

MEETING NOTES

DATE: July 10, 2000

ATTENDEES: *Committee Members/Alternates*

Stephen Corona	1 st Supervisorial District
Bill Cramer	3 rd Supervisorial District
Ed Kibbey	4 th Supervisorial District
Joe Richards	5 th Supervisorial District
Jane Block	5 th Supervisorial District
Bill Warkentin	BIA
Kimberly Wilder	Community Access Center
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Steve Ruddick	WRCOG
Steve Mandoki	City of Murrieta/WRCOG
Greg Schook	City of Calimesa/WRCOG
Bob Perkins	Farm Bureau
Gary Wanczuk	MSHCP Advisory Committee
Won Yoo	MSHCP Advisory Committee
Peter Kiriakos	Sierra Club

County Staff

Jerry Jolliffe Riverside County TLMA

Consultant Team

Melani Smith The Planning Center
Steve Smith Transcore

Agenda Package: June 6 & June 27 Meeting Notes
General Plan Status Report

1. Call to Order

1. Public Comment

A. None given.

1. Committee Administrative Business

A. *Approval of Meeting Notes*

i. Meeting notes from 6/6/00 Approved, 6/27/00 Approved.

B. *County IPG Report to Committee*

i. Report by Jolliffe summarized projects judged to be of potential interest to the Committee. Ruddick noted that the place of discussion of the RCIP in County EIRs is inconsistent, should be in the alternatives discussion.

1. Old Business

A. *RCIP General Plan Principles*

i. Warkentin commented that the Incentives Program for the General Plan is well under development. Pieces of it will be forthcoming to the Committee. Key issue now is the

General Plan Advisory Committee

attempt to find a linkage between density/intensity increases and purchasing habitat lands. This should be fee based. Idea is being discussed in MSHCP subcommittee and in Incentives group. Per Smith, in order to meet the General Plan schedule, the Incentives package must be presented to the full GPAC at the August meeting, in order for it to be approved at the September meeting.

- ii. Meeting of the Subcommittee scheduled for tomorrow morning, July 11th in the 9th Floor Conference Room of the County Administrative Center in Riverside. Subcommittee for Incentives is: Warkentin, Yoo, Wanczuk, Block, Silver, Kiriakos, Ruddick, and Kibbey.
- iii. Motion made and seconded to refer the General Plan Principles Certainty System to Jolliffe to be reviewed by County Council. Motion approved.

1. New Business

A. ***Transit Task Force Report***

- i. Steve Smith reviewed the "Riverside County Transit Oasis Concept Implementation Strategy for the Riverside County Integrated Project" paper dated July 10 with the GPAC. Comments were as follows:

- (1) Kibbey: Revenue sources? Extension of measure A? Smith responded that it is too soon to have a budget, so don't have defined revenue sources. Federal funding is available. Funds are already earmarked for other plans, so will have to redirect, according to Kibbey. Silver: Measure A is the most likely source. According to Smith, the County can try for FTA discretionary funding, but it will be tough. Ruddick: Livable Communities funding from FTA? Smith thinks this is a possibility, along with CMAQ funding. Need a continuing renewable source of funds to make this happen.
- (2) According to Winckel, RTA experimented with school busses as an alternate source of vehicles. Moreno Valley and Val Verde have tried it, but don't know the status. Wilder commented that there may be a problem of accessibility, may also be a problem of availability or perception. Wilder also commented that collaboration is a great way of getting federal dollars.

- ii. Joint GPAC/CETAP Transit Subcommittee was nominated: Wilder, Ruddick, Warkentin volunteered. July 20th at 9am at RTA is the next meeting.

- iii. Warkentin also noted that the CETAP corridor selection is controversial. He formally requested a comprehensive presentation on the corridors to the GPAC. Would like the GPAC to recommend formally on the corridors. RCTC vote on the corridors is this Wednesday, however. Warkentin knows the consultants are talking, but the stakeholders need to be on board from all Committees. He feels there is a need to look at land use in connection with the corridors, as this relates to the Circulation element, which is part of the GP. Silver noted that this will be a relevant discussion regardless of timing in relation to the RCTC vote.

A. ***General Plan Status Report***

- i. Comments/Actions were as follows, based on review of the Status Report:

- (1) GPAC/MSHCP Policy matrix to be redistributed and agendaized for next meeting.
- (2) All Committee members to be invited to upcoming Area Plan reviews.
- (3) Area Plans composites showing City uses as well as Area Plan land uses to be brought back to the Committee reflecting final changes.
- (4) Discussion of the appropriate definition and treatment of community separators within the Area Plans referred to the subcommittee.

A. ***Area Plan Public Outreach Report***

- i. Smith summarized the comments received about the Area Plans at public workshops held to date:

RCIP

General Plan Advisory Committee

- (1) Sun City/Menifee: concern about coordination among Area Plans, and between cities and County; questions about the nature and potential use of the incentives program; questions about the mixed-use land use designation; the location and availability of Plans for review and comment; and operational concerns related to roads and traffic.
- (2) Temescal Canyon: compatibility between land uses; traffic and circulation routes concerns related primarily to the 91 freeway; desire for neighborhood protection from traffic and noise and incompatible development; annexation concerns; infrastructure provision concurrence with housing development; alternatives to automobiles.
- (3) Jurupa: habitat conservation and HTM questions, and concern about maintaining rural densities in the area.
- (4) City of Murrieta: concern about the County approving development around cities; desire to slow down the development process while the RCIP is in production; habitat conservation.
- (5) City of Corona: concern about residential development outside the City, or any focused growth outside the City; concern about residents in unincorporated areas using City services; reservations about the HTM system.
- (6) City of Perris: impacts of the 74 realignment on short term city projects.
- (7) City of Hemet: conflict between habitat conservation and development along the San Jacinto River; eastern end of Diamond Valley reservoir MWD plans.
- (8) City of Norco: transportation analysis and impacts on City from Eastvale plan; also impacts on schools and public facilities; desire to achieve the Santa Ana River crossing.

A.

RHNA Update

- i. Ruddick presented an overview of the SCAG RHNA process in which each city and the county gets allocation which is the basis of the housing element update. The RHNA allocation for the WRCOG area is more units than were ever built even in the housing boom of the 80s. Affordable housing highest numbers were allocated to Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, however that allocation has been revised down. In terms of the income equity distribution issue, the WRCOG is putting forward three alternatives to the present system of allocation to SCAG now. This will affect the County in terms of housing element and land use element. The County must show it can accommodate household growth in terms of land use allocations. The RHNA also fits into Regional Transportation Plan and Air Quality Management Plan. The RTP and AQMP must conform to one another. County has been granted its appeal in the allocation in total it has been reduced by 13,000 plus units. Definition of low income housing: based on each County's median income. Very low <50% of median, low <80%, moderate 120% of median, above moderate >120%. Affordable housing in OC \$180,000, in Inland Empire \$118,000. Cramer commented that SCAG should use a job-based allocation instead. Warkentin commented that San Bernardino absorbs 1/2 to 2/3 of housing Riverside County does, so we absorb more of the regional need. Have had a drop off of housing built, but no drop in population.
- ii. Ruddick also noted that the housing element due date may have been extended to Jan 1, 2001.

A.

Housing Element Status Report

- i. Postponed until next meeting.

1. **Action Summary**

A.

From July 10 meeting:

- i. Certainty System: Referred to Jolliffe to be reviewed by County Council.
- ii. Joint CETAP/GPAC Subcommittee named: Wilder, Ruddick, Warkentin. Next meeting to be held July 20th at 9am.

RCIP

General Plan Advisory Committee

- iii. Comprehensive presentation on the CETAP corridors to be arranged for the GPAC at next meeting.
- iv. Joint MSHCP/GPAC Policy matrix to be redistributed and discussed at next meeting.
- v. Composite Area Plans with City uses to be brought back to the Committee reflecting final changes resulting from input and public comment.
- vi. Discussion of use and criteria for community separators referred to GPAC Subcommittee.
- B. ***From June 6 meeting:***
 - i. Revise General Plan Principles to incorporate WRCOG approved input - ***The Planning Center, still outstanding.***
 - ii. Discuss GPAC/MSHCP Joint Policy Subcommittee matrix at next meeting - ***Postponed.***
- C. ***From May 2 & June 6 meeting:***
 - i. Additional General Plan Principles to be developed by the Subcommittee.
- D. ***From April 4 meeting:***
 - i. Outreach to County School Boards and the Eastern and Western Municipal Water District should be conducted in connection with the Area Plans and the General Plan- ***Jolliffe, The Planning Center, still outstanding.***
 - ii. The RCIP website should be improved and updated continuously with all Committee, Subcommittee, and other project-related meetings - ***Sverdrup.***
- E. ***From March 7 meeting:***
 - i. List of NOPs requested by the Committee - ***Jolliffe, still outstanding.***
- F. ***From Feb. 1 meeting:***
 - i. List of General Plan Amendments currently being considered by the County to be provided to Committee members - ***Jolliffe, still outstanding.***
 - ii. List of County Specific Plans, as well as other development activity data, to be provided to Committee members - ***Jolliffe, still outstanding.***
- G. ***From January 11 meeting:***
 - i. A summary of lands entitled in Riverside County, as well as those not entitled and those in process, to be compiled - ***Jolliffe, still outstanding.***
 - ii. The commercial building industry to be invited into this planning process - ***Jolliffe, still outstanding.***
- H. ***From December 7, 1999 meeting:***
 - i. GIS layer access follow up - ***Jolliffe, still outstanding.***
 - ii. List of County approved development projects - ***Jolliffe, still outstanding.***
 - iii. Invitation to Planning Commission Chair to meet with the General Plan Advisory Committee - ***Jolliffe, still outstanding.***
- I. ***From September 7, 1999 meeting:***
 - i. Sverdrup to prepare a “web-access” manual for Committee members to facilitate use of the RCIP website and potential discussion forum, ***still outstanding.***

1. Public Comment

None.

1. Adjournment

Next GPAC full committee meeting rescheduled for the 8th of August to avoid conflict with the CETAP Committee meetings on the 1st of August.