

## 2.0 Methodology

---

The selection of alternatives to be carried forward into the technical studies involves a three-step process. The three-step process is presented in Figure 3 and briefly described below.

**Step 1:** Identify and classify Project segments that will be evaluated for potential combination with other segments to form iterations of alignment alternatives.

**Step 2:** Screen segments against essential Project criteria to eliminate segments that are inconsistent with the Project purpose and need, or are otherwise infeasible or avoidable based on constructibility, environmental impacts, or reasonability. Segments will be categorized with a “yes” or “no” response to determine whether or not they meet the Project criteria. Segments that receive a “yes” response will be used to develop alignment alternatives in Step 3. Segments that receive a “no” response will not be carried forward for further evaluation. If a determination of a “yes” or “no” response is not possible at this stage of evaluation, a response of “to be determined (TBD)” will be assigned; and the segment will be used to develop alignment alternatives in Step 3. In addition, if the impacts associated with a segment can be avoided because there are other segments that can be carried forward in its place, it will be assigned an “avoid” to denote that these impacts will be avoided by not carrying the segment forward for further evaluation. Segments that do not provide the potential for a continuous alternative will be identified as “isolated” and not incorporated into alignment alternatives in Step 3. The Locally Preferred Alternative of the City of Hemet and the City of San Jacinto, and adjacent less damaging segments (JN, NS, NT, 7, 8, 13, 25, 26, 27, 28), will not be eliminated during the screening process.

**Step 3:** Develop complete alignment alternatives from the segments carried forward from Step 2. In areas where more than one segment is present and similarities exist (e.g., an adjacent location, connection points from and to other segments, similar level of environmental impact, and avoidance alternative not available), an “Alignment Review Area” will be created. This Alignment Review Area will be maintained to identify that more than one segment is feasible to traverse this area. The conclusion of this process will be to establish a defined set of Project alternatives that will be evaluated in the technical studies for the Project.

### 2.1 Step 1: Identify and Classify Concept Segments

Alternative alignments for the Project will be created from a combination of roadway concept segments identified in Figure 4. Concept segments begin and end at “decision points” (defined as points along an alignment where multiple segments meet and shown as yellow colored circles in Figure 4) and are characterized by one of two segment concepts:

**Concept 1: Shared Segments.** “Shared segments” (shown in yellow in Figure 4) consist of a proposed segment that connects two or more possible segments from a decision point.

**Concept 2: Unique Segments.** “Unique segments” (shown in red in Figure 4) consist of a proposed segment that provides a unique route between decision points.

To ensure that the segment evaluation considers all possible solutions to the Project objectives, general alignment categories have been developed to further classify concept segments. Shared and unique segments are representative of one of four alignment categories:

- **Segments that Follow an Alignment of Existing SR 79.** Segments that support this alignment category include those alternatives that will be located along a portion of the existing SR 79 alignment.
- **Segments Entirely on an Existing Roadway.** Segments that support this alignment category include those segments that will be located on an existing local road that is not the current SR 79 alignment.
- **Segments Entirely on a New Alignment.** Segments that could support this alignment category include those segments that will not be located on an existing road, but will be entirely on a new alignment.
- **Segments on a Combination of Existing Roads and a New Alignment.** Segments that support this alignment category include those segments that will be located on a combination of existing roads and a new alignment.

The classification of segments by alignment categories is important to demonstrate that all possible approaches to alternative development have been considered. A summary of all concept segments is provided in Appendix A. The location of each segment is defined in Appendix A by the grid shown in Figure 4.

## 2.2 Step 2: Screen Concept Segments

At this stage, concept segments are screened against essential Project criteria to identify any constraints that would not allow the segment to be carried forward for further evaluation. A qualitative evaluation of the concept segments against the Project purpose and need criteria will occur. In addition to purpose and need, each segment will be reviewed for constraints regarding engineering, the environment, or reasonability. This approach will provide a preliminary assessment to determine if a concept segment is suitable to be carried forward for further evaluation.

The extent and location of constraints are illustrated in Figure 4. Detailed views of constraints within the Project area are identified in Appendix B. Figure B in Appendix B provides a key map showing the general location of several constraints. Enlargements of these areas and the extent of segment encroachment are shown in Figures B1 through B7. In addition, detailed information pertaining to the solid waste landfill (located in grid cells D8 and E8) is presented in Appendix C. Detailed plans of the landfill are presented illustrating the geographical limits of the landfill property, the extent of fill area, and the location of nearby groundwater monitoring wells. Also, another landfill located west of SR 79 in Winchester is presented in Appendix C.

In addition, the cities of Hemet and San Jacinto have identified an alignment that represents their Locally Preferred Alternative. The individual segments that compose the Locally Preferred Alternative are illustrated in Figure D in Appendix D. Currently, the City of

Hemet has its Locally Preferred Alternative included in their General Plan (Appendix D); and the City of San Jacinto has adopted its Locally Preferred Alternative by resolution (Appendix D). The segments that comprise the Locally Preferred Alternative of the City of Hemet (along the San Diego Canal) and the City of San Jacinto (along the Casa Loma Canal) will not be eliminated during the screening process. The Locally Preferred Alternative, and adjacent less damaging segments, will be carried forward for further evaluation in the technical studies. After the conclusion of the technical studies, refinements to these alignments may occur to reduce environmental impacts in conjunction with approval by both cities. The Locally Preferred Alternative will be carried forward into the environmental document for the Project.

The data sheets for the screening of concept segments are provided in Appendix E.

## 2.2.1 Screening Criteria

All concept segments identified in Step 1 are carried forward to Step 2, where the segments are screened against the four categories of essential Project criteria (purpose and need, feasible, regulatory constraints, and reasonable) described below. Segments included in the Locally Preferred Alternative will be tested against the screening criteria but will not be eliminated. These segments, or a close approximation of them, will be carried forward as one of the Project alignment alternatives to be evaluated in the environmental document. Segments included in the Locally Preferred Alternative (discussed below), segments to support less damaging alternatives consistent with the Locally Preferred Alternative, and segments to allow two build alternatives to occur in the City of San Jacinto (results in Section 3.2) will not be eliminated under this screening process. These segments will be carried forward for further evaluation in the technical studies.

### 2.2.1.1 Project Purpose and Need Criteria

The Project purpose and need criteria include primary goals or objectives specific to the Project as agreed upon in accordance with the NEPA/Section 404 Integration Process (USACE, 2003; EPA, 2003). Project-specific goals or objectives used in the segment screening process are defined as:

1. Provide capacity for 2030
2. Serve regional movement of people and goods
3. Provide a safe facility
  - 3A. Provide adequate geometrics
  - 3B. Separate local from regional traffic
4. Provide ability to acquire right-of-way for full cross section sufficient for SR 79 facility improvements
5. Provide a more effective connection between Domenigoni Parkway and Gilman Springs Road
6. Resolve shared use of SR 74 and SR 79
7. Provide a limited-access facility

8. Accommodate Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA) trucks
9. Provide a facility that is compatible with a future multimodal transportation system
10. Regional traffic anticipated to travel on regional facility, not local roads

### 2.2.1.2 Feasible (Constructible)

The determination of whether or not a segment is feasible is based upon the ability to construct the segment using applicable engineering design parameters. For example, a feasibility determination can be guided by the ability of the segment to incorporate standard design criteria or the typical cross section planned for the Project. Department design standards documented in the *Highway Design Manual* (HDM) will be used for the Project (Caltrans, 2002a). A summary of the design standards is presented in Appendix F. The typical cross section planned for the Project is also presented in Appendix F, Figure F1. When evaluating any particular segment, it is assumed that the typical cross section shown in Appendix F, Figure F1, would be utilized for that segment without constriction. In addition, there are some segments that are located on top of an existing local roadway. In these cases, it is assumed that parallel frontage roads will need to be constructed on each side of the segment to provide access to the adjacent parcels. A typical cross section that depicts these frontage roads is presented in Appendix F, Figure F2.

### 2.2.1.3 Regulatory Constraints

The determination of whether a segment has a regulatory constraint is based on anticipated Project impacts that will require discretionary approvals in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements (e.g., CWA, Endangered Species Act, Section 4(f), Federal Aviation Administration Advisory Circular 150/5300-13). Environmental regulatory policies require that environmental impacts be avoided when possible, minimized when required, and mitigated. During the alternatives selection process, regulatory constraints will be identified within the Project study area. Segments will be screened based on the potential impact to the regulatory constraint area. Responses to the regulatory constraint criteria in the screening sheets (Appendix F) will be either "Avoid" or "TBD." An "Avoid" response will be assigned when segments are dropped from further evaluation based on the opportunity to avoid environmental impacts when an avoidance alternative is readily available. A "TBD" response will be assigned when it can not be determined if a potential impact will result in a regulatory constraint with the information that is currently available.

#### Clean Water Act

Impacts to aquatic resources within the Project Study area have been identified to occur within the Criteria Areas of the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) (discussed below). The presence of aquatic resources represents a regulatory constraint for the Project because impacts to these areas will require permitting under Section 401 and 404 of the CWA. To avoid impacts to aquatic resources, segments may be withdrawn (i.e., "avoid" response) that impact a Criteria Area as long as other segments can be carried forward that connect to similar decision points. Because the MSHCP Criteria Areas in the Project study area also represent the location of aquatic resources, seeking to avoid impacts to Criteria Areas is consistent with the requirement by the CWA Section 404 (b)(1) Guidelines to avoid impacts to jurisdictional waters or wetlands to the extent practicable.

This decision is not intended to represent that these impacts may not be permissible. However, by withdrawing these segments from further evaluation at this time, it is intended to document that certain avoidance actions have been taken for the Project.

In addition, the State Water Quality Control Board is the delegated authority from EPA to implement Section 401 of the CWA within specific regions by the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB). The RWQCB has independent provisions (1) to regulate discharges of dredge or fill material into waters of the State independent of the CWA (Order No. R8-2004-0049), (2) to meet the objectives of the State Wetlands Conservation Policy (Executive Order W-59-93) and the California Water Code, and (3) to mandate Waste Discharge Requirements to compensate for impacts to waters of the State.

### Endangered Species Act

Biological reserves, Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), and Critical Habitat have been designated within the Project study area. These locations are shown in Figure G1 and G2 of Appendix G. Segments may be withdrawn (i.e., “avoid” response) that impact these areas as long as other segments can be carried forward that connect to similar decision points. This decision is not intended to represent that these impacts may not be permissible. However, by withdrawing these segments from further evaluation at this time, it is intended to document that certain avoidance actions have been taken for the Project. If all segments impact the same area and avoidance alternatives are not available (e.g., gnatcatcher Critical Habitat south of Domenigoni Parkway), then all segments will be carried forward for further evaluation.

### Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Consistency Determination

The *Western Riverside County Final Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan* (MSHCP or Plan) is one of several large, multi-jurisdictional habitat planning efforts in southern California with the overall goal of maintaining biological diversity within a rapidly urbanizing region. The MSHCP proposes the establishment of a multi-species conservation program to minimize and mitigate the expected loss of habitat values and the incidental take (harm or harassment) of species covered by the Plan (Covered Species). The proposed incidental take will occur as a result of habitat loss and disturbance associated with urban development and other proposed activities (Covered Activities) identified in the MSHCP. The intent of the MSHCP is to minimize incidental take of Covered Species in the Plan Area and to provide avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures for the impacts of proposed activities on these species and their habitats.

The MSHCP is a criteria-based plan, which allows for flexibility in the assembly of the MSHCP Conservation Area over time, while also ensuring the conservation of Covered Species. The framework for this criteria-based plan is a Criteria Area that is divided into cells and cell groups, each of which has associated written criteria that describe the conservation anticipated within the cell or cell group. The impacts of Covered Activities on Covered Species will be mitigated by the conservation of Additional Reserve Lands that will be assembled from within the Criteria Area.

To assist in Plan implementation, the MSHCP is divided into planning units, or Area Plans, that include Area Plan Subunits with target conservation acreage, planning species, biological considerations as well as the written cell conservation criteria. The proposed Project is contained within two MSHCP Area Plans: the San Jacinto Area Plan and the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan. The portion of the Criteria Area that is located within the Project study area is shown in Appendix H, Figure H. Criteria for each cell potentially impacted by the Project is presented in the screening sheets of Appendix E. The conservation areas within each cell have been interpreted for application to the proposed Project and illustrated in Appendix H, Figure H.

In order to ensure the conservation of Covered Species and their habitats within the Plan Area, the Plan incorporates numerous policies and guidelines to guide development planning and the assembly of the Conservation Area. These include, but are not limited to, species-specific biological objectives for each Covered Species, the Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools policy, the Protection of Narrow Endemic Plant Species policy, the Additional Survey Needs and Procedures policy, the Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban Wildlands Interface, Guidelines for the Siting and Design of Planned Roadways, project specific criteria for certain Covered Activities (including a SR 79 Realignment project), and the written criteria themselves.

As the Plan is implemented over time, Covered Activities will be reviewed in accordance with the Criteria Review Consistency Process in order to determine whether they are consistent with the MSHCP, including the various policies and guidelines listed above. The MSHCP includes a Criteria Refinement Process through which refinements to the written criteria can be proposed. This process requires that an equivalency analysis be conducted to demonstrate that the proposed refinement will provide equivalent or superior conservation with regard to Covered Species and habitats.

At this time, the USFWS has not made a permit decision for the MSHCP. If a permit is issued, the MSHCP will provide coverage of a SR 79 Realignment project contingent that the project is consistent with the requirements and approval process described in the Plan. As such, the response to the regulatory constraints criteria based on impacts to the MSHCP criteria cells from concept segments will be provided as "TBD." In some circumstances, segments may be withdrawn (i.e., "avoid" response) that impact a Criteria Area as long as other segments can be carried forward that connect to similar decision points. Because some portions of the MSHCP Criteria Areas also may represent USACE jurisdiction, seeking to avoid impacts to Criteria Areas will fulfill the requirement by the CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines to first avoid impacts to jurisdictional waters or wetlands. This decision is not intended to represent that these impacts may not be permissible. However, by withdrawing these segments from further evaluation at this time, it is intended to document that certain avoidance actions have been taken for the Project.

#### Section 4(f)

Section 4(f) properties (including recreational facilities at schools) are located within the Project study area and will be impacted by several concept segments under review. There is the opportunity that impacts to Section 4(f) properties can be avoided (i.e., "avoid" response). Segments will be withdrawn that impact a Section 4(f) property as long as other segments can be carried forward that connect to similar decision points. This decision is

not intended to represent that impacts to Section 4(f) properties may not be permissible. However, by withdrawing these segments from further evaluation at this time, it is intended to document that certain avoidance actions have been implemented for the Project.

### Cultural Resources

Cultural resource sites are regarded as constraint areas. The location and extent of cultural resources identified from a records search is not illustrated in Figure 4 to protect the integrity of the resource. Where the proximity of a segment is located on or adjacent to a documented cultural resource, a note will be included in the segment-specific matrix in Appendix E. At Step 2, a "TBD" response will be provided. Further evaluation of cultural resources will be completed in the Project technical reports and the environmental document for the Project.

### Hazard Sites

The locations of documented hazard sites are provided in Figure 4. The screening of hazard sites is based primarily on the substantial modification of contaminated areas that will be required for the Project if these areas are impacted. The one documented hazard site that represents a constraint for the Project, based on the substantial modification required, is the presence of a solid waste landfill (Figure 4, grid cells D8 and E8). Detailed plans of the landfill are presented illustrating the geographical limits of the landfill property, the extent of fill area, and the location of nearby groundwater monitoring wells that are shown in Appendix C. This site is owned by the City of Hemet and is operated by County Waste Management. The landfill closed on December 21, 1972. During operation (1958 through 1972), the landfill accepted construction debris material, municipal solid waste, and household refuse. Nonchemical septic waste, waste crank case oil, and wet sludge from car washes were also accepted at ponds onsite. Groundwater at this location is contaminated and is currently being monitored. Corrective ground measures currently are being implemented. A soil vapor extraction system began operating in May 1999. Another landfill located west of SR 79 in Winchester also is presented in Appendix C. This second landfill will not be impacted by the Project, but does represent a constraint of similar magnitude.

### Hemet-Ryan Airport/Federal Aviation Administration Policies

The location of the Hemet-Ryan Airport in the Project study area presents a constraint to the location of alignment alternatives for the Project. Relocation of this airport is also not considered to be reasonable because a suitable replacement site could not be found in the immediate vicinity of Hemet. Given the pace of development in the San Jacinto Valley, it is not realistic to consider the relocation of the Hemet-Ryan Airport for the Project; therefore, all of the alignment alternatives must pass either west or east of the existing airport. The boundary around the airport that is shown in the figures within this document consists of the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) as defined in the Hemet-Ryan Airport Layout Plan (ALP). There are two RPZs shown, the smaller area representing the RPZ based on existing conditions, and the larger RPZ identifying the future conditions based on a proposed runway extension project. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) issues regulations that restrict what can exist within the RPZ. Chapter 7 of FAA regulation Advisory Circular 150/5300-13 has designated land use criteria in the RPZ. Incompatible land uses include

“residences and places of public assembly (churches, schools, hospitals, office buildings, shopping centers, and other uses with similar concentrations of persons typify places of public assembly).”

The RPZ of the existing runway extends over the intersection of Warren Road and Stetson Avenue. FAA approved a revised ALP on January 19, 2000 that included a westward expansion of the existing runway. A westward expansion would require modifications to both Warren Road and Stetson Avenue. Further, both the expanded runway and the road modifications would be subject to their own permit evaluations under Section 404, as well as MSCHP criteria. The County of Riverside Airport Authority has investigated the option of expanding the runway to the east and encountered potential obstacles including power lines that cannot be undergrounded or relocated, the proximity of approved development on the east end of the RPZ, and the landing pattern for the dominant runway.

The realignment of SR 79 within either the existing or proposed expanded RPZ may not be appropriate from a public safety standpoint. Responses to this regulatory constraint criteria will be documented as "avoid" for impacts to the existing RPZ. Further coordination with the County of Riverside Airport Authority will define the risk to public safety and the liability of constructing the SR 79 alignment within the proposed expanded RPZ of the Hemet-Ryan Airport.

#### 2.2.1.4 Reasonable

The determination of whether or not a segment is reasonable typically involves an examination of the construction and right-of-way cost for the segment and an understanding of the Project budget. As right-of-way costs are rapidly increasing (28 percent each year in this region because of high demand and low interest rates [SCAG, 2004]) and future cost projections are not reliable for this decision process, community impact data will be used to determine if a concept segment is considered reasonable.

To determine whether a segment is reasonable requires an assessment of the volume of community impacts and the presence of an avoidance alternative. Planning level community impact assessments were generated for the Project to assist in the determination if a Project segment could not be considered reasonable. These preliminary assessments are provided in Appendix I. Community impacts by segment were calculated by querying a geographic information system (GIS) parcel-based coverage identifying parcels by land use type. In addition, a determination was made for the required right-of-way take representing a full or partial take. The number of full takes by land use type and the acreage for partial takes were calculated and shown in Appendix I, Tables I1 and I2. In these tables, all full takes are identified by land use types; and partial takes are represented by the amount of acres required per segment.

In addition to considering community impacts under existing conditions shown on the March 2003 aerial base map within the Project study area, residential developments currently under construction or constructed since March 2003 were incorporated into this estimate. Appendix J, Figure J identifies the residential developments either recently constructed or currently under construction. In addition, the new schools (elementary, middle, and high school) in the City of Hemet are also identified in Figure J. The elementary school is currently under construction, and the middle school and high school

have approved California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documentation and the property has been recently purchased by the City of Hemet. This information is indicated in a letter from the Hemet Unified School District in Appendix J. Those residential developments and City of Hemet schools incorporated into the estimate were noted in Appendix I, Tables I1 and I2. A review of the community impact data provided in Appendix I will identify segments with strong community impacts for the Project.

In this alternatives selection process, it is possible to minimize the disruption to the community by avoiding impacts to these areas. Segments that have a strong impact to the community will be withdrawn (i.e., “avoid” as a response) as long as other less damaging segments that connect to similar decision points can be carried forward. By withdrawing these segments from further evaluation, it is intended to document that avoidance actions to community impacts have been implemented for the Project. This also will result in a reduction of the right-of-way cost for the Project, assisting to provide a more reasonable alternative for the Project. When segments that completely avoid impacts to the community are not present between similar decision points, an Alignment Review Area will be carried forward for further evaluation in the technical studies and environmental document to investigate alignments that could reduce the community impacts in this area.

## 2.2.2 Screening Segments

The segment screening is conducted using individual segment-specific matrixes (i.e., one matrix is completed per segment). Results from each individual segment-specific matrix are consolidated in a summary matrix. The summary and segment-specific matrixes are provided in Appendix E. The first summary presents the results from the unique segment matrixes, and the second summary presents the results from the shared summaries. The segment-specific matrixes follow the summary segment matrixes. The header of each matrix identifies the segment that is analyzed.

The individual segment screening uses a “yes/no/ TBD/avoid” ranking system to identify positive and negative impacts associated with each concept segment as measured against essential screening criteria (i.e., purpose and need, engineering, environmental, and reasonable criteria). Concept segments that meet all screening criteria (i.e., “yes” is the response to all criteria) are carried forward for further evaluation in the environmental analysis in the Project technical reports. Any concept segments that do not meet the essential screening criteria (i.e., “no” is the response to any criteria) or can be eliminated to assist in avoiding environmental impacts (i.e., “avoid” is the response to any criteria) are eliminated from further evaluation. If it cannot be determined if the concept segment meets the essential screening criteria and further evaluation is required to respond, then a response of “TBD” is appropriate. Concept segments that have a “TBD” response (i.e., “TBD” is the response to any of the criteria) may be carried forward for further evaluation in the environmental analysis in the Project technical reports if the segment is not eliminated based on other criteria issues and has connectivity to other viable segments.

As previously discussed, the “yes/no/TBD/avoid” ranking system is summarized on the screening matrix summary sheets. The total number of “no,” “avoid,” and “TBD” responses are calculated per segment. The results of the segment screening are then summarized by the following categories:

- **Adjoining Segments Available.** This assessment screens the individual segment-specific matrixes to identify whether acceptable segments adjoin other acceptable segments (i.e., a complete alternative can be formed from adjoining segments). In some cases, an acceptable segment may adjoin only with an eliminated segment. In these cases, acceptable segments are eliminated as isolated because they fail to connect to other viable segments.
- **Segment Carried Forward for Further Evaluation.** Concept segments that meet all screening criteria (i.e., “yes” is the response to all criteria) or that require further evaluation before a determination can be made (i.e., “TBD” is the response to any criteria) and have adjoining available segments will be carried forward for further evaluation in the Project technical reports.

## 2.3 Step 3: Develop Alignment Alternatives

Complete alignment alternatives will be identified from the segments carried forward from Step 2. These alternative configurations will be the initial attempts to construct complete alternatives from the segments that have passed the initial screening process. It is understood that there are multiple ways to construct these alternatives from the remaining segments. In areas where more than one segment is present and similarities exist (e.g., an adjacent location, connection points from and to other segments, similar level of environmental impact, and avoidance alternative not available), an “Alignment Review Area” may be created if deemed appropriate. These Alignment Review Areas will be used to indicate that there remains a wider range of alignment possibilities for that particular portion of the alignment with similar environmental impacts. In some instances, avoidance of an environmental impact may not be feasible in a specific area. Therefore, the Alignment Review Area will represent a study area that the Project proponents will use to identify the less damaging alignment through the Alignment Review Area. If an avoidance segment exists for the concept segment that connects to similar decision points, then an Alignment Review Area will not be created.

The formulation of complete alignment alternatives at this stage ensures that only those segments that conform to the Project criteria and have adjoining available segments are used to establish alignment alternatives that could be used to formulate the LEDPA alignment.

The alignment alternatives developed during Step 3 will be carried forward for detailed evaluation in the technical reports. As work proceeds in the preparation of the technical reports, refinements to the alternatives may occur as new information becomes available prior to their evaluation in the Draft EIS/EIR for the proposed Project. These refinements will identify specific alternatives through the Alignment Review Areas and possible shifts in the portions of the alignments that do not have the broader coverage of an Alignment Review Area to strengthen the viability of each of the alternatives and further avoid or minimize environmental impacts without eliminating alternatives. In order to preserve a less environmentally damaging alternative that may be practicable, the shift in the alignment may involve the reconsideration of certain areas previously eliminated under the screening process. It is recognized that the LEDPA will be one of the alternatives, or a combination of these alternatives, developed during Step 3 and carried forward for environmental analysis in the EIS/EIR.