



## RIVERSIDE COUNTY INTEGRATED PLAN (RCIP)

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

**Tuesday, July 10th, 2000**  
**9:00 AM – Noon**

### MEETING NOTES

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

Andy Domenigoni, Supervisor's Appointee  
Susan Hafner, RTA  
Frank Hall, Supervisors Appointee  
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club  
Stan Lisiewicz, Caltrans  
Ameal Moore, RCTC  
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC  
Bob Perkins, Farm Bureau  
Ron Roberts, RCTC  
Dan Silver, Endangered Habitats League  
Debra Varnado, SCAG  
Gary Wanczuk, MSHCP Advisory Committee  
Borre Winckel, BIA  
Helga Wolf, Supervisor's Appointee  
Won S. Yoo, RANPAC  
Glen Campbell, OCTA  
Craig Neustaedter, Moreno Valley  
Joyce Deleo, Supervisors Appointee

Alan Crouse, WRCOG  
Wyatt Haupt, North County Times  
Jim Henderson, RCIP Project Manager  
Eric Jacobsen, S.B. County Public Works  
Transportation  
Joe Jensen, Sverdrup Civil  
Richard Masyczek, City of Hemet  
Sandra Massa-Lavitt, City of Temecula  
Rob McCann, LSA  
David Miller, TransCore  
Bill Mosby, Caltrans  
Anne Palatino, City of Corona  
Erik Ruehr, VRPA Technologies  
Steve Smith, TransCore  
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA  
Rusty Thornton, Caltrans  
Anwar Wagdy, City of San Bernardino  
Meredith Wichman, Sverdrup Civil  
Kimberly Wilder, Community Access Center  
Laurence Wilson, RBF  
Mohamad Younes, PBS & J  
Bob Ziprick, City of Loma Linda

#### **Other Attendees:**

Cathy Bechtel, RCTC  
Bill Blankenship, BIA

Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair, began the meeting at 9:10 AM.

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

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

There were no public comments.

#### **2. Approval of meeting notes from June 6<sup>th</sup>**

(Robin Lowe, Chair)

There were no comments on the meeting notes from June 6<sup>th</sup> and they were approved.

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

(Gary Wanczuk, MSCHP Advisory Committee Chair)

The MSHCP Advisory Committee has recommended five alternatives to be developed by the consultant team. These include the "no project," existing trends, a full MSHCP covering all 164

species, an alternative covering listed and proposed listed species, and an alternative covering listed, proposed, and other strong candidate species.

The General Plan Advisory Committee is reviewing the various area plans before they are taken out to the public workshops. Joe Richards is now the chair of the General Plan Advisory Committee.

#### **4. Report from CETAP Transit Task Force**

(Susan Hafner, Riverside Transit Agency)

The Transit Task Force has had excellent participation to date. The last meeting involved a look at some of the implementation principles that may be considered as the Transit Oasis Concept is taken further. Susan asked CETAP committee members to participate in a rail review meeting with several national experts. This will include a look at what other areas are doing, a review of demographics and growth trends and an assessment of the applicability of all modes of rail to Riverside County. The meeting will be held July 31, August 1, and August 2. It was decided that the August 1 meeting would be added to the next CETAP agenda and would take place from 8:30 to 10:30 a.m. as the first part of the CETAP meeting.

Robin Lowe raised the point of SCAG's recent omission of March Air Reuse Base (ARB) from the Phase 1 application for the MAGLEV pilot project, which is extremely critical to the Inland Empire. In June, when SCAG had approved the funding, ARB was included. Robin was going to follow up.

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

(Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA)

The process for reviewing projects according to the vision is being implemented. The area plans will go through the same process. The TLMA received a letter from the City of Temecula regarding level of service (LOS). They are asking the County to implement a LOS "D" review for all new development in the Temecula area.

#### **6. Report on June 14<sup>th</sup> action of RCTC and recommendations of RCTC Ad Hoc Committee on CETAP Corridors.**

(Cathy Bechtel, RCTC)

On June 14<sup>th</sup> the recommendation to move four corridors forward was presented to the RCTC Commission. There were several public comments from citizens in San Bernardino County, Moreno Valley, and Temecula. However, the Commission felt that they needed more information, specifically on funding of the work effort, and did not make a decision. The Commission decided to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee to further discuss and make a recommendation. This committee convened on Wednesday July 5<sup>th</sup> to review funding and other issues. Their recommendation with a 5 to 2 vote was to move forward on internal corridors and to allow four to six months for discussion with Orange and San Bernardino Counties to allow that direction to evolve. The Orange County Transportation Authority sent a letter to RCTC indicating that they will appoint four commissioners for a bi-county committee to take up the matter.

Robin Lowe commented that the Ad Hoc committee was formed to avoid a standstill. The underlying recommendation was that none of the four corridors would come to a halt. The two internal corridors would be taken into Tier I environmental. Robin stated that we need to use our connections and find anyone with money and find out how to get it. The emphasis is still on all four corridors. This is a very important message to convey to all.

A period of general comments on the RCTC decision followed. A summary of these comments is provided below.

Borre Winckel – The projections of growth from the RCIP process are enormous. To leave out the Riverside County to Orange County corridor is to send a very bad message. We cannot give this corridor secondary status. We are setting ourselves up for failure. We cannot pay for the MHSCP without the

economic gains that would come from inter-county transportation improvements. We need to keep pushing for some type of new alignment between Riverside and Orange County.

Peter Kiriakos – Orange County will grow at 30 percent and Riverside will see larger growth than this. We need to make the internal corridors our primary effort; instead of supporting Orange County growth, instead of being a bedroom community.

Dan Silver – The Ad Hoc Committee recommended a four to six month study for the external corridors. The CETAP Advisory Committee needs to stay involved in this process, even for the inter-county corridors.

Steve Smith –The inter-county corridors will need to be guided by a bi-county steering group for each corridor. Orange County is designating representatives and San Bernardino has been involved, so the bi-county committees will likely be set up within the next two months. CETAP will get feedback from these groups and can provide input. It will be up to the bi-county committees to determine how each of those would move forward.

Peter Kiriakos – We were told an expansive discussion would take place and we need to have an open process with other parties involved, which includes the environmental community.

## **7. Discussion of draft implementation principles for the Transit Oasis Concept**

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

Steve passed out a draft paper and made a presentation containing initial ideas on implementation principles for the Transit Oasis Concept. Alan Hoffman had made a presentation on the concept for the joint luncheon meeting of the CETAP and General Plan Advisory Committee in June. The paper outlined some of the features that would be included in the Transit Oasis Concept and how those would be reflected and implemented in the context of the General Plan. He illustrated some ways of treating priority lanes for transit vehicles and the interface between express transit and local circulator systems.

## **8. Appointment of members to proposed joint CETAP/GPAC subcommittee on transit and land use.**

It had been suggested at the June Transit Task Force meeting that a joint CETAP/GPAC subcommittee be created to coordinate issues pertaining to transit and land use. Interested members of the CETAP committee were asked to volunteer to be on the subcommittee. The following six members volunteered. Gary Wanczuk, Won Yoo, Ron Roberts, Borre Winckel, Peter Kiriakos, and Dan Silver.

## **9. Discussion of draft General Plan Circulation Element policies.**

(Erik Ruehr, VRPA Technologies)

This draft had been passed out at the June CETAP meeting. The final version of the draft will be formatted in a standard format consistent with the rest of the General Plan. There was a question as to whether we should have different level of service standards for urban and rural areas, as the policies now state. The point was raised that a lower LOS in rural areas could encourage sprawl. The question regarding how the County LOS standard related to the standard for the cities was also raised. A period of comments and questions followed. The following is a brief summary of these.

Bob Perkins – The LOS language could look negative. On page 12 it suggests that the policies are intended to modify behavior. The government should not direct habit, choice, or behavior. This section should be removed.

Dan Silver/Richard Masyczek – This wording is to encourage transit and carpooling, not to mandate the type of mode.

## **10. Discussion concerning inactive members of the CETAP Advisory Committee**

Steve Smith indicated that several of the CETAP Advisory Committee members have been inactive for quite a while. The committee agreed by consensus that a letter should be sent to the Supervisors regarding their appointees and if they would still like to have their appointee on the committee, or replace them.

## **11. Other Business**

Bob Perkins raised an additional question regarding agenda item 6. Bob stated that he is uncomfortable with the RCTC Ad Hoc committee proposal to the Transportation Commission that we should move forward with Tier 1 environmental on the internal corridors and just keep the discussions going on the others. A motion was introduced and seconded to reaffirm the CETAP Advisory Committee's previous recommendation to move all four corridors forward. Dan Silver objected and added the point that there is a minority position within the CETAP Advisory Committee, and that should be noted in the communication to the Commission.

## **12. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.