



RIVERSIDE COUNTY INTEGRATED PLAN (RCIP)

CETAP ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Assembly Community Room, Registrar of Voters

2724 Gateway Drive, Riverside, CA

Tuesday, May 1st, 2001

9 AM – Noon

MEETING NOTES

CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:

Sharon Bolton, Farm Bureau
Joyce Deleo, Supervisors Appointee
Janet Gless, Supervisors Appointee
Frank Hall, Supervisors Appointee
John Hunt, WRCOG
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club
Cis Leroy, RTA
Anne Mayer, Caltrans
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC
Dan Silver, Endangered Habitats League
Ron Roberts, RCTC
Gene Rogers, WRCOG CAC
Debra Varnado, SCAG
Gail Wanczuk Barton, MSHCP Advisory Chair
Borre Winckel, BIA
Helga Wolf, Supervisors Appointee
Won Yoo, MSHCP

Martin Corona, TransCore
Cris De Los Reyes, RCIP/Sverdrup
Alan Hoffman, The Mission Group
Bill Landon, Morongo/Cabazon Project
Richard Masyczek, City of Hemet
Rob McCann, LSA
David Miller, TransCore
Craig Neustaedter, Moreno Valley
Anne Palatino, City of Corona
Marie Petry, Caltrans
Trent Pulliam, City of Moreno Valley
Steve Smith, TransCore
Susan Streble, Res. Assn. Greater Lk. Mathews
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA
R. Taylor Berger, WRCOG
Jim Wang, Menifee
Merideth Wichman, Sverdrup

Other Attendees:

Tom Boyd, City of Riverside
Daniel Brown, USFWS
Glen Campbell, OCTA

Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair, began the meeting at 9:10 AM.

1. Public Comment Period

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

Susan Streble – Res. Assn. Greater Lake Mathews – This group is currently putting out petitions to be a community of interest. Their group is very concerned about and opposed to the Cajalco alternative in the Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore Corridor. They believe it threatens their rural lifestyle.

2. Approval of meeting notes

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

Frank Hall was added as an attendee. There were no further comments and the meeting notes were approved.

3. Report from MSHCP Advisory Committee and General Plan Advisory Committee

(Gail Wanczuk-Barton, MSHCP Chair, and Jim Henderson, Sverdrup)

The MSHCP Advisory Committee is currently active on a number of items, cleaning up miscellaneous issues. The committee is switching gears now and is in the mode of commenting on work products from the consultants.

Jim Henderson – The General Plan Advisory Committee is continuing discussion on the open space element and is involved with transit and land use issues. We are continuing our evaluation and commenting on the other elements. Today the open space element is up for final approval and we will also be looking at the housing element.

Robin Lowe called for introductions, and a period of general discussion followed. A brief summary of comments is as follows:

Robin Lowe - Reported on an RCIP meeting with cities on April 30. Meetings were held with several cities at a time to talk about the RCIP. Concerns in the morning focused mainly on communications – where the RCIP is going. There were concerns from Perris on problems with the flood control plan that has been in process for many years and that lack of approval is jeopardizing specific plans. Concerns in the afternoon had to do with the amount of development occurring in the County unincorporated areas. Robin indicated how important it is for the cities to be involved.

Frank Hall indicated that sometimes they are not getting RCIP material early enough to be able to comment – need to have more time to get comments in and be able to provide a more thoughtful response. Cities also had a concern about a business-as-usual approach, with the County approving projects that are not necessarily consistent with the RCIP. Need to get the City of Riverside letter out to committee members. Rick Bishop and Robin will be setting a meeting with the supervisors to discuss the city/county issues.

Sandra Massa-Lavitt – representing Calimesa – the message to the County was that it can't be business as usual. There is a lack of information, and the cities are not as involved in the RCIP as they should be.

Robin Lowe – The County is trying to act like a city. This needs to be discussed. There is a problem in trying to get all the key people to the meetings. All of the elected officials need to be aware that this is an important effort.

Borre Winckel – On the subject of business as usual, its not just business as usual. There are some projects that are being adapted to the RCIP. We can't say that if you have entitlements in the County, they are not somehow less valid than entitlements in the cities. Some people are now coming to the table indicating that they have some land in MSHCP areas and trying to work out the issue of entitlements and preservation of land for habitat. We need to make sure that we don't revisit major decisions already made in the MSHCP or it will set back the timetable, and we can't afford to do that.

Robin Lowe – Cities know that development has to continue. But the cities are asking the supervisors to include them in the process as they approve large projects that will use libraries, streets, stores, etc. Not one city asked for a halt to the process. They were asking for inclusion when a plan goes forward.

Frank Hall – City of Norco and other cities feel that the County has been playing lip service. Comments are provided, and they hear nothing back. For example, the Eastvale development needs to do more environmental studies rather than a negative declaration. People will inundate the schools and other services. The County has not responded with how these issues will be taken care of.

4. Report on development projects from Riverside County TLMA

(Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA)

A set of handouts was distributed on various proposed amendments and projects. There is a proposed amendment to Specific Plan 106 that would change the designation from industrial to residential; this is located along Winchester road.

Specific Plan 318 – Oak Valley – This is located near Beaumont and Calimesa. This is a new specific plan, but they are taking the remaining portion of the property in the County and making it into a specific plan.

This is in the area of the home of the Southern California PGA. Upgrades to interchanges would be required. Looking at subregional funding. Habitat issues and linkages are important in this location.

Robin Lowe – Is the County going to require them to satisfy the transportation needs?

Ed Studor – There are conditions to have a subregional funding mechanism. It is unclear exactly how this mechanism will work as yet.

Cathy Bechtel – Beaumont/Calimesa have significant concern over movement at SR-60/I-10

Pete Kiriakos – This is one of the biggest habitat crises we face right now – a big issue with the core area and linkages.

Ed Studor – There are three additional general plan amendments – 521 is located on Los Alamos Rd and could impact the Clinton Keith alternative and habitat. There are a lot of issues in this area. Next is General Plan amendment 545 in the Sun City area north of Newport Rd, 2-5 du/acre. This one does not impact the alternatives. General Plan amendment 554 is in the Lake Mathews area, 10 du/acre to 2.5 du/acre.

Pete Kiriakos – It would be nice to get maps on some of the handouts on the development projects, as well as dates when there will be hearings on the projects.

5. Report from the RCIP Integration Committee – approach to resolution of conflicts between CETAP and the MSHCP

(Jim Henderson, Sverdrup)

Jim Henderson described the transitioning of the RCIP Integration Committee to a steering committee responsible for providing input on multiple aspects of the RCIP. He explained that for a number of months we have been pursuing individual elements of the plan. We formed an integration committee four months ago to try to address some of the conflicts between the elements. After several months of meetings, the decision was made to form smaller working groups to try to accelerate progress. The integration committee was reformulated to become a steering committee to address various issues that would be thought through in more detail by the working groups. The steering committee now has five working groups associated with it. These are ad hoc groups, to address the following specific issues: rural and community separators, funding and implementation, watersheds, city participation, and transit and community centers (transit oasis and land use group). Others may be designated as needed. The role of the advisory committees is unchanged. It is to provide the Board with their views on what is happening in each of the three areas. There are work products coming out in the MSHCP, for example, and the MSHCP committee will be reviewing those products. We are now in the middle of preparing products on which these groups will provide comment.

6. Report on Transit Oasis concept

(Alan Hoffman, The Mission Group)

The Transit Oasis is a system of coordinated transit infrastructure and land use designed to improve mobility and transportation choices for Riverside County. The next step is a transit oasis design charette, scheduled for May 11. We are asking for participation of design professionals who can help us think through some of the details. The charette will address some of the questions such as: How do we integrate this into the RTA's business plan? Where does it make the most sense to locate oases? What could a community center look like around a transit oasis? How should a transit oasis be integrated with the regional transit system? What should stations look like and how should they be used? How does an oasis integrate with the auto? Alan noted that the purpose is not to take anything away from the auto, but integrate it with the auto. Comments from the committee included:

Borre Winckel – This is a very exciting exercise and it is a nice complement to other elements of the RCIP. But we shouldn't stop there; we should rethink all of the road standards in Riverside County. We have ridiculously wide roads with minimal landscaping. We need to have curb appeal. We are all being forced into new design standards in the development community. For example, we should do away with having sidewalks on both sides. We would like to see roundabouts and fewer cul-de-sacs.

Robin Lowe – Prop 218 made it more difficult to have city maintenance of landscaping. It must be funded, and citizens don't want to pay for it.

Borre Winckel – I don't see us getting into the 218 debate right now.

Pete Kiriakos – There is another movement that provides for landscaping that is drought tolerant. We can have very attractive settings with very little water.

Dan Silver – If we can narrow the roads, it takes up less space, which is a good thing. Maybe we need a small technical committee with Ed, Borre and the Fire Department. The City of Carlsbad is working on this, for example.

Ron Roberts – We are dealing with this in Temecula; the streets need to be narrower. We are building long, wide streets that are turning into speedways. We have to think outside box. City engineers will give every reason why it cannot be done. Now is the time to work on it.

Pete Kiriakos – It is imperative that the cities be a part of the process. Transit centers will also be in the cities. The way the cities design their nodes will be critical.

7. Report on progress on NEPA/404 process with Federal agencies

(Cathy Bechtel, RCTC)

We are working with resource agencies to gain concurrence on purpose and need, evaluation criteria, and alternatives. We are expecting to get an e-mail today from FHWA on what they and the other agencies can provide as a status report on the process. There are several meetings over next few weeks. We will be meeting with Michael Ritchie of FHWA on May 18 to provide a briefing.

8. Presentation on status of the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County Corridor and Riverside County to Orange County Corridor

(Cathy Bechtel, RCTC)

Two public meetings were held for the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County Corridor, April 5 in Moreno Valley and April 10 in San Bernardino. About 75 people came to the meeting at Moreno Valley City Hall, about 125 at the San Bernardino County Museum. Many of the attendees were opposed to all the alternatives through Reche Canyon. We have a technical advisory committee meeting for the corridor scheduled for next Tuesday morning, and a policy-level meeting will be scheduled sometime in May. Ed Studor indicated that we also heard that we need to optimize improvements on the existing facilities before building new ones.

Riverside County to Orange County corridor – Cathy indicated that we had a good staff-level meeting a couple of weeks ago. OCTA is doing their own study to determine their local perspectives. Assembly member Pacheco has put together legislation to conduct a study between the two counties.

Borre Winckel – Observing from the public's perspective, you get the feeling that there is no coordination going on. I don't see much of a diplomatic effort. The Pacheco bill could set back the process if it creates tension.

Glen Campbell – One concern that OCTA has is that some people are focusing in on a preferred alignment. It was apparently indicated by someone from Riverside County that the preferred alignment is through Trabuco Canyon. We need to keep the options open. This has created a high level of concern in Orange County.

Cathy Bechtel – There is absolutely no preferred alternative at this point.

9. Presentation on California High Speed Rail

(John Barna, California High Speed Rail Authority)

John Barna – The High Speed Rail Authority is now in the scoping process. We have some comment forms and other literature available. We will be having a public scoping meeting May 8 at 6:30 at

Riverside Convention Center. The Authority created a business plan last year and is proceeding with a program-level environmental document (EIR/EIS).

The high-speed rail system is a proposed 700-mile long corridor statewide. The system would serve all the major metro centers. We are looking at a fully dedicated electrified double track system. The limit of speed is 200 mph. Would need to design the system to operate at that speed in urban areas as well as rural, but it would be unlikely to go that fast in urban areas. We have broken up the state into five corridors, covered by six teams. Corridors run anywhere from 100 to 300 miles in length.

California in 2020 will have the population of France today. The models of high speed rail are found in France, Germany, Spain, Taiwan, etc. The purpose is inter-regional travel. We are hoping to streamline the process as we are moving forward. This includes looking at a variety of alternatives. We hope to get to a Notice of Determination so that we can proceed further. The other big issue is Right-Of-Way. Safety of the system is paramount.

Up until this point we haven't done much station development, but we have been conducting outreach to the public. We will be having public hearings after the draft documents are done. The Federal Railroad Administration is our federal partner. A notice of intent will be out within the next week. FRA has never been involved with a project of this magnitude. We recognize that we will not have a statewide system unless it is able to work regionally. We recognize that if we are not dealing with regional issues, we won't be able to work it into a statewide system. The idea is to have a draft document out at end of 2002. We need to finalize the document in middle of 2003, so that we can come back to the Governor with an implementation plan.

Our performance goals are travel times, safety, mobility, environmental protection, reliability. There has been no technology decision. It is not an either-or between the coast route versus the inland route. As we see the segments moving forward, the question is how can we possibly do both. We have to look at a variety of alignments. We are looking at previous ideas, such as BNSF line along the 91. We are also looking at 4 or 5 alignments in the inland area. As we come down to San Diego along an inland route, we are looking at ways to link up with a coastal route. It may be problematic to have high-speed rail on freeway alignments. We are looking at three possible station locations in Riverside County including: Riverside Metrolink, March ARB, and somewhere in southern part of western county. We are currently coming up with an implementation plan. If we get approval in 2003, we may be trying to get the first parts constructed within 10 years after. The full system could be built by possibly 2020.

Borre Winckel – What is the approximate cost?

John Barna - Per mile cost - \$14 million to \$65 million

Pete Kiriakos – Minimizing the number of stations is important for keeping speeds up. Key environmental issues – major environmental activity between Chino Hills and the Santa Anas.

Janet Gless – Concerned that it doesn't serve enough areas.

Pete Kiriakos – Issue of ownership and management is key – hopefully wont be a repeat of the 91 issue.

10. Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

11. Adjournment

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon.