



RIVERSIDE COUNTY INTEGRATED PROJECT (RCIP)

CETAP ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Assembly Community Room, Registrar of Voters
2724 Gateway Drive, Riverside, CA
Tuesday, December 5th, 2000
9 AM – Noon

MEETING NOTES

CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:

Dan Brown, US Fish & Wildlife Service
Joyce Deleo, Supervisors Appointee
Janet Gless, Supervisors Appointee
Joan Sparkman, Supervisors Appointee
Helga Wolf, Supervisors Appointee
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club
Stan Lisiewicz, Caltrans
Steve Oller, RTA
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC
Dan Silver, Endangered Habitats League
Debra Varnado, SCAG
Won S. Yoo, RANPAC
Frank Hall, Supervisorial District # 2, Norco
Gail Wanczuk-Barton, MSHCP Advisory
Chair

Other Attendees:

Don Archer, Sverdrup
Dennis Barton, City of Loma Linda
Sharon Bolton, RIU Farm Bureau
Tom Boyd, City of Riverside
Bruce Colbert, Riverside Co. Property
Barbara Dassacq, WLC
Owners Gary George, City of Redlands

John Jaquers, City of Redlands
Kathy A. Kively, City of Colton
Bill Landon, Morongo/Cabazon Project
Sandra Massa-Lavitt, City of Temecula
Richard Masyczek, City of Hemet
Rob McCann, LSA
David Miller, TransCore
Jim Miller, City of Murrieta
Bill Mosby, Caltrans
Craig Neustaedter, Moreno Valley
Anne Palatino, City of Corona
Trent Pullian, City of Moreno Valley
Lee Smith, Riverside County Transportation
Steve Smith, TransCore
William Sweeney, Land Owner
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA
Ruthann Taylor-Berger, WRCOG
Erin Warmington, WLC
Rusty Thornton, Caltrans
Bob Ziprick, City of Loma Linda

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

1. Public Comment Period

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

There were no public comments. Joan Sparkman asked to make a statement to the committee. She noted the problems with the increasing congestion in the County and particularly on SR-91. Even on a recent Saturday afternoon it took an hour and 15 minutes to get from her house in Riverside to the I-15 with no accidents. It was simply all of the traffic on a Saturday night trying to get on the 91 to go to Orange County. It was impossible to move anywhere and it is not going to get better. The environment is special and important, but we should take humans and families

more into consideration, and we should move them to the top of the priority list. Robin acknowledged the services of Bob Wolf on the California Transportation Commission, and that there will be a reception for him at the Mission Inn.

2. Approval of meeting notes

(Robin Resser Lowe, Chair)

Two names on the attendees list were adjusted. 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)

We are continuing the evaluation of the alternatives and implementation tools that support the alternatives. In mid November we met with cities to look at how the MSHCP would impact them. We met with mixed reviews; some of cities have been very involved, and some have not. We have received input from the scientific review panel and a brief oral presentation from the wildlife agencies and have received a letter from them. We will be meeting on Thursday to discuss their letter and on the 14th to finalize our recommendation to be forwarded to the board.

Jim Henderson reported that the General Plan Advisory Committee would be meeting today to discuss the area plans in terms of making a recommendation to the Board. The focus of all the efforts with the three advisory committees is to make a recommendation to the Board on December 19th. We will be bringing the recommendations of the General Plan land use alternatives to the Board so that we can receive direction from the Board on the alternatives both for the Land Use and the MSHCP and CETAP. These are integrated processes. Then we will go forward to do an evaluation of the MSHCP alternatives and at the same time we will begin digitizing the GP land uses so that the plans can come back to CETAP as part of the circulation element for the county and then be integrated with our process. We had a density workshop on the 22nd and discussed the concept of nodes of density with the Board, to determine if that was an acceptable process. The BIA made a presentation and the planning commission has also agreed to make a presentation to the Board. We talked about certainty issues and planning principles and how the land use was being prepared as part of the three alternatives.

4. Report on development projects from Riverside County TLMA

(Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA)

There were no new general plan amendments this month although we are expecting two shortly. One is the Diamond Valley lake recreation plan. The MWD has selected a development firm to move ahead with their recreation component. We are attempting to set up a meeting with MWD to discuss that. It does appear that the recreation plan is greatly scaled back from what they had talked about several months ago, which was a water-based theme park. It is now more of a traditional campground, boat launch, etc. The other is Vail Lake. There is a pending very ambitious proposal for Vail Lake. Robin stated that this committee needs to keep an eye on that development, especially the MSHCP component. Peter Kiriakos raised the point over the responses to the environmental document for the Oak Valley Plan that is a key component of the Badlands area. He encouraged those who are concerned about that part of the county to take part in that.

5. Update on status of CETAP

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

Steve Smith reviewed the results of the November 8 meeting of the Riverside County Transportation Commission meeting, at which they considered the recommendations from the November 7 CETAP Advisory Committee meeting. Steve indicated that the Commission approved the Advisory Committee comments with the exception of Van Buren Boulevard

(Alternative 3 in the Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore corridor). In that case, the Commission determined that Van Buren Boulevard should be eliminated as a major CETAP corridor. However, it will still be an important consideration in the circulation element.

Comments:

Robin Lowe: The feeling of the Commission was that dealing with Van Buren, even as a Smart Street as proposed, would slow things down within CETAP so it was removed from the process. It will still move along concurrently but with the jurisdictions that Van Buren impacts and as it pertains to March Air Reserve Base.

Dan Silver: What happens if the wildlife agency's report comes out, which comments on both the MSHCP and CETAP corridors, and one of their conclusions is that one or more of the alternatives that we picked are incompatible with the integrated plan (MSHCP).

Steve: There are two issues here. One is the impact of transportation issues on the MSHCP and the ability to get the MSHCP approved as a mechanism for protecting habitat. On the reverse side, what is the influence of the MSHCP on the need to move people and goods? This is why we have an integrated process. I think that we recognize that there are remaining conflicts. We haven't taken alternatives off that have some sort of impacts on the environment. The intent would be, as we work through the EIR/EIS and as the MSHCP is considered further, to look for ways to resolve those conflicts so that both the MSHCP and CETAP can meet their objectives. As a result of the evaluation in the EIR/EIS, we will be selecting what the federal agencies call the LEDPA, or the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative. Just because there is a conflict does not mean that one should automatically take precedence over another. We will be working to resolve the conflicts.

6. Status reports on Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County and Riverside County to Orange County corridors.

We had a meeting with the bi-county group for the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County corridor. We are trying to set up a staff-level meeting before Christmas. We also have an invitation from the City of Colton to speak on the CETAP effort to the Reche Canyon Road Task Force.

We met with one of the growth management area groups in O.C. by their invitation. OCTA's position is to do their own \$50,000 study over the next few months, obtaining comments from agencies, business concerns, environmental groups, city councils, etc. That would start at the beginning of 2001 and take roughly three months.

7. 8-month look ahead

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

Steve provided a handout showing agenda items that may be considered for upcoming CETAP meetings. It was proposed that the committee meet every other month during the EIR/EIS phase, given that there would be less for the committee to be reviewing. The committee determined that they should still have a meeting each month, even if there are not many items to discuss. They need to stay involved. However, there will not be a meeting in January.

Robin indicated that we need to schedule a transit and land use subcommittee workshop in January. A date was set for January 12, 2001.

Peter Kiriakos indicated that there is concern that transit will fall through the cracks and that this existing committee should continue to be involved in the consideration and coordination of transit issues. Steve indicated that transit is on each CETAP agenda and the subcommittee will be meeting as well. We are trying to get Alan Hoffman back on board. Alan's scope has been written and will be presented to the Board. He is prepared to be a part of this.

Dan Silver – The cities need to be engaged in this effort as well.

8. Status on Nepa/404 Process

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

Steve indicated that a package is being prepared for submission to the Federal agencies involved in the NEPA/404 review of the CETAP corridors (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Army Corps of Engineers, EPA, and the Federal Highway Administration). We should be having that ready to send out in the next couple of weeks. The agencies have 45 days to render their concurrence or non-concurrence after they have deemed the package to be complete.

9. Presentation on EIR/EIS statements and implications for CETAP

(Rob McCann, LSA) - A one-page memo was given out to the meeting attendees. Rob provided an overview of how the EIR/EIS process will work. An environmental document is a public disclosure document. It is based on objective, technical analysis of looking at the alternatives, comparing them to an environmental baseline, and identifying what are the impacts and what the mitigation measures might be. This document is not an advocacy document. It is not to advocate a position, alternative, agency, or particular position. Our role is to provide objective technical analysis. We need to distill volumes of technical information and present it in an understandable document. This is for the general public and decision-makers. It must be readable and understandable but also legally adequate and meet the scrutiny of any attorney.

We are really dealing with two processes. The state environmental process, CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act), and the federal process, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Joint documents are allowed, hence the combined EIR/EIS. Our studies will have to meet requirements under both. RCTC is the lead agency for CEQA and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) will be the lead for the NEPA document. The document details are described in the one-page memo handout.

Adjournment

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