

**RIVERSIDE COUNTY INTEGRATED PLAN (RCIP)**

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

**Tuesday, May 2nd, 2000**  
**9:00 AM – Noon**

**MEETING NOTES**

**CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:**

Andy Domenigoni, Supervisor's Appointee  
Janet Gless, Supervisor's Appointee  
Susan Hafner, RTA  
Frank Hall, Supervisors Appointee  
John Hunt, WRCOG  
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club  
Stan Lisiewicz, Caltrans  
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC  
Bob Perkins, Farm Bureau  
Ron Roberts, RCTC  
Gene Rogers, WRCOG TAC  
Dan Silver, Endangered Habitats League  
Debra Vernado, SCAG  
Gary Wanczuk, MSHCP Advisory Committee  
Borre Winckel, BIA  
Helga Wolf, Supervisor's Appointee  
Allyn Waggle, Supervisor's Appointee  
Borre Winckel  
Helga Wolf, Supervisor's Appointee  
Won S. Yoo, RANPAC

**Other Attendees:**

Don Archer, Sverdrup  
Cathy Bechtel, RCTC  
Tom Boyd, City of Riverside  
W. Cunningham, Redlands, Assn.  
Lee Ann Garcia, City of Grand Terrace  
Alan Crouse, WRCOG  
Gary George, City of Redlands  
Andrea Gullo, State Parks  
T. Milford Harrison, S.B. Co. Supervisor Jerry Eaves  
Kerrie Hudson, Caltrans District 8  
Wesley Hysten, PSC  
Kathy Kivley, City of Colton  
Mark Knorringa, Oak Valley  
Sandra Massa-Lavitt, City of Temecula  
Richard Masyczek, City of Hemet  
Patrizia Materassi, City of Grand Terrace  
Rob McCann, LSA  
Shirley Medina, RCTC  
Jim Miller, City of Murrieta  
R.A. Moore, Citizen, City of Redlands  
Craig Neustaedter, City of Moreno Valley  
Tim O-Leary, Press Enterprise  
Steve Oller, RTA

Susan Pepler, Relands City Council  
Nancy Pfeffer, SCAG  
Mel Placilla, Sverdrup  
Trent Pulliam, City of Moreno Valley  
Dick Riddell, Yucaipa Mayor  
Erik Ruehr, VRPA Technologies  
Ty Schuiling, SANBAG  
Thomas Schwab, City of Grand Terrace  
Jeffrey L. Shaw, City of Redlands  
Lee Smith, RVSD Co. TLMA  
Steve Smith, TransCore  
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA  
King Thomas, LSA  
Gary Thornhill, City of Temecula  
Rusty Thornton, Caltrans District 8  
Georgina Vivian VRPA Technologies  
Tetra W., County of San Bernardino  
Anwar Wagdy, City of San Bernardino  
Meridith Wichman, Sverdrup  
Gary Warkentin, RBF  
Bob Wheeler, EMA/RCD  
Bob Ziprick, City of Loma Linda

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

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

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

Kathy Kivley, City of Colton, speaking for Deirdre Bennett, Mayor Pro Tem, indicated that the City is very much interested in pursuing the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County corridor. However, they are not interested in a freeway but a four-lane roadway for Reche Canyon that is resident friendly. A task force has been formed to help guide the development of the project.

#### **2. Approval of Meeting Notes**

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

Robin requested comments on the meeting notes of April 4th, 2000. There were none, and the Committee approved the meeting notes.

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

(Gary Wanczuk, MSCHP Advisory Committee Chair)

The MSHCP Advisory Committee is addressing implementation and preserve assembly options. This includes policies, discussion of the Habitat Transaction Method (HTM), and fee structures. They have developed a matrix with potential MSHCP policies and applicability of policies to individual conservation units.

(Jim Henderson, Sverdrup)

The General Plan Advisory Committee has been dealing with land use policy issues, jointly working with the MSHCP Advisory Committee. They have been working on land use designations, with some slight changes to what was originally proposed. They are addressing how we deal with ongoing projects that are in the pipeline, with respect to addressing the RCIP vision. Ed Studor indicated that there will be a staff report each month from TLMA on current projects in the pipeline. The General Plan Principles are in their 10<sup>th</sup> addition. The Planning Center is working toward a roll out of the area plans beginning in late June.

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

(Susan Hafner, Riverside Transit Agency)

Approximately 40 people attended the first Transit Task Force meeting on April 13 at RTA. There were presentations from the transit operators on the status of their existing operations and plans for the future. Alan Hoffman then provided a presentation on some of the latest research on transit travel behavior and how it might relate to Riverside County. Steve Smith and Al Bell identified existing and potential activity nodes that could be connected by transit. Discussion items included issues concerning the connection between transit and land use.

## **5. Distribution and discussion of first cut policy concepts for Circulation Element of the General Plan**

(Georgina Vivian, VRPA Technologies)

Ed Studor introduced the item by explaining that presentations had been made earlier on existing policies in the Circulation Element of the General Plan. This item begins to introduce possible options we may have to change or adjust those policies, and to add new ones, if appropriate. Georgina provided a handout regarding several key policy issues to bring before the committee. She indicated that of the goals, objectives, and policies, the policies are the most important, as they set the stage for how the Circulation Element will be implemented. Policy areas discussed included:

- Highway level of service – options include maintaining current policy at level of service C, allowing level of service to fall to D, allow level of service D in the urban areas but maintain level of service C in the rural areas
- Trails – Sample policies focus on implementation and maintenance issues.
- Transit – Sample policies include possible incentives to foster transit-friendly development and provision of infrastructure that improves transit operations.
- Design standards – A major goal of the circulation element is to promote consistency in treatments between the County and City. Sample policies would address how design standards are implemented in the sphere areas of the cities.
- Transit node/activity center design – Sample policies apply to design criteria that may be appropriate for enhancing transit services in Riverside County.

## **6. Distribution, presentation, and discussion of draft Working Paper No. 6, Screening-Level Evaluation of Alternatives in the Four CETAP Priority Corridors**

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

Steve distributed copies of Working Paper No. 6, Screening-Level Evaluation of Alternatives in the Four CETAP Priority Corridors. He reviewed the contents of the working paper and highlighted some of the items that the committee should be looking for as they review the material. He then provided a review of the results for each individual corridor. After the discussion of each corridor, attendees were asked to provide any comments that pertained to that corridor, so that the Advisory Committee would have the benefit of their perspectives.

Representative comments received include the following:

- City of Redlands - The City can envision some straightening and safety improvements on San Timoteo Canyon Road, but they do not want it widened to four lanes. They would like to see it connected to California Street.
- Moreno Valley – Advocated for further development of the north-south corridor. It is important for the economy and we have a unique opportunity now as San Bernardino county cities are clearly interested. The City's second choice is the Riverside County to Orange County connection
- City of Loma Linda supports Reche Canyon improvements, as identified by Colton and new connection of San Timoteo to California Street
- Yucaipa – We need to consider multiple improvements to help spread traffic out. Live Oak Canyon Road will not be much help to anyone.

- Gene Rogers – We need to strike while the iron is hot. There is a lot of momentum for this right now.
- Helga Wolf – We need to focus on the improvements that will promote economic growth. The I-215 corridor is the growth corridor for the next job center in Riverside County. Supporting movement toward the coast should be our first priority.
- City of Murrieta - We need to be looking at internal circulation for the county. The I-215 is the real growth corridor for the county, and it is the future for Murrieta.
- Borre Winckel - The Orange County connection is the job creator for Riverside county – if we fail to create the Orange County connection, the jobs will not come – we need the land valuation to support the infrastructure investment.
- Ron Roberts - The Banning/Beaumont to Temecula corridor has to happen. If two others are chosen to be higher priority, this has to be a third. It cannot be ignored.
- Hemet - The City believes that we should focus on internal corridors.
- Dan Silver – The committee needs more guidance on the extent to which each of the corridors promote job growth in Riverside County.

**7. Discussion of process for selecting two corridors to forward into full environmental documentation and alternatives to be considered in each**

**8. Distribution and explanation of comment forms for ranking corridors**

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

Steve took both these items together. He distributed a memorandum with attachments requesting that advisory committee members rank the corridors in priority based on information in Working Paper 6, and other discussions that had occurred in this meeting and past meetings. In addition, alternatives for possible elimination should be identified. Steve indicated that the responses from the committee members would be compiled and distributed to the committee and that responses were needed by May 16.

**9. Comments from advisory committee members on corridors**

(The comments were received under item 6)

**10. Scheduling of possible task force meeting to discuss information in Working Paper No. 6**

A meeting was scheduled for May 11 at 9 a.m. at RCTC to allow anyone who had questions about Working Paper 6 to ask those questions or to make comments to the consultant team.

**11. Public comment period**

No additional public comments were provided.

**12. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m.