

RIVERSIDE COUNTY INTEGRATED PLAN (RCIP)

CETAP ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Assembly Community Room, Registrar of Voters
2724 Gateway Drive
Riverside, CA

Tuesday, April 4th, 2000
9:00 AM – Noon

MEETING NOTES

CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:

Daniel Brown, US Fish and Wildlife Service
Janet Gless, Supervisor's Appointee
Susan Hafner, RTA
Frank Hall, Supervisors Appointee
John Hunt, WRCOG
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club
Stan Lisiewicz, Caltrans
Bob Perkins, Farm Bureau
Gene Rogers, WRCOG TAC
Joan Sparkman, Supervisor's Appointee
Gary Wanczuk, MSHCP Advisory Committee
Borre Winckel, BIA
Helga Wolf, Supervisor's Appointee
Won S. Yoo, RANPAC
Allyn Waggle, Supervisor's Appointee
Debra Vernado, SCAG

Other Attendees:

Don Archer, Sverdrup
Bill Blankenship, BIA
Mary Butterwick, US EPA Region 9
Alan Crouse, WRCOG
Andrea Gullo, State Parks
Sandra Massa-Lavitt, City of Temecula
Richard Masyczek, City of Hemet
Rob McCann, LSA
David Miller, TransCore
Jim Miller, City of Murrieta
Pamela M___, CFTV (Temecula)
Bill Mosby, Caltrans
Craig Neustaedter, City of Moreno Valley
Steve Oller, RTA
Anne Palatino, City of Corona
Juan Perez, City of Hemet
Mel Placilla, Sverdrup
Erik Ruehr, VRPA Technologies
Lee Smith, RVSD Co. TLMA
Steve Smith, TransCore
Doreen Stadtlander, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA
Hideo Sugita, RCTC
King Thomas, LSA
Gary Thornhill, City of Temecula
Brad Thornton, VRPA
Merdith Wichman, Sverdrup

Gary Warkentin, RBF
Sam Yoo, RANPAC
Mohamad Younes, PBS&J

Helga Wolf, Chair, began the meeting at 9:15 AM.

1. Public Comment Period

(Helga Wolf, Chair)

Helga opened the floor for comments from the public. With no comments, the public comment period was closed.

2. Approval of Meeting Notes

(Helga Wolf, Chair)

Helga requested comments on the meeting notes of March 7th, 2000. Hideo Sugita, RCTC, noted that he was not in attendance at the last meeting. The correction was noted and the Committee approved the meeting notes.

3. Report from MSHCP Advisory Committee

(Gary Wanczuk, MSCHP Advisory Committee Chair)

Gary indicated that a series of sub-area working group meetings had been held, to obtain input from stakeholders. The committee activated the funding and implementation sub-committee, to address transaction methods and fee options and a policy sub-committee addressing land use policies in the context of land use designations for conservation.

Report from General Plan Advisory Committee

(Jim Henderson, Sverdrup)

Two significant issues were being addressed by the General Plan advisory committee: coordination with MSHCP on principles and policies and development of a document covering General Plan principles. The drafts of eleven area plans are completed, and three are still in development. These are building blocks for the General Plan. On March 28th the Board of Supervisors approved the three General Plan alternatives. The committee is continuing with the process to flesh out alternatives. A set of guidelines has been developed to guide land development consistent with the vision in the interim while the General Plan is being crafted.

4. Discussion of possible concepts, policies and strategies for integrating transportation with the area plans.

(Steve Smith, TransCore, CETAP Project Manager)

Steve provided a presentation on some of the emerging ideas for the development of the transit system in the Western County. He indicated that it would be desirable to get a transit task force together to discuss these concepts further. A meeting was set for April 13th at RTA. Steve handed out a document RTA published in November 1999 concerning a Long Range Strategic Plan for transit. There were suggestions and cost estimates for freeway flyer and express bus possibilities. It is important to integrate these concepts with the land use plans.

Steve's presentation covered the following topics: Statements contained in the vision that can guide the development of the transit system; the overall transportation strategy for Riverside County; transit spine network, review of the main concepts from the seminar with Alan Hoffman (designing time out of the system, linking origins with destinations, frequency, and coverage). Steve indicated that The PlanningCenter is developing a classification of nodes. The idea is to develop a strategy for integrating transit within each node type. Steve provided several examples for how regional/express transit service could be integrated with the nodes.

General Comments on the presentation were as follows:

- Susan Hafner and John Hunt both commented on the exhibit showing the percentage of trips by transit in several cities. They said that daily ridership is not representative of success and that you must look at peak hour ridership and congestion issues. St. Louis created their system in seven years and it carries the equivalent of 3 freeway lanes of traffic in the peak hour. Context is very important.
- Craig Neustaedter stressed that we need to consider light rail in addition to commuter rail on the San Jacinto Branch Line and possible transit routes in the Moreno Valley to the San Bernardino north-south corridor. He noted that Highgrove is currently proposed is only a Tier II Metrolink station and thought it deserved more consideration.
- Bob Perkins stated that without private enterprise involved in the transit system, we are taking the wrong approach.

5. Presentation on NEPA/404 MOU

(Rob McCann, LSA)

The Army Core of Engineers, US Environmental Protection Agency, US Fish and Wildlife, Caltrans, and Federal Highway Administration will eventually need to approve or permit transportation projects coming out of the CETAP process. The NEPA/404 MOU was developed because there was a recognition that upon completing NEPA documents they would then begin the process to obtain a 404 permit from the Corp of Engineers under the Clean Water Act and go back through many of the same steps from the NEPA approval. In the early 1990's the agencies developed this MOU to integrate these two processes. There are three key elements within the MOU: to ensure the earliest consideration of the environment factors in the transportation process, to put a high priority on avoiding waterways and threatened or endangered species related to these waters, and to work to minimize impacts and provide mitigation when avoidance is not possible. These agencies work together under the NEPA/404 process to discuss environmental considerations as early as possible. As the CETAP advisory committee decides on Purpose and Need and Evaluation Criteria, there will also be a Federal process that will take the alternatives into the environmental document stage. Discussions with the Federal agencies are ongoing.

6. Discussion of Purpose and Need Statements for the Four Corridors

(Steve Smith, CETAP Project Manager)

Steve introduced the latest draft of the Purpose and Need Statements for the four CETAP corridors (Working Paper No. 5). The paper had been distributed with the agendas for the April 4 meeting. He explained that the proposed action of the committee was to forward the Purpose and Need Statements on to the Federal and State agencies engaged in the NEPA/404 process. He indicated that the Purpose and Need Statements could change as a result of their consideration. He then opened the meeting up to the attendees for comment. The following summarize the main comments.

Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore

Jim Miller – Page 4 east-west mobility is limited – need stronger language – current east west arterials are inadequate to handle traffic projections

Juan Perez – Concern that Diamond valley lake is not fully accounted for.

Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County

Craig Neustaedter indicated that his concern is over where the emphasis lies more than in the content. There seems to be primary emphasis on relieving 60/215. But a more important aspect is that this area is a cohesive unit with a high level of interaction between MV and SB cities. Currently, there is a deficient roadway infrastructure in this urbanizing area. We have rural farm roads serving an urbanizing population. Safety of these roadways is an issue. It is also important to mention additional activity centers that exist in this area. The fact that the best means of transit access for this area is via a link to the Highgrove station and this should be emphasized. There is

a need to improve access to commuter rail for Moreno Valley residents. We also need to update socioeconomic forecasts and networks for this corridor. The forecasts appear low possibly because of the deficient roadway infrastructure being assumed in the model.

Peter Kiriakos – The Sierra Club has passed a resolution opposing addition of new lanes through the Badlands for the following reasons: it is part of the desired wildlife corridors, it is proposed as a state park, and it is a unique setting representing what much of the area previously looked like.

Bob Perkins – One of purposes is to preserve right of way for a preferred alternative. We need to be thinking of linkages to freeways to the north and it is not clear that the process has addressed these linkages.

Craig Neustaedter – Emphasizing the point above, there is a need for route continuity/access to the freeways on the San Bernardino County side of this corridor.

John Hunt – The current feeder route for I-10 is SR-60. Currently, we have a problem of diversion through Beaumont to connect the freeways. We need to have something done in that area.

Peter Kiriakos – San Timoteo Greenway Conservancy has brought to attention the area where Route 30 comes into Redlands. The City of Redlands has passed an amendment to their General Plan to keep that area in a natural state.

Banning/Beaumont to Temecula

Gary Thornhill – The City of Temecula has some real geographic constraints that are close to being analogous to the 91 problem. Currently, there is no access southerly and the SR-79 needs to be looked at now. We don't have 10 to 15 years.

Juan Perez – Juan provided a presentation on the City of Hemet's perspectives on the problems, issues, and needs in both the Banning/Beaumont to Temecula and in the Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore corridors. He indicated the City's strong support for transportation improvements in these two corridors. Copies of documentation of the issues and perspectives was provided to advisory committee members, including color maps of the area.

Riverside County to Orange County

Borre Winkel – How much time would be saved with a new corridor? We have an opportunity to create a higher assessed value. We should also stress the importance of education; this in turn lifts up the economy of Riverside County.

Bob Perkins – This corridor would not only provide congestion relief for the 91, but could provide congestion relief on 15 and 215. This corridor is the key to the whole process.

Peter Kiriakos – Put an index at the front of the document. Pete provided a copy of a letter from the Sierra Club San Gorgonio Chapter to the Riverside and Orange County Boards of Supervisors stating the Sierra Club's concerns about the Riverside County to Orange County Corridor. The text of the letter states: The Sierra Club of California, and the San Gorgonio and Angeles Chapters of the Sierra Club jointly resolve: "We oppose the construction of new freeway routes or the expansion of the existing routes through the environmentally sensitive Santa Ana mountains and the adjacent Orange County Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) areas."

After discussion, the committee approved Working Paper 5 to be forwarded to the Federal and State agencies, with consideration for the comments made.

7. Discussion of Working Paper 4, Evaluation Criteria for Alternatives

(Steve Smith, CETAP Project Manager)

Steve entertained comments regarding information in Working Paper 4

Craig Neustaedter – The participation of other jurisdictions is needed, especially on alternatives that they would like to promote. We should use community support as a factor, i.e. the relative strength of support. The accessibility to major activity centers should be a factor. The activity

centers should be mapped or identified in the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino corridor including employment centers in I-215/I-10 area – for example, MV mall and the Highgrove Metrolink station. We should also add alignment feasibility. We need to identify cross-section standards and test scenarios on topographical maps. This also applies to transit alternatives. Traffic modeling is an issue. We should look at other modeling sources as useful to particular travel demand characteristics.

Bob Perkins – We need to include connectivity in our analysis. It needs to be spelled out including connectivity to other corridors and how it fits in with the larger transportation system. Currently we have livable communities and we are planning for a population increase. The government role should be to determine what people desire and respond to it. The government should plan for the infrastructure to support population growth.

Juan Perez– The accessibility issue should be broadened beyond employment to include recreational activities and destination centers for tourism. We also need to be careful with safety. Some of the corridors will alleviate congestion from other corridors but Ramon expressway, for example, has a high accident history. Community acceptance and support is also an important factor.

John Hunt – It is important that we do things that are positive. If we do, we will have support of the community. We should also look at safety on a smaller scale and the impacts on a community. There is a need to talk to policy makers in the communities and reach out to them. People need to be updated.

Peter Kiriakos– Under the environment section, there are several things that may be worth adding. These include a series of multi-species plans that will be legal commitments (consistency with the MSHCP should possibly be a factor).

The question was raised regarding if we should also add affordability as a factor.

After discussion, the committee approved Working Paper 4 to be forwarded to the Federal and State agencies, with consideration for the comments made.

8. Discussion of initial alternatives to be considered in the four corridors

(Steve Smith, CETAP Project Manager)

Steve provided an overview of the transportation alternatives that had been initially identified up to this point in time on the memo that had been distributed with the agendas. He highlighted some of the highway alternatives on a Powerpoint projection of aerial photographs prepared by Sverdrup. Committee members provided several additional ideas for transportation alternatives for consideration in the analysis of the four corridors. Following this discussion, the committee approved the list of alternatives for initial evaluation.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 12:05pm