



# MEETING NOTES

## CETAP ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY INTEGRATED PROJECT (RCIP)

*Moreno Valley City Hall Council Chambers*

*14177 Frederick Street, Moreno Valley*

*September 3, 2002*

*10:00 a.m. – Noon*

### **CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:**

Bill Blankenship, BIA  
Sharon Bolton, Farm Bureau  
Bruce Colbert, Riverside County Property  
Owners Association  
Dick Doyle, Caltrans  
Frank Hall, Supervisor's Appointee  
Janet Henderson, SCAG  
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club  
Ann Palatino, RTA  
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC  
Ron Roberts, RCTC  
Gene Rogers, WRCOG TAC  
Dan Silver, EHL  
Gail Wanczuk Barton, MSHCP Advisory  
Chair

Glen Campbell, OCTA  
Zahi Faranesh, SCAG  
Jim Henderson, Jacobs  
Tim Higdon, Caltrans  
Darcy Kuenzi, GPAC  
Rob McCann, LSA  
Jim McGrath III, Menifee  
Bill Mosby, Caltrans  
Russ Napier, City of Murrieta  
Craig Neustaedter, Moreno Valley  
Robert Perrenoud, Menifee  
Lupe Perez, Menifee  
Robert Richardson, Menifee  
Del Schommer, Menifee  
Joe Shaw, The Keith Company  
Glennis Schommer, Menifee  
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA  
Bill Warkentin, BIA  
Ellen Webb, Menifee  
LeRoy D. Webb, Menifee  
Merideth Wichman, Jacobs  
Mohamad Younes, PBS&J

### **Other Attendees:**

Brenda Armstrong, Menifee  
Marion Ashley  
Cathy Bechtel, RCTC  
Tom Boyd, City of Riverside  
Stephen Brown, City of Temecula

## **CALL TO ORDER**

Cathy Bechtel called the meeting to order as the Chair was delayed, and gave an introduction regarding the RCIP and CETAP process and history.

Introductions followed.

### **1. Public comment period**

Ellen Webb, Menifee – Concerned about roadways going through homes instead of open space. Cathy Bechtel and Rob McCann commented on how the effects on humans are taken into account in the process.

Robert Richardson, Menifee – Same concern, against 7A and 7B and Alt 3. We feel we are unrepresented, don't have backing of a city. Many people left the cities to get away from freeways, now one is being planned adjacent to us. There has been no disclosure to the community. More and more homes are being built.

Brenda Armstrong, Menifee – With Calvary Chapel Church with over 2000 members. We have a strong community. Don't understand why CETAP would plan a roadway through 155 homes instead of open space.

Robin Lowe commented that SR-74 and SR-79 are both being studied as well as other roadways.

Rogel Anthony, Menifee – When we purchased our home recently, we were concerned with growth and were told nothing was planned but a bedroom community. We are here to get the whole story.

Cathy Bechtel encouraged the public to send her comments via email or regular mail that will be included in the public record by September 20<sup>th</sup>.

Lupee Perez, Menifee – I have a roadway planned through my home, why is it even considered?

Robin Lowe – Nothing seems logical at times during this process. The government agencies require us to study different alternatives, regardless of what we feel. We have to study what they require, regardless of how illogical those routes are. We have to go through the process, and we don't have all the answers yet because we can't make a predetermination of a route. It is not easy for us, nor is it easy for the residents. We appreciate your comments, don't stop doing what you're doing; it is part of the process.

### **2. Approval of meeting notes from June and July, 2002 (Robin Lowe took over Chairing the meeting).**

Correction regarding who Frank is representing (Supervisor's appointee). Meeting notes were approved with the correction.

### **3. Reports from MSHCP and General Plan Advisory Committees**

MSHCP (Gail Wanczuk Barton) – At our last meeting we had continued discussion of the wildlife refuge idea. That discussion was tabled to be considered at a later date, possibly in a different process. Our next meeting is Sept. 19<sup>th</sup>. We will be looking at funding, management & monitoring, and the organizational structure.

General Plan (Jim Henderson) - We are currently involved in the Planning Commission review of the General Plan. Our next meeting will be on Sept 12<sup>th</sup> in Indio at the Date Festival grounds. Another meeting will take place Sept. 25<sup>th</sup> at Rain Cross Convention Center. Two more meetings

are planned for October to take comments and review the staff recommendations on the General Plan. Currently the environmental documents are out for public review, and comments will come in until the public comment period closes in early October. If everything goes according to plan we will have a new General Plan by the end of the year. The draft environmental impact report is available on the website, electronically, and at 20 regional libraries in hard copy form.

#### **4. Report on development projects from Riverside County TLMA**

Ed Studor – We have had two General Plan amendments before the Planning Commission since our last Advisory Committee meeting.

GPA 606 – Southwest area – 6.2 acres going from residential to commercial on Anza Road – this was continued off calendar.

GPA 315 – Menifee Ranch, north of Sun City, east of 215, from 153 acres to 1548 acres from 482 dwelling units to 4200 dwelling units. This was for discussion only on August 7<sup>th</sup> and continued to August 28<sup>th</sup>. It was approved.

Ron Roberts asked what the county was going to call this new “city” and when it is all going to stop.

Robin Lowe stated that the Menifee interest group is coming forward to form their own city.

On the 12<sup>th</sup> in Indio two GP amendments will be considered by the Thermal Airport, both going from agriculture to residential.

Dan Silver – I have been following the Menifee Ranch project. This project has significant conflicts with more than one of the CETAP alternatives. A rail line also goes through the middle of it. The project takes none of this into account. Yet, the Planning Commission just rubber-stamps it. When is this insanity going to stop? Why not wait? People need to understand that the 3<sup>rd</sup> district ordered that every Specific Plan in process simply to be inserted into the draft General Plan. Isn't it time Ed that someone had a bit of courage and went to the Board and said “stop, your messing up your own plans”. Why can't the Planning Department stand up and say “put this on hold, deny it, continue it, do something, it conflicts with CETAP corridors, your own staff report says it loses an opportunity for a transit stop on the rail line and its going from 400 homes to 4000 homes”. If staff can't speak the truth to the Board there's a problem, and they obviously didn't to the Planning Commission. This is crazy.

Bruce Colbert – The plan does include a transit stop.

Dan Silver – According to the staff report it does not.

#### **5. Report from the RCIP Steering Committee**

Jim Henderson – We had a Community Centers discussion at the last date and there are recommendations coming out today. We will have a steering committee meeting on Friday to discuss a way forward regarding how we would implement community centers once the General Plan is approved. A very productive meeting with some good ideas.

#### **6. Report of progress on the intra-county corridors and the NEPA/404 process with Federal agencies**

Cathy Bechtel - We are currently in review of the draft environmental document. We are in the public hearing period. Now is the time to speak up. Once this is done, we have to consider all of the public comments, review the technical studies, and choose a preferred alternative for each corridor. We plan on making a staff recommendation at our October 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. We won't be asking for approval at that time because we need cooperation from the resource agencies.

Gene Rogers – Can you give us a more detailed explanation on how we are going to get to a recommendation?

Cathy Bechtel – This was one reason why we felt it was important to hear all of the public's comments. LSA has done a significant amount of review on the impacts. We will have a staff report that will lay out all of the options and give you a draft recommendation. We felt it was important to give the committee a starting point, and the discussion can go from there. It will be a very tight turnaround. It will be on the October 9<sup>th</sup> RCTC agenda for presentation and discussion, but no decision.

Gene Rogers – I feel that it is important to get the RCTC staff recommendation first. This way the elected officials can get the information to make their decisions.

Ron Roberts – This has become very political. Speaking for my city, I feel the same way, everything is happening so fast. I want to take this information back to my city staff. I would ask that we find some way to give us time to review the information.

Robin Lowe also disagreed with the timing of this process. A general discussion of the timing of the release of information followed. It was determined that RCTC cannot make a recommendation until some time after the public comment period. It was also determined that the CETAP Advisory Committee cannot make a recommendation with the short turnaround.

Peter Kiriakos requested that the technical documents be made available electronically. Cathy noted that hard copies are available at area libraries and the various government agencies involved. Peter also conveyed that there be more time to review the various environmental and MSHCP documents, to make the review process end at the same time for all of the documents.

Dan Silver – When will RCTC vote on a final adoption?

Cathy Bechtel – It will depend on our discussions with the resource agencies. We are hoping before the end of the year.

Robin Lowe – RCTC staff is not necessarily going to make the recommendation that other agencies want. Our decision may be different.

Dan Silver – How will the agencies give you concurrence without the MSHCP?

Cathy Bechtel – We are doing a Tier 1 environmental document. Our goal is to preserve right-of-way. We would have to do a Tier 2 environmental document, and then we get the permit.

Dan Silver – Would not it have been wiser to wait for the MSHCP to be approved and then have that in hand and approve these concurrently? I disagree with the Sierra Club with delaying the General Plan. On the other hand, coordination of CETAP and MSHCP would make a lot of sense.

Cathy Bechtel requested that Jim talk about the coordination between CETAP and the MSHCP.

Jim Henderson – The roadways are covered activities in the MSHCP, but without the MSHCP, they are not covered. As we go forward, the wildlife agencies are going to have the same concern. We will have finished our public review of the MSHCP by the end of the year. At that time we'll have comments back and we'll be in the same process that we're looking at working with the agencies. There will also be an ongoing review from FHWA. There is a lot of

coordination that will be going on in that process. If we try to sequence these things in any greater degree, we'll end up delaying things due to going back and forth. We have two processes that will go forward in parallel and interactively. It is proceeding in an integrated way right now because the MSHCP provides the environmental coverage for the other work that we're doing.

Cathy Bechtel and Robin Lowe asked if October 29<sup>th</sup> would work as a time for CETAP to make a recommendation. This would take the place of the November meeting.

Robin Lowe summarized the sequence of events – Cathy's initial report will go to Plans & Programs at RCTC on Sept. 23. The CETAP staff report will be delivered by Cathy and Rob on the 1<sup>st</sup> of October. This will be the first time the CETAP Advisory Committee sees this data. RCTC will then be given a report on October 9<sup>th</sup>, but with no request for a decision. Gene's group meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup> will then review it. Then it will come back to Plans and Programs on the 28<sup>th</sup>. On the 29<sup>th</sup> it will come to the CETAP Advisory Committee for more discussion and hopefully make a recommendation. At that time it would then be forwarded to WRCOG on the 4<sup>th</sup> of November to review. Then on the 13<sup>th</sup> of November it will go to RCTC for review and probably go to the December RCTC meeting for decision. All of this depends on the agencies' agreement.

## **7. Report on status of the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County Corridor and Riverside County to Orange County Corridor**

### **Status of the Riverside County to Orange County Corridor**

Cathy Bechtel - We were successful in getting some language included in the MSHCP to get coverage for the Orange County corridor. We haven't moved too much farther with CETAP, but we crossed a big hurdle with AB1010 legislation that would allow Orange County to purchase the SR-91 toll road and become the toll road operator. It made it out of the necessary committees and is on the Governor's desk. As part of that, a bi-county committee was included to take the steps to look at a bi-county corridor. We hope to have discussion regarding this soon.

Glenn Campbell, OCTA – The legislation allows improvements to begin on the 91.

### **Status of the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County Corridor**

A policy committee meeting was held and it was agreed that due to the work going on at Spring Mountain Ranch that we study another arterial improvement. We agreed to study how another arterial might go through that area. We need input from the technical committee to come up with some recommendations. After this we'll be ready to move forward with our CEQA work.

## **8. Report on the August 20<sup>th</sup> and August 29<sup>th</sup> public hearings for the CETAP EIS/EIRs**

Rob McCann – The hearings were held in open house format to allow the public to ask questions. About 80 people attended the Lake Elsinore hearing, about 125 in Murrieta. We received both written and verbal comments, about 60 altogether, mostly opinions about different alternatives. The comments received become public record on the projects, become part of the response to comments in the final EIR, and part of the package of information that comes back to this committee.

## **9. Discussion of advisory committee role in recommending CETAP alternatives to RCTC**

This matter was covered in the discussion following Agenda item number six.

## **10. Public comment period**

A member of the audience asked if CETAP had developed specific decision criteria, such as tolerances for human and environmental impacts, etc. Also, when you do choose a preferred corridor and if it is approved, will you stop the permitting process at that time, and how will you

notify the communities involved? Finally, is it possible that your Tier 2 study will render your Tier 1 choice implausible?

Cathy Bechtel – Yes we do have evaluation criteria, but no there are not specific numbers, such as number of households impacted, etc. for dismissing alternatives. This type of data is provided in an appendix to the EIR. When we go to Tier 2 we will do a focused evaluation of the Alternatives from Tier 1. It could be different, but that is not our hope, but it is a possibility. When we select a preferred alternative, then we have the authority to preserve right of way, but the effect won't be immediate. The County will need to get it into their General Plan.

Ed Studor – With development permits, there are several different levels. Large-scale developments are being restricted as we speak. After the General Plan, there are building permits. Anything going through the development process right now is being made aware of the CETAP process.

## **11. Adjournment**

Our next meeting will be October 1<sup>st</sup>. The location has not been determined. (Note: meeting was subsequently cancelled, with the next meeting scheduled for October 29)