

WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNTY MULTI-SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES March 1, 2001

1. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS.

Gail Wanczuk-Barton called the meeting to order at 1:20 p.m. The following were in attendance:

Borre Winckel *	BIA
Ed Sauls *	Property Owner
Wendy Picht *	MWD
Larry LaPre' *	Audubon Society
Bill Sullivan *	Lockheed Martin
Bruce Colbert *	Riverside County Property Owners Assoc.
Robin Maloney-Rames *	California Dept of Fish & Game
Julie York	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Mary Beth Woulfe *	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Peter Kiriakos *	Sierra Club
Gail Wanczuk-Barton *	Committee Chair / Property Owner
Kristi Lovelady	TLMA – County of Riverside
Mary L. Thomas *	U.S. Forest Service / Cleveland
Jane Block *	Property Owner
Kerwin Russell *	Riverside-Corona RCD
Dan Silver *	Endangered Habitats League
Bob Wheeler *	Elsinore-Murrieta-Anza RCD
Sharon Bolton *	Farm Bureau
Andy Domenigoni * (Cindy Domenigoni*)	Property Owner
Greg Reden *	Property Owner
Tracey Alsobrook *	Southern California Edison
Wyatt Haupt	North County Times / Californian
Rikki Alberson	RMA Consultants / BIA Riverside
Nelson Miller	City of Perris
Steven B. Imhoof	Hewitt & McGuire
Michael Rowe	Property Owner
Joe Rank	County Counsel
Monica Lawrence	Nossaman Law Firm
A.C. Nejedly	Property Owner
Steve Lech	County of Riverside – Waste Mgmt.
Norman Gritton	Meadowbrook – property owner
Garry Grant	Meadowbrook – property owner
Shenna Moqheet	City of Calimesa

Richard Masyczek	City of Hemet
Peggy Temple	City of Corona
Joel Schultz	Bureau of Land Management
Bill Warkentin	Warkentin Partnership
Steve Brown	City of Temecula
Joe Gonzales	Wilson Creek Land Owner
Mike Ashley	Motte & Ashley properties
Chris Ormsby	City of Moreno Valley
Michele Staples	Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh

*Denotes Advisory Committee member

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Garry Grant, property owner Meadowbrook, opined that one of his requests for additional information regarding the justification and data on endangered species has not been forthcoming from the agencies and that this item has not yet been agendaized. Mr. Grant continued stating that he has observed developers being forced to “perform” and meet project requirements. Mr. Grant suggested that this is unfair practice and unfair burden.

2. FORMULATE RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING MSHCP FUNDING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Gail Wanczuk-Barton announced that a more recent draft version of the MSHCP Implementation Outline, which included changes made through February 27, was available at the back table. Ed Sauls offered a brief background on the origin of the document and a summary of tasks requiring further attention. After some discussion, the following changes to the document were recommended:

- add potential establishment of Western County-Wide Bond Measure
- remove discussion of Safety-Net issue
- modify wording on Item 13 - Additional Issues, sub-item b – Minor amendments to read “...All such reserve additions or off-sets must be from willing landowners.”

The committee acknowledged and documented the issues remaining that need to be worked out. Dan Silver motioned to accept for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, the Draft Implementation Strategy as a final document inclusive of proposed changes. Motion seconded by Borre Winckel.

The floor was opened for discussion.

Michael Rowe, property owner, expressed concern that the public has not had an opportunity to review and comment on the draft implementation document. Jim Miller, City of Murrieta, noted that the cities had not participated in discussions concerning the Draft Implementation Outline and several cities were not currently endorsing the MSHCP. Mr. Miller also expressed some concern regarding some of the proposed local funding methods. Richard Masyczek expressed the opinion that the County has not coordinated adequately with the cities. Kristi Lovelady noted that the document is neither an implementation agreement nor a draft thereof, but that it is a representation or an outline of the direction the stakeholders see the plan taking. She agreed that dialogue with the cities is necessary but that a starting point is required for such discussions. Garry Grant concurred with earlier statements that the public has not had a chance to review the document. Shenna Moqet suggested that the cities might fail to endorse a plan if they see it as something that would create additional financial burden as opposed to

something being implemented with established available funding. Norman Gritton suggested that a “safety net” be implemented for property owners to protect their rights.

The motion was restated and carried unanimously.

3. FORMULATE RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING THE PROJECT THAT WOULD BE ANALYZED IN THE CEQA/NEPA DOCUMENT.

Kristi Lovelady noted that the Funding and Implementation Subcommittee recommended that:

For purposes of defining the project description for the MSHCP and defining the preferred project pursuant to the joint NEPA/CEQA document that the consultant analyze Alternative 1 consistent with the Funding and Implementation Outline. Additionally, the environmental document may include analysis of those alternatives considered in the October 2000 Alternatives Development Document. Stakeholders reserve the opportunity to give comment on other Alternatives that might emerge in the course of the Environmental Review process.

Discussion ensued and concerns were voiced about proceeding with a CEQA/NEPA document and the definition of a preferred project. Kristi Lovelady offered that for purposes of CEQA the county is the lead agency. For purposes of NEPA, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Agency (USFWS) has not indicated a preferred alternative and is not required to do so until farther along in the environmental review process.

Dan Silver moved that the recommendation from the Funding and Implementation Subcommittee be adopted. Borre Winckel seconded.

The floor was opened for discussion and public comment. Discussion included consideration of narrow endemics in relation to Alternative 1 and reluctance to recommend a project description in light of the current planning stage of the MSHCP. Michele Staples, Jackson, DeMarco and Peckenpaugh, counsel for the Domenigoni Family, stated that the Domenigoni’s oppose the process imposed on the Stakeholders because science and information that was requested has not been received. Nelson Miller, City of Perris, opined that there is a lack of consistency between Alternative 1 and the San Jacinto River project. Additional discussion was held on this topic.

The original recommendation was supported by a majority of those present with 11 members in favor; Andy Domenigoni (on behalf of Cindy Domenigoni), Farm Bureau, Elsinore-Murrieta-Anza Resource Conservation District, Lockheed Martin Corporation, and the Riverside County Property Owners Association against; and Ed Sauls abstaining.

Dan Silver motioned that the committee recommend that a range of alternatives for the San Jacinto River should be analyzed. The motion was seconded by Ed Sauls.

Recommendation was supported by a majority of those present with 14 members in favor; Sierra Club opposed, with Lockheed Martin Corporation, Southern California Edison and Elsinore-Murrieta-Anza Resource Conservation District abstaining.

4. DISCUSSION CONCERNING INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY OWNER NOTIFICATION

Sharon Bolton reported that a recommendation had not yet been fully formulated but should be ready for the next meeting. Mr. Sullivan, Lockheed Martin, asked that this item be agendized for April and presented to the Advisory Committee in the format of a draft notice to help expedite Committee review.

5. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for April 12, 2001 at 1:00 p.m. in the Community Room – Registrar of Voters.

6. FINAL PUBLIC COMMENTS

Garry Grant expressed concerns about Advisory Committee members who leave the meeting before its conclusion and the lack of the city involvement. Mr. Grant also expressed support for a broad based taxation measure.

7. ADJOURNMENT.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00.