



MEETING NOTES

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

Moreno Valley City Hall Council Chambers

14177 Frederick Street, Moreno Valley

March 5, 2002

10:00 a.m. – Noon

CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:

Sharon Bolton, Farm Bureau
Dick Doyle, CALTRANS
Janet Gless, Supervisors Appointee
Janet Henderson, SCAG
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club
Cis LeRoy, RTA
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC
Gene Rogers, WRCOG CAC, Moreno Valley
Joyce Deleo, Supervisors Appointee
Gail Wanczuk Barton, MSHCP Advisory Chair
Borre Winckel, BIA

Zahi Faranesh, SCAG
Jim Henderson, Jacobs
Joe Jensen, Jacobs
John Kain, Urban Crossroads
Charles Landry, Jacobs
John Licata, City of Corona
Sandra Massa-Lavitt, Temecula
Rob McCann, LSA
Michael McCoy, WRCOG
Jim Miller, City of Murrieta
David Miller, TransCore
Bill Mosby, Caltrans
Trent Pulliam, City of Moreno Valley
Joe Sanchez, The Californian
Joe Shaw, The Keith Companies
Steve Smith, TransCore
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA
Jim Wang, Menifee
Bill Warkentin, BIA/GPAC
Kathy Westrope, Rancon
Sharon Wick, O'Reilly Communications
William Zeidlik, Menifee CEDCO

Other Attendees:

Cathy Bechtel, RCTC
Jane Block, Endangered Habitats League
Glen Campbell, OCTA
Bill Davis, Menifee CEDCO
Fran Dunanski, City of Riverside

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

CALL TO ORDER

1. Public comment period

William Zeidlik – I am with Menifee Valley CEDCO and the resource conservation district. The Oak Tree council of the State has provided us with a conservation advisory to the County. We

are doing a health and age criteria analysis and inventory for the County of all the oak trees. We are also gathering their coordinates for use in a GIS system. This is a proposal through the Department of Forestry. We have identified the centerpiece oaks. Also, Menifee Valley is in the incorporation stages. They are trying to get this onto the November ballot. We are asking that LAFCO give us a status report. We are talking about gaining control of the County land area in our area. We have to do an analysis of how much infrastructure is required, whether we can afford it, etc.

The Bundy Canyon/Scott Road advisory committee is being formed. The section west of I-215 is not a CETAP corridor. We can't wait for developers to widen this road. There are many individual property owners in this area, but no major landowners. We are going to have to have some sort of special district, since the individual property owners will not widen the road.

2. Approval of meeting notes from February 5, 2002

The Meeting Notes were approved with no changes

3. Reports from MSHCP and General Plan Advisory Committees (Gail Wanczuk-Barton, MSHCP & Bill Warkentin, GPAC)

Gail Wanczuk-Barton (MSHCP) - We are meeting on Thursday to get the administrative draft of the MSHCP. There are two meetings on the next two Thursdays. Jim Henderson stated that this is the administrative draft. The actual permit application will not be in that package. The application may be discussed at the WRCOG meeting on the 20th.

Jim Miller – I had understood that the permit application might happen this month, but sounds like it could be April.

Jim Henderson – It still may happen in March. Cities will need to sign the implementing agreement. Part of the process is signing the application so that they can be included in the Implementing Agreement.

Bill Warkentin (GPAC) – The General Plan is essentially finished. We have discontinued meetings for the moment. We will have next meeting in April when we will receive the entire plan. The first hearing with the Planning Commission will be April 27, time still to be determined.

Peter Kiriakos– The last piece will be the implementation plan, which we have not seen.

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

Ed Studor – During this past month, we had six amendments, as follows.

588 – This is in the Lake Mathews area right off of La Sierra. The proposal is to go from 112 acres of rural agriculture to 15,000-foot lots. Has been continued off calendar. Intent is to consider after or during RCIP.

486 – This is in the Corona Hills area, El Cerrito area, near the Cleveland National Forest. The proposal is for various types of uses – 1032 acres. Project was denied by the Planning Commission.

600 – This is in the southwest area, south of city of Temecula, out near wine country. The proposal is to change from 10-acre minimum to 20,000 sf lots. It was continued to April 24th.

449 – This is in the Rancho California area and is an amendment in a specific plan in the French Valley area. It is 697 acres proposed for R1 residential development. It was continued to April 10. It is in the area that Murrieta is annexing, possibly an area to be purchased for Quino habitat.

607 – This is also Rancho California Rd on Benton Road in the French valley area. The proposal would expand the Winchester 1800 specific plan with 40 acres going from 10-acre minimum to single family homes and would allow an additional 120 dwelling units.

The last is a possible farm annexation that proposes 792 acres of mixed use, mainly residential that provides for 943 lots. There was no action as it was an introduction to the Planning Commission on the project. No hearings are set.

Borre Winckel – I would like to have copies of aerial photos from RCTC to calculate how many homes will need to be obtained through eminent domain.

5. Report from RCIP Steering Committee (Jim Henderson, Jacobs)

Jim Henderson – Our next meeting is March 8. At the last meeting we had a discussion of the interim implementation process and the use of incentives for open space. Jerry Jolliffe had a discussion on that subject. We also had a discussion on the upcoming General Plan hearing schedule.

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

Cathy Bechtel - We reported last month that we had sent out a request for final Purpose and Need agreement. We have now received concurrence on Purpose and Need. LSA has finished draft technical reports and sent them to the agencies. The resource agencies have commented, and they want additional information. We are reviewing their requests. We are working on getting environmental documents out to transportation agencies in early May.

Borre Winckel – How are out of county corridors being considered in MSHCP?

Jim Henderson – We have no direct alignment in the two corridors. In Orange County, you cannot run a line up to the county boundary and then have it just stop. We have to be careful in how to approach this; it needs to be legally defensible. Everyone agrees that the process was set up to accommodate the out of county corridors. We are analyzing the MSHCP to make sure that we have appropriate conditions in place. We have to be careful to make sure that the MSHCP can stand up to a challenge.

Borre Winckel – I am agitating the process to get you to go there. It is a last minute addition. We disagree that a precise alignment is needed to cover it in the MSHCP. The county needs to be very firm on the issue with the Service. Borre discussed an example of a project in San Diego County.

Jim Henderson – San Diego was able to deal with that issue because it was entirely within their own county.

Borre Winckel – That was why we have proposed a corridor that stays within the county (note: this is the “SR-291” alignment proposed by the BIA to connect I-15/Cajalco with SR-91 just east of the Orange County line).

Pete Kiriakos – To clearly speak on different concepts, from the perspective of the Sierra Club, it is not legal to piecemeal projects. To have complete environmental analysis, we need a holistic analysis of all the issues.

Jim Henderson – The issue is that we are following the law.

Robin Lowe – Borre’s frustration is with the law, not following the law.

Pete Kiriakos – For Jim to indicate that the county is working closely with the BIA shows undue concern for the BIA, neglecting the other stakeholders, it is a point of equity.

Sharon Bolton – Which agencies have responded with comments?

Cathy Bechtel – FWS, Corps, and EPA, - They are providing oversight as part of the NEPA/404 process.

Sharon Bolton - Is there a limit on what they ask for? Do we not have something to say here at the local level?

Jane Block, representing Dan Silver - There has been request for additional information as we go along. We shouldn't try to create an atmosphere of them versus us. The environment is not *them*, it's our heritage, and we all have to care about it. Jane passed out a letter from Dan Silver's transportation consultant to the committee and indicated that Dan would like to talk about it at the next meeting.

Cathy Bechtel – I also get frustrated with amount of time that it takes. But we also work with the resource agencies as partners.

Pete Kiriakos – The MSHCP does set out a grid system, and each grid does not have to get conserved 100 percent.

Joyce Deleo – We are concerned about funding the MSHCP. We will be entering many more lawsuits without a funding mechanism. We are talking about money that we don't have. It is a serious problem.

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 - The latest map for the bi-county corridor was distributed. Cathy noted that RCTC and SANBAG voted on a preferred alternative to carry into the EIR (alternative with the tunnel through Box Springs mountain). We are moving forward with the CEQA process and project descriptions.

Borre Winckel - Is this the out of county corridor to SB? I do not understand how the committee voted on the billion-dollar proposal. On the Orange County corridor, did Orange County say that they did not want to see any of the alignments? There are agreements developing on the 91. Shouldn't we include in the toll lane buyout, language on the new corridor?

Glen Campbell – That issue should not play into it. It is really more of a funding issue. No one has ever said that we won't have a need for something else. OCTA feels that the focus right now needs to be on the 91 to acquire the franchise.

Cathy Bechtel – It is more of prioritization issue, OCTA wants to deal with the 91 first. Riverside County thinks we should go in parallel. We did send a letter to the Forest Service. OCTA hasn't shut out the corridor in their letter to the Forest Service.

Pete Kiriakos – Having been present at both RCTC and OCTA deliberations, there is clearly is a difference of opinion . The clear vote of OCTA was not to deal with new corridor. Back on the San Bernardino corridor, the red and green lines would bi-sect the mountains. There is a very expensive tunnel for Box Springs, but not for other parts of the alignment.

Cathy Bechtel – When RCTC took action on the San Bernardino corridor, they cited the need to address wildlife movement. We recognize that Blue Mountain is a sensitive area, for example.

Pete Kiriakos – We also need wildlife overpasses and underpasses.

Joyce Deleo – The General Plan addresses nothing on the corridor to Orange County, right? Even though that is what we had as a main objective?

Robin Lowe – It lays out the intent, we just haven't found a solution.

Jim Henderson – We have to plan for the internal infrastructure though, to support what may occur in connecting up to the external corridors.

Borre Winckel – Regarding the TUMF policy committee meeting, which corridors are we costing out? How is the TUMF affected by CETAP? Is CETAP taking some of the TUMF money?

Cathy Bechtel – The TUMF discussions are still evolving. This is a new issue as of last week.

Borre Winckel - This all interrelates to Measure A. The Measure A expenditure plan is in flux. How does that relate to CETAP funding? If we move CETAP into TUMF, that gives the BIA a heart attack.

Robin Lowe – Many different concepts are being discussed.

Borre Winckel – What part of TUMF are people talking about moving to CETAP?

Robin Lowe – You can't bond against TUMF money. That's why we are taking a hard look at the financing mechanisms. We are looking at the timing of how we get early congestion relief. What kind of money can we legitimately use to move a project forward early? Nothing has been settled.

Pete Kiriakos – Are we trying to get some clarity on line item funding in any of the propositions?

Robin Lowe – Just Proposition 42, no line item issues involved.

8. Review of changes made in the General Plan Circulation Element (Ed Studor, TLMA)

Ed Studor – Joyce had brought up the circulation element issue last time. This draft reflects the changes from the two committees. There are still some things that are being added on trails, etc. The main thing for us begins on page 9. We had a discussion on LOS and the proposed language is to maintain LOS C in the county, but allow LOS D in community development areas at intersections.

Pete Kiriakos – A technical request, could we get another little packet of info?

Sharon Bolton – Can we get a pdf file? GPAC would also like to get a copy of the pdf version.

Ed Studor – We can do that.

Jim Miller – Are we getting the traffic analysis?

Ed Studor – That will be in the EIR.

Bill Warkentin – It looks like everything is coming down to traffic issues.

Robin Lowe - The discussion belongs at the steering committee level.

Bill Warkentin – We need to see the traffic results as soon as possible.

Pete Kiriakos – On the pdf files, I want to compliment the MSHCP, with the PDF files, it works well. I would like to see the CETAP maps done the same way, on CD.

9. Discussion and Recommendations on the Transit Oasis 30-year Strategy (Gene Rogers, WRCOG, Moreno Valley)

Gene Rogers – I am concerned about the locations of sites for transit oases. The bigger issue is of densities in the County. We hope that the process is meaningful in that the oases will be in currently denser areas. Also, separate ROW may not be practical.

Cis Le Roy – I also feel that exclusive ROW may not be realistic.

Bill Warkentin – I believe that the transit oasis is viable, but we need to have flexibility as a matter of policy.

Steve Smith – The Transit Oasis Strategy was written with a great deal of flexibility in mind.

Gene Rogers moved to send the Transit Oasis Strategy to RCTC Plans and Programs – no objection

10. Public comment period

Cathy Westrope, Rancon – I would like to bring you up to date on the Newport road issue. We have been working closely with the County Transportation Department. We now have plans for Newport Road as a six-lane road from Menifee to the SR-79. We are currently trying to figure out how to get the road built.

Bill Zeidlik – I would like to raise the issue regarding trucks, trails, and easements. In the last package on 496 GPA, the regional trails system has been designated as 20 feet wide. In some areas, it is proposed as 30 feet. This may endanger trees. We are all in favor of the Newport connection. Murrieta won't let trucks through, and others won't let trucks through. The roads are narrow, but they need to accommodate trucks. We need to talk about truck traffic accommodation. There are 11 trails crossing Bundy Canyon Road. We are going to need to think about trail crossings. The trail system is not being spoken for., Jeanie has retired. The trucks and trails are beginning to conflict with each other. I will be discussing GPA 496 with the County.

11. Adjournment