



RIVERSIDE COUNTY INTEGRATED PLAN (RCIP)

CETAP ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Assembly Community Room, Registrar of Voters
2724 Gateway Drive, Riverside, CA
Tuesday, August 7th, 2001
9 AM – Noon

MEETING NOTES

CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:

Sharon Bolton, Farm Bureau
Bruce Colbert, Riv Co. Prop. Owners Assoc.
Andy Domenigoni, Supervisors Appointee
Frank Hall, Supervisors Appointee
John Hunt, WRCOG
Joan Sparkman, Supervisors Appointee
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club
Anne Mayer, Caltrans
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC
Gene Rogers, RCOG CAC, Moreno Valley
Dan Silver, Endangered Habitats League
Doreen Stadflander, USFWS
Debra Varnado, SCAG
Gail Wanczuk Barton, MSHCP Advisory Chair
Helga Wolf, Supervisors Appointee
Borre Winckel, BIA

Other Attendees:

Mike Amling, LSA
Enrique Arroyo, Cal. State Parks
Rick Bishop, WRCOG
Tom Boyd, City of Riverside
Daniel Brown, USFWS
Nita Bullock, UCR
Glen Campbell, OCTA

Dick Doyle, CALTRANS
Cynthia Ferry, Res. Assn. Greater Lk. Mathews (RAGLM)
George Hague, Moreno Valley
Claire Harrington, Reche Canyon
Jerry Jolliffe, Riverside County
John Kain, Urban Crossroads, Inc.
Bill Landon, Morongo/Cabazon Project
David Miller, TransCore
Anne Palatino, City of Corona
Juan C. Perez, Riv. Co. TLMA
Marie Petry, Caltrans
Louise Rocke, Reche Canyon
Eric Ruehr, VRPA
Steve Smith, TransCore
R. Taylor Berger, WRCOG
Mark Tyler, Lake Mathews
Miguel A Vizquez, resident
Jim Wang, Menifee
Bill Warkentin, BIA
Merideth Wichman, Sverdrup
Russell Williams, CALTRANS
Larry Wilson, RBF

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

1. Public Comment Period

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

Claire Harrington, resident of Reche Canyon – Please don't build a highway in Reche Canyon, and if you do, build trails and make it safe.

George Hague, resident of Moreno Valley – I have been at almost every CETAP organized meetings thus far. At every one, the citizens have said that they don't want these corridors. The survey that is referenced to show resident support did not indicate specific corridors, only general transportation improvements. At all of the public meetings all of the residents have said they do not want the corridors. Mira Loma is an example of a "trucking nightmare". A USC study showed that children in that area have the weakest lung capacity in the region. On average, U.S. trucks fail safety inspections at a rate of 25% and Mexican trucks fail at a rate of 33%. There have been 8000 vehicle accidents in Riverside and San Bernardino County in the past two years, and half of those involved trucks. The public does not want these corridors and we do not want trucks in and through this area.

Cynthia Faire, resident of Lake Mathews area representing the Residents Association of Greater Lake Mathews (RAGLM) – My main goal today was to find out what exactly the options are. I think Riverside and San Bernardino have a great opportunity to establish a presence for an area that is rapidly growing. We have an opportunity to set up the infrastructure for business, travel, and to bring and keep jobs in the area. However, we are concerned with bringing a freeway through the Cajalco Rd. area. We believe this will be a health hazard for the residents. The option that travels behind the mountains seems to be a better route.

2. Approval of July 3 CETAP meeting notes

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

Doreen Stadtlander noted that she was not at the July meeting. She was removed from the attendees list. No other corrections were noted, and the minutes were approved.

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

(Gail Wanczuk-Barton, MSHCP Chair, and Jerry Jolliffe, Riverside County TLMA)

Gail Wanczuk-Barton - Regarding the MSHCP advisory committee, we have one meeting scheduled for August. The draft MSHCP will not be out until the end of August. We have a meeting scheduled on September 16th at County Flood Control to discuss the MSHCP draft.

Jerry Jolliffe - At the last meeting the General Plan advisory committee discussed the initial results of the traffic modeling. We are also working on how to reflect the land use incentives program in the plan. The consultant team was directed to increase the Community Centers density as a way to respond to the traffic results. That plan plus other scenarios and the Draft EIR are currently being worked on.

4. Report on development projects from Riverside County TLMA

(Jerry Joliffe, Riverside County)

There are currently several projects that are being processed. There were two public hearings in July on five General Plan amendments. About a year ago the board established a policy that general plans and specific plans would be reviewed regarding compatibility with RCIP. The Form 11 presented to the Board by the staff was considered by the Board last Tuesday. The Board continued the action until September 11. We are in a transition period. A copy of the Form 11 was given to committee members. Committee members provided several comments on this issue. Dan Silver proposed that the CETAP advisory committee support the interim controls as represented in the Form 11.

Borre Winckel – The BIA was the primary opponent to this revision to the General Plan policy, primarily because the General Plan advisory committees had not finished with any of the incentive program. The point we were making to the Board was that if you want to have greater interim controls on projects that precede the adoption of the RCIP you need to also have the incentives program in place. The incentive program makes the RCIP implementation a reality. The more progress we make with this program the more likely it is possible to have interim

controls. What we are talking about, if the interim controls were to be adopted, is putting a semi-moratorium on plans that may have been submitted on the basis of current policies in place. These projects could then be rejected even though the standard that will go through an entire year of project review and be adopted may not be the integrated plan as it stands today.

Dan Silver – I believe we should support the recommendation in the Form 11. We have been here for three years and the Board has approved tens of thousands of homes. The General Plan amendments are killing the hope to realize the vision. The BIA has been catered to for three years and its time to adopt this very modest staff recommendation. I agree we need higher densities through the incentives program. But in the meantime the Board should stop amending the General Plan. This is not a radical motion.

Robin Lowe indicated that no position could be taken on the Form 11 at this meeting because the committee cannot vote on unreviewed material.

This matter was agendaized for the following CETAP meeting and/or will be taken up by the RCIP steering committee.

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

(Cathy Bechtel, RCTC)

Progress is being made with the Federal agencies on the two internal CETAP corridors. The agencies have provided their preliminary agreement on the Purpose and Need statements and alternatives. A meeting of the “small working group” was held on July 18th with the Federal agencies, supervisors, and RCIP management staff. We came to agreement on which alternatives should be studied and we produced lists and maps of these alternatives. We are working with them on defining the evaluation criteria.

Robin Lowe – This was an exasperating experience for the elected officials. It is evident that there are different perspectives among the Federal agencies.

Steve Smith showed maps of the alternatives that are currently proposed to be moved forward into the EIR/EIS for each corridor. Maps were distributed to committee members showing these alternative alignments for both the Winchester to Temecula corridor and the Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore corridor. Steve explained that some alternatives were added back in by the Federal agencies even though the CETAP advisory committee and RCTC had recommended that they not be advanced. There are also several “hybrid” alternatives that the Federal agencies have introduced.

Borre Winckel – Alternatives 5a and 5b in the Winchester to Temecula Corridor go through an existing specific plan that is currently being built whereas 6a and 6b do not. We need to make sure that the staff are using the latest data.

Cathy Bechtel and Steve Smith – The selection of these alternatives was made by the advisory committee and RCTC last Fall. Scoping meetings will be held on August 27th (Temecula) and August 29th (Perris) to provide information to the public on the alternatives and the issues being addressed in the EIR/EIS. Changes to the alternatives may be considered as a result of the scoping meetings.

Mike Amling – The least damaging alternatives will come to the forefront through the analysis.

Andy Domenigoni – I also have concerns about alternatives 5a and 5b.

Borre Winckel – There is a weakness in this process. We are approving alternatives that do not match real world existing conditions. Several corridors go through hundreds of homes.

Robin Lowe – If we find there is no way a corridor will work it can come out.

Borre Winckel – The committee puts in recommendations on roadways and the Feds make decisions to keep them or delete them; what is the purpose of the advisory committee?

Sharon Bolton – Where does the expense come from when the Fed’s add new alternatives?

Peter Kiriakos – Alternatives 1a and 1b in the Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore corridor are piecemeal alternatives through the mountains. I also disagree with 5b in the Winchester to Temecula corridor.

Ameal Moore - There are negative impacts on La Sierra Ave. in the hybrid alternative the Federal agencies have introduced for the Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore corridor.

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

There was a policy level meeting on July 19th to determine which alternatives to recommend to move forward to the Federal agencies. (Maps, environmental and engineering impact matrices were passed out to the committee)

Ameal Moore – Which alternatives were approved or eliminated?

Cathy - Everything is still on the table, except that the alternative to the west side of Box Springs mountain was eliminated.

An agenda item to formally provide input on these alternatives was to be added for the next CETAP meeting.

Riverside to Orange County Corridor

We are talking to OCTA regarding transit opportunities and are moving forward in areas where we have agreement. We are looking at express bus, on-board surveys to obtain more data, and procurement of funding. There was no further movement with OCTA on discussion of a CETAP corridor.

Borre Winckel – The Orange County chapter of the BIA hosted a meeting between Riverside and Orange County representatives. The BIA sees itself in a facilitating role. Until such time that we prove to Orange County that their lives will be materially improved by this corridor, there will be no buy-in. The other option is to maximize the 91, possibly through the purchase of the toll lanes and changing them into free lanes.

7. Status report on transportation modeling of the General Plan land use plan

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

Steve Smith made a presentation to the committee providing an update on the transportation modeling of the circulation element. He distributed a memo indicating the results of a review of the modeling assumptions by John Kain and the actions being taken to address several of the issues raised. He indicated that the EIR “project” would include the “vision plan” with the higher-density community centers as originally provided for in The Planning Center’s land use

plans. He explained the assumptions to be incorporated into each EIR alternative. The EIR alternatives include:

- General Plan land use map with smaller community centers (Alternative "A")
- General Plan land use map with more intensive community centers (Alternative "B")
- "No Project" consisting of buildout of the existing General Plan (Alternative 1)
- No Build alternative consisting of buildout of the cities with no development in County areas.
- There will also be selected "sensitivity analysis" runs (e.g. with and without inter-county corridors, other MSHCP variations, and with and without transit)

A period of discussion followed. Dan Silver questioned whether an additional six lanes, which was being assumed in the buildout modeling, could actually be constructed on SR-91. Steve Smith indicated that this assumption was made because buildout would occur beyond the expiration date of the franchise agreement for the toll road and that physically constructing the additional lanes would be possible. Anne Mayer indicated that Caltrans is examining options for the 91 right now and said that the additional lanes may be possible but will also be very expensive.

8. Discussion of policies for the circulation element (Erik Ruehr)

Erik Ruehr provided a brief overview of the circulation element policies document. He pointed out that the level of service policies are discussed on page C-4. A handout was also provided from Bruce Colbert with several suggestions, including one that the level of service policy for all county roadways be retained at C, rather than modified to D. The CETAP staff indicated that the D standard was proposed for the community development areas, not the rural areas, and that this was consistent with what most of the cities are currently using.

Bruce Colbert - The consultant team is proposing to downgrade the County's existing level of service standard of the circulation element. I believe this standard should be maintained. If we downgrade the current standard, it will lower the quality of life in Riverside County by making it more congested and a less desirable place to live and work. It is going to make it harder to increase the jobs to housing ratio because congestion will drive businesses outside the County. It will make air quality worse, due to more stop and go traffic. All waiting times will increase. If you wait 10 minutes now, you will wait 15 minutes in the future. Policy 2.8 shows that a level of service "F" will be allowed in the Community Centers, which will be three times worse than it is now. That means if it currently takes you one traffic light change to get through an intersection now, it will take you three light changes in the future.

Cathy Bechtel – This is the draft policy and the advisory committee has an opportunity for input at this point. When is the last time for comment and the appropriate time for comment?

Steve Smith – The VRPA draft will be given to The Planning Center for additional review and then they will provide the draft to the County within approximately three weeks. We could schedule a special work session to go through some of these issues in detail. It was determined that a work session for further discussion of the policies would be held on Monday, August 20 at RCTC. Anyone is invited to attend.

9. Report on status of the Transit Oasis concept

A meeting to discuss the transit oasis concept was to be held immediately following the CETAP meeting, and no discussion occurred during the CETAP meeting.

10. Report on examination of County road standards

Ed Studor was not able to attend the meeting. Ed is involved in organizing a group to address County road standards.

11. Public Comment Period

George Hague clarified that housing, wildlife, and various hazards should show up on maps being used for analysis.

Claire Harrington – The County should consider a moratorium on housing along possible routes.

12. Adjournment

Adjournment

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