



# MEETING NOTES

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

*Moreno Valley City Hall Council Chambers*

*14177 Frederick Street, Moreno Valley*

*January 15, 2002*

*9:00 a.m. – 11 a.m.*

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

Sharon Bolton, Farm Bureau  
Andy Domenigoni, Supervisors Appointee  
Dick Doyle, CALTRANS  
Zahi Faranesh, SCAG  
Frank Hall, Supervisors Appointee  
Janet Gless, Supervisors Appointee  
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club  
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC  
Ameal Moore, RCTC  
Gene Rogers, WRCOG CAC, Moreno Valley  
Dan Silver, Endangered Habitats League  
Joan Sparkman, Supervisors Appointee  
Gail Wanczuk Barton, MSHCP Advisory Chair  
Helga Wolf, Supervisors Appointee

### **Other Attendees:**

Rich Bishop, WRCOG (delete)  
Cathy Bechtel, RCTC  
Judy Behrens, USFS  
Glen Campbell, OCTA  
Fran Dunanski, City of Riverside  
Jim Henderson, Jacobs  
John Kain, Urban Crossroads  
John Licata, City of Corona  
Sandra Massa-Lavitt, Temecula  
Rob McCann, LSA  
Bill Mosby, Caltrans  
Craig Neustaedter, Moreno Valley  
Trent Pulliam, Moreno Valley  
Steve Smith, TransCore  
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA  
Jim Wang, Meniffee

Cathy Bechtel began the meeting at 9:10 AM.

## **CALL TO ORDER**

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

Public comments – Resident Association of Greater Lake Mathews (name of resident not recorded) – their association submitted an alternate proposal in response to the scoping meetings for the Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore Corridor. Why was it not considered further?

Cathy Bechtel – Letters are going out this week to all those individuals who submitted comments as a part of the scoping process. (correction – only letters to those who suggested alternatives ) The suggestions were considered at the December RCTC meeting. Cathy indicated that the suggested alternative goes through a major core linkage area for the MSHCP. It was determined by the Commission that the alternative will not be considered further in the environmental studies.

### **2. Approval of meeting notes from December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2001**

Janet Gless - Statements were attributed to me that should have been attributed to Joyce Deleo – I was not at the meeting. The meeting notes were accepted with the name change.

### **3. Reports from MSHCP and General Plan Advisory Committees(Gail Wanczuk Barton, MSHCP Advisory Chair – Jim Henderson, RCIP)**

Gail Wanczuk-Barton - MSHCP – We met last Thursday concerning the schedule. The draft MSHCP is still scheduled for January 25. A status report was provided from Carolyn Sims Luna concerning acquisition and management of the reserve. There will be an informational presentation of the management strategy this Thursday. There is renewed concern that the criteria maps should not be shown without the actual criteria. The next meeting will be this Thursday the 17<sup>th</sup> beginning at 1:30. (Carolyn Sims Luna – comment only related to the SKR plan, not to the MSHCP)

Sharon Bolton – There is particular concern over the length of time that the property owners will have to wait for acquisition decisions.

Jim Henderson – General Plan – There is an Advisory Committee meeting today to talk about the air quality and noise sections of the new general plan. We have completed the analysis and will be discussing it with respect to how it affects the plan. There is a planning commission workshop tomorrow on the General Plan from 9 to 12. The Planning Commission will be briefed by the staff on the new General Plan. April 10<sup>th</sup> will be the first Planning Commission public hearing. There will be a meeting on Jan. 22 on the community centers. Jan 29 we will have a wrap-up on the new general plan with the Advisory Committee. At the same time, we are working on the environmental documents for the General Plan. There is a lot of work going on in preparation for the hearings.

Sandra Massa-Lavitt – Actually, this afternoon we will be looking at community center criteria, not the noise and air quality issues. They are not ready yet. Air and noise should be ready on the 22<sup>nd</sup>.

### **4. Report on development projects from Riverside County TLMA (Ed Studor – Riverside County TLMA)**

I have not received any development project reports from the planning department lately. We had a workshop last Monday with the Board of Supervisors. The key issue was the interim review

process for the RCIP and General Plan amendments currently in process. The current schedule involves Planning Commission hearings in April, with adoption by the Board targeted for July. There will be a cycle of General Plan amendments probably in March before approval of the General Plan. There are 58 General Plan amendments in various stages of consideration. Of the plans that might make the March cycle, there were five that are inconsistent with the General Plan as proposed. That is out of a total of 58. The five will proceed forward through the hearing process. These will have their hearing before the Board so that they can get a decision. There are some new General Plan amendments that have been submitted, but I haven't seen them yet. I will try to get copies for the committee.

#### **5. Report from RCIP Steering Committee(Jim Henderson)**

We have had two meetings this month. The one on the Jan. 4 had to do with a proposal for the implementation process which went to the Board of Supervisors on the 7<sup>th</sup> of January and was approved in concept. Those that are consistent with the RCIP will continue to move forward. Those that are not will be given an opportunity to be heard by the Board and possibly modified in that process. We talked on the 11<sup>th</sup> about how important it was for the County to provide information to applicants and to the general public for how this process was going to work. The County is going to prepare something that describes the process that will be followed prior to the approval of the General Plan. The other discussion was over the implementation of the MSHCP within the General Plan. There are some issues with regard to the sequence of the approvals and how the MSHCP is considered within it. There are ongoing discussions with the funding group.

#### **6. Report of progress on the intra-county corridors and the NEPA/404 process with Federal agencies(Cathy Bechtel, RCTC)**

There is nothing new to report. Unfortunately, this has not been moving as quickly as we had hoped, mainly due to FHWA workloads on other projects. Some of their correspondence hasn't gone out. We have been getting a lot of attention, but things have slowed down in the last couple of months. We are scheduled to get environmental documents out May 1. We have a meeting this Thursday with the Small Working Group, consisting of all the involved Federal agencies, to try to keep this process moving forward.

Rob McCann– The technical studies have been forwarded to transportation and resource agencies for review. We are stuck on procedural details, not technical details.

Cathy Bechtel – We met with all the Federal agencies in November/December to explain and review the technical reports.

Sharon Bolton – What are the involved agencies again?

Cathy Bechtel - FHWA is the lead on EIS. There is also the EPA, FWS, and Army Corps of Engineers. RCTC is the lead for the CEQA documents.

#### **7. Report on status of the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County Corridor and Riverside County to Orange County Corridor (Cathy Bechtel, RCTC)**

Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County Corridor - At the December meeting RCTC voted to move forward with Alternative 1,(the tunnel option) as the preferred alternative, and also supported arterial improvements. We are working with the individual cities to focus on what those arterial improvements are and what will be included in the CEQA document. There is no policy committee meeting scheduled as yet. There is a possible TAC meeting on February 4.

Orange County Corridor - We haven't had much progress on Orange County corridor. We are hopeful that 2002 will be the year that this begins to move forward. The Riverside to Orange

County connection does have the attention of a lot of local politicians. There are no meetings scheduled at this time.

Glen Campbell (OCTA) – OCTA was authorized to negotiate on purchase of the 91 toll lanes. Not sure what is happening with it at the moment. With regard to transit service, we put forward a proposal for express service on the 91. It is currently under review. There are four routes we have put forward from Riverside County – to Anaheim, East Anaheim South Coast Plaza, and the airport office area.

Cathy Bechtel – Passed out an RCTC newsletter called the Commission Connection. It describes initiatives under way for improvements to Metrolink. – We are on the list to receive \$11 million from Sacramento to build a parking structure at the Corona-main station. That will allow us to move forward with a true multimodal transit facility that will accommodate park-and-ride, express bus, and improvements on train service. That is moving forward. RCTC is also receiving a grant from the AQMD Mobile Source Review Committee with RTA for a \$97,000 grant to do a rideshare to rails program. We are also moving forward with express bus service from Moreno Valley to downtown Riverside and Metrolink. We are trying to get people out of their cars to allow people to ride the bus to Metrolink.

This Friday the Tustin Metrolink station is opening. It should be a popular service for Riverside residents. Orange County is improving their feeder service to that station. In early May we will have additional rail service from Riverside to Fullerton and Los Angeles.

Glen Campbell – OCTA looks like they will be able to get the fifth lane in on the westbound 91 at the County line. This has been a bottleneck in that area.

Cathy Bechtel – OCTA and RCTC are also doing a license plate survey in April to assess origins and destinations on the 91. This will be a \$100,000 project.

Dan Silver – I noted a funny article about keeping a second car in Orange County to get from the Orange County stations to work.

Cathy Bechtel – This happens at a number of stations in Orange County. Orange County has their Station-Link project to try to improve connections to and from the stations.

Sharon Bolton – The front page of Press Enterprise had an article about the train delays, indicating that there have been excessive delays.

Ed Studor – The Riverside Line seemed to have the most problem reports.

Frank Hall – The delays referred to were mainly due to construction on the tracks. The article should have stressed how much it was on time. The article had the wrong emphasis.

## **8. Status of the Riverside County Circulation Element(Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA)**

The County has provided comments on the General Plan circulation element. Revisions are in the process of being made by The Planning Center. We have been working with Dudek and FWS on transportation projects being permitted within the MSHCP. There are several categories of roads that have been discussed – existing roads that do not need to be expanded (County or private), General Plan Circulation Element Roads that will need to be expanded, and Circulation Element roadways that may not need to be expanded but may need other types of improvements, such as safety improvements. It has been a productive series of meetings to understand how these roadways relate to the management of the reserve areas and for them to understand our needs. There will be criteria associated with some of these roadways for them to be permitted activities within the MSHCP.

Steve Smith passed out some preliminary statistics from the traffic modeling of the circulation element for Western Riverside County. The table presented information on development and travel statistics for the proposed General Plan land use, and four alternatives being examined in the EIR. The four alternatives included: reduced intensity community centers (Alt A); increased intensity community centers (Alt B); the existing General Plan land use; and a scenario with buildout in the cities but no additional growth in the unincorporated area beyond what exists today. The table presented data on the number of dwelling units projected at buildout for Western County, the vehicle miles of travel, and the emissions. The table shows the differences in statistics between each alternative and the proposed General Plan (the EIR “project”). All scenarios include buildout in the cities. He highlighted some of the differences between various alternatives.

Dan Silver – Why would there have been increases or decreases relative to alternatives A and B. For example, why would alternative B have more dwelling units but less travel.

Steve Smith – It partially represents some of the benefits of the increased clustering in the community centers. The more development you have in the community centers, the more transit capture you are getting. There are also some other things that were done in Alternative B outside the community centers, including reduction of some of the retail use in some areas. Retail use removed may have been replaced by residential use. You will almost have to see some of The Planning Center’s mapping of these areas to understand all the differences. Steve noted that the proposed General Plan generates less traffic than the existing General Plan.

Craig Neustaedter – Your mode split was an assumed mode split, not a modeled mode split, is that correct?

Steve Smith – Correct.

#### **9. Presentation and discussion of the draft Transit Oasis 30-year Strategy(Steve Smith, TransCore)**

Steve Smith passed out a discussion draft of a document entitled “The Transit Oasis Strategy – An Initiative in Transportation Choices for Western Riverside County.” This document was a draft of the 30-year strategy for the Transit Oasis Concept that is being considered within the RCIP. Some of the major points of the presentation included: 1) the purposes of the transit oasis concept are to connect most major destinations and mixed use areas with regional express transit, provide the highest possible frequencies within the available budget, create core transit infrastructure around which development can concentrate, and attract “choice” riders to transit; 2) There is a broad spectrum of circumstances to which the strategy will need to be tailored, ranging from built-out areas to undeveloped land – the strategy is tailored to the particular type of area 3) an “ideal” or “master plan” is defined, but the plan will be implemented in increments as circumstances and budgets allow – some places may reach the ideal, while others may not, due to various constraints and circumstances; 4) the plan builds on what RCTC and RTA are already doing; 5) the cities are a very important part of the implementation of the strategy, and RCTC/RTA will need to work directly with the cities to determine the optimum station locations, types of service, and potential for enhancing the efficiency of the express and circulator service 6) possible actions for transit agencies and the cities/county were outlined. A discussion of the draft ensued, and comments were to be provided back to Cathy Bechtel by January 29 so that appropriate revisions could be made and re-circulated back to the committee for the February meeting.

#### **10. Report on examination of County road standards(Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA)**

No additional activity

**11. Public Comment Period**

No additional public comments

**12. Adjournment**