



1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE EIR

The City of Corona is the Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and is responsible for preparing the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Foothill Parkway Westerly Extension Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2007061044). This EIR has been prepared in conformance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), California CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.), and the rules, regulations, and procedures for implementation of CEQA, as adopted by the City of Corona. The principal CEQA Guidelines sections governing content of this document are Sections 15120 through 15132 (Content of an EIR), and Section 15161 (Project EIR).

All discretionary projects within California are required to undergo environmental review under CEQA. A discretionary project is defined as any project that has the potential to result in a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect change to the environment. Additionally, a project is required to undergo environmental review if a decision-making action by a public agency is required; if the project is wholly or partially supported by public agency contracts, grants, subsidies, etc.; or an activity requires a public agency to issue a lease, permit, license, certificate, or other entitlement.

The purpose of the Draft EIR is to review the existing conditions, analyze potential environmental impacts, and identify feasible mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant effects. The proposed Foothill Parkway Westerly Extension is included as a planned Secondary Four-lane Arterial roadway in the *City of Corona General Plan* Circulation Element, and has been a part of the City's planning process for over 20 years. The primary purpose of the Project is to complete a critical east/west connection from Foothill Parkway's current terminus, approximately 600 feet west of Skyline Drive, to Green River Road, which is a critical component of the City's *General Plan* Circulation Element. The roadway extension would alleviate existing traffic congestion on the local circulation network and accommodate traffic generated by approved and planned development in south Corona. The operational goal for the roadway is to achieve a level of service (LOS) "D," which has been adopted by the City as the standard for local streets and arterial highways. It is the City's goal to identify the most cost-effective improvements that would be compatible with existing and future physical and legal constraints, while minimizing impacts and providing value to the community.

The EIR has been prepared as a Project EIR, addressing the environmental effects of the proposed alignment. In accordance with Section 15121 of CEQA, a primary purpose of this EIR is to provide decision makers and the public with specific information regarding the environmental effects associated with development of the site, identify ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the Project.



Mitigation measures are provided in order to reduce the significance of impacts resulting from the Foothill Parkway Westerly Extension Project. With certification of the Final EIR, the City of Corona shall adopt a monitoring and reporting program for assessing and ensuring compliance with any required mitigation measures applied to the proposed Project. In addition, this EIR is the primary reference document in the formulation and implementation of a mitigation monitoring program for the proposed alignment.

The City of Corona has the principal responsibility of processing and approving the Project. Other public agencies that may use this EIR in the decision-making or permit processing will consider the information in this EIR, along with other information that may be presented during the CEQA process (for a list of responsible and trustee agencies, refer to Section 1.5 of this EIR). Environmental impacts are not always mitigable to a level considered less than significant; in those cases, impacts are considered significant and unavoidable impacts. In accordance with Section 15093(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, if a public agency approves a project that has significant impacts that are not substantially mitigated (i.e., significant and unavoidable impacts), the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons for approving the project, based on the Final EIR and any other information in the public record for the project. This is termed, per Section 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a “statement of overriding consideration.”

This document analyzes the environmental effects of the Project to the degree of specificity appropriate to the current proposed actions, as required by Section 15146 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The analysis considers the actions associated with the Project to determine the short-term and long-term effects associated with their implementation. This EIR discusses both the direct and indirect impacts of this Project, as well as the cumulative impacts associated with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. CEQA requires the preparation of an objective, full disclosure document to inform agency decision makers and the general public of the direct and indirect environmental effects of the proposed action; provide mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate significant adverse effects; and identify and evaluate reasonable alternatives to the proposed alignment.

1.2 COMPLIANCE WITH CEQA

The Draft EIR is subject to a 45-day review period by responsible and trustee agencies and interested parties. In accordance with the provision of Sections 15085(a) and 15087(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, as amended, the City of Corona, serving as the Lead Agency, will: 1) publish a notice of availability of a Draft EIR in the Press Enterprise Corona/Norco Edition, a newspaper of general circulation; and 2) will prepare and transmit a Notice of Completion (NOC) to the State Clearinghouse (proof of publication is available at the offices of the Lead Agency).

Any public agency or members of the public desiring to comment on the Draft EIR must submit their comments in writing to the individual identified on the document's NOC prior to the end of the public review period. During the public review period, the City of Corona will hold a regularly scheduled public hearing regarding the Draft EIR. The public will be afforded the opportunity to verbally comment on the Draft EIR at



the public hearing. Such comments shall be recorded and shall have the same standing and response requirements as written comments provided during the public review period. Upon the close of the public review period, the Lead Agency will proceed to evaluate and prepare responses to all relevant oral and written comments received from both citizens and public agencies during the public review period.

The Final EIR will consist of the Draft EIR, along with revisions to the Draft EIR and responses to comments addressing concerns raised by responsible agencies or reviewing parties. After the Final EIR is completed and at least 10 days prior to its certification, a copy of the response to comments made by public agencies on the Draft EIR will be provided to the respective agency.

1.3 EIR SCOPING PROCESS

In compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines, the City of Corona has taken steps to maximize opportunities to participate in the environmental process. During the preparation of the Draft EIR, an effort was made to contact various Federal, State, regional, and local government agencies and other interested parties to solicit comments and inform the public of the proposed alignment. This included the distribution of an Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (NOP) on June 11, 2007, and Public Scoping Meeting on June 28, 2007.

INITIAL STUDY

In accordance with Section 15063(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, as amended, the City undertook the preparation of an Initial Study. The Initial Study determined that a number of environmental issue areas may be impacted by the construction and build-out of the Project. As a result, the Initial Study determined that the Draft EIR should address the Project's significant impacts on a variety of environmental issue areas that are addressed in Section 5.0 of this EIR.

Based on the Initial Study, no impacts upon agricultural resources, mineral resources, public services, or recreation are anticipated as a result of the proposed alignment. As a result, these issues are addressed in Section 10.0, EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT, contained in this EIR.

NOTICE OF PREPARATION

Pursuant to the provision of Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, as amended, the City of Corona circulated an NOP to public agencies, special districts, and members of the public requesting such notice for a 30-day period commencing June 11, 2007, and ending on July 10, 2007. The purpose of the NOP was to formally convey that the City is preparing a Draft EIR for the Project, and that as Lead Agency, was soliciting input regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the EIR. The Initial Study was circulated with the NOP. The Initial Study, NOP, and responses to the NOP are provided in Appendix 15.1 and 15.15 of this EIR, respectively.



EARLY CONSULTATION (SCOPING)

During the NOP circulation period, the City of Corona advertised a public scoping meeting. The meeting was held on June 28, 2007, and was intended to facilitate public input. The meeting was held with the specific intent of affording interested individuals/groups and public agencies a forum in which to orally present input directly to the Lead Agency in an effort to assist in further refining the intended scope and focus of the Project EIR as described in the NOP and Initial Study.

Community outreach for the Foothill Parkway Westerly Extension Project has been extensive. In addition to the public scoping meeting held on June 28, 2007, five smaller focused neighborhood meetings were held to allow for community input. Additionally, a Project website and Project hotline were established to field questions and comments and to provide information.

Generally, the greatest concern among the focus neighborhood meeting attendees was traffic. Although the traffic model demonstrated that most neighborhood areas, with the exception of the south ends of Border Avenue and Mangular Avenue, would experience a reduction in traffic volumes, residents generally feared that the connections would create more cut-through traffic. Safety was another very critical issue, especially with regard to children walking or playing near the streets, security of homes in the area, and speeding. Many people felt that there are existing problems that are not being addressed. Other discussions that were common to all of the meetings were cut-through traffic from Interstate 15, fire safety, and noise impacts. Specific issues that were brought to the Project team's attention during these meetings included: existing erosion issues near Condor Circle homes; existing neighborhood cut-through along Peacock Avenue; existing parking concerns on Mangular Avenue near Chase Drive; and concerns about the roundabout access for properties at the end of Mangular Avenue, south of Chase Drive.

NOP AND SCOPING RESULTS

The following specific environmental concerns were raised by responses to the NOP for the Project (the numerical reference in parenthesis is the EIR Section in which the analysis is provided). The NOP comments are contained in Appendix 15.15, CORRESPONDENCE (NOP RESPONSES AND AGENCY LETTERS).

- ❑ Identification of the presence and condition of existing utility infrastructure, including right-of-way (R/W) (refer to Section 5.3, PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY);
- ❑ Identification of existing natural gas infrastructure, which would be relocated and/or abandoned (refer to Section 5.3, PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY);
- ❑ R/W or easement for natural gas facilities (refer to Section 5.3, PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY);
- ❑ Grading and/or drainage improvements that would redirect drainage and increase erosion around Southern California Gas Company facilities (refer to Section 5.9, HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY);



- ❑ Modifications to the Kroonen Canyon will require approval from the Riverside County Flood Control District and Water Conservation District (refer to Section 3.0, PROJECT DESCRIPTION);
- ❑ Address impacts and mitigation to public/quasi-public land, pursuant to Section 3.2.1 of the *Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan* (MSHCP) (refer to Section 5.7, BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES);
- ❑ Regulatory permits need to address both construction and long-term maintenance activities (refer to Sections 5.1 through 5.10);
- ❑ Contact the California Historic Resource Information Center for a cultural resources search (refer to Section 5.8, CULTURAL RESOURCES);
- ❑ Contact the Native American Heritage Commission for a Sacred Lands File search (refer to Section 5.8, CULTURAL RESOURCES);
- ❑ If a records search and field survey are prepared, include findings and recommendations (refer to Section 5.8, CULTURAL RESOURCES, and Appendix 15.10, CULTURAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT);
- ❑ Provisions for human remains or unmarked cemeteries in mitigation plans (refer to Section 5.8, CULTURAL RESOURCES);
- ❑ Provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archeological resources in mitigation plans, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (refer to Section 5.8, CULTURAL RESOURCES);
- ❑ Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources Code §5097.98, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 mandate procedures for handling discovered human remains discovered outside a dedicated cemetery (refer to Section 5.8, CULTURAL RESOURCES);
- ❑ Consider avoidance of cultural resource impacts (refer to Section 5.8, CULTURAL RESOURCES);
- ❑ Identify short-term (construction) emissions and long-term (operational) emissions impacts (refer to Section 5.5, AIR QUALITY);
- ❑ Mobile source health risk assessment (refer to Section 5.5, AIR QUALITY);
- ❑ Calculate localized air quality impacts and compare to localized significance threshold or dispersion modeling (refer to Section 5.5, AIR QUALITY); and
- ❑ Recommendation for global warming analysis, including identification and evaluation of green house gas emissions, no determination of significance, and mitigation measures such as smart/growth/new urbanism, green building, and LEED (refer to Section 5.5, AIR QUALITY).



The following discussion provides a brief summary of the comments received for the Project at the scoping meeting (the numerical reference in parenthesis is the EIR Section in which the analysis is provided).

- ❑ Increased traffic within and adjacent to the properties surrounding the Project site (refer to Section 5.4, TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION);
- ❑ Safety of children near local schools (refer to Section 5.4, TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION, for traffic-related concerns);
- ❑ Noise impacts (refer to Section 5.6, NOISE);
- ❑ Impacts to aesthetics (refer to Section 5.2, AESTHETICS, LIGHT, AND GLARE);
- ❑ Proposed connections at Border Avenue and Mangalar/Chase Drive, regarding whether or not the connections are necessary (refer to Section 3.0, PROJECT DESCRIPTION);
- ❑ Property value impacts (this issue is not addressed in this EIR, which analyzes environmental issues listed in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines);
- ❑ Wildlife impacts (refer to Section 5.7, BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES);
- ❑ Pollution (refer to Section 5.3, PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY);
- ❑ Support for the Project citing a need to relieve traffic on Ontario (refer to Section 5.4, TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION); and
- ❑ Support for the regional improvements (refer to Section 5.4, TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION).

The EIR focuses primarily on changes in the environment that would result from the proposed alignment. The EIR identifies potential impacts resulting from the construction and operation of the proposed alignment and provides measures to mitigate potential significant impacts. Those impacts which cannot be mitigated to levels less than significant are also identified. This EIR addresses impacts in the following areas:

- ❑ Land Use and Relevant Planning;
- ❑ Aesthetics, Light, and Glare;
- ❑ Public Health and Safety;
- ❑ Traffic and Circulation;
- ❑ Air Quality;
- ❑ Noise;
- ❑ Biological Resources;
- ❑ Cultural Resources;



- ❑ Water Resources;
- ❑ Geologic and Seismic Hazards; and
- ❑ Hydrology and Drainage.

1.4 **FORMAT OF THE EIR**

The Draft EIR is organized into fifteen sections, as follows:

- ❑ Section 1.0, INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE, provides CEQA compliance information.
- ❑ Section 2.0, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, provides a brief Project description and summary of the environmental impacts and mitigation measures.
- ❑ Section 3.0, PROJECT DESCRIPTION, provides a detailed Project description indicating Project location, background, and history; Project characteristics, phasing, and objectives; and the required associated discretionary actions.
- ❑ Section 4.0, BASIS FOR THE CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS, describes the approach and methodology for the cumulative impacts analysis.
- ❑ Section 5.0, DESCRIPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING (Impacts and Mitigation Measures), contains a detailed environmental analysis of the existing conditions, Project impacts, recommended mitigation measures, and unavoidable adverse impacts. The analysis of each environmental category in Section 5.0 is organized as follows:
 - “Regulatory Setting” lists and discusses the laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards that apply to the Project.
 - “Existing Conditions” describes the physical conditions that exist at this time and that may influence or affect the issue under investigation.
 - “Significance Criteria” provides the thresholds that are the basis of conclusions of significance, for which the primary source for the criteria is Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Sections 15000-15387).
 - “Project Impacts” describes potential environmental changes to the existing physical conditions that may occur if the proposed alignment is implemented.
 - A designation of “no impact” is given when no adverse changes in the environment are expected.
 - A “less than significant impact” would cause no substantial adverse change in the environment.



- A “less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated” avoids substantial adverse impacts on the environment through mitigation.
- A “significant and unavoidable impact” would cause a substantial adverse effect on the environment, and feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce the impact to a less than significant impact.

“Cumulative Impacts” describes potential environmental changes to the existing physical conditions that may occur with the proposed alignment, together with all other reasonably foreseeable, planned, and approved future Projects.

- “Mitigation Measures” are those specific measures that may be required of the Project to avoid a significant adverse impact; minimize a significant adverse impact; rectify a significant adverse impact by restoration; reduce or eliminate a significant adverse impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations; or compensate for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environment.
 - “Level of Significance After Mitigation” identifies the impacts that would remain after the application of mitigation measures, and whether the remaining impacts are or are not considered significant. When these impacts, even with the inclusion of mitigation measures, cannot be mitigated to a level considered less than significant, they are identified as “unavoidable significant impacts.”
- Section 6.0, LONG-TERM IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT, discusses significant environmental changes that would result from the proposed action, should it be implemented, and discusses growth-inducing impacts of the proposed alignment.
 - Section 7.0, ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT, describes a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project or to the location of the Project that could feasibly attain the basic Project objectives.
 - Section 8.0, INVENTORY OF MITIGATION MEASURES, lists mitigation measures proposed to minimize the significant impacts of the Project.
 - Section 9.0, INVENTORY OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION, describes those Project impacts that remain significant following mitigation.
 - Section 10.0, EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT, explains potential Project impacts that have been determined not to be significant.
 - Section 11.0, ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONSULTED, identifies all Federal, State, or local agencies, other organizations, and individuals consulted in the preparation of the EIR.



- Section 12.0, BIBLIOGRAPHY, identifies reference sources for the EIR.
- Section 13.0, MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM, identifies responsibilities for monitoring mitigation.
- Section 14.0, COMMENTS AND RESPONSES, will be provided as part of the Final EIR and will include comments and responses to comments pertaining to the Draft EIR.
- Section 15.0, APPENDICES, contains the technical documentation for the Project.

1.5 RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

Certain projects or actions undertaken by a Lead Agency require subsequent oversight, approvals, or permits from other public agencies in order to be implemented. Such other agencies are referred to as *Responsible Agencies* and *Trustee Agencies*. Pursuant to Sections 15381 and 15386 of the State CEQA Guidelines, as amended, Responsible Agencies and Trustee Agencies are respectively defined as follows:

“Responsible Agency” means a public agency which proposes to carry out or approve a project, for which a Lead Agency is preparing or has prepared an EIR or Negative Declaration. For the purposes of CEQA, the term “Responsible Agency” includes all public agencies other than the Lead Agency which have discretionary approval power over the project. (*Section 15381*)

“Trustee Agency” means a State agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project which are held in trust for the people of the State of California. Trustee Agencies include:

- (a) The California Department of Fish and Game with regard to the fish and wildlife of the State, to designated rare or endangered native plants, and to game refuges, ecological reserves, and other areas administered by the department;
- (b) The State Lands Commission with regard to state owned "sovereign" lands such as the beds of navigable waters and state school lands;
- (c) The State Department of Parks and Recreation with regard to units of the State Park System;
- (d) The University of California with regard to sites within the Natural Land and Water Reserves System. (*Section 15386*)

Responsible and Trustee Agencies and other entities which may use this EIR in their decision-making process or for informational purposes include, but may not be limited to, the following:



- ❑ United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE);
- ❑ California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG);
- ❑ California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWCQB), Santa Ana Region;
- ❑ Riverside County Flood Control District (RCFCD);
- ❑ California Division of Dam Safety; and
- ❑ Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA).

1.6 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

Pertinent documents relating to this EIR have been cited in accordance with Section 15148 of the CEQA Guidelines, which encourages “incorporation by reference” as a means of reducing redundancy and length of environmental reports. The following documents, which are available for public review at the City of Corona, are hereby incorporated by reference into this EIR. Information contained within these documents has been utilized for each section of this EIR. A brief synopsis of the scope and content of these documents is provided below:

- ❑ *City of Corona General Plan*. The *City of Corona General Plan*, adopted March 17, 2004 (Resolution No. 2004-034), is a policy document designed to give long-range guidance for decision-making affecting the future character of Corona. It represents the official statement of the community’s physical development as well as its economic, social, and environmental goals. The *General Plan* Circulation Element describes the location and extent of planned circulation facilities and services, and identifies standards for those facilities. The Circulation Element outlines the long-term plan for roadways, including the number of lanes, right-of-way (R/W), and general operating conditions. The proposed westerly extension of Foothill Parkway is consistent with the Circulation Element of the City’s *General Plan*. The *General Plan* Circulation Element designates Foothill Parkway as a secondary four-lane arterial from I-15 to Paseo Grande.
- ❑ *Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan*. The *Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan (RCCGP)* (February 1990) is designed to provide an administrative guideline for the County in providing services for the residents of the County. This is accomplished through the County’s implementation of the *General Plan’s* Administrative Element and the programs located in other Elements of the Plan. The *RCCGP* is also used to determine appropriate land uses and infrastructure requirements for sites within the County. In conjunction with this use, development and infrastructure improvement projects are reviewed for consistency with the *RCCGP*.
- ❑ *South Corona Community Facilities Plan*. The *South Corona Community Facilities Plan (CFP)* was adopted by the City of Corona in 1989 to establish land use policies and infrastructure requirements for that portion of the City located south of Ontario Avenue. The *CFP* identified proposed circulation improvements to serve the south Corona area, including the extension of Foothill Parkway. The *CFP* identified a general conceptual alignment for



Foothill Parkway with the direction that the City develop a precise alignment and further evaluate design issues. The proposed westerly extension of Foothill Parkway is consistent with the *CFP* land use policies and infrastructure requirements.

- *Sierra Del Oro General Plan Amendment EIR*. The *Sierra Del Oro General Plan Amendment EIR* (August 1985) refers to the proposed Chase Drive Extension (now referenced as the Foothill Parkway Westerly Extension), extending from Mangular Avenue, westerly to the Green River Road/Paseo Grande intersection. The EIR states that this connection would serve as a key element to facilitate east/west travel and would provide an important arterial facility for the City.
- *South Corona Agricultural Area General Plan Amendment EIR*. The *Final EIR* for the *South Corona Agricultural Area* (November 1985) concludes that the Foothill Parkway Westerly Extension would significantly mitigate traffic impacts to/from the South Corona Agricultural Area on the southern portions of Main Street, Grand Boulevard, and Lincoln Avenue.
- *Riverside County Integrated Project*. The *Riverside County Integrated Project* (RCIP) is a comprehensive regional planning effort that was begun in 1999. The project is a comprehensive three-part program to determine solutions to the planning, conservation, and transportation needs of Riverside County residents. The primary goals of the RCIP include: updating the *Riverside County General Plan*; identify transportation corridors or toll roads to address current congestion problems and meet the County's future transportation and transit needs; and create a Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan to ensure the preservation of open space, endangered species, and prime habitat areas through an area-wide permitting process. The three-tiered Integrated Project incorporates public opinion and the input of a variety of stakeholders, including environmental organizations, business associations, and property owners, as well as the Riverside County Transportation Commission and State and Federal regulatory agencies.
- *Western Riverside Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan*. The *Western Riverside Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP)* is a criteria-based plan, focused on preserving individual species through habitat conservation. The *MSHCP* is one element of the Riverside County Integrated Project (RCIP), a comprehensive regional planning effort begun in 1999. The purpose of the RCIP is to integrate all aspects of land use, transportation, and conservation planning and implementation in order to develop a comprehensive vision for the future of Riverside County. The Foothill Parkway Westerly Extension is part of the regional transportation project proposed for the County and is identified as a Covered Activity under the *MSHCP*. As a Covered Activity, the impacts would be mitigated through participation in the Plan, through implementation of construction best management practices, completing necessary species surveys, and meeting specific species conservation objectives.



- Community and Environmental Transportation Process. The *Community and Environmental Transportation Process* (CTEP) is the part of the RCIP that is a comprehensive planning process to determine future placement of buildings, roads, and open spaces for Riverside County. The CTEP addresses improvements for highways and transit systems. The two main purposes of the CTEP include the following: (1) identify and set aside areas for major transportation facilities (both highway and transit) that will be necessary to support the future growth in western Riverside County, and (2) ensure that the transportation infrastructure will be in place to foster the economy of Riverside County and provide access for citizens to jobs, schools, shopping, and other daily activities.
- Community and Environmental Transportation Acceptability Process. The *Community and Environmental Transportation Acceptability Process* (CETAP) identifies future transportation corridors in the western part of the County and provides the appropriate environmental documentation to allow early preservation of the necessary rights-of-way for future corridor development. These corridors will be designed to meet future mobility needs for autos, buses, and trucks, as well as for goods and information. The corridors will allow room to implement transit plans well into the next century. CETAP forms an essential component of the County's circulation element and its arterial highway plan, both associated with the *General Plan*.
- 2003 Air Quality Management Plan. The 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) is the most recent AQMP prepared by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) to accomplish a five percent annual reduction in pollutant emissions. The 2003 AQMP was adopted on August 1, 2003. The 2003 AQMP proposes policies and measures to achieve federal and state standards for improved air quality in the South Coast Air Basin (Basin), and those portions of the Salton Sea Air Basin (formerly named the Southeast Desert Air Basin) that are under SCAQMD jurisdiction. The 2003 AQMP updates the attainment demonstration for the Federal standards for ozone and particulate matter (PM₁₀), replaces the 1997 attainment demonstration for the Federal carbon monoxide (CO) standard, and provides a basis for a maintenance plan for CO for the future, and updates the maintenance plan for the Federal nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) standard that the Basin has met since 1992. The 2003 AQMP also addresses several state and federal planning requirements and incorporates significant new scientific data, primarily in the form of updated emissions inventories, ambient measurements, new meteorological episodes, and new air quality modeling tools. Additionally, the 2003 AQMP points to the urgent need for additional emission reductions (beyond those incorporated in the 1997/99 AQMP) to offset increased emission estimates from mobile sources and meet all federal criteria pollutant standards within the time frames allowed under the Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA). Refer to Section 5.5, AIR QUALITY, for a detailed discussion of the Project's consistency with applicable SCAQMD standards.
- Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide. The document that provides the primary reference for Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) project review activity is the *Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide* (RCPG), which is intended to serve the region as a general guide to



the growth and changes that can be anticipated during the next 20 years and beyond. The RCPG chapters address three categories: core, ancillary, and bridge. The Growth Management (adopted June 1994), Regional Mobility (adopted June 1994), Air Quality (adopted October 1995), Hazardous Waste Management (adopted November 1994), and Water Quality (adopted January 1995) chapters constitute the core chapters and provide the basis through which local governments ensure consistency of their plans with applicable regional plans under CEQA.

Ancillary chapters consist of Economy, Housing, Human Resources and Services, Finance, Open Space and Conservation, Water Resources, Energy, and Integrated Solid Waste Management. These chapters address important issues facing the region and may reflect other regional plans. However, ancillary chapters do not contain actions or policies required of local government.

- Regional Transportation Plan. The *Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)* is a 30-year long-range transportation plan developed and adopted by the SCAG. The RTP identifies strategies to meet mobility, financial, and air quality requirements. In order to receive federal funding and project approvals, transportation projects must be included in the RTP. The current RTP was adopted in April 2004 by the SCAG Regional Council. The SCAG RTP covers a six county area including Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura. The next RTP update (2008 RTP) is scheduled for adoption in April 2008.
- Regional Transportation Improvement Program. The *Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)* was developed in compliance with State and Federal requirements. County Transportation Commissions have the responsibility under State law of proposing county projects, using the current RTP's policies, programs, and projects as a guide, from among submittals by cities and local agencies. The locally prioritized lists of projects were forwarded to SCAG for analysis. From this list, SCAG developed the RTIP based on the consistency with the current RTP, inter-county connectivity, and financial constraint and conformity satisfaction.



This page intentionally left blank.