

RIVERSIDE COUNTY INTEGRATED PLAN (RCIP)

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

Tuesday, June 6th, 2000
9:00 AM – Noon

MEETING NOTES

CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:

Dan Brown, US Fish and Wildlife Service
Jason Dietz, FHWA
Andy Domenigoni, Supervisor's Appointee
Janet Gless, Supervisor's Appointee
Susan Hafner, RTA
Frank Hall, Supervisors Appointee
John Hunt, RCTC
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club
Stan Lisiewicz, Caltrans
Robin Lowe, RCTC
Bob Perkins, Farm Bureau
Gene Rogers, WRCOG TAC
Ron Roberts, RCTC
Dan Silver, Endangered Habitat League
Jack Van Haaster, RCTC
Debra Varnado, SCAG
Gary Wanczuk, MSHCP Advisory Committee
Borre Winckel, BIA
Helga Wolf, Supervisor's Appointee
Won S. Yoo, RANPAC

Bonnie Flickinger, MPT-Moreno Valley
Andrea Gullo, State Parks
Jim Henderson, Sverdrup
Kathy Kivley, City of Colton
Sandra Massa-Lavull, City of Temecula
Shirley Medina, RCTC
David Miller, TransCore
Jim Miller, City of Murieta
Bill Mosby, Caltrans
Craig Neustaedter, City of Moreno Valley
Tim O'Leary, Press-Enterprise
Steve Oller, RTA
Nancy Pfefer, SCAG
Trent Pulliam, Moreno Valley
Dick Riddell, City of Yucaipa
Erik Ruehr, VRPA Technologies
Lee Smith, Riv. Co. TLMA
Steve Smith, TransCore
Susan Streble, Perris
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA
Joe Suarez, San Bernardino
Gary Thornhill, City of Temecula
Rusty Thornton, Caltrans
Merideth Wichman, Sverdrup
Anwar Wagdy, City of San Bernardino
Bob Wolf, CTC
Mohammad Younes, PBS&J

Other Attendees:

Don Archer, Sverdrup
Cathy Bechtel, RCTC
Bill Blankenship, BIA
Sharon Bolton, California Land Institute
Keith Butler, E2M
Alan Crouse, WRCOG

Robin Lowe, Chair, began the meeting at 9:20 AM. General introductions followed.

The meeting was opened by a presentation by Steve Smith (TransCore, CETAP Project Manager) on the review of the draft recommendations for moving the CETAP corridors forward. A memo describing the draft consultant recommendations was included with the agenda mailout. The presentation served as an introduction and also addressed agenda item 6. The item was moved to the front to help provide a context for the public comment period. Steve indicated the importance of all four corridors to the future of Riverside County and that all four were being recommended to move forward, but in different ways. The Banning/Beaumont to Temecula corridor and Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore corridor were recommended for initiation of the Tier 1 CEQA/NEPA process. The Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County corridor was recommended for moving forward into a bi-county effort to develop a program of arterial improvements and to look at additional options for addressing mobility in the SR-60/I-215 corridor. The Riverside County to Orange County corridor was recommended for continuation of the dialogue with Orange County

to formulate a scope of work within the next six months for addressing the transportation issues in the corridor. Steve indicated that these recommendations were to serve as a starting point for discussion by the committee and had been formulated to stay within the allotted consultant budget for CETAP.

1. Public Comment Period

(Robin Lowe, Chair)

Robin opened the floor for comments from the public. Public parties interested in speaking were asked to fill out a sign up sheet and were called according to topic. The following section gives the speaker's name, and basic position expressed

George Hague, Moreno Valley

Passed out a letter to committee members that declares opposition to any corridor into or through Moreno Valley.

Anne Mckiven, Friends of the Northern San Jacinto Valley

Opposed to the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County corridor.

Betty Wyatt, Reche Canyon

Wants to see safety improved on Reche Canyon Road.

Al Schwartz, Moreno Valley, North-South corridor in Moreno Valley

Reiterated opposition to north-south corridor project and stated support to previous speakers.

Claire Harrington, Reche Canyon,

Spoke in opposition to the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County corridor.

Joe Suarez, San Bernardino council member

He stated that the City of San Bernardino is in support of moving the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County corridor forward.

Kelly Chastain, Colton City Council member,

She stated that they are in favor of the Reche Canyon corridor and that they have city and county support and funding. This will not be a freeway but improvements to the roadways.

Dick Riddel, Mayor of Yucaipa, Reche Canyon

Endorses and supports the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County corridor.

Bonnie Flickinger, Mayor pro-tem Moreno Valley

Requested that the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County corridor be kept in the plan for CEQA/NEPA process.

The following individuals all spoke in opposition to the Date Street option in the Banning/Beaumont to Temecula corridor.

David Edwards, Murrieta

Mike Fitzpatrick, Murrieta

Terry Vernon, Murrieta

Thomas Cox, Murrieta

Terry Kelly, Murrieta

Susan Streble, Lake Mathews

Spoke in opposition to the widening of Cajalco Road and in favor of mass transit.

Anne Palatino, Corona

Passed out a letter from City Manager, Bill Workman to address the committee. The City would like to make sure that all four corridors are maintained. The Corona bypass is not a viable option.

Andrea Gullo, California State Parks

Comment letters have been sent out. We oppose any road through the parks, the core reserves. .

2. Report from MSHCP

(Gary Wanczuk, MSHCP Advisory Committee)

The advisory committee had an illuminating presentation from Todd Olson on the HTM (Habitat Transaction Method). The MSHCP is on track to begin the conservation analysis in the next 4 to 6 weeks.

3. Report from the General Plan Advisory Committee.

(Jim Henderson, Sverdrup)

There was a great deal of discussion on the interim guidelines approved by the Board of Supervisors. Concerns were raised regarding how the guidelines could deal with existing development. Substantial emphasis was placed on the approach to communicating the area plans to the communities at the upcoming outreach meetings. There has also been substantial coordination between the MSHCP Advisory Committee and the General Plan Advisory Committee regarding conservation requirements and land use, including how land use would interface with the Habitat Transaction Method.

4. Report from CETAP Transit Task Force Report

(Steve Smith, TransCore, CETAP Project Manager)

Steve explained that Alan Hoffman provided an overview of the Transit Oasis Concept for Riverside County. Steve indicated that Alan would be giving the same presentation at the joint CETAP/GPAC luncheon meeting following the CETAP Advisory Committee meeting.

5. Report on development projects from Riverside County TLMA

(Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA)

This was a continuation of last month's discussion on projects already in the pipeline. The county has adopted a set of guidelines for the county staff when reviewing such projects. The guidelines are based on the vision statement and the planning principles developed by the General Plan Advisory Committee. The staff now reports on these projects and looks at them against these two criteria. Procedures are beginning to be implemented.

6. Presentation of draft recommendations for moving corridors forward.

(Steve Smith, TransCore, CETAP Project Manager)

This agenda item was covered in the opening presentation by Steve Smith.

7. Discussion, modification, and approval of corridor recommendations

A period of general comments was opened. The following is a brief summary of these comments.

Dan Silver – The consultants have given us something realistic. The Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County corridor should be put into another framework. Dan made the point that we are not choosing alignments or recommending particular outcomes. We should take out the wording in this corridor on the set of arterial improvements and leave the outcome open. We should make it clear that no single roadway is being recommended but rather that arterials and freeways should be looked at by the local governments and stakeholders to make their decisions.

A motion was made by Dan to amend the recommendation to make it clear that we have not decided on anything yet and that nothing has been predetermined. The motion was seconded. It was proposed that the motion be changed to reflect this idea not only in the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County corridor, but in all four corridors.

John Hunt presented his desire that there be presentations to all the cities. Robin Lowe stated that scheduling is in process to make presentations to all the cities.

Dan Silver indicated that if the current recommendation is carried out, it basically is a strategy that says we are going to focus on internal connections at this moment in time, and that we are going to continue the inter-county connections in the form of inter-county coordination. This strategy will help to force the county to look at job growth, internal connections and coordination with land use. In the meantime, we can look at transit to improve inter-county connections for people, but, if the strategy is successful and the focus on internal connections does help to increase jobs, we still have the problem of goods movement and it is not clear how we are going to address the goods movement between Riverside County and Orange County.

The previous motion was again raised and amended by Robin Lowe to state that "For no corridor are we recommending an alignment today." Frank Hall stated that the recommendations already reflect this point. Dan Silver withdrew his motion temporarily and suggested that the motion be discussed at the end of the session.

Borre Winckel indicated that he wanted to go on record as expressing frustration that CETAP has now become an "in county" issue only. He indicated that we are following the road of least resistance by caving into environmental pressures by choosing not to go out of county. We are sending a very bad message to San Bernardino and Orange County that we are in some way giving these corridors less status than our internal issues. It is a complete fallacy and a pipe dream that we can have jobs and housing balance in Riverside County unless we first create umbilical cords to the other counties where those jobs come from or where the investment comes from to have higher job growth. Development of March Air Reserve Base will never be a reality unless we find a way to relieve the congestion on the 91, and the goods movement will also not occur. So will go our education. Riverside County will become a third world country if we do not now today find the alignment and funding to get out of Riverside County. How ironic the CETAP process was to involve the environmental process. We are setting up the MHSCP to fail. The MHSCP cannot be paid for unless we create the tax base in Riverside County by which we acquire the critical funds by which we make the MHSCP a success. You cut off the out of county transportation and the MHSCP will not happen. There is a complete disconnect with staying in county and at the same time going forward with smart growth planning. I will encourage you to reconsider going to four corridors to give everyone equal status.

Gene Rogers spoke on behalf of the WRCOG Technical Advisory Committee. A recommendation from the WRCOG TAC was handed out that states that all four corridors are of priority importance to the county and acknowledged that a phasing plan with a time-certain schedule to address the Orange County and San Bernardino County routes must be identified.

Jack Van Haaster indicated that we are not talking about eliminating corridors but about the degree of emphasis and where the limited amount of funds will go. We are finding that more of our residents are working in the county. Businesses are looking at us now because we do have a workforce here. Jack indicated that because we have a limited amount of funds he would prefer to see them spent within the county as the emphasis; not that we won't have all four corridors, but that we should focus on the two internal corridors first.

Bob Perkins indicated that he came to this committee with the expectation that we were not going to talk about the status quo. This process was going to be about the big picture, the economic future of Riverside County. He agrees with the BIA, that the future of this county and its economic strength relies on its ability to be part of Southern California's economy, which essentially depends upon the corridors that connect us with the routes that goods and services are going to follow. Absolutely we need a new and different connection with the coast and we need to improve the existing corridors that move goods and services into and out of this county. The internal connections are obvious and they will be taken care of through the ordinary course of political business. But that is the status quo, he indicated that he wants to see the big picture. He expressed disappointment that we have come down to a set of recommendations that are essentially status quo. Let's fix this road, let's follow this existing alignment, let's improve this particular corridor over here that already exists. We're not really emphasizing the big picture. If we have to go forward with something, it is to go forward with all four of the corridors because what we've got right now with this recommendation is the status quo. The effort that this committee has put out is not very well reflected in a two corridor proposal.

Frank Hall indicated that he agrees with Bob Perkins. He indicated that he can understand the consultant recommendation because they are in line with the guidelines we set some time ago. But now is the time to step out of the box. We need to have the faith that we can raise the additional money to look at four corridors rather than two corridors. I know that the suggestion was to move ahead with the two corridors into the environmental process.. Any corridor that does not get that status could be perceived as a corridor that we are throwing out. We should not set that tone. We have to bite the bullet, find the money, and go forward with four corridors.

Peter Kiriakos

We are functionally a third world country as far as the internal transportation here. There is no disagreement that we need to stress the external connections. But in the thought of prioritizing, if we can't take the limited resources and apply them to making a strong functional internal network, then we cannot serve the need of the residents, economy, and environment in this area. If we made the main priority increasing the pipeline to Orange County so that people can enter and exit they will continue doing this. There is increasing interest in having significant employment here to go along with the mass of housing increase that will occur. Increasing the internal connections should be the top priority, but we should not ignore the external corridors.

Robin Lowe

When we started this process a year ago we always knew we were going to go to two corridors. It has never been denied by any member that we need to address the route to Orange County. We need to relieve the congestion in Corona. It's a funnel, we know that. We know we have to get the jobs here. When I look at the corridor billed as Hemet to Lake Elsinore I see that as a new corridor to Orange County. We are already working with San Bernardino County. Both these corridors (Orange County and San Bernardino County) are in alignment with the decision the committee is making today. Maybe our recommendation should be that we understand we need to get our people jobs here and to do that we need to address the movement between Orange County and Riverside. We cannot back peddle our responsibility.

Jack Van Haaster stated that we set out to pick two corridors. We have narrowed it down to four. There are limited funds and it has been a tough decision. The future doesn't end, but at this point in time we should focus our energies on two recommended corridors. It is already a given that the two that don't get picked are important and will continue to be worked on.

Cathy Bechtel said that many of the comments this morning all walked around the same thing, that all the corridors are important. The recommendation from the consultant, was based on having a fixed budget. It is inappropriate for them to say, "lets study all of them" and thereby

increase their budget. That's not their place to do that. But, I'm hearing a lot of comments that we need to keep all of them on the plate. I thought the WRCOG Executive & Technical committee recommendation was good and acknowledges that they are all important but that there is a phasing involved. It is the reality that we are not going to move at the same pace on all of them, but we need to keep them all on the plate.

Robin Lowe indicated that some of the comments today stated that the corridor between Moreno Valley and San Bernardino doesn't go anywhere, look north folks. Look at the 30 freeway as it intersects the 15 and the truck traffic that moves those goods that bring jobs and manufacturing.

Borre Winckel said that we were asked to perform a ranking exercise and indicated that he did not know how the consultant came to their conclusions that the two internal corridors have the preference of the advisory committee. Not everyone voted but look at the papers, it is clear that the Banning/Beaumont to Temecula and Riverside to Orange County were the two highest-ranking corridors.

Steve Smith stated that there is no mechanism right now for us to get started on an environmental documentation process for the Orange County corridor. We do not yet have the participation of Orange County, and we must have that. What we tried to do is develop a mechanism to keep that going. And at the point where we have the other counties together with us, we can figure how to proceed. It would be great to have that proceed as rapidly as we can. We all recognize the importance of dealing with that issue. But practically speaking, we have no way right now to initiate an environmental process of the kind we talked about in the other corridors.

Stan Lisiewicz indicated that the best thing to do may be to allow all the corridors to start, and each one can then proceed at the pace at which it can proceed, based on the circumstances.

Robin Lowe stated that our charge is not to look at the dollars. Our charge is to look at the best thing we can do to make a recommendation for our county. It is up to a few of us to go find the money. The Advisory Committee is not confined by money and we have never been. Steve had constraints placed on him but we don't. Don't lose sight of where we are going.

Helga Wolf made a motion to move all four corridors forward for Tier I environmental documentation with the understanding that they may proceed at differing schedules due to the various issues that must be considered within each study area.

Stan Liesewicz seconded the motion.

This motion was approved by a vote of 15 to 3 to be forwarded to RCTC and the Board of Supervisors.

8. the meeting was adjourned at 12:05pm. A joint meeting was then held of the CETAP and GPAC Advisory Committees to hear a presentation on the Transit Oasis Concept.