

3.0 Results

3.1 Step 1: Identify and Classify Concept Segments

The identification and classification of concept segments (Step 1) identified 39 shared segments and 52 unique segments as listed in Appendix A. Only one segment (unique segment 1) could be classified as following the alignment of existing SR 79. The majority of the remaining segments (29 shared and 46 unique) were classified as segments entirely on a new alignment. However, segments representative of the remaining classifications (i.e., five shared segments and two unique segments located entirely on an existing roadway; five shared and three unique segments located on a combination of existing roads and a new alignment) were also identified. Figure 4 identifies the locations of all the concept segments.

3.2 Step 2: Screen Concept Segments

The screening analysis resulted in a number of segments being dropped from further evaluation. A total of 30 segments (5 shared and 25 unique) were eliminated, leaving a total of 61 segments to be carried forward for further evaluation. The specific justification for each criterion is provided in the segment-specific matrix sheets in Appendix E. A summary of the segments that failed the Project criteria is provided in Table 1. Figure E1 in Appendix E illustrates the segments that are being carried forward for further evaluation (in green) and the segments that are not being carried forward for further evaluation (in red).

An additional 11 segments are not being carried forward for further evaluation due to their connection to an eliminated segment and subsequent isolation from the remaining viable segments being carried forward for further evaluation. The 11 isolated segments (6 shared and 5 unique) are summarized in Table 2 and illustrated (in yellow) in Appendix E, Figure E2.

Concept segments that conform to all screening criteria or that require further evaluation before a final determination can be made, and those that have adjoining available segments are carried forward to develop alignment alternatives. The 50 segments (28 shared and 22 unique) being carried forward are summarized in Table 3 and illustrated (in green) in Appendix E, Figure E3.

Within the 50 segments being carried forward for further evaluation, several segments have specific reasons to be included for additional study. The Locally Preferred Alternative of the City of Hemet and the City of San Jacinto (Appendix D), and adjacent less damaging segments (JN, NS, NT, 7, 8, 13, 25, 26, 27, 28), will be carried forward for further evaluation in the technical studies. In addition, segments 43, MMOO, 47, SSWW will be carried forward to provide a second alternative in the City of San Jacinto. While segments MMOO and 47 impact a MSHCP Criteria Area, it is the least damaging combination of segments to the proposed conservation area considered in the screening analysis.

TABLE 1
Segments Not Carried Forward for Further Evaluation

| Segment | Failed Criteria¹ | Elimination Factor | Alternate Segment Available between Decision Points (Yes/No) |
|----------------|--|------------------------------|---|
| 1 | 7 Purpose and Need (3A, 3B, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10), Regulatory Constraints, Reasonable | Failed Purpose and Need | Yes |
| 4 | Purpose and Need (3B) | Failed Purpose and Need | Yes |
| 9 | Regulatory Constraints | MSHCP Avoidance | Yes |
| 10 | Regulatory Constraints | MSHCP Avoidance | Yes |
| 12 | Regulatory Constraints | MSHCP Avoidance | Yes |
| 14 | Purpose and Need (3B), Regulatory Constraints, Reasonable | Failed Purpose and Need | Yes |
| 15 | Purpose and Need (3B), Reasonable | Failed Purpose and Need | Yes |
| 16 | Regulatory Constraints, Reasonable | Section 4(f) Avoidance | Yes |
| 19 | Regulatory Constraints, Reasonable | Hemet-Ryan Airport Avoidance | Yes |
| 21 | Reasonable | Community Impact Avoidance | Yes |
| 23 | Reasonable | Community Impact Avoidance | Yes |
| 24 | Reasonable | Community Impact Avoidance | Yes |
| 32 | Regulatory Constraints | Section 4(f) Avoidance | Yes |
| 35 | Reasonable | Landfill Avoidance | Yes |
| 37 | Regulatory Constraints, Reasonable | Section 4(f) Avoidance | Yes |
| 38 | Regulatory Constraints, Reasonable | Section 4(f) Avoidance | Yes |
| 39 | Regulatory Constraints, Reasonable | Section 4(f) Avoidance | Yes |
| 44 | Regulatory Constraints | MSHCP Avoidance | Yes |
| 45 | Purpose and Need (4), Feasible, Regulatory Constraints | MSHCP Avoidance | Yes |
| 46 | Regulatory Constraints | MSHCP Avoidance | Yes |
| 48 | Regulatory Constraints | MSHCP Avoidance | Yes |
| 49 | Purpose and Need (5) | MSHCP Avoidance | Yes |
| 50 | Purpose and Need (5) | MSHCP Avoidance | Yes |
| 51 | Regulatory Constraints | MSHCP Avoidance | Yes |
| 52 | Regulatory Constraints | MSHCP Avoidance | Yes |
| M Q | Regulatory Constraints, Reasonable | Hemet-Ryan Airport Avoidance | Yes |
| Q Y | Regulatory Constraints, Reasonable | Hemet-Ryan Airport Avoidance | Yes |
| CC EE | Regulatory Constraints, Reasonable | Section 4(f) Avoidance | Yes |
| GG LL | Regulatory Constraints, Reasonable | Community Impact Avoidance | Yes |
| LL QQ | Regulatory Constraints, Reasonable | Community Impact Avoidance | Yes |

Note: ¹ The criteria that failed Purpose and Need are identified by the number corresponding to the list of criteria in the segment specific matrices in Appendix E.

TABLE 2
Isolated Segments Not Carried Forward For Further Evaluation

| Segment | Shared/Unique |
|----------------|----------------------|
| L P | Shared |
| 20 | Unique |
| 33 | Unique |
| 34 | Unique |
| HH JJ | Shared |
| 40 | Unique |
| 41 | Unique |
| RR VV | Shared |
| TT VV | Shared |
| UU XX | Shared |
| VV XX | Shared |

TABLE 3
Segments Carried Forward for Further Evaluation

| Segment | Shared/Unique |
|----------------|----------------------|
| 2 | Unique |
| 3 | Unique |
| 5 | Unique |
| 6 | Unique |
| 7 | Unique |
| 8 | Unique |
| 11 | Unique |
| 13 | Unique |
| 17 | Unique |
| 18 | Unique |
| 22 | Unique |
| 25 | Unique |
| 26 | Unique |
| 27 | Unique |
| 28 | Unique |
| 29 | Unique |
| 30 | Unique |
| 31 | Unique |
| 36 | Unique |
| 42 | Unique |
| 43 | Unique |

TABLE 3
Segments Carried Forward for Further Evaluation

| Segment | Shared/Unique |
|----------------|----------------------|
| 47 | Unique |
| A B | Shared |
| A E | Shared |
| B C | Shared |
| D H | Shared |
| E G | Shared |
| E I | Shared |
| E O | Shared |
| F J | Shared |
| I K | Shared |
| J N | Shared |
| K M | Shared |
| M U | Shared |
| N S | Shared |
| N T | Shared |
| R PP | Shared |
| V X | Shared |
| W Z | Shared |
| X GG | Shared |
| Y DD | Shared |
| AA GG | Shared |
| DD NN | Shared |
| FF NN | Shared |
| II KK | Shared |
| MM OO | Shared |
| NN PP | Shared |
| PP WW | Shared |
| SS WW | Shared |
| WW XX | Shared |

3.3 Step 3: Develop Alignment Alternatives

Based on the results of the screening evaluation, segments were collected to identify alignment alternatives for the Project. In some 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” was created. This Alignment Review Area will identify that

more than one alignment possibility is feasible to traverse this area and more technical analysis is required to finalize the location of the alternative. Three Alignment Review Areas were identified, two in the south (Alignment Review Areas A and B) and one in the central/eastern portion of the Project study area (Alignment Review Area C).

Alignment Review Area A was created for two reasons: (1) to identify less damaging alternatives through the Criteria Area that would be consistent with the Locally Preferred Alternative of the City of Hemet and the future expansion of the Hemet-Ryan Airport, and (2) to coordinate with the Sobobas based on their proposed property transfer along Domenigoni Parkway.

Alignment Review Area B represents all of the alignment alternatives within the area of the railroad.

Alignment Review Area C was created to further evaluate the alignment alternatives through the community adjacent to Sanderson Avenue. All alignment alternatives through this Alignment Review Area will have community impacts. The objective of this Alignment Review Area is to allow the Project Proponents the flexibility to identify an alignment alternative that minimizes impacts to the community while maximizing the viability of this eastern alignment alternative.

All of the Alignment Review Areas are illustrated in Figure K1 of Appendix K. The segments that compose each Alignment Review Area are identified in Table 4.

TABLE 4
Alignment Review Areas

| Alignment Review Area | Unique Segments | Shared Segments |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| A | 2, 5, 6, 11, 13, 25, 26 | AB, BC, DH, FJ, JN, NS, NT |
| B | 7, 8 | EG, EI |
| C | 17, 18, 29, 30 | MU, Y DD, DD NN, FF NN, N PP, R PP |

There are multiple ways to construct complete alignment alternatives from the remaining segments to be carried forward. Three general alignment corridors can be created from the remaining segments for the Project shown in Figure L1 of Appendix L. These include western, central, and eastern alignment alternatives. These alignment alternatives are presented in Figures L2, L3, and L4 of Appendix L. The segments used to create these alternatives are included in Table 5. The segment decision points in these figures (Figures L1 through L4 of Appendix L) were renumbered to clarify how the individual segments can be joined to form alignment alternatives. Based on the opportunity to mix and match the segments carried forward for further evaluation in Figure L1 of Appendix L, 48 complete alignment alternatives can be created. Table L1 of Appendix L identifies these alignment alternative variations and the segments that comprise them.

All of the segments identified in Figure K1 of Appendix K will be carried forward for further analysis in the Project technical reports.

TABLE 5
Project Alignment Alternatives

| Alternative | Segments Between Decision Points |
|--------------------|---|
| Eastern | 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11 |
| Central | 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11 |
| Western | 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 11 |