



RIVERSIDE COUNTY INTEGRATED PLAN (RCIP)

CETAP ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Assembly Community Room, Registrar of Voters
2724 Gateway Drive, Riverside, CA
Tuesday, October 2nd, 2001
9 AM – Noon

MEETING NOTES

CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:

Sharon Bolton, Farm Bureau
Bruce Colbert, Riv Co. Prop. Owners Assoc.
Joyce Deleo, Supervisors Appointee
Andy Domenigoni, Supervisors Appointee
Dick Doyle, CALTRANS
Janet Gless, Supervisors Appointee
Frank Hall, Supervisors Appointee
John Hunt, WRCOG
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC
Ron Roberts, RCTC, City of Temecula
Gene Rogers, RCOG CAC, Moreno Valley
Dan Silver, Endangered Habitats League
Debra Varnardo, SCAG

Other Attendees:

Don Archer, Jacobs/Sverdrup
Enrique Arroyo, Cal. State Parks
Nita Bullock, UCR
Gail Wanczuk Barton, MSHCP Advisory Chair

Cathy Bechtel, RCTC
Glen Campbell, OCTA
William G. Davis, MV-CEDCO
Fran Dunanski, City of Riverside
Claire Harrington, Reche Canyon
Ned Ibrahim, City of Corona
John Kain, Urban Crossroads, Inc.
Sandra Massa-Lavitt, City of Temecula
Rob McCann, LSA
David Miller, TransCore
Jim Miller, City of Murrieta
Jon M. Ramires, CPTC
Joe Sanchez, The Californian
Viren Shah, City of Corona
Steve Smith, TransCore
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA
R. Taylor Berger, WRCOG
Merideth Wichman, Jacobs/Sverdrup

Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair, began the meeting at 9:05 AM with introductions.

1. Public Comment Period

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

There were no public comments.

2. Approval of meeting notes

(Robin Reeser Lowe, Chair)

The meeting notes were approved.

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

(Gail Wanczuk-Barton, MSHCP Chair)

At the next MSHCP meeting we will hear a report on the wilderness plan for the Cleveland National Forest. Our next meeting is on October 18th at County Flood Control.

The General Plan Advisory Committee is working on funding and implementation issues as well as making revisions to the area plans. We will be reviewing area plans on a weekly basis, as well as the Circulation Element.

4. Report on development projects from Riverside County TLMA

(Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA)

A handout describing general plan amendments was distributed to the committee. There are several general plan amendments in the works.

SP 317 in the Bedford Cyn/I-15 area. This is a 1032 acre development, 500 of which would be set aside as open space, 252 acres for golf facilities, and 167 acres of residential development equaling a little over 500 units. This is adjacent to the Cleveland National Forest and currently part of the Temescal Canyon community plan.

GP 576 located on Clinton Keith Rd. between I-15 and I-215. It is currently zoned for residential of 2-4 units per acre. The proposal is to change this to a Light Industrial zoning so that a veterinary hospital can be built on the 3 acre lot.

GP 106 east of the SR-79 in the French Valley area. The proposal is for very low to medium density housing.

GP 172 in the Walker Basin and includes several different amendments. One is proposing 761-925 units. The staff is proposing 106 total units.

GP 529 near Morgan Hill along the SR-79. The proposal is for a more urban use including a possible school site. It is currently 2-4 units per acre or zoned R-1.

GP 451 which is the Domenigoni/Barton Plan with 4600 units.

GP 564 which is a proposed change from LI to residential.

GP 224 in the Woodcrest area. One unit per acre changing to 2-4 units per acre and the relocation of an equestrian center. There are transportation issues involved including the requirement of Washington St. to be extended south to Van Buren.

Dan Silver restated a question from Supervisor Buster stating “is there going to be anything left to plan in the integrated plan?”

5. Report on progress of intra-county corridors and the NEPA/404 process with Federal agencies, including a discussion of alternatives 5 and 6 in the Winchester to Temecula Corridor.

(Cathy Bechtel, RCTC)

The recommendation from the CETAP Advisory Committee from last meeting that Alternative 5a/5b in the Winchester to Temecula Corridor should be dropped was taken to RCTC. RCTC determined that these alternatives will still move forward in the EIR/EIS process but would not be considered an RCTC preferred alternative.

City of Murrieta Staff – This alternative already has an existing alignment. Is it still part of the 10a permit? Is it still in the circulation element?

Cathy – Yes, but not as a major CETAP corridor.

Dan Silver – What is Butterfield Stage Rd. now and what will it be in the future?

Ed Studor – Currently it is designated as an Arterial with a 110' right-of-way. The portion by Johnson Ranch will be extended northward.

Ron Roberts – The City of Temecula has designated this roadway to be no more than a four-lane arterial. The City has adopted a resolution to this affect. I want it to be known now that you can talk about six lanes, but it will remain four. Talking about it being wider only upsets the city, and CETAP loses support.

6. Report on status of the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County Corridor and Riverside County to Orange County Corridor

(Cathy Bechtel, RCTC)

We have scheduled a policy level meeting for the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County corridor on October 11th at RCTC to look at the next steps to be taken. On the Orange County Corridor, we are currently working with OCTA to look at transit solutions and attempting to get some state funds as well as getting Caltrans Districts 8 and 12 to make some improvements to the 91 corridor with the Metrolink service.

7. Report on status of the General Plan circulation element and discussion of level of service policy

(Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA)

Ed Studor gave a brief summary and history of level of service standard development in Riverside County. In addition, a copy of the Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan Public Facilities and Services Element was passed out which includes a section on Levels of Service. Included in this handout was a preliminary working draft of the new Streets and Highways LOS. Ed explained that the current County policy is somewhat involved. Ed reviewed the current policy and the conditions in which LOS applies. The committee had last time voted to go back to the County's current LOS policy, C with D allowed in certain conditions. The difference between LOS C and D in the HCM is only 20 seconds of delay. We also did a survey last month of other cities. Most specify LOS D, but some are at C. The County is now proposing that the LOS requirement be C, with D allowed in community development areas. This simplifies the previous policy and makes it more consistent with the policies of the cities. A general discussion of Levels of Service followed.

Robin Lowe – The WRCOG cities said they didn't want to lower the standard, but in fact most of the city standards are lower.

Jim Miller, City of Murrieta – Really, the LOS standard isn't the issue. There is no funding source. Until facilities get built we only have paper streets and paper facilities.

Peter Kiriakos – The cost of development is far more than we acknowledge. For this integrated process to be viable, we have to deal with this problem. The fees need to match the costs. To be complete in our process, we need to deal with this issue.

Robin Lowe asked the question of when this would go back to the County and become part of the new General Plan. It was indicated that there would be hearings next April.

Steve Smith – The GPAC and CETAP will be reviewing the draft circulation element and will provide those comments to the County. The County will provide revisions to The Planning Center, and then the EIR will be done on the entire General Plan. The next meeting we will have a formalized packet on this topic.

John Hunt – The TUMF fee will give us some relief in the funding area. We need a partnership so that everyone is on board.

City of Corona Staff – In the City of Corona, we linked land use activities with the level of progress made on developing facilities, with thresholds based on the percent of permits issued vs. the facility building schedule.

Peter Kiriakos – We need a real time database and permit process so transportation people know about permits. This process needs to be computerized.

Bruce Colbert – We need an analytical link between costs and fees with the LOS. This is a complex issue. I want to note that the preliminary draft is different from what we saw last meeting. The standard has been downgraded within the community plan areas.

8. Report on status of the Transit Oasis concept

(Steve Smith, TransCore)

We will be in discussions with Alan Hoffman on the 30-year strategy in the next two weeks. In the following week we will have a meeting of the Transit and Land Use Working Group. We hope to distribute a more extensive report at the November CETAP meeting.

9. Report on examination of County road standards

(Ed Studor, TLMA)

A handout was distributed to the committee showing General Plan roadway cross section standards. A general discussion followed, and a brief summary of comments is provided below:

Peter Kiriakos – We need lanes for transit only. I would like to see this concept incorporated into policies, including policies on arterials.

Ed Studor – Allan Hoffman showed us some of how transit can get priority at intersections.

Dan Silver – The board of supervisors had a good discussion on narrow streets and is pushing movement on the narrow streets issue.

Ed Studor – I am working with Juan Perez and Bill Warkentin on this subject, as well as getting the cities involved.

Bruce Colbert – ROW reservation is needed to accommodate buildout for the freeways. Caltrans is working towards LOS D. We can apply standards to the new corridors.

Robin Lowe – We need to reserve time for a discussion on this topic in a future meeting.

Peter Kiriakos – I would like to see words in the General Plan regarding a data exchange computerized system.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 am