



## **RIVERSIDE COUNTY INTEGRATED PROJECT (RCIP)**

### **CETAP ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**The Simpson Center  
305 E. Devonshire  
Hemet, CA**

**Tuesday, February 6<sup>th</sup>, 2001  
9 AM – Noon**

### **MEETING NOTES**

#### **CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:**

Rudy Acosta, Coachella Valley  
Dan Brown, US Fish & Wildlife Service  
Joyce Deleo, Supervisors Appointee  
Janet Gless, Supervisors Appointee  
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club  
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC  
Anne Mayer, Caltrans  
Steve Oller, RTA  
Dan Silver, Endangered Habitats League  
Frank Hall, Supervisorial District # 2, Norco  
Gail Wanczuk-Barton, MSHCP Advisory  
Chair  
Bob Perkins, Farm Bureau  
Ron Roberts, RCTC – City of Temecula

Eric Haley, RCTC  
Bill Landon, Morongo/Cabazon Project  
Sandra Massa-Lavitt, City of Temecula  
Rob McCann, LSA  
David Miller, TransCore  
Jim Miller, City of Murrieta  
Bill Mosby, Caltrans  
Craig Neustaedter, Moreno Valley  
Anne Palatino, City of Corona  
Jon M. Ramirez, CPTC  
Lee Smith, Riverside County Transportation  
Steve Smith, TransCore  
Doreen Stadtlander, USFWS  
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA  
Bob Wheeler, EMA/RCD  
Merideth Wichman, Sverdrup  
Laurence Wilson, RBF  
Mohamad Younes, PBS&J

#### **Other Attendees:**

Opoku Acheampong, Caltrans  
Don Archer, Sverdrup  
Cathy Bechtel, RCTC  
Nita Bullock, UCR-Capital Planning  
Glen Campbell, OCTA  
Dick Doyle, Caltrans  
Clem D. Lagrosa, USFS

Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair, began the meeting at 9:20 AM.

#### **1. Public Comment Period**

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

Bob Wheeler of the conservation district shared his concern regarding the MSHCP. He feels that CETAP is not coordinating with the MSHCP and that critical points are not being addressed. Specifically, he feels that throwing out the Date St. option was a bad idea, especially when looking at the options it leaves, several of which are environmentally damaging. He particularly objects to the alternative that runs down Rainbow Canyon Road. There are several concerns in that area including environmental issues, BLM lands, and home owners. There are

options such as following Pala Rd. over to SR-76. We should use technology, such as building underground, to protect habitat. CETAP is outrunning the MSHCP and they need to be brought together.

Clem D. Lagrosa, Cleveland National Forest District Ranger, USFS – The U.S. Forest Service will be having a series of regional meetings to discuss revisions to its Forest Management Plan. It is important for CETAP representatives to attend. A Notice of Intent will be issued in the March time frame. Several meetings will be held in Riverside County as well as Orange County. One of the meetings is on March 3 in the Corona Library from 10 a.m. to 12:30.

Robin Lowe gave a report from a mayor's meeting she attended in Washington. Some of the mayors there mentioned it would be good to have an integrated planning process. The City of Belle vue is doing an integrated plan on a smaller scale and was curious how our process was proceeding with the Federal agencies. Across the country there is an awakening of the need to do this. Several different counties in our state are running across endangered species but the main problem is congestion; how to fix it while also dealing with private property rights, with environmental problems, and with future land uses. We are an example for the entire country.

Cathy Bechtel stated that the message is getting out. She will be meeting with representatives from Merced County who are planning on bringing down a group for a five-hour briefing on what we are doing.

## **2. Approval of meeting notes**

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

The public comment by Joan Sparkman from the previous notes should have been attributed to Janet Gless. There were no other comments and the minutes were accepted.

## **3. Report from MSHCP Advisory Committee and General Plan Advisory Committee**

Gail Wanczuk-Barton, MSHCP Chair, provided comments on MSHCP progress. At the end of the month the committee has two decisions to make. The first is to recommend alternatives for the NEPA/CEQA process. The second is regarding the funding proposal. They are currently working on three issues: property owner notifications, economic analysis, and defining the outreach process.

Peter Kiriakos gave a brief summary of the General Plan meeting. They are currently reviewing elements of the General Plan. They have had three or four meetings on the land use element and have made significant changes. They are now reviewing the safety element and are discussing the incentives program as well as reviewing issues surrounding open space and rural land uses.

Peter also commented on the need for more in the General Plan such as land use designations regarding design and energy efficiency. There needs to be more conservation in homes and in the commercial sector. This can be accomplished through codes, design, and encouragement of specific approaches.

## **4. Report on development projects from Riverside County TLMA**

(Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA)

Five reports were handed out to the committee. A discussion regarding the various development projects followed. A brief summary of the comments is given below.

- Dan Silver – Regarding the Spring Mountain Ranch development. The EIR and staff report do not contain information showing that the project's treatment of the Spring Brook wash was inconsistent with the MSHCP. The EIR and report do not clearly represent this information to the committees. This is one case out of many where the EIR and staff report given to various committees do not tell of development project inconsistencies with the MSHCP.
- Dan Brown – This is known gnatcatcher habitat. Coastal Sage Scrub has been cleared along the banks. There are clean water violations going on, fill problems, drainage problems, and concern about the adjacency to the Box Springs Mtn. Area. Fish & Wildlife (FWS) is looking into it.
- Peter Kiriakos – Reiterated these points. This bureaucratic language in these reports being given to the committees is not adequate.

- Robin Lowe – The General Plan committee needs to weigh in on this. That is one concern of the cities right now, that the County is allowing these types of projects to occur.

## **5. Report from the RCIP Integration Committee – approach to resolution of conflicts between CETAP and the MSHCP**

(Steve Smith, TransCore – Jim Henderson, Sverdrup)

There have been two meetings of the RCIP Integration Committee thus far involving CETAP, the General Plan, and the MSHCP. The role for this committee is evolving, but includes the effort to resolve conflicts, and to define the mechanisms for bringing the different interests together. The consultant team is in the process of documenting conflicts and proposing resolutions. They are also looking at broader issues on policy. The committee is on a four to five month schedule to work through all the conflicts, area by area. Western Riverside has been broken into nine geographic areas. In each area the conflicts, policy issues, language in the MSHCP, and alternatives are being examined. All of these will be brought to the committee on an on-going basis for review and decision-making. For example, with the Elsinore area plan, we are looking at conflicts with the SR-74 alignment alternatives and habitat areas. The Integration Committee is the focal point for resolving these issues. There is no re-circulation back to the individual element committees. If resolution cannot be reached, the issue will be elevated to the Small Working Group. A period of general comments followed. A brief summary of these is presented below:

- Ron Roberts stated that there is considerable controversy in Temecula area concerning the transportation alternatives, and there are ongoing negotiations with the Pechanga Indians. We need input as we are going along.
- Robin Lowe stated that a summary of the Integration meetings should be sent out to the committee.
- Jim Henderson – We will be spending time with the individual cities to work out the various issues with the MSHCP.
- Jim Miller – When we decided on the alternatives in Southwest Riverside County it was without having the FWS analysis. Should we re-review? Perhaps the Date Street alternative should be re-visited.
- Bob Perkins – The MSHCP is a long-term plan to meet the requirements of 164 species. Now we are talking about species forming our decisions. That is not an integrated process. I am concerned that we are saying we are willing to foreclose some of the options that we have developed through good transportation planning.
- Robin Lowe – I am not willing to do that either, but we do need to do a review of the information to justify our corridors, then it goes back to the Federal agencies to see what we can do to make things work together.
- Jim Henderson – We have taken the MSHCP as the platform because it is the least flexible element. It is also clear that we need to maintain balance.
- Dan Silver – The FWS has not said “no way”. It is clear however that we are going to need some creative thinking with many of these issues.

At this point in the meeting Jim Henderson gave a brief presentation on a set of notebooks being handed out to committee members. These notebooks contain some of the key information from the RCIP process thus far.

Bob Wheeler – We need an economic analysis. We need a benefit cost analysis for the RCIP. This can be done in two months. It will determine such issues as what our funding problems are going to be, economic development, quality of life, transportation, and the environment. We will be able to solve many of these issues by being able to quantify them. Who pays? Who benefits? What corridors will really be helping us in 30 years?

## **6. Report from Transit and Land Use subcommittee on Transit Oasis concept**

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

We have reinvigorated Alan Hoffman’s effort and he is back on board. We are looking at the RTA 10-year plan and how to integrate this with the transit oasis concept. Alan will also be developing a 30-year strategic plan, design guidelines and example applications for early implementation. Alan has contacted selected elected officials to get their input.

## **7. Report on progress on NEPA/404 process with Federal agencies**

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

There was a package put together for the Federal NEPA/404 agencies. Three notebooks were submitted, one for each of the two intra-county corridors and one for general background information. We are waiting for feedback and hoping to get concurrence as soon as possible. There have been some requests for additional information. The outcome of the NEPA/404 process could be a refinement of the alternatives, variations, eliminations, etc.

## **8. Presentation on status of the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County Corridor and Riverside County to Orange County Corridor**

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

OCTA is progressing with their \$50,000 outreach study. They are looking to get input from all of their stakeholders. This will be completed in approximately the April time frame.

Steve Smith provided a Powerpoint presentation on the status of the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County corridor. He indicated that all alternatives are on the table and illustrated the range of options that has been identified by the bi-county committee overseeing the work effort. He noted the importance of maintaining the rural character of the Reche Canyon area. The San Bernardino Associated Governments has voted to contribute \$250,000 for the bi-county effort. Cities in San Bernardino County have been requested by SANBAG to contribute matching amounts.

- Bob Perkins said he is glad to see creativity within this corridor, specifically the link to Highway 30 along California Street. This could allow for a bypass to the 10/215/91. We should avoid development along the route.
- Jim Miller expressed agreement with this. He indicated that Gilman Springs Rd needs to be brought out in this corridor.
- Robin Lowe – Gilman Springs Rd is very heavy at certain times. The environmental impacts need to be looked at regarding widening. There will be a great deal of traffic on this road in the future.
- Craig Neustaedter – An initial interchange analysis has been completed with the SR-60 and Gilman Springs Rd. by the City of Moreno Valley. This will be provided to the committee.

## **9. Presentation on assumptions and methodology for analysis of the Circulation Element**

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

Steve Smith provided an overview of the modeling work that is going to be done on the circulation element once the General Plan land use plans have been digitized.

Two different models will be used, one for the Coachella Valley and one for Western Riverside County. The analysis will be conducted of the current General Plan, the Vision Plan (Alternative 3), and a revision of the Vision Plan that could come from the process of resolving the conflicts, concluding in June. He indicated that mid-range densities would be used. He indicated that the analysis would be used to help determine whether facilities should be added, modified, or deleted. He indicated that the transit analysis would be conducted with a modeling process separate from the transportation model, in conjunction with Alan Hoffman's work. For sizing the highway network, traditional percentages of transit would be assumed.

- Peter Kiriakos – We should look at a visionary transit model, with what a large increase in transit service would actually do in regards to congestion. Also, we should be analyzing the trip lengths after the projected increase in jobs.
- Craig Neustaedter – What about the build-out of San Bernardino County? Are we going to let the cities review our build-out scenario? This would prevent having to redo things later on.
- Bruce Colbert – What are the ramifications of the incentives program? We should be proactive and understand what could occur.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.