

**RIVERSIDE COUNTY INTEGRATED PROJECT (RCIP)
CETAP ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

*Riverside County Flood Control District
1995 Market St., Riverside
Tuesday, March 7, 2000
9:00 a.m. - Noon*

MEETING NOTES

CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:

Joyce Deleo, Supervisor's Appointee
Andy Domenigoni, Supervisor's Appointee
Janet Gless, Supervisor's Appointee
Frank Hall, Supervisors Appointee
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club
Stan Lisiewicz, Caltrans
Steve Oller, RTA
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC
Bob Perkins, Farm Bureau
Ron Roberts, RCTC
Gene Rogers, WRCOG TAC
Dan Silver, Endangered Habitat League
Joan Sparkman, Supervisor's Appointee
Debra Varnado, SCAG
Gary Wanczuk, MSHCP Advisory Committee
Helga Wolf, Supervisor's Appointee
Allyn Waggle

Other Attendees:

Cathy Bechtel, RCTC
Keith Butler, E2M
Alan Crouse, WRCOG
Dick Doyle, Caltrans
Andrea Gullo, State Parks
Rob McCann, LSA
Gary Grant, Meadowbrook
Thelma Grant, Meadowbrook
David Miller, TransCore
William Mosby, CALTRANS
Craig Neustaedter, City of Moreno Valley
Anne Palatino, City of Corona
Nancy Pfefer, SCAG
Erik Ruehr, VRPA Technologies
Lee Smith, RVSD Co. TLMA
Steve Smith, TransCore
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA
Hideo Sugita, RCTC
Merdith Wichman, Sverdrup
Mohamad Younes, PBS&J

Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair, began the meeting at 9:15 AM.

1. Public Comment Period

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

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

2. Approval of Meeting Notes

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

Robin requested comments on the meeting notes of February 1, 2000. There were none and the Committee approved the meeting notes.

3. Reports from MSHCP and General Plan Advisory Committees

(Gary Wanczuk, MSHCP chair, and Mel Placilla, Sverdrup RCIP Project Manager)

Gary indicated that the MSHCP had been holding additional stakeholder meetings to help further define a conservation scenario and establish a policy framework for the MSHCP. Mel indicated that the General Plan Advisory Committee was working on Tier 2 principles to guide the development of the General Plan.

4. Presentation on Four Corners Study

(J.D. Douglas, Parsons Brinkerhoff)

J.D. Douglas provided a briefing on the process and recommendations made for the Four Corners Transportation Study. The Four Corners study has been an ongoing effort of the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino to examine transportation needs and solutions in the general area where the four counties come together. J.D. indicated that the Four Corners Steering Committee had recently agreed on a set of recommendations and was moving forward with further actions to prioritize and implement the proposed improvements. He indicated that they had examined several transportation options in the SR-91 corridor and that one of the recommendations was for the extension of the High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes from the current terminus of the FASTRAK lanes to I-15. They had also examined reversible lanes and advised that they had found the engineering issues of reversible lanes to be very challenging and that further proposals should get into sufficient detail to work out the engineering issues.

5. Discussion of Draft Purpose and Need statements

(Steve Smith, TransCore, CETAP Project Manager)

Two Draft Purpose and Need statements were distributed including the Riverside to Orange County corridor and the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County corridor. Steve indicated that the Purpose and Need Statement has become an increasingly important part of transportation studies, particularly in reviews with Federal agencies. A Purpose and Need Statement describes why a transportation action is necessary in the study corridor. It needs to be kept separate from transportation solutions. Solutions need to be identified and evaluated with respect to how well they meet the stated need. The following comments were obtained from committee members.

Add the following statements or topics to the Purpose and Need statements:

- A recognition of the importance of the environment
- A section describing what improvements have already been accomplished and what is being planned.
- A description of coordination with other agencies, projects, and studies.

The following is a list of ideas and issues to be added or considered for individual corridors:

Banning/Beaumont to Temecula

- Environmental/social issues are important in this corridor
- Consider economics as an evaluation factor
- Concern over appropriateness of future land uses in certain areas
- Need to mention commercial/recreational activity centers: Diamond Valley Lake, French Valley Airport, Hemet/Ryan Airport
- Need to serve ground access to air transportation
- Need a section describing the coordination that has already taken place with SCAG.

- Delete the note that describes I-15 backing up on Winchester in Temecula (the interchange was improved)
- Change wording to reflect SR-79 realignment as “critical”.

Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore:

- Identify major sources of traffic within the corridor (recreational/commercial areas, Lowes Distribution, March ARB)
- Mention topographical features/constraints, multi-species reserves

Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County:

- Increasing interaction is occurring among cities within the corridor
- The need in this area is underplayed if you only look at forecasts based on existing number of lanes
- This is an urbanizing area
- Coordination with agencies is difficult due to multiple jurisdictions
- Lack of options forces traffic onto 215/60/91
- Need to find out what percentage of Moreno Valley residents work in San Bernardino County
- Loma Linda study revealed 15% worked in Moreno Valley
- The best option for Moreno Valley Metrolink is Highgrove station in Riverside
- Roadway access to rail stations is important

Riverside County to Orange County:

- Congestion overflows onto NORCO streets as well as Corona.
- Strong east west movement north of the 91

6. Presentation on SCAG Performance Indicators

(Debra Varnado, Principal Planner – SCAG Planning and Policy Department)

Debra made a presentation on the SCAG performance indicators. The presentation described the nine performance indicators that SCAG currently uses for evaluation of the RTP. These indicators are used to show system performance and to improve the planning process including helping with tradeoffs and choices. The indicators were summarized in a paper distributed to the committee and are listed below as well.

- Mobility, Accessibility, Environment, Reliability, Safety, Livable Communities, Equity, Cost-effectiveness, and Customer Satisfaction.
- SCAG is also considering adding an additional indicator titled “Transportation Sustainability”.

The committee stressed the need for CETAP to continue “thinking outside the box”. Debra indicated that CETAP should try to use all the performance indicators in some form.

7. Discussion of evaluation criteria to be used for evaluation of CETAP alternatives

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

Steve discussed draft Working Paper No. 4, Evaluation Criteria for Alternatives. He indicated that the SCAG performance indicators had been used as a starting point, but a number of factors were added, particularly in the environmental area, and other adjustments were made. Steve asked the committee members to return comments on the Draft Purpose and Need Statements and Evaluation Criteria within two weeks.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:08pm