



# MEETING NOTES

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

*Assembly Community Room, Registrar of Voters*

*2724 Gateway Drive, Riverside, CA*

*Tuesday June 4, 2002*

*9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.*

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

Sharon Bolton, Farm Bureau  
Joyce Deleo, Supervisors Appointee  
Janet Gless, Supervisors Appointee  
Frank Hall, RCTC  
Janet Henderson, SCAG  
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club  
Cis LeRoy, RTA  
Ameal Moore, RCTC  
Bill Mosby, CALTRANS  
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC  
Ameal Moore, RCTC  
Joan Sparkman, Supervisors Appointee  
Gail Wanczuk Barton, MSHCP Advisory  
Chair  
Borre Winckel, BIA

Steve Smith, TransCore  
Ed Studor, Riverside County TLMA  
Ruth Ann Taylor Berger, WRCOG  
Mohamad Younes, PBS&J

### **Other Attendees:**

Marion Ashley  
Cathy Bechtel, RCTC  
Judy Behrens, USFS  
Glen Campbell, OCTA  
Matthew Fegan, RJH Development  
Richard Hanes, RJH Development  
Jim Henderson, Jacobs  
Charles Landry, Jacobs  
Sandra Massa-Lavitt, Temecula  
Jim Miller, City of Murrieta  
Craig Neustaedter, Moreno Valley  
Jon Ramirez, CPTC  
Dierdre Sanders, So. Cal. Edison

## **CALL TO ORDER**

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

No public comments

### **2. Approval of meeting notes from May 7, 2002**

Gail Wanczuk-Barton's name should be removed from the attendee list. Meeting notes were approved.

(Note: skipped to item 8 in the agenda, then back to item 3)

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

Gail Wanczuk-Barton - No recent meetings have been held on the MSHCP. The meeting a week from Thursday will be looking at the proposed structure for implementation and management.

Ed Studor - Planning Commission hearings are continuing – next one is June 5 at Raincross Center in Riverside, starting at 8:30 a.m. with displays. Time has been set aside for city comments in the morning. On June 19 there will be a special presentation dedicated to community centers, probably at Raincross Center, a half day in the afternoon

Robin Lowe – the City of Hemet has offered to hold a hearing in Hemet as well.

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

Ed Studor - Only had one case last month, since the Planning Commission has been devoting their time to the hearings. GP 612 is a proposal to go from manufacturing to residential in Indio. It involves low cost housing in the Thermal area – was continued at hearing on May 8 to July 10 – Coachella Valley Housing Coalition was the sponsor.

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

Gail Wanczuk-Barton - The Steering Committee met on Friday – mainly dealt with outstanding issues on the MSHCP: concern about the Orange County Corridor – other concerns shared by many that the MSHCP involves creating a new layer of government and that agencies will have a continued over the shoulder role – concern about how to have the critical habitat go away – there is no viable way indicated yet for having that happen – the Form 11 dealing with the Orange County Corridor was distributed at the meeting – the science issues, the funding issues, and the time requirements for purchase of property. There was a short discussion on the SR-291 alignment proposed by the BIA. Concerns were also discussed about the inclusion of the MSHCP in the General Plan.

Robin Lowe – one of the concerns we have had is the Orange County corridor – what happens when that route is eventually identified – will the federal agencies require us to start from scratch? That has been a concern. Borre and Gail will be making a request to the Board of Supervisors this afternoon for language to cover the Orange County corridor in the MSHCP

Gail Wanczuk-Barton – My request is strictly personal – maybe there is something logical that can be included in the MSHCP that we are ignoring – Supervisor Tavaglione made a request several weeks ago and staff is responding to his request through the Form 11 for alternative ways of dealing with the Orange County corridor. One of the alternatives considered is a major amendment to the MSHCP – the other option would be to extend the MSHCP out three years – in my opinion that would be the death knell for the MSHCP. I don't see that as being realistic. We should attempt to negotiate coverage for an alignment that would be a placeholder, which would be further refined later. It would be responsible for us to attempt such a negotiation. I support the idea of moving forward with a placeholder alignment. The best case scenario is that we would be able to deal with refinements of the alignment as a minor amendment. The worst case

scenario is that at least we have something in our pocket that we can negotiate with. My suggestion is that the Board identify a small group to develop the conditions and the language that would go into the MSHCP to cover the Orange County corridor.

Robin Lowe – I have received panic calls and e-mails from people saying that the BIA was trying to torpedo the RCIP process through delay. I met with Borre over these issues last week. We walked through the entire process we have been going through for three years. It is not the intent of the BIA to submarine this project – it is the intent to be prepared to answer the questions for the public that are obvious to us already. We need to have as many answers as we can possibly have and find solutions to the problems before the County signs off on the MSHCP. I support that strategy. If that delays the RCIP a month or two, that is not going to damage the effort. We can't afford to live on rumor. We have come too far for this to go down the tubes. We have had disagreements, but we have always worked through them. All of us will have mud on our face if we have wasted the money the Board has put into it.

Sharon Bolton – The Farm Bureau has long said that we have questions and issues – we do have some serious concerns that we think need to be heard – our position is that the issues have to be worked on and that there need to be answers to the questions. This could involve several months.

Borre Winckel – Would like to talk to the Form 11. About a year ago there was a long debate over whether to separate the external and internal corridors – RCTC voted to keep all four corridors going simultaneously. All the officials were not aware that the Orange County corridor was slowed down so much. The BIA has been trying to keep the debate on the Orange County corridor alive. The transportation system does not work without new connections to Orange County. The BIA believes the Orange County corridor should be specifically included in the MSHCP, and not through a major amendment. We respectfully disagree with the Form 11. We believe it does not need to be a three year process to get a corridor in the MSHCP. We cannot leave it up to a major amendment, which will take almost as long to structure as the MSHCP itself. Given what Riverside County is contributing to habitat, 153,000 acres, the federal agencies should bend over backwards to work with us to try to get something permitted. It seems that CETAP has taken a back seat to the MSHCP and the General Plan. Cities are used to dealing with amendments to their General Plans. Amendments to the MSHCP are not like that. They are difficult to amend. All the other entities in Orange County and San Diego County took six to eight years to develop their MSHCPs and NCCPs. We made a proposal to deal with this by means of a new roadway tunnel south of Corona that was contained entirely within Riverside County. We know that the Service was willing to provide coverage for this roadway, but the project was shelved due to parochial politics. But there are more ways to skin this cat, and we need to pursue them. It can possibly be done through a programmatic approach. The Board meeting this afternoon on the Orange County corridor will involve one of the most important decisions they will be making. Once we sign off on the MSHCP, the County will have no leverage left.

Jim Miller – What we have been talking about is getting the corridor considered as a permitted activity as part of the MSHCP. How does that tie into the CETAP process?

Cathy Bechtel – The Orange County corridor would be covered environmentally under a separate EIS, which would be done jointly between Riverside and Orange Counties.

Borre Winckel – We think a programmatic approach could be developed where you craft everything possible in terms of criteria to protect the environment but without specifying the exact alignment, because there are too many alternatives at this point. The good news is that Riverside County and Orange County will get together on the modeling data. The Irvine Co. says that 80 percent of the traffic today goes west on the 91, to north county.

Craig Neustaedter – Borre has an issue here that makes a lot of sense. We need to keep the momentum going on the corridor to Orange County. Moreno valley could get behind this but we need more information on the specifics of how a programmatic approach would work.

Peter Kiriakos – I would like to take a step back and consider that the greater good may be to invest the money that might be used for an inter-county corridor internally in Riverside County. We might be just enriching the coffers of Orange County if we try to build a new corridor. If a new corridor encourages building more homes in Riverside Co., that may not be good for the County. I am concerned about delaying the General Plan. The whole RCIP process began because of litigation over the General Plan. The General Plan has been coming along as an integrated process – the longer the General Plan is delayed the more unplanned development occurs – a programmatic approach does not work. I agree with what the staff put in their report.

Robin Lowe – No one is trying to skirt the issue. The intent is not to delay the General Plan for three years. The intent is to include in the MSHCP some options for dealing with our inter-county transportation issues.

Sharon Bolton – When Gail referred to a generic corridor in the MSHCP, we need to insist that we add it. We are not talking about years, we are talking about a short term process to incorporate a set of criteria that can cover the corridor in the MSHCP.

Joan Sparkman – Motioned that the CETAP advisory committee support the inclusion of a programmatic approach to covering a corridor to Orange County

Motion carried, one no vote - Pete Kiriakos.

Frank Hall – This is CETAP, not the MSHCP committee – we spent a lot of time choosing the four corridors. We should re-emphasize that they need to move forward as quickly as possible. The MSHCP problems should be solved by the MSHCP group.

Robin Lowe – However, what they come up with as a solution will affect the four corridors. They have to be taken together.

Joyce Deleo – I have to take exception to what Peter said – when we have a corridor as congested as the 91, it affects businesses and their willingness to locate here. We are losing businesses because of the congestion on the 91 corridor.

Janet Gless – We are practically prisoners here. Even the weekends are awful. My son has turned back from trying to get to Orange County the last two Sundays, leaving at 10:30 in the morning, because of congestion on the 91. I spend and make money in Riverside County, but don't tell me I have to be trapped here. If we have only one roadway, people wont even want to come here or live here. We need to be able to move about freely.

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

We did get final written agreement on the alternatives to study for the internal corridors for all but the Corps of Engineers. The Corps indicated that the letter is coming, it's just a matter of writing the letter. We are still working on the evaluation criteria. I am cautiously optimistic that next Tuesday we will have verbal agreement on the evaluation criteria. We are still scheduled to have the environmental documents out to the public in early July. The Federal Highway Administration has been working very hard to try to keep those documents on schedule. We are looking into times for public hearings on those documents, probably in July and August, possibly also extending into September. We plan to have environmental documents available on the internet and CD.

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

We had a policy meeting last month for the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County corridor. We are almost ready to move ahead on a CEQA document. We are looking at one additional alignment from Pigeon Pass Road through the Highgrove area to Pepper Avenue in the City of Colton area. Engineers are looking at it now, but it is not looking good at this point. We have a Technical Advisory Committee meeting on June 20. There is a policy meeting on July 1 at 4:00 to review this last alternative.

Ed Studor – The alternative calls for a new bridge across the Santa Ana River.

Peter Kiriakos – The people from SANBAG are thinking that the flow is not running north to east, but rather north to west. SANBAG is trying to address this direction of travel.

Cathy Bechtel – The committee was not saying they will change the preferred alternative, but is looking at an additional arterial improvement that might connect to it.

Robin Lowe – The July meeting may be an important one, given the information that may be available at that time. Hopefully we will have an implementation agreement in place, and EISs. Reserve the date and check your e-mails. The meeting could be cancelled or delayed.

## **8. Temecula Old Town Transit Oasis Presentation**

Cis LeRoy - RTA has been working with the City of Temecula on a development project near Old Town. This particular presentation involves a potential residential development project near Old Town that could become part of a transit oasis. We thought it would be good to get a presentation of the project in front of CETAP. Matthew Fegan of RJH development will give the presentation.

Matthew Fegan, RJH development. We have been working with the City of Temecula on this project for the last year and a half. It is located immediately to the west of Old Town Temecula. We sat down with RTA four to five months ago to discuss some of the transit possibilities. RTA was enthusiastic about the potential for the project to become part of a transit oasis in the Old Town Temecula area. The Villages of Old Town is a high quality residential development, clustering densities and preserving open space. The project will include 1631 dwelling units over 152 acres. Additional information on the project can be viewed at [villagesofoldtown.com](http://villagesofoldtown.com).

Borre Winckel – It's nice to see this public/private partnership happening.

Cis Le Roy – RTA is working with two other developments like this one. This one is near the final stages of development, but has not been approved by the city. The Harveston project has already been approved, and they are providing funds for operation of a shuttle.

Ed Studor – Several developers have approached the County with interest in developing in potential community center locations.

Borre Winckel – On June 19 the Planning Commission will have a special session on community centers. This is a good example of one and should be highlighted in that presentation.

## **9. Public comment period**

No public comments

## **10. Adjournment**