



MEETING NOTES

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

Moreno Valley City Hall Council Chambers

14177 Frederick Street, Moreno Valley

February 5, 2002

10:00 a.m. – Noon

CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:

Sharon Bolton, Farm Bureau
Joyce Deleo, Supervisors Appointee
Dick Doyle, Caltrans
Frank Hall, Supervisors Appointee
Janet Henderson, SCAG
Janet Gless, Supervisors Appointee
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club
Cis LeRoy, RTA
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC
Ron Roberts, RCTC
Gene Rogers, WRCOG CAC, Moreno Valley
Joan Sparkman, Supervisors Appointee
Gail Wanczuk Barton, MSHCP Advisory Chair
Helga Wolf, Supervisors Appointee

Other Attendees:

Cathy Bechtel, RCTC

Judy Behrens, USFS
Glen Campbell, OCTA
Stephanie Crossey, O'Reilly Comm.
William Davis, Menifee Valley SEDCO
Dick Doyle, CALTRANS
Fran Dunanski, City of Riverside
Jim Henderson, Jacobs
Joe Jensen, Jacobs
John Licata, City of Corona
Rob McCann, LSA
Sandra Massa-Lavitt, Temecula
Jim Miller, City of Murrieta
Craig Neustaedter, Moreno Valley
Trent Pulliam, Trent Pulliam
Steve Smith, TransCore
Mike Snyder, Resident Association of Greater Lake Mathews
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA
Ruth Ann Taylor-Berger, WRCOG
Jim Wang, Menifee

Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair, began the meeting at 10:05 AM.

CALL TO ORDER

1. Public comment period

Joyce Deleo asked about how the CETAP committee was going to be involved in reviewing the Circulation Element.

Ed Studor indicated that the committee had reviewed the circulation element in detail last fall, and those comments, along with those of the General Plan Advisory Committee, were being incorporated into the revised version. The schedule is for the General Plan to go through Planning

Commission in April, probably one or two months of hearings. Next meeting we will go back through the circulation element in detail, to review the changes that have been made.

Robin Lowe– We want to look at it as the whole picture. We want to see how the circulation element is affected by the whole General Plan.

Jim Henderson– A GPAC meeting was held last week. The consolidated General Plan will not be finished until mid March.

Cathy Bechtel– We will get a description of the review process to the committee.

Jim Henderson – There will be no opportunity to change the General Plan documents until after the public review period that starts in late April. There will probably be at least four Planning Commission hearings. The environmental document will be available in late May or June. The General Plan will be adopted sometime before Labor Day. The committees also will have a chance to look at the plan before it is approved by the Board.

Mike Snyder, a resident of Lake Mathews representing the Resident Association of Greater Lake Mathews, to comment at the end. No other public comments.

2. Approval of meeting notes from January 15, 2002

Ruth Ann Taylor-Berger noted that Rick Bishop was not in attendance at the last meeting but that she was there for WRCOG. Cathy Bechtel corrected the public comment section regarding letters that were to be sent out. Letters were only sent out to those who made suggestions on alternatives. Gail corrected Item 3 – Caroline Simms Luna was presenting related to the SKR. The following sentence relates to the MSHCP. Minutes were approved with these corrections.

3. Reports from MSHCP and General Plan Advisory Committees (Gail Wanczuk Barton, MSHCP Advisory Chair)

MSHCP – At the last meeting we had presentations on the conceptual monitoring strategy by Fish & Game and conceptual management strategy by Dudek. The management plan looks to break the entire reserve into five units, based on habitat similarities, to streamline this process. We also discussed the funding and implementation strategy, how we got where we are, what is lacking, and where we've met our goals. We had a meeting scheduled for February 14th. It was cancelled. We are waiting for delivery of work products.

GPAC - At the last meeting we looked at proposed recommended changes in the land use, with the understanding that no maps will be changed. The next GPAC meeting is February 14th.

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

Ed Studor distributed a package of staff reports. The Planning Department has provided an update of amendments processed since November. One of the new ones is Temescal Hills just south of Tom's Farm and is very sensitive in terms of the environment.

John Licata – It is in the Corona sphere and they are concerned about the development standards that will be used.

Gp 587 to go from rural residential to R1 residential in Jurupa area – it is not proceeding forward and it is in the equestrian sphere.

Gp 583 in southwest area to go from commercial to light industrial – 30 acres in Murrieta sphere along Clinton Keith west of 215.

Gp ??? - This is along McCall. This has been tentatively approved by Planning Commission and will probably go to the Board before RCIP is complete

Gp 561 in Mira Loma – 121 lots near county line – this was approved by the Board in January.

Gp 579 – This is in the French Valley area near Auld and Benton. Single Family residential plan near Southwest Justice Center. It was approved by the Board.

Gp 549 – Southwest area on Palomar near Starbuck Circle. The proposal is to go from light industrial to residential. It was approved by the Planning Commission on Nov. 14, but hasn't gone to the Board yet, but probably will before the RCIP is approved.

Gp 529 – This is immediately adjacent to the Morgan Hills development, and was approved by the Board in November.

Gp 451 – Was adopted by Board in December.

The Domenigoni/Barton specific plan was approved and is in litigation at present.

Gp 564 – Southwest area – going from light industrial to residential on Clinton Keith – was approved by Planning Commission in October, should go to the Board before RCIP is adopted.

Menifee Ranch. Currently in study session. Located on Highway 74 between 215 and Hemet – modification to an existing specific plan – changed to more residential.

5. Report from RCIP Steering Committee (Jim Henderson)

We had a presentation by the County of San Diego, who is struggling with their water quality Board about how to handle new permitting processes. They are looking at the Santa Margarita River and the problems they are seeing with the downstream reaches of the Santa Margarita. They talked about their approach – 80 percent of the watershed is in Riverside County. We can expect to see some of the similar issues come up in Riverside County, both for the Santa Margarita and the Santa Ana watershed as well. As a result, there was some meaningful discussion on how to handle discharges from the river. There will likely be some representation from Riverside County on the Santa Margarita Watershed study group.

With respect to the RCIP, it was discussed at the Steering Committee that we expect that there will be another series of adjustments to the plan after the public hearing process so that the plan is in concert with all the changes that have occurred since that time. We looked at the formation of a committee to examine monitoring and management. We decided that we would see what came out of the MSHCP and then support whatever came out of that with our committee process. There were also discussions of funding outside of our funding and implementation plan, trying to bring new sources of revenue to the funding mix. Supervisor Mullen is in Washington this week to try to raise additional funds.

Jim Miller – The San Diego water quality board has been coming to Riverside County to look for mitigation. If you are a local jurisdiction, they can buy it, and they control it, and you are at their mercy if it ever gets developed. On face value the mitigation may not look bad, but if the mitigation is right-of-way for a major road or a retail center that you had planned, the result could have some serious economic, transportation, and land use implications. Somehow we have to start coordinating this. I understand that all of San Diego County's water quality issues are being mitigated in the Santa Margarita Watershed area. We are becoming their mitigation bank for projects throughout San Diego County. This situation definitely needs to be monitored.

Sharon Bolton – The Santa Margarita watershed project has long been steeped in controversy – it is an overlay on all the work we are doing. The property owners were concerned because they could not get a seat at the table to affect decisions. The bottom line was that we had BLM, Bureau of Reclamation, etc. coming in wanting to put a Wild and Scenic River designation on the river. So we have a lot to pay attention to the watershed management, Corps of Engineers, and so on.

Jim Henderson – At least it is a positive sign that they wanted to come talk with us.

Pete Kiriakos – There was a signup sheet for whatever group you represent to be a part of the process. The watershed effort can be an opportunity to implement much of what we have intended in the RCIP. It should be an opportunity to get all the stakeholders to the table on this issue.

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

We are still in the process of developing the draft environmental documents – LSA has completed the technical reports, and we are getting comments back from the resource agencies on those. We are meeting with FHWA Friday the 15th so that we are all in agreement as to how we want to move forward from this point. We are a bit stuck right now. Another positive thing happening is that Jacobs is hiring Lt. Col. Landry to help us out – should be a positive addition. He starts Feb. 11. We are hoping to have draft environmental documents in May still.

Ruth Ann Taylor-Berger– How about letter requesting final agreement on purpose and need?

Cathy Bechtel – Received the letter today.

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

Cathy Bechtel - For the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino Corridor, we met with the technical advisory committee yesterday. The Jacobs team has been looking a little more closely at the preferred alternative. We are in the process of scheduling a policy meeting. RCTC voted to move forward with Alternative 1 as the preferred alternative. We are investigating all the alternatives in the EIR however.

Cathy Bechtel - We haven't had much progress on the Orange County corridor. Supervisor Mullen, Eric Haley, and Richard Lashbrook are in D.C. this week briefing elected officials, including Senator Feinstein. We are making a request of \$5 million as a Federal appropriation to be used toward the study for that corridor. We are hoping to make some good progress in 2002.

Jim Miller - Where are we with Caltrans on their participation in the MSHCP?

Dick Doyle – We are trying to identify the list of projects we want covered and to make sure we understand the program. I am hoping that we will be able get you the information you need by the end of the month. We are committed to signing on with the plan, but need to work out a variety of details with RCTC and the County. We also need to go to the CTC to see how this can be funded.

Glen Campbell – OCTA was authorized to negotiate on the sale of the 91 toll lanes. Not sure what is happening with it at the moment. We also bought the rights to make an interim improvement between Green River and the 241.

Dick Doyle – That should be going to construction this summer.

John Licata – Is that being headed up by District 8 or District 12?

Dick Doyle – District 12. District 8 has reviewed their plans and has had discussions with other involved agencies.

Peter Kiriakos – My understanding is that the environmental documents for CETAP would have only the internal corridors, not the San Bernardino or Orange County corridors. Is that correct?

Cathy Bechtel – Yes. The MSHCP will have a reference that recognizes that we have a full intent to study a corridor to Orange County, so that there will be no surprises in the MSHCP.

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

Discussion to occur in March.

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

Robin Lowe – I am not looking for a recommendation from the committee today on the Transit Oasis. There are several key members who are not here. We should have a full discussion and recommendation at the March 5 meeting. We will have a recommendation from this committee directly to the full commission.

Cathy Bechtel – We could make a presentation to Plans and Programs in February so that they are familiar with it and let them know that a recommendation will be coming from the committee to the Commission on March. 13.

Frank Hall – We had a very good presentation on the Transit Oasis at the last WRCOG meeting.

Steve Smith – reviewed changes to the draft of the Transit Oasis Strategy, which was handed out and discussed in January. A strikeout version was mailed to committee members with the agenda packet for February, reflecting comments that had been received. Steve indicated that few comments had been received since the presentation on January 15. Dan Silver had provided some comments, and the City of Moreno Valley provided a letter late last week. A lot of the City's issues had to do with the land use side of the equation, with concerns about creating some of the nodes in the unincorporated area.

Gene Rogers – There are 19 or so nodes that were identified, and 11 of these were in the cities. If you look at Moreno Valley, a couple of them we believe would not be viable. It seems to me that a lot of the oases will occur more in the County, not in the cities, and our concern is that you might take land that is currently vacant and put a lot of density in there. We felt that if there are densities to be built to support transit, they ought to be in places where there is some density to begin with.

Steve Smith – There are no specifications as to how dense the nodes need to be, and there is a recognition that the nodes will evolve over time.

Gene Rogers – I can't disagree with the concept, but the issue is a little broader than just the transit issue. It has to do with development in the unincorporated areas. It is mainly a land use issue for us.

Cathy Bechtel – The map that shows locations for possible oases is very helpful. The nodes correspond to those in the General Plan, right?

Ed Studor – The nodes are in locations that we think make sense to have development, rather than spreading it out peanut butter style.

Steve Smith – There are several nodes in the County that should be noted: Eastvale, Pedley, Menifee, French Valley, Diamond Valley Lake, and Winchester. This is six out of the entire set. The intent is for RCTC and RTA to work with the cities to determine together where the best places for the nodes would be. Perhaps the fundamental issue is whether Western Riverside County wants an express transit service long term, or not. That is what this is all about – trying to find an economical way to provide express transit and link our cities together. It will not necessarily happen in two or three years, but we are trying to ensure the possibility of building it over time. The early implementation routes are all city routes. The suggested early implementation routes thus far are between Moreno Valley and Riverside, Temecula to Corona, and wherever the Bus Rapid Transit occurs, as a result of that study. Some of these cities already

have emerging plans. We are just building on what is already happening, and creating the master plan so that all the pieces will eventually fall in place.

Peter Kiriakos – This concept without buy-in from the cities will not work. We hope the cities will adopt these ideas so that we can have a comprehensive system.

Gene Rogers – The concept of express transit is something the city will support. We mainly have land use issues.

Peter Kiriakos – The map does not reflect what I remember was the discussion on the number of centers. It seemed that we were cutting out more nodes.

Cathy Bechtel – These are possible locations. Cis LeRoy will be setting up meetings with the affected cities to find out where some of the better locations may be.

Ron Roberts – We are already working with RTA on express bus service and are hoping to get some funding this year. The I-15 route should also connect with the Ontario Metrolink station. We are also talking with San Diego on transit issues.

Peter Kiriakos – Ontario should be brought into this also.

Cis LeRoy – We are not going to site oases in a vacuum. We will be working closely with city staff.

Frank Hall – We really need to do some coordination between RTA and Omnitrans, so that we don't let the artificial border get in the way of efficient transit service.

Dick Doyle – Caltrans is investing significantly in transit, such as the parking garage at Corona Metrolink.

10. Public Comment Period

Mike Snyder, RAGLM - Lake Mathews area – Originally Cathy Bechtel came to us and said that the alternate route we had recommended would be considered. We were told that the reason it was rejected is that it conflicts with habitat. The wildlife agencies told us that the main place it conflicts is toward I-15, but you have another alternative going through that area. So why is that a problem? It would be foolish to put a freeway near Lake Mathews, one of the most important reservoirs serving Riverside and Orange Counties.

Steve Smith – The alternative that is still being considered in CETAP was not endorsed by RCTC and is not viewed to be acceptable by the wildlife agencies. It was supported by the Corps of Engineers and therefore was put back on the list after having been taken off earlier. It is being analyzed, but not viewed to be a viable alternative. Both alternatives have the same problems with habitat.

Robin Lowe – next meeting March 5 – but the location may change – stay tuned.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at