⁴ **URBAN** – Represents the following: *commercial, industrial, business park, mixed use and residential* (all density categories) land use designation categories described in Section 2.0. Areas with these designations are assumed to have little or no potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP.
- ⁵ **REMAP** – Represents the *remap* land use designation category described in Section 2.0. Areas designated *remap* are considered to have potential for conservation for the benefit of species addressed in the MSHCP; however, it is recognized that an assortment of land use categories may ultimately occur in this area as a result of the General Plan update effort.
- ⁶ **MISSING DATA/UNKNOWN** – Represents areas for which land use or vegetation data are missing or incomplete in the data base. It should be noted that land use data for the City of Moreno Valley was not available in the data base for this draft. The potential for conservation of these areas is undetermined at this time.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



It should be noted that the land use designations shown on FIGURE 5 are preliminary based on the composite, generalized land use designations described in SECTION 2.3 of this document. Much work remains to be done in completing a composite land use designations map and resolving inconsistencies; this work is ongoing by the RCIP consultant team. The preliminary land use designations represented in FIGURE 5 are, however, useful in framing issues as the MSHCP planning process proceeds and this figure and the associated analyses are therefore included in this document.

Subarea 1

Within the desirable conservation areas in Subarea 1, this alternative includes approximately 53,060 acres of land designated as open space, including approximately 560 acres of agricultural land, 22,030 acres of chaparral, 11,430 acres of coastal sage scrub, 6,810 acres of grassland, 260 acres of meadows, 150 acres of peninsular juniper and scrub, 5,750 acres of riparian sage scrub, 720 acres of Riversidean sage scrub, 1,720 acres of open water, and 3,560 acres of woodlands. This represents approximately 62% of the total area desirable for conservation within this Subarea.

Within the mountainous designation area, there are approximately 11,830 acres of desirable conservation areas. This includes 60 acres of agriculture, 2,710 acres of chaparral, 7,640 acres of coastal sage scrub, 1,120 acres of grassland, 50 acres of peninsular Juniper and scrub, 140 acres of riparian sage scrub, 30 acres of Riversidean sage scrub and 80 acres of woodland. Conservation of these habitats would be contingent on the policies developed for the Mountainous designation as a part of the RCIP process. The mountainous designated areas comprise approximately 14% of desirable conservation areas within Subarea 1.

Areas proposed for agriculture within this Subarea include a total of 270 acres, most of which is currently shown as being in agricultural production. Urban development would occupy a total of 19,720 acres of the desirable conservation areas. This total includes 1,110 acres of agricultural land, 3,940 acres of chaparral, 6,850 acres of coastal sage scrub, 6,340 acres of grassland, 410 acres of peninsular juniper and scrub, 630 acres of riparian sage scrub, 210 acres of Riversidean sage scrub, 90 acres of open water and 90 acres of woodlands. Urban designated land would occupy approximately 23% of the total area desirable for conservation in Subarea 1.

Unknown land use categories, REMAP and missing data account for approximately 1% of the desirable conservation areas in Subarea 1.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



Subarea 2

Within the desirable conservation areas in Subarea 2 this alternative includes approximately 88,370 acres of land designated as open space, including approximately 320 acres of agricultural land, 44,490 acres of chaparral, 5,180 acres of coastal sage scrub, 5,330 acres of grassland, 80 acres of meadows, 16,860 acres of montane coniferous forest, 20 acres of peninsular juniper and scrub, 3,210 acres of playas and vernal pools, 510 acres of riparian sage scrub, 1,370 acres of Riversidean sage scrub, 2,390 acres of open water, and 7,580 acres of woodlands. This represents approximately 53% of the total area desirable for conservation within this Subarea.

Within the mountainous designation area, there are approximately 40,340 acres of desirable conservation areas. This includes 70 acres of agriculture, 22,770 acres of chaparral, 13,160 acres of coastal sage scrub, 3,730 acres of grassland, 130 acres of riparian sage scrub, 220 acres of Riversidean sage scrub and 260 acres of woodland. Conservation of these habitats would be contingent on the policies developed for the Mountainous designation as a part of the RCIP process. The mountainous designated areas comprise approximately 24% of desirable conservation areas within Subarea 1.

Areas proposed for agriculture within this Subarea include a total of 2,230 acres, 840 acres of which is currently shown as being in agricultural production. Agricultural designation also includes 120 acres of chaparral 20 acres of coastal sage scrub, 170 acres of grassland, 60 acres of meadows and marshes, 620 acres of playas and vernal pools, 140 acres of riparian sage scrub, 220 acres of Riversidean sage scrub and 260 acres of woodland. The agricultural designated lands would cover approximately 1% of the desirable conservation areas within Subarea 2.

Urban development would occupy a total of 20,490 acres, or 12% of the desirable conservation areas in Subarea 2. This total includes 1,060 acres of agricultural land, 7,070 acres of chaparral, 2,380 acres of coastal sage scrub, 6,620 acres of grassland, 1,450 acres of playas and vernal pools, 440 acres of riparian sage scrub, 1,220 acres of Riversidean sage scrub, 160 acres of open water and 90 acres of woodlands.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



Unknown land use categories, and missing data account for approximately 2% of the desirable conservation areas in Subarea 2, primarily due to missing land use data for the City of Moreno Valley. REMAP designated lands occupy approximately 10,300 acres, or approximately 6% of desirable conservation areas within this Subarea.

Subarea 3

Within the desirable conservation areas in Subarea 3, this Alternative 1 includes approximately 57,010 acres of land designated as open space, including approximately 30 acres of agricultural land, 42,640 acres of chaparral, 3,620 acres of coastal sage scrub, 4,620 acres of grassland, 30 acres of playas and vernal pools, 990 acres of riparian sage scrub, 30 acres of Riversidean sage scrub, 2,380 acres of open water, and 2,670 acres of woodlands. This represents approximately 75% of the total area desirable for conservation within this Subarea.

Within the mountainous designation area of Subarea 3, there are approximately 8,270 acres of desirable conservation areas. This includes 60 acres of agriculture, 3,300 acres of chaparral, 1,680 acres of coastal sage scrub, 1,990 acres of grassland, 60 acres of riparian sage scrub, 10 acres of open water and 1,170 acres of woodland. Conservation of these habitats would be contingent on the policies developed for the Mountainous designation as a part of the RCIP process. The mountainous designated areas comprise approximately 11% of desirable conservation areas within Subarea 3.

No agriculturally designated land is proposed under Alternative 1 within Subarea 3. Urban development would occupy a total of 10,080 acres of the desirable conservation areas. This total includes 230 acres of agricultural land, 2,160 acres of chaparral, 3,750 acres of coastal sage scrub, 3,480 acres of grassland, 210 acres of riparian sage scrub, 80 acres of Riversidean sage scrub, 90 acres of open water and 80 acres of woodlands. Urban designated land would occupy approximately 13% of the total area desirable for conservation in Subarea 3.

Unknown land use categories, REMAP and missing data account for a total of 190 acres within Subarea 3, which is less than 0.3% of the desirable conservation areas.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



Subarea 4

Alternative 1, Subarea 4 includes approximately 85,360 acres of land designated as open space within the desirable conservation areas. This includes approximately 60 acres of agricultural land, 60,690 acres of chaparral, 6,860 acres of coastal sage scrub, 200 acres of desert scrubs, 4,370 acres of grassland, 130 acres of meadows and marshes, 4,380 acres of montane coniferous forests, 30 acres of playas and vernal pools, 800 acres of riparian sage scrub, 140 acres of Riversidean sage scrub, 1,400 acres of open water, and 6,110 acres of woodlands. This represents approximately 45% of the total area desirable for conservation within this Subarea.

Within the mountainous designation area, there are approximately 37,860 acres of desirable conservation areas. This includes 120 acres of agriculture, 23,700 acres of chaparral, 9,700 acres of coastal sage scrub, 400 acres of desert scrubs, 2,640 acres of grassland, 250 acres of riparian sage scrub, 70 acres of Riversidean sage scrub, 20 acres of open water, and 960 acres of woodland. Conservation of these habitats would be contingent on the policies developed for the Mountainous designation as a part of the RCIP process. The mountainous designated areas comprise approximately 20% of desirable conservation areas within Subarea 4.

Areas proposed for agriculture within this Subarea include a total of 4,240 acres, of which 800 acres is currently shown as being in agricultural production. Also included in this total are 1,050 acres of chaparral, 580 acres of coastal sage scrub, 1,340 acres of grassland, 300 acres of playas and vernal pools, 140 acres of Riversidean sage scrub, and 30 acres of woodland. Total area proposed for agriculture is approximately 2% of the total area desirable for conservation within Subarea 4.

Urban development would occupy a total of 20,880 acres, or approximately 11% of the desirable conservation areas in Subarea 4. This total includes 1,260 acres of agricultural land, 4,900 acres of chaparral, 4,620 acres of coastal sage scrub, 250 acres of desert scrubs, 6,620 acres of grassland, 70 acres of meadows and marshes, 500 acres of playas and vernal pools, 790 acres of riparian sage scrub, 710 acres of Riversidean sage scrub, 640 acres of open water and 520 acres of woodlands.

Unknown land use categories, and missing data account for approximately .6% of the desirable conservation areas in Subarea 4. REMAP areas in the Subarea are extensive, and include approximately 42,130 acres of desirable conservation area. One of the new core reserve areas in the Sage/Aguanga area is proposed as part of the Conceptual Conservation Scenario, and within the REMAP plan area in the eastern portion of Subarea 4. Land use designations and/or policies for this area will be important in determining conservation of this area.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



3.2 ALTERNATIVE 2 - SPHERE OF INFLUENCE ALTERNATIVE

Analysis for this alternative is pending. This alternative was not sufficiently refined at the time of publication of this document to provide analysis.

3.3 ALTERNATIVE 3 - VISION ALTERNATIVE

Analysis for this alternative is pending. This alternative was not sufficiently refined at the time of publication of this document to provide analysis.

3.4 ALTERNATIVE 4 - OPEN SPACE DESIGNATION ALTERNATIVE

Under this alternative, it is assumed that areas identified as desirable for conservation will be included within existing reserve areas or designated as natural open space. No other land use designations would be included in areas identified as desirable for conservation under this alternative. TABLE 5 summarizes vegetation acreages by subarea within potentially designated open space areas under this alternative. As discussed previously, a preliminary General Plan land use alternative has not been developed for this scenario.

3.5 ALTERNATIVE 5 – NO PROJECT

Under this alternative, an MSHCP would not be prepared, approved or implemented. As part of the MSHCP planning process, a detailed description of this alternative will be developed based on existing land use policies and historic trends, coupled with application of existing policies and regulations regarding the species under consideration for conservation in the MSHCP. Analysis will be undertaken regarding existing threats to listed and unlisted species addressed in the MSHCP and the protection of those species that might occur under existing regulations and policies. Analysis will also be undertaken regarding the configuration of conserved open space, managed for the benefit of species, that might occur under existing land use policies and historic trends.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES



TABLE 5
ALTERNATIVE 4 — VEGETATION AND LAND USE SUMMARY

Vegetation Type	Sub Areas				
	Subarea 1	Subarea 2	Subarea 3	Subarea 4	Total
Agriculture	1,910	2,950	320	2,620	7,800
Chaparral	28,690	81,170	48,160	115,850	273,870
Cismontane Alkali Marsh	0	0	0	0	0
Coastal Sage Scrub	26,360	23,050	9,140	29,180	87,730
Desert Scrubs	0	0	0	3,890	3,890
Grassland	14,470	16,660	10,130	17,970	88,170
Meadows and Marshes	310	180	0	290	780
Missing Vegetation	20	1,010	0	0	1,030
Montane Coniferous Forest	0	19,380	0	5,130	24,510
Peninsular Juniper & Scrub	610	20	0	0	630
Playas and Vernal Pools	0	6,060	30	830	6,920
Riparian Sage Scrub	6,760	1,240	1,270	2,270	11,540
Riversidean Sage Scrub	1,060	3,000	110	1,730	5,900
Unknown	80	20	0	190	290
Water	1,870	2,930	2,470	2,070	9,340
Woodlands	3,730	8,070	3,920	8,340	24,060
TOTAL	85,870	165,740	75,550	190,360	517,520