



RIVERSIDE COUNTY INTEGRATED PROJECT (RCIP)

CETAP ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

**The Simpson Center
305 E. Devonshire
Hemet, CA**

**Tuesday, November 7th, 2000
9 AM – Noon**

MEETING NOTES

CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:

Dan Brown, US Fish & Wildlife Service
Joyce Deleo, Supervisors Appointee
Frank Hall, Supervisorial District # 2, Norco
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club
Stan Lisiewicz, Caltrans
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC
Bob Perkins, Farm Bureau
Ron Roberts, RCTC
Gene Rogers, WRCOG representative
Dan Silver, Endangered Habitats League
Debra Varnado, SCAG
Gail Wanczuk-Barton, MSHCP Advisory Chair
Borre Winckel, BIA
Won S. Yoo, Supervisor's appointee

Other Attendees:

Mike Amling, LSA
Cathy Bechtel, RCTC
Bill Blankenship, BIA
Tom Boyd, City of Riverside
Jim Cardigus, RSD Group Inc.
John Petrick, Colton resident
Brian Grattidge, Office of Planning & Research
Thomas Ittig, Hemet resident
Bill Landon, Morongo/Cabazon Project

David Pope, CPTC

Sandra Massa-Lavitt, City of Temecula
Rob McCann, LSA
Pat Melvin, Valley Economic Development Coop
Mike McCullough, Sverdrup
Pamela Miod, CFTV
Craig Neustaedter, Moreno Valley
Anne Palatino, City of Corona
Juan C. Perez, City of Hemet
Trent Pullian, City of Moreno Valley
Ron Rauch, RSD Group Inc.
George Roberts, Jr., NAIOP-IE
Louise Rocke, Colton resident
Roger Scherer, City of Murrieta
Lee Smith, Riverside County Transportation
Steve Smith, TransCore
Doreen Statlander, US Fish and Wildlife Service
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA
Ruthann Taylor-Berger, WRCOG
Steve Temple, City of Hemet
Rusty Thornton, Caltrans
Steve Wood, Domenigoni-Barton Properties
Merideth Wichman, Sverdrup
Kimberly Wilder, GPAC member-CAC/CAP

Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair, began the meeting at 9:00 AM.

1. Public Comment Period

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)
There were no public comments.

2. Approval of meeting notes from October 3

(Robin Lowe, Chair)

The meeting notes October 3 were not able to be prepared as of the meeting date and will be distributed prior to the December meeting.

3. Report from MSHCP Advisory Committee and General Plan Advisory Committee (Gail Wanczuk-Barton, MSHCP Chair)

The MSHCP is considering the alternatives prepared by Dudek and also working on the finance and implementation strategy. The committee is awaiting a response from the Scientific Review Panel and ultimately the Fish & Wildlife Service in order to make a recommendation on the alternatives to the Board of Supervisors in December.

Robin Lowe stated that a set of meetings is being held on the MSHCP on November 15th with appointments being set with each of the cities. This will facilitate a discussion with each city of where we are, how we got there, and where we need to go with the entire integrated plan. The intent is to bring everyone to the same point of knowledge, and get greater city involvement on the process. There is a major concern that the interest level is not the same in every city. These meetings will be held at Sverdrup offices in Riverside. Review of the land use plans and work on the incentives program is continuing in the General Plan Advisory Committee.

4. Report on development projects from Riverside County TLMA

(Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA)

Ed Studor briefly presented information on the status of several development projects. There is an amendment to The Farm project. This has possible impacts to our Scott Rd alternative and would bring additional traffic to the Scott Rd interchange. The French Valley Specific Plan has impacts just south of Keller Rd. Specific Plan 519 is a current dairy agricultural use. This would change to R-2. This is consistent with what we have discussed for the Mira Loma area. Specific Plan 313 is south of the City of Temecula on Morgan Hill. It would be an expansion of an urban area that is currently agricultural. This would be a concern for alternatives 5 and 6. General plan amendment number 523 will be discussed at tomorrow's meeting. It is in the Wild Rose area along I-15 near the Temescal Interchange. This is consistent with land use proposed for that area and does not affect any alternatives within the corridor.

At this point in the meeting Robin Lowe introduced Brian Grattidge who was representing the Governor's Office of Planning & Research. Robin brought attention to a partnership agreement for the RCIP that was recently signed by Federal, State, and local agencies. Copies of the agreement were distributed.

5. Selection of members to serve on an RCIP integration subcommittee.

(Robin Lowe, CETAP Committee Chair)

Robin indicated that an additional RCIP advisory committee was being formed to provide input to the integration of the three RCIP elements. Members would be identified from each of the three current advisory committees. Robin asked for those interested to contact Cathy Bechtel.

6. Summary of CETAP Public Workshops

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

Steve Smith handed out summaries of comments received at the CETAP public workshops on October 30 (Lake Elsinore), November 2 (Perris), and November 6 (Temecula). He provided an overview of the workshops. The workshops were held in an open house format between 4 p.m. and 8:30 p.m. each of the three nights, with brief presentations on the CETAP corridors followed by discussion group opportunities. The handout included a summary of the comments from each of the discussion groups. It was estimated that 150 citizens attended the workshops over the three nights. Steve also handed out written comments from citizens who attended the meetings. He

provided a separate handout with copies of written comments received on the alternatives suggested for elimination by the CETAP advisory committee members or from the cities.

7. Status report on Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County and Riverside County to Orange County corridors.

(Cathy Bechtel, RCTC)

Cathy Bechtel indicated that a meeting was held between Riverside County and Orange County elected officials to open up discussions on the Riverside County to Orange County corridor. Orange County officials desired to learn more about the RCIP, and the meeting provided an opportunity for them to be briefed on what had occurred with the RCIP up to this point. Subsequently, the OCTA Board approved a \$50,000 study to look at transportation issues and perspectives of cities and stakeholder groups pertaining to the corridor. An additional meeting was held with the acting Executive Director and the Director of Planning and Development for OCTA to help define the next steps that should be taken.

The first formal bi-county meeting on the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County corridor was held on November 1 with Riverside County and San Bernardino County elected officials. CETAP project staff made a presentation on the process to date. San Bernardino County officials asked for additional information on traffic volumes and movements. They would like to have a staff level committee and talked about meeting again in roughly six weeks.

8. Presentation on status of Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan and implications for CETAP

(Joe Monaco, Dudek)

Joe Monaco provided a presentation of the MSHCP and gave a background and description on the three MSHCP alternatives. The presentation also described how these alternatives relate to the CETAP corridors. Major areas of proposed habitat conservation were noted as well as specific possible conflicts with proposed CETAP alternatives. The following is a brief summary of comments made after the presentation.

Peter Kiriakos pointed out the most sensitive habitat areas from the Sierra Club's point of view.

A general question was raised over possible conflicts with Indian Lands. It was pointed out that alternatives 5b and 6b in the Banning/Beaumont to Temecula corridor pass near or through the Pechanga Indian Reservation.

Borre Winkel raised the question of whether individual species were analyzed in regards to possible conflicts and how alternatives were analyzed to indicate general areas of potential impact. It was indicated by project staff that we are at a screening level currently, and the extent and level of impact would be identified in greater detail. Today's meeting had the purpose of screening down the alternatives to those that should be carried into the environmental documentation stage, not to get to the point of one alternative.

Bob Perkins stated that it is possible to have joint acquisition of right-of-way for transportation alternatives and for the MSHCP and that the advantages and disadvantages of such a joint effort should be explored.

9. Presentation of consultant recommendation on alternatives to be carried forward into detailed study and environmental documentation.

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

Steve Smith presented the draft recommendations of the RCIP consultant team for alternatives to be carried forward into the environmental documentation stage for both the Banning/Beaumont to Temecula and Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore corridors. The draft recommendations were

contained in a memorandum to the CETAP advisory committee, handed out at the meeting. Steve emphasized that these were draft recommendations and that the committee could take whatever direction they deemed to be appropriate.

**10. Committee recommendation on alternatives to be carried forward for
Banning/Beaumont to Temecula and Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore Corridors**

A discussion was held on the consultant's draft recommendation. The following is a brief summary of committee member's comments on the alternatives.

Ron Roberts – Clinton Keith is a better option than Scott Rd. Date Street will be an arterial in the future, projected to carry 40,000 vehicles per day, based on City of Temecula studies. Regarding alternative 5b, the eastern bypass at the south end has conflicts with a possible Indian hotel, golf course, and cultural center. There is a great deal of possible conflict in this area and it must be handled delicately. Rainbow Canyon Rd creates possible issues with San Diego County.

Ed Studor – Another possibility is the use of Pala Road to SR-76 to I-15; there are conflicts with the Pala Indian Reservation however.

Borre Winkel – Borre raised the question over how the cost of alternatives was computed. This was answered that the alternatives were examined at a planning level in terms of how much they might cost, and methods of funding (such as tolls) were not yet evaluated. Borre also raised the point that eliminating alternatives 2 and 3 in the Banning/Beaumont to Temecula corridor endangers the viability of French Valley Airport.

Bob Perkins – Anything into the SR-91 is a major problem, there is no future in any alternative that connects into SR-91. Alternative 1b in the Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore corridor addresses access to March ARB. Clinton Keith Rd. (Alternative 2) and Alternative 5b in the Banning/Beaumont to Temecula corridor. should still be considered. Alternative 5b will also benefit the Indian tribe as well as San Diego County.

Dan Silver – The Rainbow Canyon interchange (5b) has substantial environmental effects. What is the environmental threshold to eliminate alternatives? Community impacts have been well respected; this is shown by how the alternatives avoid developed areas. New roads are also growth inducing. We have to look at where we are going to induce growth, especially when we are going away from existing communities. We need additional analysis with GPAC that shows where growth will likely occur. Then we look at how this ties in with the mixed use, current infrastructure, etc. The Orange County connection is very uncertain. We should at least look at a "what if" scenario for both having a connection, and never having a connection.

Won Yoo – We should keep Clinton Keith because of the French Valley airport and several shopping areas. Scott Rd takes people around these.

Steve Smith – The consultant recommendation was to eliminate Clinton Keith Rd. as a major CETAP corridor but to keep it as a circulation element roadway.

Borre Winkel – Several alternatives show that they dead-end at the I-215. Clinton Keith has the right-of-way through to I-15 and should be kept in the recommendation.

Peter Kiriakos – Clinton Keith bisects three core habitat areas that include the quino checkerspot butterfly and coastal sage scrub, there are multiple species that would be directly impacted by Clinton Keith.

Craig Neustaedter – Regarding Van Buren, the design standard has not been adequately addressed. The City of Riverside might see a freeway or limited access roadway as threatening. We should forward Van Buren as a "smart street" rather than eliminate it. Van Buren is key to March ARB. One of CETAP's goals is to enhance economics, job growth, etc. There is a huge bottleneck at I-215 and SR-60 and Van Buren addresses this bottleneck. The CETAP scope should include consideration of Van Buren.

Tom Boyd from the Riverside Public Works Department was asked to give a summary of the City of Riverside's position. A freeway or expressway is not supported. If CETAP looks at Van Buren from a system wide approach then it can be considered for improvement. If it is proposed as a freeway or expressway then there is no support from the City of Riverside.

Borre Winkel – Borre indicated that he rejected the theories regarding the growth inducing impacts of new roadways. He stated that millions of people are going to come here regardless of the roadways.

Won Yoo – Raised a question of the reality of an interchange at Date Street and the I-15.

Dan Brown – Would like the committee to be aware that the Fish & Wildlife Service will be providing comments on the MSHCP, but not until December 1st at the earliest. There are a lot of issues that have not been put out on the table yet. Working papers gave a number of species affected by each alternative. This analysis may not be fully reflective of all species.

Peter Kiriakos – Raised major concern about the integration of this process. Feels that the Fish and Wildlife Service needs to have a major input.

Following the comments, the committee voted on all of the consultant team's draft recommendations, whether to carry forward or to eliminate. The following is a list of the alternatives and the committee's decision.

Banning/Beaumont to Temecula Corridor

Alternatives:

1. Carry forward (unanimous)
2. Carry forward (two nays – environmental concerns)
3. Eliminate (unanimous)
4. Eliminate (four opposed to elimination– offers good access to French Valley Airport with little environmental impact)
 - 5a. Carry forward (unanimous)
 - 5b. Carry forward (3 opposed due to environmental concerns)
 - 6a. Eliminate (unanimous)
 - 6b. Eliminate (unanimous)
 - 7a. Eliminate (unanimous)
 - 7b. Carry forward (unanimous)

All Transit Options – Unanimous to carry forward

Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore Corridor

Alternatives:

- 1a. Eliminate (1 opposed to elimination)
- 1b. Carry forward (1 opposed)
- 1c. Eliminate (1 opposed to elimination)
2. Eliminate (unanimous)
3. Carry forward as a “smart street” (unanimous)
- 4a. Eliminate (1 opposed to elimination)

- 4b. Eliminate (unanimous)
- 4c. Eliminate (unanimous)
- 4d. Eliminate (unanimous)
- 4e. Eliminate (unanimous)
- 5a. Carry forward (1 opposed)
- 5b. Carry forward (1 opposed)
- 5c. Carry forward (1 opposed)
- 5d. Eliminate (unanimous)
- 5e. Carry forward (1 opposed)
- 6a. Eliminate (unanimous)
- 6b. Eliminate (unanimous)

All Transit Options – Unanimous to carry forward

The recommendations will be taken to the RCTC commission meeting on November 8 for consideration and approval.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 p.m.