



AGENDA

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

Keith Companies. Bldg.

DPSS Training Center

22690 Cactus Ave., Suite 101

Moreno Valley, CA

Tuesday, October 29, 2002

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon

CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:

Bruce Colbert, Riverside County Property Owners Association
Joyce Deleo, Supervisor's Appointee
Frank Hall, Supervisor's Appointee
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club
Anne Mayer, Caltrans
Ameal Moore, RCTC
Anne Palatino, RTA
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC
Ron Roberts, RCTC
Gene Rogers, WRCOG TAC
Dan Silver, EHL
Gail Wanczuk Barton, MSHCP Advisory Chair
Borre Winckel, BIA

Other Attendees:

Marion Ashley, EMWD/MWD
Cathy Bechtel, RCTC
Judy Behrens, Cleveland Nat'l Forest
Tom Boyd, City of Riverside
Stephen Brown, City of Temecula
Glen Campbell, OCTA
Stephanie Crossey, O-Reilly Public Relations

Barbara Darracy, Warmington Land Co.
Bill Davis, Menifee Valley SEDCO
Cynthia Ferry, RAGLAM
Julie Gagnon, Rural Res. Policy Area E-215
Eric Haley, RCTC Executive Director
Tim Higdon, Caltrans
John Kain, Urban Crossroads
Darcy Kuenzi, Ashley for Supervisor
George Lenfestey, Keith Cos.
John Licata, City of Corona
Paul Marx, Newport Road
Randy Mayer, AEI-CASC Eng.
Rob McCann, LSA
Dave Miller, TransCore
Donna Miller, Laer, Pearce and Assoc.
Marika Montgomery, Homeowner
Bill Mosby, Caltrans
Bill Mugavin, Calvary Menifee
Craig Neustaedter, Moreno Valley
Tom Nieves, AEI-CASC Eng.
Trent Pulliam, City of Moreno Valley
Del Schommer, Country Gardens
Glennis Schommer, Country Gardens
Steve Smith, TransCore
Susan Streble, Lake Mathews
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA
Jim Wang, Menifee
Bill Warkentin, BIA

Ann Warmington, Warmington Land Co.
Mary Webb, Country Gardens
Robert Westover, Laer, Pearce and Assoc.
Merideth Wichman, Jacobs
Bob Wolf

CALL TO ORDER

1. Public comment period

Susan Streble, Lake Mathews. I am disappointed that RCTC has not taken the opportunity to do something major with mass transit. Second I oppose anything that goes along the Cajalco Road/El Sobrante Road alignment (alternatives 1a, 1b, H1 or H3). Last year I turned in a petition of some 300 signatures opposing these alternatives. There is very strong opposition to these alternatives. Lake Mathews is a very active community. There are a number of groups in Lake Mathews that will consider legal action if a Cajalco alignment is selected.

Mary Webb, Country Gardens. I attended a Planning Commission meeting on October 10 where the Anza Road alternative was mentioned by a planner from the City of Temecula. Could the Anza road alternative end up being considered as a freeway, since the City seems to favor that alignment?

Bill Davis – Menifee Valley SEDCO. I would like to bring everyone's attention to an article in today's *Californian* that talks about the possibility of Anza Road being a freeway.

Ron Roberts indicated that he would comment on that article at the end of the public comment period.

Bob Wolf – I would like to commend the committee on three years of hard work. We are going to have a huge amount of growth in the future. We aren't going to stop growing. The Inland Empire by itself will be growing faster in the next 20 years than 47 states in the union. CETAP's background as I understood it was to examine the various aspects of transportation need in Western Riverside County and to take into account all the various environmental and community factors. I ask your considered review of the Cajalco alternatives. That is, without question, the number one beneficial route for transportation movement in this part of Riverside County. The other alignments involve threading the needle through pockets of opposition, rather than looking at the benefit to the movement of people, goods, and services throughout Riverside County. I would ask you to not forget about the other two legs of the stool beyond environmental concerns, and they are economic development and the transportation of people, goods, and services. The design of the corridor can be done, in my opinion, in an environmentally sensitive manner. But we cannot forget the fact that it is the number one area to provide for Riverside County's future. If we can't find a way to get to market, forget about jobs.

Cynthia Ferry RAGLAM Board member – I would like to thank Cathy Bechtel for coming out to meet with us. We continue to oppose the Cajalco alternatives. If that route is selected, property values will go down the day you make that decision. If the freeway were to go in there, we would have no way out in the event of an evacuation. We are willing to have Cajalco expanded to possibly four lanes to carry some of the traffic coming into the area, but not a freeway.

Marika Montgomery, Sun City – Unfortunately, I don't see many people here from our area. People near Ethanac Road and Goetz Road are not aware of what is going on here. This is a rural area with one acre lots.

Paul Marx I have property at the corner of Leon Road and Newport Road. I do not support the current alignment as proposed. We support an alignment along the Ramona Expressway, not the 5c and 7b alternatives. We are supporting the Newport road alignment as currently planned, and are being asked to support the construction of that road for many millions of dollars. Adding the freeways would wreck our property values and overburden the area with too much traffic. We have a Specific Plan filed.

Ron Roberts – I would like to make a clarification on the article written this morning on Anza Road, raised as an issue earlier. The new reporter from the *Californian* does not understand the difference between freeways and arterials. Our letter specifically requests the consideration of Anza Road as an arterial, nothing more, nothing less. It is not recommended as a freeway in any way, shape or form.

Ed Studor – The County is recommending an arterial there also, but it will require some sensitive design treatments. There is a concern from the resource agencies about the Johnson Ranch acquisition, which had been set aside as open space, that the Anza Road alignment would serve as a barrier. It will need to accommodate wildlife movement, but it looks like it will be a permitted activity under the MSHCP.

2. Approval of meeting notes from September, 2002

Meeting notes were not available.

3. Reports from MSHCP and General Plan Advisory Committees

Gail Wanczuk Barton – We are hoping that the draft MSHCP document will be out on Nov. 8. That would mean that the next MSHCP Advisory Committee meeting would be Nov. 14. But that is still uncertain.

Cathy Bechtel – Based on the conference call this morning, it will be pretty tight. The agencies are trying to get the language finalized at this time. It might end up being the 15th for the release of the MSHCP.

Ed Studor – The General Plan is in hearings. The next hearing is tomorrow at Raincross at 1:30. We have had a lot of input from the public so far. Most of the public comments so far have been on individual land uses. Planning Department staff have been preparing responses to the comments, some of which will be presented tomorrow. The hearing will be continued to Nov. 6 at Raincross, further going through individual requests.

4. Report on development projects from Riverside County TLMA

Ed Studor - Nothing new on development projects, given that the General Plan hearings have been occurring. There are several specific plans that are in the process of re-filing for amendments. None of those have come forward yet.

Dan Silver – At the last meeting, Bruce Colbert and I presented differing information on a particular project, Menifee Ranch. I would like to point out that Bruce was correct on the Menifee Ranch Specific Plan. The question was whether a transit hub had been designated. There is a transit hub shown in the Menifee Ranch Specific Plan. However, the staff report indicates that the densities may not be sufficient to support it.

5. Report from RCIP Steering Committee

Gail Wanczuk Barton – The discussion of the steering committee has been relating to the community centers. There has been a realization that we have not done a very good job of explaining them, so there has been more work to try to do a better job of explaining what they are, what they might look like, and how they would be implemented. There is an effort right now to put information together to better explain that.

Bill Warkentin – The notion of community centers has been thoroughly endorsed by GPAC and the Steering Committee. We are working very hard to dispel what appears to be a great deal of mis-information and to better represent the potential of the community centers to benefit this area. We are in the process of getting a package out that will have better information about the community center concept.

Dan Silver – The community center concept is gaining more recognition and support outside the spheres of these committees. It has been recently endorsed by the Riverside Chamber of Commerce and Hispanic C of C.

Bruce Colbert – The committee is also addressing the concerns of property owners who own property within the community centers.

Borre Winckel – It is now a policy of the second district to have lot sizes of at least 7200 s.f. I would like this committee to bear that land use in mind as we contemplate building new corridors. The problem I foresee is tying the building of the corridors to such limited land use. The point is that the population forecast may not be supported by this level of density. It is why the community centers are so important. The BIA supports the entire range of densities, not just community centers, and not just 7200 s.f. lots.

Pete Kiriakos – The transit oasis concept applies to the cities also, not just the County. My concern is that the transit oasis concept be kept visible. That is what makes the community centers work. We need to get city buy-in on this to get a holistic system.

Robin Lowe – Riverside County has been very aggressive with transit – High Speed Rail, MAGLEV, Metrolink, express bus (including south to San Diego). Mass transit is an integral part of the planning for this committee and of RTA, RCTC, SANBAG, OMNITRANS, CVAG, etc.

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

Cathy Bechtel - There is not a lot to report here. On the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino corridor, we have a policy meeting scheduled for November 21 at 3:00. The location has not been determined. We are close to being ready to start the environmental process on that corridor, but we need to meet with the Policy Committee before it is kicked off. On the Riverside County to Orange County corridor, with passage of AB 1010, there will be a committee of representatives from both counties (five representatives each). However, this will not start until early next year. First six months will focus mainly on toll road issues.

Frank Hall – Riverside County has already designated members, even though they won't be meeting for a little while.

Glen Campbell – OCTA is going through the long range planning process. Consideration of an inter-county corridor is being recognized, in general terms.

Cathy Bechtel – We met with the Forest Service again a couple of weeks ago, to make sure they were still considering the transportation needs between the counties.

7. Presentation and discussion on the RCTC staff recommendation on the intra-county corridors

Cathy Bechtel indicated that the draft staff recommendation on the CETAP corridors was presented to the RCTC Commission on October 9. The staff recommendation was for information only, and to give the public an opportunity to respond prior to the close of the EIS comment period. The Commission determined that there should be a series of public hearings on the corridors to provide input on the recommendation. Cathy provided a review of the basic structure of the hearing process. The Commission indicated that there should be four public hearings, which will be held in December and January. The County is pulling together a map showing where the approved Specific Plans and other development approvals are located. One of the things we have to remember is that we are trying to do things differently with CETAP –

integrating the community, environmental, and transportation needs. The corridors have been planned as multi-modal facilities. The concept has always included the concept of a freeway, but it could be phased in.

Winchester to Temecula Corridor

Cathy Bechtel went through the Winchester to Temecula corridor recommendation of Alternative 7b (see staff recommendation). It was pointed out in the staff report that this is not the number one transportation corridor. However, we are supporting the County's improvement of Anza Road. Anza Road is not envisioned as a freeway facility, but as an arterial improvement. Alternative 7b would work together with the SR-79 realignment that goes from the north end of this alignment to Lambs Canyon. We tried to use a balanced approach, considering all three parts of CETAP – Community, Environmental, and Transportation.

Rob McCann – One of the requests from the RCTC Commission was to identify some of the technical issues that led us to the recommendation. All the alternatives have some degree of impact. There is no silver bullet. There are tradeoffs involved. Another point is that this is a Federal process, as Federal funding will be required for construction of these facilities. Rob identified some of the key considerations that came through the environmental process, looking at effects on aquatic resources, cultural resources, section 4(f) resources, etc.

Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore Corridor

Cathy Bechtel described the alternatives. RCTC had taken some of them off the table previously, but the Federal agencies requested that we keep them on. These included 6a and 6b, the La Sierra hybrid alternative, and the "4" alternatives. We stated that Alt 1 has the greatest transportation benefit, but has substantial community and environmental impacts. Cathy went through the alternatives, noting the recommendation of Alternative 5c (see staff recommendation). RCTC is supportive of the County's proposed General Plan, which calls for expressways on Ramona/Cajalco Roads and SR-74.

Rob McCann went through some of the environmental issues on the Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore corridor.

Cathy Bechtel – In closing, we wanted to outline some of the major issues involved in making the recommendation. The final decision from FHWA is six to eight months away.

Rob McCann - The discussions with the agencies are continuing.

Cathy Bechtel – FHWA will not take a position until after the public comment period is closed. They will issue a Federal Record of Decision probably some time next summer.

Gene Rogers – There is one chance for us to make the right decision. There are a lot of people who may not be happy with any of the alternatives. We cannot live with what we have now. We need many of the alignments. We need to be thinking of what is in the best overall interest of the county. The City of Moreno Valley and some other cities prefer another alternative. But we need to at least make the Cajalco corridor work as an expressway and to get enough attention from a funding perspective. The Commission needs to think of these as a system. On the Winchester to Temecula corridor, we are concerned that the I-215 will not have enough widening to handle the additional traffic.

Dan Silver – Have we received a letter from the wildlife agencies?

Cathy Bechtel – They will not have comments until Nov. 15, the new deadline for comments.

Dan Silver - How do the different alternatives affect the community centers?

Ed Studor – Alt 7b serves community centers in Winchester and Menifee. There are several community centers along the 5c alignment.

Ameal Moore – Can we have one map that shows the relationship between all the corridors? You have stated that the Cajalco corridor is the superior alternative. When the ROW is purchased, it is with a view toward the future. Bob Wolf gave a foundation for the Cajalco corridor earlier. The City of Riverside still supports Cajalco, because it provides better relief to the 91.

Ron Roberts - The new County General Plan is up-zoning a couple of ranch areas in the Temecula area. People are going to use Anza Road anyway, whether it is two-lane or four-lane. We need to look ahead and realize that there will be a need for additional capacity out there. We need to keep Anza Road as four lane.

Anne Palatino – We should show other layers on the maps as well, not just CETAP corridors. We should include the TUMF roads, the General Plan roads, transit, etc.

Frank Hall – I always thought that 5a and 5b were the best in the Winchester to Temecula corridor. But if we go with the 7b recommendation, we will probably need some express lanes on the 215 and 15 to try to eliminate some of the weaving.

Joyce Deleo – The recommendation is out for public comment, so we should be listening mainly right now. We will be making a recommendation later, correct?

Peter Kiriakos – I would like to commend the staff for the work that they did. There are certain of north-south and east-west corridors that are community disasters. The effort has been to identify the best routes on a balanced basis. I support the proposed recommendation personally, but there are other voices within any organization. There does need to be a specific display that is shown on the wall that brings it all together. We need to show the complexity, but also show the individual components as well. The citizens need to see these things in hard copy on the wall. We should show the environmental considerations. There is a need for taxpayers to know of the Caltrans plans. We are not doing this in isolation. We have not had a portrayal of all the Caltrans plans together with the CETAP and General Plan work. The recommended routes north-south and east-west are shorter routes and piggy back on other plans, making it more financially feasible.

Anne Mayer – Caltrans and RCTC plans address the same needs. Although none of these recommendations on the corridors are state highways, there is that potential, and we will be working on that issue with RCTC.

John Kain provided an extensive Powerpoint presentation of the analysis of the CETAP corridors from the Building Industry Association perspective. The RCTC staff concede that the recommended routes are not the ones that have the highest benefit but ones that have less environmental impact. Our question is whether these routes are really worth the investment as freeways. The Winchester to Temecula Corridor alternative 7b does not relieve the 215/15 freeway problem. As a freeway, the Alt 7b alignment is contingent on SR-79 to the north becoming a freeway. East-West route 5c undulates north and south and overlaps with the SR-74 expressway to Hemet. The BIA is concerned that the recommended freeways complicate and even impede other facility plans and programs. The General Plan circulation element provides a network of expressways and closes gaps in the existing system. The term expressway has different connotations. Caltrans has a specific meaning of expressway being a high-speed facility where you may have mostly grade separated interchanges and occasional at-grade intersections. We use the term expressway here to mean an arterial with at-grade intersections, limited access, and occasional grade separations. The BIA position can be summarized as a focus on finding transportation corridors that have the greatest transportation utility (in terms of relief to the SR-91 and SR-60 Freeways for the east-west corridor) with the least community and environmental

impacts. The staff recommendation (5c and 7b) do not offer relief to the existing SR-91/SR-60 congestion problems or projected I-15/I-215 issues in Temecula.

Pete Kiriakos – The cost of building the full system is extensive. We need to show the costs and revenue.

Dan Silver – I have had the same question, and I presented a letter to this committee some time ago from a traffic engineer who expressed the same concern. If we eliminate the very worst alignments like 5a and 5b, but we come back with these things that have similar environmental impacts, is that appropriate?

John Kain – The arterial south of Lake Mathews has been accommodated in the proposed General Plan. Two arterials have been proposed to the east of Temecula in lieu of Alternatives 5a and 5b. I think it is a balanced result. Although I am not favoring the 5C and 7B outcomes, there has been a lot coming out of this process that is good for transportation.

Bruce Colbert - Staff needs to add information to the alternatives analysis regarding mitigation that would be required for the Cajalco alternative south of Lake Mathews, so that an informed evaluation of the various alternatives can be made.

Gail Wanczuk Barton – I appreciate having the waters muddied some more with these additional ideas. It is good for the thought process.

Pete Kiriakos – We need to have more information on the arterials with respect to the MSHCP.

8. Public comment period

Julie Gagnon Gavilan Hills - I live east of the 215 – Ed Studor gave a presentation to the Planning Commission on modified Alternative 7b, and implied that it could go as far north as Garbani Road. This is way different from saying slightly north of the current alignment. Maybe we should go for 5C only, not both.

Bill Davis Menifee Valley SEDCO – I have to congratulate RCTC. You got some people upset, but that is probably part of the process.

Priscilla McNealy – I live off of Craig Road – I am still concerned about the 15/215 split. The future meetings should include the projected traffic flows in that area.

Bill Warkentin – Mr. Wolf made a very pointed plea for economic issues. John Kain's presentation worked along together with that. We need more thorough mapping that shows the CETAP corridors together with the Circulation Element. The Alt 7b is the worst of the solutions. The process could have been much more about finding the best transportation route and making sure they are mitigated to the extent possible.

Comment from resident of Menifee who lives along Craig Road - 7b is no better than 7a. We see it as a dumping ground to the 215.

Steve Smith – At the next meeting we will have an integrated presentation of transportation issues as they relate to the MSHCP, General Plan, and CETAP, given that the MSHCP will be out by that time.

The next meeting will be Dec. 3 at 8:30 AM to accommodate other meetings later in the morning.

9. Adjournment