



RIVERSIDE COUNTY INTEGRATED PROJECT (RCIP)

CETAP ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Assembly Community Room, Registrar of Voters
2724 Gateway Drive, Riverside, CA
Tuesday, July 3rd, 2001
9 AM – 11 AM

MEETING NOTES

CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:

Sharon Bolton, Farm Bureau	Tom Boyd, City of Riverside
Joyce Deleo, Supervisors Appointee	Bruce Colbert, Riverside County Property Owners
Dick Doyle, Caltrans	Glen Campbell, OCTA
Janet Gless, Supervisors Appointee	Martin Corona, TransCore
Frank Hall, Supervisors Appointee	Cris De Los Reyes, RCIP/Sverdrup
John Hunt, WRCOG	Alan Hoffman, The Mission Group
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club	Bill Landon, Morongo/Cabazon Project
Cis Leroy, RTA	Richard Masyczek, City of Hemet
Ameal Moore, RCTC	Rob McCann, LSA
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC	David Miller, TransCore
Ron Roberts, RCTC	Craig Neustaedter, Moreno Valley
Mary Ann Rondinella, FHWA	Anne Palatino, City of Corona
Gene Rogers, WRCOG	Marie Petry, Caltrans
Dan Silver, Endangered Habitats League	Trent Pulliam, City of Moreno Valley
Gail Wanczuk Barton, MSHCP Advisory Chair	Steve Smith, TransCore
Helga Wolf, Supervisors Appointee	Doreen Statlander, USFWS
Joan Sparkman, Supervisors Appointee	Susan Streble, Res. Assn. Greater Lk. Mathews
Debra Varnardo, SCAG	Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA
Borre Winckel, BIA	R. Taylor Berger, WRCOG
Won Yoo, MSHCP	Jim Wang, Menifee
	Bill Warkentin, BIA
	Merideth Wichman, Sverdrup

Other Attendees:

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

1. Public Comment Period

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

There were no public comments.

2. Approval of meeting notes

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

There were no comments on the meeting notes and they were approved.

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

(Gail Wanczuk-Barton, MSHCP Chair)(Bill Warkentin, BIA representative)

Gail Wanczuk-Barton - The MSHCP is currently commenting on work products. They have completed their second product and are waiting for next one that should be coming in next week. Their next meeting is on the 19th of July.

Bill Warkentin – The General Plan advisory committee is placing heavy emphasis on activities of the working groups. The Incentives Working Group determined that there should be no net increase of units as a result of the incentive program. One possibility is to use the units lost to the MSHCP as an offset. These ideas are currently being developed.

4. Report on development projects from Riverside County TLMA

(Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA)

There are no new general plan amendments since our last meeting. There is a Planning Commission hearing on July 11th in Temecula regarding the downscoping of the Walker Basin project. The project originally started at about 3,200 units; the latest proposal from county staff is 106 units.

5. Report of progress on NEPA/404 process with Federal agencies

(Cathy Bechtel, RCTC)

Cathy Bechtel reported that the “Small Working Group,” consisting of the County, RCTC, Caltrans, FHWA, and the resource agencies, has been meeting to review and make decisions on various elements of the MSHCP and CETAP. On May 24 we understood that we had verbal concurrence on purpose and need. But there was a setback at the June small working group meeting, at which EPA determined that they would need additional information prior to their granting concurrence. We are having a small working group meeting on July 18 to try to iron out some of the issues. We met with FHWA on July 2 to identify the specific alternatives to be evaluated in the EIR/EIS. Our schedule has slipped. We anticipated getting concurrence originally on April 1. At this point we hope to be receiving what the NEPA/404 agencies would call “Preliminary Agreement” on Purpose and Need and on alternatives at the July meeting.

(note: the following discussion points occurred under item 6 of the agenda, but pertain to item 5)

Dan Silver – I understand you are under discussion with the federal agencies to identify alternatives to carry forward. What is the status on the alternatives?

Cathy Bechtel – The NEPA/404 agencies have suggested several hybrid alternatives in the Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore Corridor and one hybrid alternative in the Winchester to Temecula Corridor. (note: the Federal agencies recommended the corridor name be changed from Banning/Beaumont to Temecula Corridor to the Winchester to Temecula Corridor to better reflect the study area being considered)

Peter Kiriakos – If we are to be functional we need to be involved. This is a major restructuring of what we’ve done. I would like to see a detailed report with maps to see the latest information.

Steve Smith explained the role of the federal agencies, indicating that their concurrences were necessary as part of the NEPA/404 process, which had been described to the committee at prior meetings.

Ron Roberts – The cities need to be involved. The cities are the ones affected, and all decisions are being made by the small working group.

Jim Henderson – The CETAP advisory committee made recommendations on the corridors and alternatives. The process was to move forward with the recommendations. We then faced the challenge of getting concurrence on the suite of alternatives. We are not ignoring the committee. The NEPA/404 agencies have not yet come to the point where their concurrence has been obtained. We have a clear understanding of what CETAP wants to do and once we obtain concurrence from the agencies, we will come back and make a full report.

Robin Lowe – The August meeting would be a good opportunity to give this report. This also keeps the city and staff involved.

6. Presentation 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 Corridor

Cathy indicated that we are moving ahead with the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino corridor. The contributions of the cities in San Bernardino County have been very good and much appreciated. We are working to determine which alternatives to move forward into the environmental process. All of the alternatives are still on the table that were identified in the public meetings this spring. We are also examining a combination of alternatives involving multiple arterial improvements and a limited access expressway linking them together.

Advisory committee members indicated that information being considered by the bi-county committee should be reviewed by the CETAP advisory committee. At certain points, the CETAP advisory committee may wish to provide recommendations to the RCTC commission.

Steve Smith indicated that nothing can happen without concurrence from both counties and that a two-tier process was established with a technical committee consisting of staff, and policy committee consisting of elected officials of both counties. The vision was to use this structure to obtain concurrence from both counties on various elements of the study. The CETAP advisory committee could provide input to this structure, but decisions were intended to be made by the bi-county policy committee.

Robin Lowe and Ron Roberts reiterated that any proposals should come back to CETAP for review and possible recommendations.

Craig Neustaedter – The City of Moreno Valley has adopted a statement supporting the corridor and the alternatives. We are also looking at the option of having super streets included as well as a variation of the tunnel option. The study is proceeding with a parallel structure of TAC and policy committees. On the other side of the border, they don't have a CETAP advisory committee, and there needs to be a balance of the structure on both sides of the border.

Ameal Moore – Information should come back to CETAP. There was one alternative in the study that did not make sense.

Frank Hall – The whole process started with the three advisory committees in Riverside County. If our recommendations differ, that's fine, but we should take action on every item related to transportation. CETAP started this process and we need to be involved.

Staff agreed to bring additional information on corridor progress to the next meeting.

Riverside to Orange County Corridor

Cathy Bechtel - OCTA took action not to participate in the planning of a new corridor between the counties at this time. First they want to talk about what we can do with transit and SR-91.

Glen Campbell, OCTA – This decision was as a result of OCTA’s recent outreach to Orange County citizens and the feedback received as part of that outreach. The feedback from the outreach program was for the focus to be on the existing freeways. The cities and supervisors gave the direction to work on the 91 first. The feeling was that we need to maximize the use of the existing freeways.

Robin Lowe – There is a meeting on Monday night the 9th between Riverside and Orange County BIAs to talk about CETAP. This is a followup to a prior meeting. The conclusion from the prior meeting was, yes we should do what we can for the 91, but we also need to be starting to plan for the other corridor. The meeting on the 9th is at the Marriott in Irvine.

Joan Sparkman – The 91 is not a panacea and we should strongly encourage another alternative. I am concerned that OCTA’s view is too limited. They should join us in planning for an alternative corridor.

Peter Kiriakos – I sat through the entire hearing at OCTA; their statements were very clear, they did not envision a corridor through the mountains for at least another 20 years.

Glen Campbell – On the auxiliary lane westbound between the 71 & 241 we can make improvements by 2006. If we do it earlier, we can look at the revenue loss and compensate the CPTC. The input we obtained from the cities is the desire to act more quickly on the 91. Another possibility is refinancing the toll facility, which might open up some options faster than we think. We are also looking at getting the additional service between Riverside and Fullerton as well as express service. Burlington Northern may add another main line.

Cathy Bechtel – We had a staff meeting last week. We decided to at least talk about things we can agree on. The new OCTA Executive Director is very interested in fast tracking improvements on Metrolink, express buses, origin/destination surveys, etc. – a lot of positive steps are being taken.

Craig Neustaedter – Speaking as an Orange County resident, as a personal observation, there are a lot of issues that the supervisors of the two counties are knocking heads on. I am concerned that the CETAP corridor is getting wrapped up into the other problems. There is a need to do some diplomacy to get these things going, to have better communications.

Frank Hall – Besides the 91, it will take a lot of improvements on other roadways feeding the 91. Currently Corona and Norco are getting inundated with the traffic. That is as much an issue as traffic in the canyon itself.

Glen Campbell – We are aware of the same problem in Orange County. Also, cities in the foothills have concerns over local traffic impacts if there were to be a new facility built. It might be a good idea to get some interaction between the cities of both Riverside and Orange County.

Craig Neustaedter – Based on survey results, the issue of the 91 is hardly on the radar screen for most of the residents in Orange County.

Glen Campbell – To give you a sense of the view of the cities in Orange County, we are even finding it hard to get infrastructure internally to help the cities. Some cities are trying to delete

links in the planned system to avoid more traffic; they are wanting to close themselves off and they don't even want the Orange County traffic. This is the political arena we are working with.

Ameal Moore – As the CETAP committee, we are looking at corridors for movement of autos; but it seems like we also need to figure out how to use alternatives such as Metrolink. We need to work harder at how we get people from the stations to their employment areas. We need more emphasis on building the transit commuting system.

Anne Palatino – The four-corners forum has been in place for several years as a way to promote dialogue on transportation issues among Riverside, San Bernardino, Orange, and Los Angeles Counties. If some additional energy was put into this, perhaps a lot could be accomplished.

Dick Doyle – Caltrans District 8 has been tasked with identifying improvement options for SR-91, in coordination with District 12. The approach is to look at what is physically possible, not being constrained by the limitations of the CPTC franchise agreement. The institutional issues will be dealt with separately, and that is not a part of this study. We are charged with having a report on the options in the October time frame.

7. Presentation on results of transportation modeling of the General Plan land use plan (Steve Smith, TransCore)

Steve Smith provided a presentation on the transportation modeling of the general plan land use plans. He provided a background of information on projected growth in households and employment for year 2020 and for buildout of the General Plan land use. There is no specific year associated with buildout. Steve indicated that a variety of scenarios had been modeled, including different ways of considering the conservation areas in the MSHCP, inclusion of the transit oasis concept, and roadway network alternatives. The basic conclusions of the analysis were that we can make the arterial system work in the buildout scenario, but that major problems remain on some freeways.

A period of comments and questions followed the presentation. A brief summary of these are listed below.

Bill Warkentin – What is the impact of growth patterns, city vs. county? Historically, the trend has been 2/3 in the city, 1/3 in the county. Please explain these numbers. We need to know why these numbers are what they are. This is a significant difference from historical patterns.

Steve Smith – As the cities build out, the trend would be less of a proportion of the growth in the cities, and a greater proportion in the county.

Unknown speaker – The General Plans are all prepared separately. I'm not sure how coordinated this is, but it is astounding that the county's population is going to increase four times and the cities' population will double. We are talking about urban sprawl across a large portion of the county and at the same time talking about encouraging density to facilitate transit. Does it make sense to encourage low density growth? Shouldn't we look at this in the sense of how to encourage density that will accommodate growth, and not perpetuate this system that apparently is going to lead to a difficult situation with transportation and infrastructure.

Dan Silver – A fundamental problem is buildout. What reason is there to plan for so much buildout today? Why not plan for 20 years out, then 20 years from now plan for the next 20 years. Why are we planning for such an astronomical buildout at this time, while the transportation infrastructure we can afford at this time does not stretch out that far. Why not scale back the county buildout? We are having general plan updates every five years. There is ample

opportunity to plan for more development in future decades. My understanding is that this buildout is maybe 50 years out. What sense does it make to plan residential development today that isn't going to happen for 50 years? Isn't that a fundamental disconnection between transportation and land use?

Steve Smith – We cannot predict exactly when buildout is going to occur. It will be a reflection of market conditions and many other factors. From the transportation perspective, we need to look at buildout to provide some assurance that we have at least accommodated the ability to build transportation facilities in certain areas. The problems of not having done that earlier are coming back to haunt us now. We want to make sure that we can accommodate, from a right-of-way perspective, any facility that may be necessary.

Dan Silver – I don't think that answers my question. Why aren't we planning land use and transportation so that they fit?

Ed Studor – We aren't done with the analysis yet, and our goal is to make the land use and transportation fit.

Robin Lowe – When the 91/60/215 interchange opened it was a problem. It was really unfortunate that someone didn't plan 50 years in advance. We know we are going to grow, and I'm really glad that we are beginning to look that far in advance. If we wait 20 years it's too late. When you use a smaller time frame the tendency is to miss the bigger picture.

Dan Silver – You are planning for level of service F on the freeways. What I am saying is, don't plan the residential development at this minute, because in 20 years we might decide that development needs to go in a different direction, or in a different configuration that is better. Why dig a hole today for the residential development you may not be able to get out of in 20 years, even though 20 years from now we might say that it was stupid of us to plan this low density sprawl the way we are doing today. I'm saying why plan residential today? Don't identify its exact configuration today. What's the rush? Build the transportation, but don't plan the exact location of all your housing when 50 years from now you won't know where you want it to be.

Deborah Varnado – Have trucks been factored in? What solutions are there for trucks? Has MAGLEV been factored in?

Steve Smith – Trucks have been included as percentages of total traffic, based on typical existing percentages from Caltrans data. No specific truck lane projects have been included. We are aware of the SCAG MAGLEV ridership forecasts, but those forecasts have not explicitly been included at this point.

Robin Lowe – MAGLEV is too much of a “what if” to factor in.

Steve Smith – SCAG forecasts show about 12,000 trips on MAGLEV between March ARB and Ontario. So, even though it could help, the percentage reduction in traffic would be very small.

Peter Kiriakos – We should have an option that has increased density with housing. We need to have a traffic analysis that looks at greater housing densities for the EIR.

Robin Lowe – We can take that idea to the advisory committee.

Deborah Varnado – How does TDM (travel demand management) play out in the impact?

Steve Smith – There is a mode-choice component to the model but it does not include additional TDM or ridesharing programs. It is assumed that TDM will proceed at a basic level.

8. Report on potential resolution of conflicts between roadways and MSHCP

This item was not addressed.

9. Report on status of the Transit Oasis concept

(Alan Hoffman, The Mission Group)

The committee was urged to stay for the Transit and Land Use Working Group meeting, which immediately follows the CETAP Advisory Committee meeting.

10. Report on examination of County road standards

(Ed Studor, TLMA)

We are still trying to set up a sub-committee and will have more to present next month.

11. Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

12. Adjournment

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 p.m.