



# Meeting Notes

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

*City Council Chambers*

*Moreno Valley City Hall*

*14177 Frederick Street, Moreno Valley*

*November 6, 2001*

*9:00 a.m. – Noon*

**CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:**

Sharon Bolton, Farm Bureau  
Bruce Colbert, Riv Co. Prop. Owners Assoc.  
Joyce Deleo, Supervisors Appointee  
Janet Gless, Supervisors Appointee  
Frank Hall, Supervisors Appointee  
Janet Henderson, SCAG  
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club  
CIS Leroy, RTA  
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC  
Gene Rogers, RCOG CAC, Moreno Valley  
Joan Sparkman, Supervisors Appointee  
Gail Wanczuk Barton, MSHCP Advisory Chair  
Borre Winckel, BIA  
Helga Wolf, Supervisors Appointee

Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA  
Jim Wang, Menifee  
Dale West, WRCOG  
Merideth Wichman, Jacobs/Sverdrup

**Other Attendees:**

Don Archer, Jacobs/Sverdrup  
Cathy Bechtel, RCTC  
Judy Behrens, USFS  
Glen Campbell, OCTA  
Dick Doyle, CALTRANS  
Fran Dunanski, City of Riverside  
Joe Jensen, Jacobs/Sverdrup  
John Kain, Urban Crossroads, Inc.  
David Miller, TransCore  
Pamela Miod, Temecula  
Rob McCann, LSA  
Craig Neustaedter, Moreno Valley  
Trent Pulliam, City of Moreno Valley  
Erik Ruehr, VRPA Technologies  
Steve Smith, TransCore

Robin Lowe began the meeting at approximately 9:10

1. Public comment period – no public comments
2. Approval of meeting notes from October 2, 2001

Correction on Page 2 in the second paragraph – Funding & Implementation is related to the MSHCP. Gail Wanczuk-Barton should be listed as an advisory committee member, not as an other attendee.

3. Reports from MSHCP and General Plan Advisory Committees

Gail Wanczuk-Barton - The MSHCP had the last advisory committee meeting on 10/18. There was discussion at that time of changes to the Funding and Implementation plan. Several concerns were expressed. We realize that not everyone is in total agreement, but have sent it on to become part of the Implementation Agreement. We recognize that public information is very important. A public scoping meeting was held Oct. 29 and another will be held Nov. 7. This initiates the EIS.

General Plan Advisory Committee – The area plan drafts have been completed and are being sent to the committee. The committee is meeting all day every Tuesday to review these. They are going through Area Plans page by page. They are meeting at the Keith Companies, generally. We need to include in the minutes the schedule of the meetings and locations.

4. Report on development projects from Riverside County TLMA –

Ed Studor - Nothing to hand out today, but I have a verbal report.

Oct 3<sup>rd</sup>, the Planning commission met in Indio. There was a fairly minor change from AG to LDR in the Blythe area which we talked about last meeting, taking 40 acres and splitting it into three lots. It was approved.

Oct. 17 – Three GP amendments considered, which were all discussed last month at the advisory committee meeting. One was GP 529 south of Temecula. 85 acres, 187 lots. It was continued through Nov. 14. GP 564 on Clinton Keith, a change from LI to LDR was continued to 31<sup>st</sup>. GP 451 – also discussed last month – also continued to Oct. 31.

Oct. 31<sup>st</sup> had hearing on housing element. That was continued to Nov. 14. Also had GP amendment in the Sun City area – 571 – various designations currently going to 2-4 du/acre on McCall Blvd. east of 215 on south side across from hospital, about 56 acres – also continued to Nov. 14

The Domenigoni/Barton SP was approved at Oct 31<sup>st</sup> hearing and being passed on to Board. GP 549 near Clinton Keith and I-15 – a higher density residential 5-8 du/acre– townhouse project – also continued to Nov. 14. Domenigoni/Barton only one approved.

There is also a Form 11 going to the Board today. Copies were passed out. The Form 11 includes recommendations as far as the transition to the Integrated Plan, and what we do in the interim. It also includes a GP hearing schedule. The plan is that in April and May the GP would be going to the Planning Commission, with all-day hearings at various places in the county. The GP will also be going to the Board for a series of hearings. We are ultimately looking at adoption in mid July of next year. There was quite a discussion about this at the steering committee meeting.

Robin Lowe – the Form 11 will require that any amendment coming forward after Dec. 31 will fall into the RCIP schedule.

Borre Winckel – We need to have an interim review process with incentives.

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

Cathy Bechtel – moving along with technical reports – being completed right now. Will be completed in next month or so. We are working with resource agencies to get concurrence on evaluation criteria.

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

Cathy Bechtel – On the Riverside Co. to Orange County corridor, discussion is continuing with OCTA on transit solutions. This is going very well. We have regular monthly meetings. RTA is making improvements on Route 149 (express to Orange County) – changes will happen in Nov./Dec. Orange County is also looking at adding new service from Corona to the Anaheim area. We are also working on more money for Metrolink improvements in the 91 corridor. We are moving ahead with the North Corona train station. The Forest Service is in a public meeting process on the Forest Management Plan. Public meeting period closes Dec. 31. This is to get input on what the public wants to see. The public meetings are to get input on the big picture – not on a specific project.

Robin Lowe – How is the public being notified of meetings?

Judy Behrens – They are publicized through the supervisor's office in San Diego. -

Robin Lowe – The publication of these meetings has not been good.

Borre Winckel – are you tracking the wilderness areas initiative?

Cathy Bechtel – yes we are. I know a little bit. I received a copy of some draft maps, not sure where they came from. It is still too early to say whether this may present a problem.

Pete Kiriakos – The Sierra Club gave a presentation at the MSHCP – this is an effort that began about two years ago to identify special areas in California that had potential for designation as wilderness areas.

Borre Winckel – What is the relationship between wilderness areas and potential CETAP corridors?

Pete Kiriakos - There could potentially be some conflicts. This is being worked on at the national level.

Glen Campbell – What is the schedule for the Forest Mgmt. Plan?

Judy Behrens – We are still in the process of gathering information. There will be a formal scoping process.

Borre Winckel – Can we be absolutely sure that we are integrating this process with the corridor planning?

Cathy Bechtel – OCTA knows that we are going to submit the letter on potential corridors.

Robin Lowe – RCTC's Plans and Programs Committee should be looking at this. Need to get it on the next agenda.

Frank Hall – What is the Forest Service e-mail address? ([www.fs.fed.us](http://www.fs.fed.us))

Craig Neustaedter – In East Orange, there is a specific plan for which comments are closing at the end of this month. I would encourage the staff to be attentive to what is going on here, because it could have as much impact as anything the Forest Service would do.

Glen Campbell – in your letter to the Forest Service, will you be recommending an alignment?

Cathy Bechtel – They will be multiple alignments.

Moreno Valley to SB County corridor – Cathy Bechtel - The policy committee made a recommendation to identify Alternative 1 as the preferred alternative, which will go back to the SANBAG Board and RCTC in December. The committee gave some specific direction – no truck traffic, limited access, not a full freeway, but an expressway. There will be improvements to other arterials as part of it. We are working with the City of Redlands and Loma Linda to refine the alignment in that area. These cities were OK with an expressway up to Barton Road and an arterial along California Street.

Robin Lowe – How will it work at the interchange at 215?

Ed Studor described how it might work. It would be just to the west of the KB Home development along Morton Road.

Cathy handed out maps and an evaluation matrix. She indicated that we will be working on CEQA level clearance rather than an EIS. We will have a technical advisory committee meeting on Dec. 6 at 1:30 in the Loma Linda community room. That will be a technical level committee. Jacobs is looking at tunneling options and will be reporting on that.

Pete Kiriakos – The Sierra Club opposes this route, and if it does go through, we are requesting mitigation for habitat.

#### 7. Discussion of Draft Riverside County Circulation Element

Ed Studor discussed the Circulation Element review process – the Sept. 19 draft was distributed to the General Plan and CETAP advisory committees. GPAC and CETAP provided their comments, and the county is deciding on how the comments get incorporated.

Pete Kiriakos – How in the integrated process do we look at the comments

Ed Studor – we discussed the LOS issue last month – GPAC had concerns with LOS in community centers – they thought that LOS E should be allowed in those areas. The County would support this. There is also going to be a community centers component of the General Plan.

Brian James – We are getting that in a form that can be given to the County. The intent is for these to be downtown type areas, pedestrian oriented.

Ed Studor reviewed some of the County comments – We probably do not want to refer to Measure A, but make it more generic. Same with the 2001 RTP. Take the year out. On page 10 of the draft, there is an exhibit in there showing freeways. The County relates more to the arterials – we suggest arterial LOS illustration replace this.

Ed Studor – we are suggesting that guidelines for the 2<sup>nd</sup> district be used as the new cross-section standards. Incorporates potential transit ways, etc.

Borre Winckel – Do you have at the County a body of people who prioritize these transportation improvements. This is kind of like a candy store. How do we know how these will really get funded and built?

Ed Studor – The roads generally get built with conditions of approval. We have multiple funding systems, including benefit districts. We do have folks that work on determining what gets built.

Borre Winckel – So is it a fair statement to say that we are decreasing road standards for internal roadways and increasing them for more major roadways?

Ed Studor – That would be the intent.

Craig Neustaedter – Section C.2.1. – comment on LOS E as a planning standard. That presumes an accuracy level in your modeling that is perhaps too great. In terms of conventional practice, LOS is not good to plan for, because you could be under predicting.

Brian James – the community centers are very small areas.

Pete Kiriakos – these are more built on a human scale. Florida is building in a transit LOS – the LOS we are working on is just for cars. We need a transit LOS also. If CETAP is promoting transit as an alternative, not a replacement,

Bruce Colbert – Even in New York, only about 20 percent of the people ride transit. Forcing people into transit is not necessarily what we want to do here.

Gail Wanczuk-Barton – The concern was if you make it too convenient for cars, then transit will not have a chance.

Gene Rogers – The County is planned to be more rural and less dense than cities – It seems like we are planning backwards – why aren't we keeping the county less dense. The evolution of cities is that they get denser over time. If we aren't careful, we will have dispersed development throughout the County. The cities do not feel that the plan is headed in the right direction. The cities are not going to be on board if this is the way the plan looks.

Robin Lowe – This has been passed on to the Board, but they have not done anything about it. Whenever the cities raise the issue, it is ignored. It is going to come to the end and there is not going to be acceptance from the cities.

Pete Kiriakos — Most of the nodes are actually in the cities. It is important for cities to be on board with the basic idea of transit nodes. We are planning for the first time in a holistic sense. Much of the Sierra club would like for the transit oriented villages to be in existing cities.

Robin Lowe – There will be discussion with WRCOG, RCTC, RTA on Nov. 14 where a lot of these issues will be discussed.

Eric Haley - On the 14<sup>th</sup>, the TUMF fees will be a primary focal point of discussion.

Pete Kiriakos – When you look at New York City, it is impossible to build streets wide enough to move the cars. Transit will not replace the auto traffic, but we better start well in advance to plan for the future higher levels of congestion.

Bruce Colbert – On the LOS issue, the consensus of the committee was to maintain the existing standard. If we downgrade it, it will be worse than some of the existing cities. It also reflects the views of the public that they want to have a good level of service.

John Kain – To handle the high flow arterials, we need to reference eight lane facilities.

Ed Studor – We agree.

Bruce Colbert – What is in here drops LOS to D in community development areas. This is a downgrade.

Robin Lowe – We are not changing our position at CETAP. After hearing GPAC recommendation of D, we still disagree.

Borre Winckel – I move that we accept the new language proposed by the County.

Gail Wanczuk-Barton - second.

Ed Studor re-read the language. “the county has established as a countywide target LOS C on all county maintained roads and conventional state highways except that LOS D would be allowed in community development areas only at intersections of any combinations of major streets, arterials, urban arterials, expressways, and conventional state highways or freeway ramp intersections.”

Three against. Five for. Janet Gless – abstained.

John Kain – There are one or two community centers that are large – if we are not going with E, are we going to revisit the LOS in community centers?

Robin – All those that disagree with E in community centers raise hand – five. Those that agree with E – three.

Ed Studor – Page 16, policy C.3.2 – we had recommended that it be broken into individual policies. Page 17 – a change in words on C.E.6 – talks about improvement to traffic flow. Suggest we replace that with “manage” traffic flow. Page 5 – talks about the planned circulation system. It was suggested that we add C.1.5 – about modifying the network. In the section dealing with system design, page 19 – suggest that we plan off-street parking facilities. Page 20 top, C.4.2 – the final sentence is to be struck. C.5.2 – modify wording. C.6.3 – add CVAG.

Borre Winckel - On system financing under C.72, allocating equitably based on those who benefit. If you are the first one in, there is no mechanism in place where if you overbuild that you get reimbursed. If you collect fees at the County for roads on the needs list, you need to reimburse the developer – this is state law and is not being followed. This should facilitate more of the infrastructure being built earlier. Language should include something about nexus to the project.

Craig Neustaedter – Does the County have reimbursement agreements?

Ed Studor – yes.

Borre Winckel – There is no standard mechanism.

Ed Studor – It is on a case by case basis.

Borre Winckel – That is part of the problem. So refer to fee credits and reimbursement.

Pete Kiriakos - Would like to put all the different things that are related to public transit in the same location – would like to see comments in rail systems section to be included under public transportation. I made the same comments in GPAC.

Gail Wanczuk-Barton – We talked about a reorganization of that. Was there a change on 7.3?

Pete Kiriakos – We talked about the possibility of lanes set aside for transit on freeways and other roadways.

Bruce Colbert – The traffic model shows that all the freeways will be stop and go in the buildout scenario. My proposal will save the county a lot of money. This proposal provides an envelope – it protects adjacent land owners as well as accommodates transportation needs.

Dick Doyle – When we do our Transportation Concept Reports, we work with LOS E. Bruce is proposing LOS D. There is a lot of question about how we finance this.

Craig Neustaedter – Will Caltrans revisit the route concept reports after CETAP is over?

Dick Doyle – When the corridors become state highways, then the planning for them can come under the state’s purview.

Janet Gless – There is a problem with possibly condemning my land.

Borre Winckel – This is always the problem. The MSHCP has a mechanism for dealing with it. We do not have that here.

Robin Lowe – What is the mechanism for buying the land if this were to become policy?

Bruce Colbert – Does the policy need to spell that out? We took out the part about the overlay zone. Now it talks about acquisition.

Craig Neustaedter – The subdivision map act provides for the dedication of right of way. As far as Bruce's policy, priority should be given to areas with undeveloped land. It is fundamental to what this committee is charged to do is to protect our options to preserve ROW. There are two separate areas – developed and undeveloped land.

Ed Studor – C.3.21 and C.3.23 – both generally address these issues. In urban areas, we should be consistent with Caltrans policy.

Gene Rogers – Made a motion to recommend strengthening of language on reservation of ROW.

Borre Winkel against. Other committee members agree.

Pete Kiriakos – Would like to have something under local agency coordination that directs a real time information exchange system in the County, with the cities, etc. We don't really have a real time handle on the permits.

Robin Lowe – Where will the money come from to do this? It needs to be a designed system.

Ed Studor – The land management system already does a lot of this. We will give it a shot .

Bruce Colbert – One more thing. Need to try to at least get the two new corridors at LOS C. Does everyone agree?

John Kain – We will be rejoicing if we can live with LOS E. Just not practical to do C. It is an extravagance to expect C.

Eric Haley. We have some serious challenges to fund the internal corridors as it is.

Robin Lowe – People may want things, but they will not be willing to pay for it.

Pete Kiriakos – We need to change our thought process so that we blend rail and other transit together.

Brian James - Page 34 – We will be reformatting the trails section. Scenic corridors – will go to open space section. Corridor preservation will be reworked also. Under environmental considerations, we will incorporate urban runoff issues, BMPs, etc. Under goods movement, encouraging truck only lanes where appropriate.

Borre Winckel – Today, the policy is that if you build a road, you build a half width. We would like county to recognize that the landowner who fronts a major facility should not be on the hook for half the major improvement.

Robin Lowe – Doesn't the property owner benefit from being on that major frontage?

Borre Winckel – There should be a graduated program.

Frank Hall – But then the cost needs to be allocated to property that doesn't front on it.

8. Report on status of the Transit Oasis concept – no report

9. Report on examination of County road standards –

Ed Studor - We have had a couple of meetings. The recommendation is to go ahead with 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> district guidelines and to work to reduce requirements for internal roadways.

10. Public comment period

Next meeting date Dec. 4, location to be determined.

11. Adjournment