



# MEETING NOTES

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

*Moreno Valley City Hall Council Chambers*

*14177 Frederick Street, Moreno Valley*

*Tuesday, May 7, 2002*

*10:00 a.m. – Noon*

### **CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:**

Sharon Bolton, Farm Bureau  
Bruce Colbert, Riv. Co. Property Owners  
Joyce Deleo, Supervisors Appointee  
Dick Doyle, CALTRANS  
Frank Hall, RCTC  
Janet Henderson, SCAG  
John Hunt, RCTC  
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club  
Anne Palatino, RTA  
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC  
Ameal Moore, RCTC  
Ron Roberts, RCTC  
Dan Silver, Endangered Habitats League  
Gail Wanczuk Barton, MSHCP Advisory  
Chair  
Borre Winckel, BIA  
Won Yoo

### **Other Attendees:**

Enrique Arroyo, State Parks  
Cathy Bechtel, RCTC  
Judy Behrens, USFS  
Dahlia Boyarski USFWS  
Anita Bullock, UCR  
Glen Campbell, OCTA  
Stephanie Crossey  
Fran Dunanski, City of Riverside  
Eric Haley, RCTC  
Jim Henderson, Jacobs  
John Kain, Urban Crossroads  
Darcy Kuenzi,  
Charles Landry, Jacobs  
Sandra Massa-Lavitt, Temecula  
Jim Miller, City of Murrieta  
Mark Roberts, Caltrans  
Trent Pulliam, City of Moreno Valley  
Dierdre Sanders, So. Cal. Edison  
Viren Shah, City of Corona  
Steve Smith, TransCore  
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA  
Jim Wang, Menifee

### **CALL TO ORDER**

#### **1. Public comment period**

No public comments

#### **2. Approval of meeting notes from March 5, 2002 (no meeting in April)**

Meeting notes were approved.

#### **3. Reports from MSHCP and General Plan Advisory Committees**

No recent meetings have been held for the MSHCP Advisory Committee or General Plan Advisory Committee. Ed Studor indicated that Planning Commission hearings have started on the General Plan. About 300 people attended the first meeting, held in Riverside. Most of the property owners testifying had concerns about the land use designation on their property. Meetings are also being held in Indio, Temecula, and Riverside Convention Center.

Sharon Bolton noted that the Planning Commissioners had not received the General Plan information until about two weeks prior to the first meeting, and we are concerned about the schedule and about being able to review the EIR along with the General Plan.

Borre Winckel – The BIA supports the General Plan per recommendations from GPAC. We want to keep the density issue and incentives program intact. Unfortunately, there was some misinformation on community centers. Community centers are designated on only 2700 acres. We are also recommending that all references to the MSHCP be eliminated until it is a reality. We believe landowners are not getting enough information about the RCIP. We are also recommending that the BIA's proposal for the 291 (an alternate route south of Corona between I-15 and SR-91) be included in the General Plan.

Sharon Bolton – The Farm Bureau is also concerned about the merging of the MSHCP into the General Plan. By taking the unfinished MSHCP and merging it into the General Plan, they have made it regulatory versus voluntary. We have been told that there will be a re-write of the open space element of the General Plan to reflect this.

#### **4. Report on development projects from Riverside County TLMA**

Ed Studor provided the following overview of General Plan amendments.

GP 582 – a desert case in Mecca – affordable housing – changing to 8-14 units to acre – approved on March 13

GP 602 – on Newport road just west of Murrieta Road – designated as a special planning area. Want it to be removed from that designation – approved March 13

GP 449 – 3M property off Winchester Road – Amendment to GPA 309, Winchester Mesa - Trying to make a deal to set aside more land for open space, but also designating more for commercial on SR-79. In an area already slated for annexation by City of Murrieta – Planning Commission recommended denial

GP 594 – in Sun City area – currently designated commercial/senior design – redesignated residential 2 to 5 units per acre – was approved by Planning Commission

GP 600 – in Southwest area – equestrian area off of SR-79 south – proposed to go from 10 acre lots to half acre lots – item was continued to June 19

GP 535 - near Diamond Valley Lake – next to the Domenigoni-Barton specific plan – a new specific plan of 335 acres, combination of residential and commercial – approved on April 24

GP 581 – for discussion – Audie Murphy Ranch between Canyon Lake and Sun City – discussion only

Ed explained that the County has not prohibited General Plan amendments at this time, but the thought was that if you are not already through the hearing process you are not going to get through the process before the new General Plan is adopted. If someone wants something included in the new General Plan they need to come to the hearings and make their case so that it can be reflected in the new General Plan when adopted later this year.

Borre Winckel — explained where the Press Enterprise got it wrong on the SR-291 issue – the BIA is trying as part of the CETAP process to augment what is being done by proposing a new

road that follows the Cajalco Road alignment and continues west of I-15, proceeding south of Corona under the national forest with a tunnel, and then to SR-91. The BIA is trying to get the route covered in the General Plan Circulation Element and MSHCP.

Eric Haley – SR-291 is something of a misnomer. There is no state route. It is a planning concept advocated by the BIA. The inclusion in the state highway plan would involve discussions with the California Transportation Commission. RCTC has no position on the route right now. The host city is extremely important to the process, and Corona has recently been aggressively opposed. It is the sense of the commission that anything of this magnitude would need to go through a formal process. It is an extraordinary proposal, and not to say that it does not have merit, but it is ill-timed and should go into the amendment process.

Borre Winckel – we came together in this room largely because of the corridor to Orange County.

Joyce Deleo – we have to look for a new corridor to Orange County to relieve the 91

Jim Miller – why can't the multi-species plan address the 291?

Borre Winckel – The City of Corona is holding up the 291 discussion, in favor of a more direct route through the forest

Bruce Colbert – it would be a major mistake for Measure A extension not to address the county's most congested corridor

Robin Lowe – Measure A extension does address improvements to the 91.

## **5. Report from RCIP Steering Committee**

Jim Henderson – The last meeting of the Steering Committee covered what we talked about the last couple of minutes – the 291 proposal. We also talked about the issue Sharon brought up regarding the MSHCP inclusion in the General Plan. There will probably be some changes in the language.

Robin Lowe – We talked about the misperception of the community centers. The WRCOG task force is talking about the Implementing Agreement for the MSCHP. We will see how far we get in the next couple of weeks. We have a meeting with WRCOG this Thursday. One of the issues is the jurisdictional agency. Cities were concerned about the details of the jurisdictional issues.

Peter Kiriakos – I had a proposal on some funding possibilities. We may have a significant breakthrough on some funding opportunities relating to streams and water bodies.

## **6. Report of progress on the intra-county corridors and the NEPA/404 process with Federal agencies**

Cathy Bechtel – The consultant team has worked hard to get out the first draft of EISs for the two internal corridors. They are being reviewed by the transportation agencies. We are planning on distribution of drafts to the public in the first week of July. We will have hearings in late July or early August. We will work through the process for selecting a preferred alternative in September. We are still working with resource agencies to approve the criteria by mid June.

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

Cathy Bechtel – We have had a difficult time working on a date for the next Policy Committee meeting for the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County corridor. The date is May 23 at 3:00 at the Loma Linda community center. We have had good cooperation from all the cities on both sides of the border.

Glen Campbell – On the Orange County corridor, OCTA has reached tentative agreement to acquire the 91 toll franchise. However, we need state legislation to authorize us to operate the lanes. We are working on the legislation this summer. We have to do a financial assessment of the toll road, but the critical thing is the legislation. It looks like it will happen, but it is not final. Yesterday the expanded service on the Metrolink line from Riverside to Fullerton to LA got underway.

Cathy Bechtel – the Orange County corridor has not been dropped – we need to make that clear. It is not forgotten. We have a meeting scheduled with the Forest Service next week to keep it moving forward.

#### **8. Dan Silver item on review of the Circulation Element traffic modeling (consultant letter distributed at March meeting)**

Dan Silver – We had a traffic modeler that has looked at the circulation element modeling. To summarize the points, the modeler did not have any major critiques of the modeling itself. He noted that the plan included over 9000 lane-miles of new roadways. He tried to make some rough cost estimates and estimated a cost between \$16 and \$50 billion. He calls for a detailed, hard financial analysis to be included with the General Plan. If the infrastructure can be built, you are probably OK, but he questions that assumption. He thinks there are a lot of things that can be done. He doesn't think transit will be the panacea. What struck him was to have a more realistic timeframe in the planning horizon. Most planning at the project level looks at 20 to 25 years in the future. This may be the fatal flaw in this effort. We are going too far out. The chance of the Board reversing decisions on specific plans is nil. But we could state what we plan on developing in the next 20 to 25 years. Anything after that could be called an urban reserve. The fact is that it will not develop to that level anyway. We need to figure out what you need to develop and be able to pay for it. It is not apparent how we are going to pay for this.

Borre Winckel – asked Dan whether we would want to take the same approach for the MSHCP.

Robin Lowe – are you aware of what Sacramento is making us do on housing?

Dan Silver – if you are doing a CEQA document, the mitigation needs to be real.

Robin Lowe – perhaps you should submit this issue at the hearings

#### **9. Review of changes made in the General Plan Circulation Element**

Steve Smith indicated that the General Plan hearing draft is now available and that CD's of the draft had been mailed to committee members with the agendas. He asked if there was any desire to go through any of the changes in the General Plan Circulation Element.

Borre Winckel – The Steering Committee soundly rejected the city MOU language.

Robin Lowe - LAFCO rejected the MOU language – The City of Riverside showed no objections to the petitioners.

Sandra Massa-Lavitt– as a city attendee on the steering committee, I don't find that there is strong objection to the MOU.

Borre Winckel – of course the cities love it.

Sandra Massa-Lavitt – LAFCO is a state agency.

Robin Lowe – Riverside County is the only county in the state that has communities of interest.

Borre Winckel – could we have an amendment to add the corridor

## **10. Presentation on the Traffic Analysis for the General Plan Circulation Element**

Steve Smith made a presentation on the traffic analysis that had been conducted on the General Plan Circulation Element. He indicated that a draft working paper had been prepared and was mailed to CETAP Advisory Committee members with the agendas. The material in this working paper will be incorporated into the General Plan EIR. Steve indicated that an analysis was conducted comparing the traffic impacts of the proposed General Plan, the existing General Plan, and a “no-project/no-build” alternative (no more development or road construction in the County unincorporated areas - assumes buildout in the cities). All the alternatives assumed buildout in the cities. Steve summarized the conclusions from the analysis as follows:

- The arterial system can accommodate demand
- Freeway system will be congested over most of Western County in peak hours
- Existing congested areas on freeways will be worse
- County contribution to deficient locations in cities is relatively small
- Proposed General Plan results in less congestion than Existing General Plan
- There is more congestion on many County roadways under the No-Project/No-Build than under Proposed General Plan

## **11. Public comment period – no public comments**

## **12. Adjournment**