



RIVERSIDE COUNTY INTEGRATED PLAN (RCIP)

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

Tuesday, September 5th, 2000
9 AM – Noon

MEETING NOTES

CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:

Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA
Joyce Deleo, Supervisors 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
Dan Silver, Endangered Habitats League
Joan Sparkman, Supervisor's Appointee
Debra Varnado, SCAG
Borre Winckel, BIA
Helga Wolf, Supervisor's Appointee
Won S. Yoo, RANPAC

Don Archer, Sverdrup
Cathy Bechtel, RCTC
Bill Blankenship
Tom Boyd, City of Riverside
Glen Campbell, OCTA
Bruce Colbert, Riverside County Property Owners
Martin Corona, TransCore
Dick Doyle, Caltrans
Jim Henderson, RCIP Project Manager
Sandra Massa-Lavitt, City of Temecula
Rob McCann, LSA
Jim Miller, City of Murrieta
Craig Neustaedter, Moreno Valley
Anne Palatino, City of Corona
Steve Smith, TransCore
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA
Ruthann Taylor-Berger, WRCOG
Rusty Thornton, Caltrans

Other Attendees:

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

1. Public Comment Period

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

Jim Henderson expressed the committee's sadness over the loss of Gary Wanczuk, chairman of the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Advisory Committee, who had passed away the previous week. Jim indicated how important Gary's presence had been in working to bring together a consensus among diverse interests in how to approach the development of the MSHCP. He will be greatly missed.

2. Approval of meeting notes from August 1st

(Robin Lowe, Chair)

The meeting notes were approved, with the addition of Joan Sparkman to the attendee list.

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

Jim Henderson reported that the MSHCP Advisory Committee gave the go-ahead to the RCIP team to proceed with three alternatives: a 160+ species alternative, a currently listed and expected listed alternative, and a currently listed plus strong candidates alternative. The consultants agreed to come back with a report on the alternatives by the 4th of October.

In the General Plan Advisory Committee, it was reported that the area plan meetings were continuing. The meetings are winding up in September in Western County and will subsequently move to the desert. The meetings confirmed the desire for maintaining separation between communities and tended to support Alternative 3. The advisory committee spent time during the month analyzing revisions to meet concerns over particular areas.

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: the Domenigoni Specific Plan, the recreational plan for Diamond Valley Lake, the French Valley Specific Plan, and The Farm on Bundy Canyon Road.

5. Overview of approach to evaluation of alternatives for Banning/Beaumont to Temecula and Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore Corridors (intra-county corridors)

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

Steve Smith provided a handout and made a presentation describing the process to be followed for the evaluation of alternatives for the Banning/Beaumont to Temecula and the Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore Corridors. Some of the key steps in the schedule include:

- Preparation of a working paper describing the evaluation of alternatives in each corridor for handout at the October 3 CETAP advisory committee meeting
- A question-answer session on the working papers scheduled for October 12
- Public meetings in late October to be held in three locations within the corridor areas
- A recommendation by the CETAP Advisory Committee at the November 7 meeting concerning alternatives to carry forward for more detailed analysis in the environmental documents. This recommendation will be advisory and will be subject to decisions by RCTC, the Board of Supervisors, and the Federal and State resource agencies involved in the process.
- By the end of 2000, concurrence by Federal and State resource agencies on the Purpose and Need Statement and alternatives to carry forward into the EIR/EIS for detailed analysis
- By July, 2001, completion of a draft EIR/EIS for each of the two corridors
- By October, 2001, RCTC and Board of Supervisors recommend a preferred alternative
- By December, 2001, completion of the Final EIR/EIS

The committee asked how the SR-79 realignment study was being coordinated with the CETAP corridor studies and requested that more information be provided on the SR-79 realignment study. A presentation on the alignment study will be included as an agenda item for the October meeting. Steve circulated a newsletter on that study, and copies were provided to the committee members in attendance.

6. Discussion of community outreach plan for intra-county corridors

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

Steve Smith provided an overview and handout of the proposed approach to community outreach for the two intra-county corridors. He indicated that outreach will take place through public meetings, city council briefings, speakers bureau, newsletters and information on the RCIP web site. A set of public meetings will be scheduled prior to each major decision point. These include narrowing the alternatives down to those to be carried into the EIR/EIS, and following the production of the draft EIR/EIS, prior to the identification of the preferred alternative.

7. Presentation on engineering concepts and issues associated with the intra-county corridors

(Don Archer, Sverdrup)

Don Archer provided information on how the team was approaching the engineering issues associated with the alternatives. He showed maps delineating the alternatives and described how each of the alternatives was divided into segments. Each of the segments will be addressed individually in terms of engineering issues and environmental impacts. A complete alternative will consist of a series of segments. Don also presented a sample “typical section” for purposes of preserving right-of-way. The typical section includes space for highway lanes and transit, buffers, utilities, and trails. He explained that the cross-section may need to vary depending on constraints and that the transit alignment may need to vary from the highway alignment, depending on the points the transit system was serving. Don described some of the engineering issues being taken into consideration.

8. Presentation and discussion of trails plans and issues

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

Steve Smith provided a brief overview of progress on the trails portion of the General Plan. He explained that a GIS map of planned trails has been produced. He indicated that, in consultation with the County Parks Department, which was also obtaining input from the Trails Committee, the 11 trails categories were consolidated into four. This served to reduce overlap and conflict among definitions. Additional subcategories may be appropriate. Steve indicated that the most significant issues for trails had to do with implementation. He indicated that the County had concluded that piecing together trails based on development projects and dedications was not working and that specific funding for trails was needed for both construction and maintenance.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.