



*Carolyn Syms Luna*  
*Director*

**COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE**  
*TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY*

**Environmental Programs Department**

RECEIVED  
JAN 09 2009

January 7, 2009

RIVERSIDE COUNTY  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Ms. Cathy Bechtel  
Riverside County Transportation Commission  
P.O. Box 12008  
Riverside, CA 92502-2208

**Re: Draft EIR/EIS for the Mid County Parkway Project**

Dear Ms. Bechtel:

The Environmental Programs Department (EPD) appreciates the opportunity to review the above-referenced document. As a permittee under the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) is identified as the lead agency for the project. The MSHCP identifies the project as a covered activity, and as such, requires review and concurrence by the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA), U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). While EPD is not an approving agency, we offer the following comments and requests:

- The list of acronyms was placed in Appendix G, Volume II, of the document. EPD suggests placing the list near the beginning of the document and including a "Definition of Terms" as well.
- The original biological information collected for the preparation of the document should be included in the document as an Appendix. The information should include, but not be limited to, methodology, tables, and maps showing species' populations, etc.
- Under 3.17.2.3 – Wildlife Corridors/Habitat. Fragmentation appears to be addressed through the application engineering controls that will minimize the impacts to linkages and cores. Although locations of bridges and wildlife crossings are presented in Appendix I, no discussion of the size or function for these crossings was found throughout the document. Additional details that briefly describe the size, length, and rationale for location selection relative to their function should be provided. This information would benefit permittees when evaluating adjacent projects for MSHCP consistency.
- Page 3.17-3, Figures 3.17.1a and 3.17.1b "Cores and Linkages" shown in the Figures are confusing and misleading to the reader. The map should identify criteria area cells and where wildlife crossing will occur along the MCP.
- EPD recognizes that additional mitigation areas will be set aside by the RCTC as a result of the equivalency analysis process. EPD requests a map identifying those areas after they have been secured by RCTC.

Ms. Cathy Bechtel  
January 7, 2009  
Page 2

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please don't hesitate to contact me at (951) 955-2009.

Sincerely,

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS DEPARTMENT



Ken Baez  
Principal Planner

KB:kh

xc: Kathleen Browne