



MEETING NOTES

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

Moreno Valley City Hall

14177 Frederick Street, Moreno Valley

December 4, 2001

9:00 a.m. – 11 a.m.

CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:

Bruce Colbert, Riv Co. Prop. Owners Assoc.
Joyce Deleo, Supervisors Appointee
Dick Doyle, CALTRANS
Frank Hall, Supervisors Appointee
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club
Ameal Moore, RCTC
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC
Gene Rogers, WRCOG, Moreno Valley
Gail Wanczuk Barton, MSHCP Advisory Chair
Borre Winckel, BIA

Other Attendees:

Cathy Bechtel, RCTC
Judy Behrens, USFS
Rick Bishop, WRCOG
Glen Campbell, OCTA
Bill Davis, MV CEDCO
Fran Dunanski, City of Riverside
Ned Ibrahim, City of Corona Public Works
Sandra Massa-Lavitt, Temecula
Rob McCann, LSA
David Miller, TransCore
Craig Neustaedter, Moreno Valley
Jon M. Ramirez, CPTC
Arnold San Miguel, SCAG
Steve Smith, TransCore
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA
Merideth Wichman, Jacobs/Sverdrup

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

CALL TO ORDER

1. Public comment period

No public comments, introduction of attendees.

2. Approval of meeting notes from November 6, 2001

No comments on the meeting notes. Borre Winckel complimented the detail of the notes.

3. Reports from MSHCP and General Plan Advisory Committees(Gail Wanczuk-Barton, MSHCP Advisory Chair – Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA)

MSHCP – Gail Wanczuk-Barton indicated that the last meeting was November 8th. Brad Hudson discussed the County's early application process to achieve conservation. Funding sources were also discussed. The bottom line is that if we have more money we will have more deals. Concern was expressed by the Sierra Club regarding coordination between the MSHCP and General Plan. Next meeting is on December 13th.

Borre Winckel added that they spent the bulk of the morning dealing with subarea units subject to the MSHCP, the mapping issue. The BIA is waiting for the exact criteria that will apply. Until then they cannot say where they stand on the MSHCP. They don't know where the 153,000 acres is coming from so in the interim there is a bubble that is twice that size. BIA wanted to remove the cell overlays from the area plans. These represent almost twice as much area as needed.

Gail Wanczuk-Barton – acquisitions within the last year will be included within the 153,000 acres. There will be a discussion in GPAC today on whether the cell maps will continue to be included on the area plan maps.

Borre Winckel – we were told that the science we are waiting for will not be available until February.

Rick Bishop – The focus of yesterday's WRCOG meeting was a resolution asking for conceptual support of the RCIP as well as for conceptual support of the TUMF but it recognized that more of the details would come later. Questions to be addressed include: who is going to be liable, who is going to own the land, etc. City managers will be dealing with their own city councils to work through the issues with their city. The science and the criteria are not available yet, so cities are still having questions about what conceptual approval means.

Borre Winckel – it is important to note that the MSHCP is a voluntary program to make the environmental regulation, processing, and streamlining of environmental approvals easier. Neither the General Plan nor CETAP need the MSHCP to move forward.

Robin Lowe – It is important to remember that. But we also need to remember that we don't want to repeat the K-rat experience.

Gail Wanczuk-Barton – The cells were there to trigger people to look at the criteria behind it. The cells were not there to conserve everything in the cells. There is always a sense that if you are not the one involved in the agency meetings, you believe you may have been able to do better than what happened with those who were in the meeting.

Craig – I was under the impression that we were buying into this to avoid lawsuits.

Janet – I work with the Temescal Canyon group. The developers there were very angry. It was frightening for the maps to be out. People make the assumption that everything that is green will be taken.

Robin Lowe – We had the same concern with CETAP alternatives. Even though we know that some of them are not going to happen, it is difficult to convey all that to the public. We are not getting enough understanding out to the public.

Gail Wanczuk-Barton – People scream for a map and then they don't want to see it.

Borre Winckel – To have a hard line map for the MSHCP will be helpful, but there is a clear majority that still don't want to see it. The biggest problem is the inadequacy of the funds to pay for the land.

Rick Bishop – We all need to recognize that these endangered species don't go away if we don't do the MSHCP. I see a strong linkage to the transportation program. There is a need to be thinking regionally. The problems may be more significant in the future.

Gail Wanczuk-Barton – We have talked about the issue of this being a partnership between the feds, state, and local entities. If this goes down, it goes down because the partnership has failed.

Robin Lowe – The partnership will not be blamed for the failure. The locals will see a waste of 32 million dollars and much of the blame will be assigned locally. Revenue has been taken by Sacramento, and it looks like more of this is on the way. John Tavalone indicated that we are forming local partnerships with Southern California Counties. We have to carry this over to this plan also. State spending has increased 21 percent, city spending only 9 percent.

Pete Kiriakos – Relative to funding, I would like to throw out an idea. I went to Department of Interior for a San Bernardino Coounty project. They indicated that one state bypassed the system and got money for that project. We should get our reps to have a direct allocation in a bill directly through congress.

Robin Lowe – the K-rat got 2.5 million over the last few years. But there isn't a lot of availability of earmarked money these days.

Pete Kiriakos – We need to keep the funding pressure on .

GPAC report – Ed Studor– We have been meeting on a weekly basis going over area plans. The recommendations will have a final review on January 29th by the committee. We have also talked about how the MSHCP will be reflected in the General Plan. This has not been resolved yet.

Craig Neustaedter – How are the area plans being presented to the cities?

Ed Studor – We had a review of all the RCIP issues last week at a city summit where all the area plans were presented to the cities.

Craig Neustaedter – There needs to be some sort of forum where the cities can say they have reviewed this and have resolved incompatibilities between city municipal boundaries and between the county.

Borre – There have been public meetings for all the area plans. The cities have been able to attend and provide comments. I don't think its fair to put another level of meetings on the County. The cities can attend the public meetings, take information back, and then come back to the County with comments.

Craig Neustaedter – Maybe the cities are participating and I was just unaware of it. For circulation the goal is to have continuity among the cities. We want to make sure it happens for trails also.

Ed Studor – The city planning directors get info through the WRCOG RCIP TAC.

4. Report on development projects from Riverside County TLMA

Current projects have already been discussed previously.

5. Report from the RCIP Steering Committee

Robin Lowe – We have already discussed several of these issues.

Borre Winckel – On December 18th, the Board of Supervisors will deal with two significant issues; interim review procedures, and the incentive program. They will also deal with how to handle interim project review procedures if the proposed interim procedures are not approved.

Ed Studor – This will be in their afternoon session. The Board will also adopt the final round of GP amendments for the year on that date.

Gene Rogers – There is an issue that overlays some of these things. It has to do with development near cities, primarily in sphere areas. The issue has to do with whether the county provides similar standards of development to cities. Supervisor Mullen indicated that he would try to have the Board address that concern. Communications with the supervisors are continuing. There may or may not be agreement on the Board that the county should provide this level of services. This is a watershed issue.

Robin Lowe – This has been a big issue in Hemet. The supervisors don't necessarily realize all the impacts of county development. Our mutual aid calls are up over 500 percent in the last 8 months. We have to build three new fire stations in the city, which puts a big drain on our funding.

Gene Rogers – There seems to be a recognition by the Board that they need to deal with the issue.

Pete Kiriakos – Couldn't we make an attempt to capture the issue in the General Plan itself? It is our opportunity to include it in the General Plan at this point.

Robin Lowe – The General Plan committee has been so focused on land use that they haven't really dealt with services.

Ed Studor – The Level of Service between the city and county is an issue. Also, one of the big topics between the cities and county has been parks and recreation. Many areas of the county do not have anything. This needs some attention.

Pete Kiriakos – If the County authorizes development it needs to support the desired services.

Gene Rogers – This issue draws the largest concern. It is extremely important.

Janet – The response we have gotten from Parks is that everything goes to critters.

Ed Studor – We have historically relied on districts to provide different services.

Gene Rogers – This is a make or break deal.

Borre Winckel – The County has just gone through two years of review of their impact fee structure. The cities were not there. I recently wrote a column for the BIA magazine in that the cities need to come out of their boundaries and work more with the county. The building industry is not the only piggy bank for this. The amount of fees for a house in Riverside County now stand at \$45,000. We are opposed to the TUMF fee at its current level.

Gene Rogers – Regional cooperation is important and the County has gone out of its way to distribute information. The county does not generate funds for operating parks, etc. So therefore, the county does not build some of these things.

Borre Winckel – As an example, Seal Beach recently rejected a street cleaning fee increase to reduce storm water runoff into the ocean. The fee was \$12 per year.

6. Report on 11/28/01 WRCOG meeting with the cities and 11/14/01 meeting on the TUMF

See previous item.

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

Cathy Bechtel – There is not much to report. We are still working on the environmental documents. The technical studies are completed. We are going to be doing technical study briefings with the federal agencies. We are still waiting on review of the criteria by the federal agencies.

Robin Lowe – The committee would like to see the latest version of the criteria.

Cathy Bechtel – We will bring it back to the committee.

8. 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 Commission did approve moving forward on the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino corridor. The ad hoc committee recommended the preferred alternative as Alternative 1. This is going to the SANBAG board tomorrow and to RCTC on December 12th. We have a technical advisory committee meeting this Thursday in Loma Linda.

Borre Winckel – Is this the billion dollar project?

Cathy Bechtel – Yes, the tunnel. We will be getting additional information on the tunnel costs on Thursday.

Borre Winckel – I met with the City of Corona to ask them why they took out the Corona Bypass. Is there any way the bypass could be initiated again?

Ned Ibrahim – That proposal may have made sense 15 years ago. The proposal was hashed and rehashed and rejected.

Janet – We must have some alternative to divert traffic off the 91.

9. Status of the Riverside County Circulation Element (Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA)

The County provided comments on the General Plan Circulation Element text. Revisions are in process of being made by The Planning Center. We have been working with Dudek and FWS on transportation projects being permitted within the MSHCP. Last Thursday was the final meeting in the Anza/Sage area.

10. Report on examination of County road standards(Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA)

Ed Studor – A small group of stakeholders convened and agreed that there would be a four foot reduction in right of way and pavement width on local roads, with further reductions possible on a case by case basis. The major roads will have slightly wider rights of way to accommodate landscaping.

Craig Neustaedter – What does the fire department think?

Pete Kiriakos – We would support narrow road concepts. But would like to tweak that to provide for transit capability on some of the roads, such as pullouts for buses. We should note that certain

streets should be transit capable. We need to be able to support the transit oasis concept with streets that they can run on.

Borre Winckel – This is where I hope we can find some of the TUMF funding (i.e. from narrow streets)

11. Public comment period

William Davis – Menifee Valley. We want to incorporate, but we can see from these meetings that there are some challenging issues.

Craig Neustaedter – We would like to find out how the freeway standards are being resolved.

Bruce Colbert – Ed has prepared some material based on language that was discussed at the last meeting.

Cathy Bechtel – The next meeting falls on Jan. 1.

Jan. 15 was set as next meeting.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30