



MEETING NOTES

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

Keith Companies. Bldg.

DPSS Training Center

22690 Cactus Ave., Suite 101

Moreno Valley, CA

Tuesday July 16, 2002

9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

CETAP Advisory Committee Attendees:

Frank Hall, RCTC
Janet Henderson, SCAG
Peter Kiriakos, Sierra Club
Bill Mosby, CALTRANS
Robin Reeser Lowe, RCTC
Gene Rogers, WRCOG
Gail Wanczuk Barton, MSHCP Advisory
Chair
Helga Wolf, Supervisors Appointee

Other Attendees:

Cathy Bechtel, RCTC
Judy Behrens, USFS
Glen Campbell, OCTA
Stephanie Crossey
Diane Huggett, City of Riverside
Darcy Kuenzi, Ashley for Supervisor
Bice Landon, Wkforce Devel Board
Bob Moehling, City of Murrieta
Jill O'Connor, LSA Associates
Trent Pulliam, Moreno Valley
Jon Ramirez, CPTC
Ruth Ann Taylor Berger, WRCOG
Jim Wang, Meniffee
Bill Warkentin, BIA/GPAC

CALL TO ORDER

1. Public comment period

Bill Warkentin –What time frame is RCTC thinking about for making a decision on the internal corridors?

Cathy Bechtel – We are starting the public hearing period on July 22. This will run through September 20. Jill O'Connor will be giving a report on that later in the agenda. We are anticipating going to the Commission in October to have a selection of RCTC's preferred alternative.

Bill Warkentin – How do you perceive the relationship between the CETAP advisory committee's recommendation and the follow through with RCTC?

Robin Lowe – Our October CETAP meeting will be one of the most important that we will have. The RCTC meeting will be October 9. The Advisory Committee recommendation will be forwarded to the Commission. The Plans and Programs Committee will likely have a discussion at the September 23 meeting. I would encourage any advisory committee members to be present at the Plans and Programs committee to make comments they would wish to make on the alternatives.

2. Approval of meeting notes from June 4, 2002

Approval of the notes was delayed until the next meeting.

3. Reports from MSHCP and General Plan Advisory Committees

Gail Wanczuk-Barton – The MSHCP advisory committee met last week. We discussed the organizational structure that would oversee the MSCHP. We discussed funding and wetlands issues. On July 25 we will have a discussion and presentation on a wildlife refuge area that is a consideration for receiving federal funding. We have had discussion of this possibility by Slater Buck of FWS. This would involve suggesting a broad area, which would be narrowed down through a public outreach process.

Bill Warkentin – The GPAC is no longer meeting. I received an e-mail from Jerry Jolliffe that the public comments and corresponding staff recommendations generated through the Planning Commission hearing process will be submitted to the Planning Commission on August 28. There were about 1000 specific changes requested in either land use, policy, or otherwise. The staff report will be available on or about the 14th of August. At the Steering Committee, there are three or four ongoing issues. The County has retained a contract employee to work out the details of the incentive program. The time frame is unclear.

4. Report from RCIP Steering Committee

Gail Wanczuk-Barton – The Steering Committee met on June 28. One of the big issues was the concern of the farming community that the five year limitation on converting to a community development use would make it more difficult for them to obtain loans. It was determined that a poll would be taken of other counties regarding how they deal with this issue. The two other topics were the certainty provisions and the incentives program. The next meeting will address community centers and the certainty principles.

Gene Rogers – Are the community centers still an issue?

Robin Lowe – Yes. There is still much to be discussed regarding community centers. This will be discussed on July 26 at the next Steering Committee.

Pete Kiriakos – There was a presentation by WRCOG and SCAG on the community centers that indicated that the transit mode split would go from 3 to 4 percent. We need to have a more optimistic view of what transit can do.

Cathy Bechtel – The General Plan is trying to make some realistic assumptions.

Pete Kiriakos – If SCAG and WRCOG are right, we are going to be at gridlock. I believe there is going to be a great desire for transit in the future as congestion increases.

Cathy Bechtel – Our approach is that when traffic gets bad enough, then at least we will have the option available for people to ride transit.

Frank Hall - The percentages may be small, but with growth, the actual numbers of transit riders will be increasing significantly. Bus Rapid Transit could help transit ridership substantially in certain corridors, and RTA is moving in that direction.

Glen Campbell – In Orange County, the share of riders by transit is less than it was a couple of decades ago. We are where you may be in 20 years, yet we are still struggling with the same issues as Riverside County.

Pete Kiriakos – Because Orange County is already built out, it is more costly to build transit. Riverside County is in the position to plan ahead.

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

We have received all the approvals we need from the federal agencies to move forward with the release of the environmental documents. We have the letters in hand on purpose and need, alternatives, and evaluation criteria. On July 10 I took an agenda item to the commission to provide a review of where we have been with CETAP from a financial perspective. We started in May 1999 with a budget of \$5 million, with the expectation that we would focus on two major corridors. After public workshops, we grew to four priority corridors, two internal and two inter-county (one to Orange County and one to San Bernardino County). That increased the budget to \$12 million. Through requirements of the resource agencies for additional alternatives and data, that increased the budget for the internal corridors to \$8 million. Three years ago we didn't have all the money committed. RCTC has committed now over \$3 million, and there has been substantial help from other agencies. Some \$8.5 million in funds have been identified for CETAP to date. It is a bit of a balancing act to keep the money coming in. An increase to \$14 million for CETAP was approved by RCTC on July 10, and we need to continue the hunt for money. Eric Haley, Tom Mullen, and Charlie Landry recently went to DC to request an additional \$5 million for the 2003 apportionment. We are moving forward and ready to release the draft environmental documents. Jill O'Connor of LSA will talk about that.

Robin Lowe – We had a meeting with the staff of three congressional committees responsible for apportionment. We are trying to get them to identify more funds that can be used for planning.

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

For the Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County Corridor, we are a bit on hold right now. We were ready to begin, but a month or so ago the representatives from San Bernardino County were

interested in our studying another option from Pigeon Pass Road to Main Street in Highgrove, crossing I-215 and connecting to Pepper Ave. or Riverside Ave. and Interstate 10. The alternative would impact the recently approved Spring Mountain Ranch development and some environmentally sensitive areas. We are looking at reconvening the policy committee on August 15. It is still very much a cooperative effort, but we are on hold.

Trent Pulliam – It was agreed that Riverside County and San Bernardino County would have their own caucuses. Riverside County has indicated that they would be willing to enter into an MOU that would study the additional alignment but that it would be a separate effort from CETAP.

Gene Rogers – The San Bernardino County cities see some potential benefit of the corridor to them in connecting to the 10. That is one of the reasons why they want to at least study it and not dismiss it out of hand. The Moreno Valley City Council has not articulated a position on the subject as yet.

Pete Kiriakos – San Bernardino County has been trying to approach it in a rational fashion and they see that the traffic movement is more to the west than to the north and east. The proposed alignment through the badlands is a major concern to environmentalists. There are fewer miles of environmental impacts in the route to the northwest than the route to the northeast. It is something that needs to be looked at. The San Bernardino County cities are concerned that if the study of this alternative is delayed until later, it will probably never happen. I believe it is important that this other alternative be included.

Cathy Bechtel – This alternative would not replace the alternative through the badlands. It would be an additional arterial improvement that would connect to the core facility.

Cathy Bechtel – For the Orange County corridor we need to distinguish between what is happening with the MSHCP versus what is happening with CETAP. For CETAP a connection to Orange County is one of our priority corridors, and we need to work further with Orange County to identify alternatives. At the Board of Supervisors meeting several weeks ago it was determined that we will work on a parallel track with the MSHCP proceeding while Riverside County discusses with Orange County ways to get a corridor covered in the Riverside County MSHCP. The Board would then consider in September whether it is possible to include a corridor in the MSHCP. The County is working with the FWS in how general the language may be able to be. Draft language is being reviewed by the wildlife agencies. Some traffic analysis is being conducted jointly with Orange County to identify the relative traffic demands for a range of alternatives.

Glen Campbell – Some of the issues Riverside County faces are not the same issues as Orange County faces. We need to consider that there are sections of south and central Orange County that are already at LOS E and F. Even with the recent widening of I-5, it is still clogged. We are wanting to work with Riverside County to find something that will help both counties. Our projections are that even without a new facility the Eastern Transportation Corridor will be at E or F by 2025.

Gene Rogers – There is concern on the part of the cities that we need to get a facility covered in the MSHCP and not depend on the whims of environmental approval at a later stage. We cannot afford to leave on the table the most important improvement of all.

7. Presentation on structure of the CETAP EISs for the intra-county corridors and the public hearing process

Jill O'Connor – (Copies of the EIR/EIS public notice were distributed.) These address two EIR/EISs, one for the Winchester to Temecula (WT) Corridor and one for the Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore (HCLE) Corridor. The notices will be mailed out this week to a long list

of recipients. The public review period will start on Monday, and will last 60 days. The EIR/EIS is a Tier 1 evaluation, looking at band widths for where these corridors could possibly be located. There are seven alternatives for the WT corridor and 14 for the HCLE. There has been a lot of information gathered for these documents. The notice describes how the review process will work, states where the public should send their comments, describes the documents, and gives an overview of some of the environmental issues. There are two planned public hearings. Certain agencies will get their own review copies, but most people will need to review the documents at one of the public libraries or other locations listed. You will also be able to review them at RCTC and Caltrans District 8. It will also be available on the web site at rcip.org. You will be able to purchase a copy of the document at Riverside Blueprint, downtown, if desired. The public hearings will be on August 20 at the Lake Elsinore Cultural Center and August 29 at Murrieta City Hall. These will be open house type formats where people can get the information and some of their questions answered. These will both be 4 to 8 p.m. I brought the tables of contents for each of the documents. I understand that there will be more of a presentation on the findings at the next CETAP meeting.

Cathy Bechtel –The reason why the documents are available for purchase is that the HCLE document is over 1000 pages. The WT document is over 700 pages. Each city will get a copy of it. It will also be available on CD-ROM in addition to the web site. The cost for printing the documents is likely to be \$250. People can just purchase the portion of the document that they want.

Jill O'Connor – The technical reports were not bound with the document, but will be available at the public reviewing places also.

Cathy Bechtel – These hearings will be very different from the Planning Commission hearings. They will be in open house format. People can provide their comments at the meeting or send them in by mail. There will also be a court recorder there to take people's comments directly. There will be a discussion of the environmental documents at the August CETAP meeting.

Bill Warkentin – I have a concern about the lack of integration. Some sort of detailed attention needs to be brought to where the community centers are and their relationship to the transportation system. The reason I bring this up is that one would think that a corridor designation next to a community center makes a lot of sense. What is interesting is that a corridor next to a community center may make it more difficult to access the center. This interface is critically important, and both CETAP and GPAC should look at this issue. It may make or break the viability of particular community centers. Some alternatives may be better in this respect than others, and should be a consideration in the selection of the alternative.

Cathy Bechtel – One of our discussions with the resource agencies was where interchanges should be located on the new corridors. The resource agencies had a real problem with that and the possible inducement of growth in areas that should not be intensely developed. It was recommended by FHWA that we not get into the identification of interchange locations in Tier 1. That will be determined in Tier 2.

Pete Kiriakos – My concern has to do with the integration issue. The CETAP advisory committee seems to have taken some responsibility for review of the transportation considerations of the General Plan. I found yesterday that the Schliesman Avenue extension is in the General Plan and MSHCP. The impacts of roadways like this on the environment should be disclosed. There should be an overlay of the habitat areas and the circulation element.

Frank Hall – The portion of the roadway Pete is talking about is actually in San Bernardino County.

Darcy Kuenzi – Copies of the environmental documents should be provided in the libraries in Sun City and Menifee also.

Robin Lowe – Perhaps a hard copy could be provided in Sun City and a CD-ROM at the library in Menifee.

8. Public comment period

No public comments

9. Adjournment

The next meeting will be August 6.