

**RIVERSIDE COUNTY INTEGRATED PLAN (RCIP)
CETAP ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Assembly Community Room, Registrar of Voters
2724 Gateway Drive
Riverside, CA
Tuesday, January 4th, 2000
9:00 AM – Noon**

MEETING NOTES

CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:

Sandra Balmir, Federal Highway Administration/Federal Transit Administration
Dan Brown, US Fish and Wildlife Service
Barry Burnell, Riverside County Property Owners
Janet Gless, Supervisor's Appointee
John Hunt, WRCOG
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club
Stan Lisiewicz, Caltrans
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC
Steve Oller, RTA
Ron Roberts, RCTC
Gene Rogers, WRCOG TAC
Dan Silver, Endangered Habitat League
Gary Wanczuk, MSHCP Advisory Committee
Borre Winckel, BIA
Helga Wolf, Supervisor's Appointee
Won S. Yoo, RANPAC

Other Attendees:

Don Archer, Sverdrup
Cathy Bechtel, RCTC
Sharon Bolton, BIA
Alan Crouse, WRCOG
Dave Downey, The Californian
Maurice Eaton, Caltrans D-8
Beth Kueh, Sverdrup
Rob McCann, LSA
Jim Miller, City of Murrieta
Anne Palatino, City of Corona
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA
Hideo Sugita, RCTC
King Thomas, LSA
Merdith Wichman, Sverdrup
Jane Williams, City of Moreno Valley
Mohamad Younes, PBS&J

1. Public Comment Period

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair, began the meeting at 9:20 AM, welcomed members to the meeting, and provided some opening comments. Self-introductions followed. Robin then opened the floor for comments from the public. There were no comments from the public. Ron Roberts raised

concern over cities with newly elected council members who have no knowledge regarding CETAP. It was noted that communication with the cities was very important to be able to continue working as a team in Riverside County. He indicated that the City of Temecula is holding a workshop on Tuesday January 18th. He stressed the importance of outreach to the cities, as did several other committee members.

2. Approval of Meeting Notes

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

Robin asked if there were any comments on the meeting notes of December 7, 1999. There were none and the Committee approved the meeting notes.

3. Reports from MSHCP and General Plan Advisory Committees

Gary Wanczuk provided an update on progress of the MSHCP Advisory Committee. He indicated that recent discussions have focused on approaches to implementation, such transaction methods, fee structures, share of federal versus local match, etc. The report on the General Plan was deferred until Dick Ramella's presentation on land use issues.

4. December 21st Workshop Update

(Mel Placilla, RCIP Project Manager)

Mel Placilla indicated that a presentation on the RCIP was given to the Riverside County Board of Supervisors on December 21 to provide an update on RCIP status and forthcoming issues the Board would need to be considering. Mel indicated that the Board adopted the RCIP vision statement at their meeting on December 22, with a request to include a statement regarding migrant worker housing.

5. Presentation, discussion, and approval of revised recommendation on corridors to move forward to CETAP Phase II, and associated actions

(Steve Smith, CETAP Project Manager)

Steve stated that the follow-up meeting on December 16 regarding the corridor recommendations was very helpful, and the comments from the attendees at that meeting were added into the draft. A redline/strikeout version of the recommendations was distributed to committee members to indicate the changes that had been made since the first draft. Steve covered the changes point by point.

A group discussion of the corridor recommendations followed, with each Advisory Committee member having an opportunity to comment. Changes to the recommendations included the addition of the idea of a network of bikeways and pathways, and rephrasing of the Banning/Beaumont to Temecula corridor recommendation to be consistent with the phrasing in the Riverside County to Orange County corridor recommendation. The recommendations were approved by consensus, with the indicated additions. The recommendations will be forwarded to the RCTC and County Board of Supervisors for approval.

6. Presentation and Discussion of Riverside County roadway level of service

(Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA)

An excerpt from the Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan regarding the public facilities and services element was handed out as the basis of the presentation. Ed Studor began the presentation on Riverside County's current policies regarding the level of service, indicating that LOS C was the current standard. Ed indicated that the policy states that projects that have little impact, or have an overriding benefit to the community, can be allowed a lower LOS. It was stated that the new plan needs policies for LOS. It is necessary to look at both urban and rural

areas because the LOS and requirements are different. An open discussion followed with the main points briefly listed below.

- Peter Kiriakos raised the issue regarding pedestrian safety. He indicated that cities are designed for vehicles, making walking difficult. Walking should be encouraged and emphasized by design. It was stated that Section 217.2 of the General Plan should be re-worked to reflect this.
- The county LOS is not applicable to the cities but only to county roads. Cities have their own standards and concerns. (Ed Studor)
- Hideo Sugita indicated that the Riverside County Congestion Management Program was established in response to state law requiring that the urban counties monitor the impact of development and provide a structure for mitigation. Originally, the CMP required studies for development projects. In 1996 the RCTC's CMP was retooled to focus mainly on monitoring congestion and traffic growth. A new program is in the works to use the CALTRANS loop detectors to count and monitor traffic and give reports on the LOS bi-annually to allow the targeting of areas for application of resources by the RCTC.

7. Presentation and discussion on characteristics and locations of transit supportive land use nodes, and relationship to the transit system

(Dick Ramella, General Plan project manager, The Planning Center)

Steve Smith introduced Dick Ramella and provided some introductory comments on the transit spine network being considered in the CETAP process. He indicated the importance of supporting the transit system with corresponding land use decisions and indicated that it was important to define potential locations and types of land use nodes in western Riverside County.

Dick Ramella provided a summary of guidelines and key lessons learned from the Planning Center's work on the Centerline transit project in Orange County and their work in San Diego. He distributed a sample set of policies from the Centerline project as an example. Dick reviewed the Planning Center's work in the last seven months of information gathering and plan development for the General Plan. He indicated that the VISION has some differences from the normal way Riverside County has been developing. He indicated that general surveys of citizens taken during the outreach program indicated that citizens desire their communities to have and a sense of place with a central location that can serve as a focal point for their community. To implement the VISION will require the allowance of some higher density development, designed more for access by pedestrians, accompanied by a good public transportation system. Dick provided several examples of areas in San Diego and Sacramento they had worked on that achieve these objectives. The main idea is to move away from sheet-type development to mixed-use development. However, the concern is that these mixed-use community centers could be difficult to develop when there are many property owners. An open discussion of these concepts followed.

8. Request for distribution of CETAP Advisory Committee member mailing list

(Cathy Bechtel, RCTC)

The issue was raised over whether to provide the CETAP Advisory Committee mailing list to a requesting agency or individual. There were no objections to distribution of the mailing list, and concerns regarding addresses, etc should be directed toward Cathy Bechtel or Steve Smith. A request was made for attendees wanting to receive e-mail notifications to add their e-mail on the sign-up sheet.

9. Adjournment

The next meeting is scheduled for February 1st at 9:00 at the same location. The meeting was adjourned at 11:35 AM.