



**TRANSPORTATION BOARD/
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP
AGENDA**

Wednesday, January 9, 2013

5:30 PM

*County Board of Supervisor's Room
4080 LEMON STREET, RIVERSIDE, 92501*

Special Meeting

City of Arts & Innovation

Transportation Board Members Present: Aldana, Angel, Bellavia, Curtis, Gritton, Hildebrandt, Love, McEntee, Nelson, Rios

Transportation Board Members Absent: Bromley

Planning Commissioners Present: Allen, Maloney Riggle, Stosel, Tavaglione, Wade, Zaki

Planning Commissioners Absent: Kain, Stockton

Staff Present:

Al Zelinka, Community Development Director
Steve Hayes, City Planner
Diane Jenkins, Principal Planner
Erin Gettis, Historic Preservation Officer/Principal Planner
Kristi Smith, Supervising Deputy Attorney
Gus Gonzalez, Associate Planner
Frances Andrade, Senior Admin. Assistant
Tom Boyd, Public Works Director
Steve Libring, City Traffic Engineer
Sharon Hedges, Senior Office Specialist

**MINUTES APPROVED AS
PRESENTED AT THE
MARCH 7, 2013 MEETING**

Consultants:

Charity Schiller, Attorney Best Best and Krieger
Lisa Lind, RECON
Greg Kazmer, RECON
Gary Hamrick, Iteris
Janet Harvey, Iteris

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Curtis called the meeting of the Transportation Board to order. All members present except for Board Member Bromley.

Chair Allen called the meeting of the Planning Commission to order.

Approval of minutes of December 5, 2012

The minutes of December 5, 2012 were approved as presented. Motion by Board Member Angel, second by Board Member Aldana. Motion carried unanimously.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was given to the flag.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Chair Curtis asked if there was anyone present wishing to speak on an item not on today's agenda, no one came forward.

DISCUSSION CALENDAR

1. Transportation Issues of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Crystal View Terrace/Green Orchard Place/Overlook Parkway Project - Oral Presentation by the Consultant RECON Environmental, Inc.

Chair Curtis announced that as well as this being a regular meeting of the Transportation Board, the Planning Commission is also present for a joint workshop on the Crystal View Terrace/Green Orchard Place/Overlook Parkway Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). The Transportation Board and Planning Commission are here tonight to hear the presentation and take comments from the audience on the Transportation/Traffic related issues of the DEIR only.

She asked those who would like to speak to fill out a speaker card. She also noted that there were comment cards for those who would like to submit their comment in writing but did not wish to speak tonight. Public comments will be limited to 3 minutes and comments will be taken until 8:00 p.m. only as the Supervisor's Chamber is available for a limited time only. The video of tonight's meeting will be available on the City's website.

Steve Hayes, City Planner, reiterated that tonight's meeting was to discuss the transportation/traffic impacts in the Draft EIR. He introduced Recon and Iteris as the consultants who prepared the EIR. Due to a request to permanently remove the gates located on Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place, staff has undertaken this EIR to determine the environmental consequences. The Project EIR will provide informational analysis of the environmental impacts of removing the gates and impacts of such removal on traffic in the area with or without the completion of the remaining segments of Overlook Parkway. The Draft EIR has been prepared because the City's General Plan Master Plan of Roadways has analyzed and determined the need for the connection of Overlook Parkway as an arterial roadway. Vehicle gates were required on Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place to prevent traffic that would normally use the arterial network from using these local residential roadways until such time as Overlook Parkway could be completed. The local streets were not designed to accommodate the anticipated vehicle trips, which is why gates were required. The City is undertaking this study because of a request to review whether or not the gates on Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place could be removed permanently without the completion of Overlook Parkway. The Draft EIR looks at 4 different scenarios for area wide circulation in the southeasterly quadrant of the City. He emphasized that the presentation is intended to provide objective information and in no way should be construed that the City or consultant is advocating a position or preference for any particular scenario. All comments will be addressed and acknowledged as part of the overall EIR process. The comments will be addressed in writing and included in the record when the City Council considers this study and related EIR at a public hearing. He introduced Lisa Lind, consultant with RECON Environmental to explain the EIR process and how everyone can participate in this process.

Lisa Lind, RECON Environmental, introduced Greg Kazmer, RECON, and Gary Hamrick and Janet Harvey with Iteris. She stated that the public review period is 90 days but has been extended to March 1, 2013. The Draft EIR is available at libraries, City Hall and can be downloaded on the web. She announced that public meetings were held in December at the Casa Blanca and Orange Terrace neighborhoods. There are four scenarios being analyzed. Scenario 1: Gates at Crystal View Terrace will remain closed until Overlook Parkway is built in the future; Scenario 2: Considers the traffic pattern if the gates are removed with no connection over the Alessandro Arroyo, and; Scenario 3: The gates are removed and Overlook Parkway is connected. This scenario looks at several bridge designs and depicts the one with fewer impacts to the arroyo. Scenario 4: Removes the gates at Crystal View Terrace with the Overlook connection and a

proposed "C" Street between Washington and Victoria. She announced that it will be helpful if the public comments specifically call out which scenario they are addressing. She reiterated that a preferred scenario has not been identified. It is expected that the City Council will make that decision only after public comments have been reviewed. She introduced Gary Hamrick who will go over the traffic analysis for the area.

Gary Hamrick, Iteris, stated that the traffic analysis included assessment of existing traffic conditions. A comprehensive existing conditions analysis was concluded, which included 28 intersections as shown on the exhibit 15. In addition 38 mid block counts were also conducted both with the gates closed and gates open scenario. Mr. Hamrick went over the traffic analysis for the four scenarios showing existing conditions and projections to 2035.

Ms. Lind restated that all comments will be included in the Draft EIR. The comments can be delivered to the Planning Division, either through the mail or e-mail up until March 1, 2013.

Chair Curtis opened the public comment period. She reminded everyone to refer to the specific scenario they prefer.

Andy Wilson, 7468 Dufferin Avenue, stated he was present to urge everyone not to certify the Draft EIR. He did not want to see the DEIR certified in any of the scenarios. His family farms the orange grove at the corner of Washington and Victoria. The proposed "C" Street, is a proposed 4-lane highway that goes right through the orange grove. This grove is one of the original groves in Riverside and a lot of the trees were planted in the 1890s. From his perspective, the DEIR's findings seem to be that blowing a road through here is not a significant environmental impact. A vote in favor of the DEIR would be a vote to destroy citrus in Riverside. There are findings in the DEIR, if allowed to stand, a different Council may vote for the road and the time to challenge the EIR would be past. He was looking for the intersections between Lincoln and Indiana on Madison and was trying to find out why they were not analyzed. There are only 18 intersections and the report is supposed to say why what intersections were looked at why they weren't. The reason was because the staff directed RECON not to look at them. Those are the intersections where the people in Casa Blanca walk across Madison, and where a lady was recently struck. He did not think it was right to designate those intersections as not being significant, it's like saying those people aren't significant.

Bill Wilkman, Hawarden Hills resident, stated this was not a criticism of Public Works or Planning. In his history as a planner, he has learned that computer models can often give bogus data and unless corrected, this data can lead to bogus conclusions. He is in communication with 40 people who travel the corridor between Overlook Parkway and Victoria Avenue, consisting of Orosco, Gainsborough, Hawarden and Mary Streets. They have been working for over four decades to try to get the City to understand and correct the growing traffic issues in the area. They had hoped that this DEIR would finally provide the needed comprehensive analysis and viable solutions to the neighborhoods traffic issues but they are extremely disappointed that it fails to do so. The project background section of the EIR only covers the history of Overlook Parkway subsequent to the 2001 Crystal View Gates. Overlook's history goes back at least four decades. In the 1970s the City Council removed from the General Plan, two critical components of the Overlook Parkway. One was the extension of Overlook Parkway to the 91 freeway to serve east/west traffic. The other was the establishment of an arterial in the Mary Street corridor to serve north/south traffic. The City promised to redesign Overlook to accommodate and make up for these losses but this never happened. In the absence of these planned arterials, drivers cut through our neighborhood and as development has increased along Overlook Parkway, traffic has increased exponentially. The DEIR fails to acknowledge this fundamental fact and fails to provide viable solutions. This is aptly illustrated in the traffic flow data in the DEIR. The noise section the DEIR indicates that on one segment of Gainsborough Drive, opening the Crystal View Gates increased daily traffic from 773 to over 2,000 cars a day, yet subsequent charts say that connecting Overlook Parkway to Alessandro Boulevard would add less than 200 additional cars to this figure. This simply defies logic. If the simple opening of Overlook Parkway to a local street system added over 2000 cars a day surely opening it up to Alessandro would add more than just 200 cars a day. The consultant

indicated that Overlook Parkway would carry 17,000 cars; he would like to know where those cars will go when they get to the west end of Overlook Parkway. Something is wrong with the data and this DEIR must not be certified until that problem is corrected and appropriate solutions to cut through traffic in their neighborhood are developed.

Mark Ohlgren, resident of Overlook Parkway on Muirfield. He stated that he is also the Corporate Director for Verizon Wireless in the area. He moved here from El Segundo 10 years ago, to get away from the traffic thoroughfare and busy cars. He was concerned for his 4 and 2 year old and having 36,000 cars in his back yard. This is what he is doing here today. He is against the whole thing. If he had to pick, he would choose Scenario 2, this should be open for safety reasons. The Hawarden Academy, where his children attend, he cannot get there unless he goes through those gates. Opening this up to a thoroughfare is a big problem. He brought up El Segundo and the 105 Freeway, where he used to live, as an example. He sees Overlook Parkway as a super fast highway/racetrack. You can already go fast on that road and it will need massive police presence, stop lights...a lot of stuff. This will bring a lot of traffic to an area he chose to live in but that he would never have chosen if that bridge was open. If it opens, he will be the first one to sell his home because property values will drop and crime will increase. He will take his business out of Riverside and move to Corona. He does not want to live in an area like that. He chose Overlook Parkway because of its exclusivity and that will be gone if the bridge is constructed.

Tom Hunt stated he has lived in the area for 26 years. His was one of the original homes there. He said that from the night they moved in, he is astounded at the increase in traffic. The traffic is fast paced and a real problem. He echoed Mr. Wilkman's comments. The DEIR claims that it makes a right assertion that traffic has increased by 300% since Crystal View has opened. This is not the first time they have had to go through this. There seems to be a discourteous attitude to the residents in these neighborhoods. This hearing should be, not just in Orange Crest but also Casa Blanca. He asked that the DEIR not be certified. Choose Scenario 1, and please correct the indignity done to the neighborhoods by a former Councilmember in allowing a buddy homebuilder to connect there at Crystal View Terrace.

Gary Mata, 28 year resident, 7884 East Gate Court. He appreciated the comments made tonight. He loves oranges and would hate to see them go. Unfortunately, homes have been built like mushrooms all over Riverside. The City isn't stopping there and there will be more homes built in the future. Right now there is a horrendous mess. At the intersection of Victoria and Washington, there was a mile of cars stopped just waiting to get through the stop sign. They need road access and it is a hazard for residents that live in that area. If they need emergency vehicles, they cannot get across. They need access to streets, more arterials to move around. He currently lives in the area of Bradley and Washington. He understands their concerns, they don't want any traffic in their areas but everyone is finding ways through his neighborhood. He has a horrendous mess because traffic cannot get through Overlook Parkway. As the City builds out, there needs to be a future vision. Obviously someone did do a lot of planning for Washington and Victoria but they were not expecting to have so many homes. He stated he was in strong support of Scenario 4. He hoped the Board would consider this. The area is growing fast and if it is not done now, it will be impossible down the road.

Suzanne Rowlands, stated that she had not intended to speak. It is obvious from what Mr. Wilkman has said that the data regarding the number of cars is incorrect. She lives on Hawarden Drive. When she moved there 30 years ago they were told by a Realtor that it would not go through to Washington. A few cars used a dirt path and had access for awhile, and then it developed into a new street. In spite of what someone said in the paper, they did not know about Overlook when they purchased the property. She felt that Scenario 1 – don't do anything, was best. She asked if staff had considered any other ideas after putting in all this money into building Overlook. Has an alternative been considered to get traffic across without going onto Madison Street, possibly further south and connecting to Cajalco? This is a bad idea. Nobody on the western side of Overlook Parkway thinks this is a good idea in spite of all of this. The air quality will definitely be affected for everyone with that many cars.

Karen Wright, resident, stated she was against Overlook Parkway. She lives on a similar street, Central Avenue, which turned into an unlivable condition. It is unlivable on Central Avenue due to the horrendous traffic. The traffic will occur if Madison is connected through the rural area and Overlook and Alessandro will be much worse than Central. She has experienced four cancers in her family. This is being done to make a freeway to UCR. The DEIR report concludes that there is no significant impact which is a lie and joke. Once this becomes a freeway, you will destroy the Casa Blanca neighborhood and rob these people of their property values. This ignores the fact that what makes Riverside special is the green belt area. This will destroy a national treasure. This needs more discussion and it is not in the best interest. It won't be just traffic from Moreno Valley, it will be thousands, hundred of thousand cars.

Frank Heyming, resident of the area around Adams and the 91 freeway, and also President of Victoria Avenue Forever. He has already submitted a letter of comment and will be submitting another one. He also urged the Board that the DEIR not be certified. When considering scenarios 1 and 2, he felt that was up to the neighborhoods to decide. Scenarios 3 and 4, this would be a disaster. What are all the vehicles going to do when they get to Washington? He heard that Scenario 3 will have zero impact after mitigation. He has not read the DEIR closely and didn't know what the factors were. He asked about the impact to historical Victoria Avenue, increased pollution, noise pollution. As far as the region was concerned, he felt that there were many alternate paths. Cajalco is an excellent path. Van Buren, Washington, Alessandro and 91 freeway already exist. He urged the Board not to certify the DEIR and save their neighborhoods.

Anthony Bellanca, resident on Flemington Rd, addressed the Board and Commission. This proposal will have an impact on Flemington and the surrounding roads. Vehicles will turn onto Cannon Road before the left turn lane gets to Overlook. This will play itself out in the evening in the opposite direction. As serious an impact this seems to be, the neighborhood streets are much narrower. If vehicles are parked on either side of the street and two other vehicles are attempting to negotiate the streets in opposite direction, it will create a hazardous problem. The residents have a right to peaceful and most importantly, safe use of the neighborhood streets. He asked that the extension of Overlook Parkway not be approved.

Kerry Maloney, 1085 Tiger Tail Drive, resident since 1978. She was also one of the pioneers trying to have an impact on what types of homes were built there. She was in favor of connecting Overlook Parkway. Anyone who chose to purchase or build in the area should have done their homework. There are a lot of people in the area with no way to deal with traffic. As far as this huge traffic amount, she drives Crystal View and Hawarden which have speed bumps, stop signs but never crosses path with a car. Citizens should have a right to drive the streets and not be harassed. She felt traffic has been grossly over estimated. As for having that road hanging on both sides, the barn door has already been opened.

James Monks, 1293 Tiger Tail, stated this was a difficult decision. With regard to Scenario 4, he asked that Overlook not be connected and that the DEIR not be certified. This would have an adverse impact on the area and property values would also fall for the surrounding area.

Dennis Garcia, 7339 Ismael Villegas Street, stated he was also a member of the Community Action Group in Casa Blanca. He stated he was not aware of this study until last night. He asked if the study looked at the multi-toxin exposure to the community and its effects. The neighborhood is already adjacent to the railroad and the 91 freeway. This will be another source of emissions so that a study will be required for the community. Recently a couple of lanes were closed along Madison to slow traffic down for pedestrians. A woman was killed on Mother's day on Madison Street. He asked what a gate on Crystal View had to do with putting traffic through his community. It didn't sound as though the City was giving this enough consideration to the community and informing the people what was going on.

Ramona Gamache stated she lived off Victoria and Mary just before Hawarden. She stated that within the past year, Jane has been closed off and diverted the traffic to Mary Street. In order for them to get to their homes, they have to go down Mary or Washington. It is already a grid lock between 7 a.m. – 9 a.m. and again at 4 p.m. until 6 p.m. Opening up Overlook would be a disaster.

Paul Benoit stated he did not intend to speak until he heard someone suggest that the impact on the local streets would be minimal. The EIR, as much as he understands it, does appear to be incomplete. He suggested that the DEIR not be certified. On an anecdotal basis, he has lived at 2390 Mary Street, for the last 30 years. This street has since opened up the residential housing developments up off of Overlook and has been nothing less than a drag strip for commuters in the morning and people going home in the evening. As an ex-police officer, he knows the traffic was going through there in excess of 75 mph before the speed bumps and stop sign were installed at Frances Street. This has helped tremendously but the volume and speed of the traffic going through will not be mitigated by extending Overlook through. He stated Washington was one of the most dangerous streets in the City, especially in the area of Washington and Dufferin. If the EIR is approved and this project includes either phase 3 or 4, people will be frustrated because of the backup that can be anticipated there. He suggested not certifying the EIR and if the report is done properly, it will be plain to see this is a huge issue for the local residents.

There was no one else requesting to speak. Chair Curtis closed the public hearing. She asked if the Transportation Board or Planning Commission had any comments.

Chair Curtis asked staff what the process for the certifying of the EIR was. She noted this was not something the Board was being asked to do tonight.

Mr. Hayes explained that the public comment period will close on March 1, 2013. After the comment period, a public hearing will be held before the Planning Commission before it goes to the City Council. A final EIR will be created that addresses all of the comments that have been generated during the public comment process. When the City Council considers the final EIR adoption, they will have not only the draft EIR and any supplemental information but they will also have any and all responses to comments to all the public comments for their consideration at the certification hearing.

Chair Curtis noted then that the certification hearing was quite a ways down the road. Tonight, the Transportation Board will be considering the four options presented and the public comments heard are to determine whether or not to make a recommendation to the City Council.

Kristi Smith, City Attorney's Office, clarified that the Board has the opportunity today to review the four scenarios and ask questions of staff. If the Board chooses to make a recommendation, it will be forwarded to the City Council. Again, when the final product goes to City Council, it will not only have the Planning Commission's recommendation, it will also have the Transportation Board's recommendation in the staff report.

Board Member Nelson pointed out that there appeared to be a lot of opposition to putting this through. He understood the EIR was meant to be an objective analysis, not a recommendation. He asked what the rationale was for building this street.

Tom Boyd, Public Works Director, replied that the street is currently included in the City's General Plan Circulation Element. The traffic model for the entire Circulation Element includes the street and is part of the network of streets that make up the circulation as laid out in the General Plan.

Board Member Hildebrandt stated his personal opinion was that Overlook should not be built. He knows traffic, like water, finds the path of least resistance. He definitely didn't see supporting the Overlook connection. He expressed his concerns regarding the gate closure for the local community up there. He heard from the public that people are avoiding Washington and Victoria and are using other streets in the area. He was sure those gates are contributing to that. It is a tough situation but he definitely did not support putting Overlook through. He was leaning toward supporting Scenario 2 but after hearing the comments and reading more about the traffic pattern circulation, it is not an easy situation. He wanted to go

on record that he supports not connecting Overlook and further studying the traffic impacts of cut through traffic as it comes down from the local neighborhoods.

Board Member Angel said he wanted to get an understanding. Mr. Boyd mentioned that Overlook is part of the current Masterplan. Having said this, it seems that they will be looking at this eventually, regardless of whether or not they make a decision. It appears that the City will be heading in this direction based on the amount of traffic in this region.

Mr. Boyd explained that the intention is that the Masterplan be implemented at some point in time and Overlook is part of the Masterplan. The Transportation Board and ultimately the City Council have several options. The City Council can continue with the current Masterplan or re-examine the Masterplan which would mean updating and developing a new traffic model.

Commissioner Zaki referred to the traffic count study done. There are 28 points of traffic that were studied and analyzed for the EIR, he inquired how the consultants determine the traffic points. Did staff instruct the consultant to study specific points or was this at the consultant's discretion? What was the rationale for omitting some traffic points and including others?

Mr. Hamrick responded that the decision to determine which locations to study was done jointly with staff and the consultant team. Whenever an EIR traffic study is done, they look at the area they feel is most likely to be affected and try to cover the entire area. If there was anything that they felt was to be potentially impacted, it was included. They did not look at a section or segment that could be impacted and omitted it. The answer to why things were omitted was because they felt this would be outside the likely area of impact or significant impact.

Commissioner Zaki asked if it was based on an objective/scientific determination or was this a subjective determination based on the consultant's or city employees' feeling of a particular traffic point?

Mr. Hamrick explained that it was based on their best professional judgment as to the likely locations of impacts. Traffic is not always scientific. They do their best at the beginning of any of these processes to estimate what they think is an area of impact and then study that.

Board Member Gritton commented that if they were to go by the residents, there is no doubt how this would work out. It being on a Masterplan, yes that complicates things but he is an advocate of issues like this and asking "then what?" What happens if you get a substantial amount of traffic going down to Washington and from there down to the 91 freeway, which is where people intend to go. He asked if there were plans to widen Washington. How is the traffic going to be handled opening onto Washington and down to the freeway?

Mr. Hamrick replied that they did look at locations along Washington to identify if there were impacts. If it was determined that there would be impacts, mitigation measures were identified. There are locations along Washington where significant impacts have been identified as a result of the project. If they were feasible mitigation measures, those were identified in the EIR. If they felt there weren't feasible measures, for various different reasons, then mitigation measure would not have been recommended and it would remain an unmitigated significant impact. There is also the "C" street proposed connection under scenario 4 which was really intended to take the traffic at the end of the connection and bring it to the freeway. Under scenario 3 you would not have that. Scenario 4 itself, is a mitigation measure to what happens to the traffic at the end of Overlook and without the "C" Street roadway connection, you would have more traffic.

Chair Curtis noted that page 22 of the slides may show the numbers Board Member Gritton is asking about.

Board Member Gritton commented that under Scenario 4, as it drops onto Madison, there would still be a similar problem with the width of the street. He asked if Madison Street would be considered for four lanes.

Mr. Hamrick agreed there will be an increase in traffic on Madison under Scenario 4. "C" Street does not get the traffic to the freeway, it connects it up to Madison. Mr. Hamrick replied that Madison is considered for 4 lanes under the Masterplan.

Board Member McEntee there were comments made earlier during the public comment period that perhaps the neighborhood area between Victoria and 91 freeway wasn't taken into consideration when doing the environmental impact. The overview map of the project shows that perhaps it was, particularly regarding the air quality issues. To clarify, he asked if this area was included in the study?

Ms. Lind replied that it was included. She did not have an overlay of the Riverside neighborhoods that were in the study area. She stated that there were seven of the neighborhoods, portions of which are in the study area. The workshop tonight is focused on traffic tonight but to respond to the question, the studies related air quality and emissions did take into consideration a larger study area. This was done to ensure that they were capturing a clear picture of the impacts.

Board Member McEntee noted the numbers on page 17, the traffic count slide #16. He asked what these numbers represented.

Mr. Hamrick explained that the numbers inside the red circle are just numbers used to identify which intersection it is, it is not data.

Board Member McEntee asked if there were traffic counts done at those intersections? If leaving the gates open is considered but not extending the Parkway, was there any significant change in the impact at those intersections?

Mr. Hamrick explained that was proposed but a study was done, gates opened versus gates closed. In that blue area there were some significant differences percentagewise where traffic shifted around. This information is all in the EIR. He stated this was real data, it is not a forecast.

Board Member McEntee pointed out that in slides 19-23 the information provided predict what the changes will be based on the various scenarios. These are 2035 projections which is quite a way out in the horizon. He inquired if nearer term predictions were made and if they were in the EIR.

Janet Harvey, Iteris, explained that in the EIR it looked at the 2011 conditions as if any of the scenarios were in place today and this would be the near term analysis.

Board Member Hildebrandt suggested that under Scenario 4, it would appear that the traffic would have been pushed to Adams if Madison Street remained a two-way street. Now that it will be opened up to four lanes, maybe his question won't be answered but was there ever a study done pushing traffic to Adams?

Mr. Hamrick stated that the existing analysis for 2011 would have considered Madison Street in its current condition, two lanes. The 2035 projects assume build out of the Masterplan to four lanes. He said that a 2035 analysis without that assumption of the Masterplan build out on Madison was not done.

Commissioner Riggle stated he realized they only have a small portion of the EIR and this is a pretty focused group tonight. He had a question for staff regarding the initial premise of the EIR.

Ms. Smith replied that the premise behind the EIR actually stems from the gates at Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard. There are two other environmental documents; one an EIR and a Mitigated Negative Declaration which required those gates to remain in place and remain closed until such time as Overlook is put through. There is also a requirement in the General Plan that requires the gates to remain closed until Overlook is put through. A request by many in the community was made, because of the opening and closing

of Crystal View and Green Orchard by the community, that those gates be removed. However, because of the requirements in the other two environmental documents, that were mitigation measures, in order to even look at the removal of those gates, this comprehensive document had to be done because an amendment of the previous documents is required. This is the purpose of the EIR. Of course, when looking at removing the gates or opening them up we've now have to look at the Overlook issue and that is how this whole issue came into play.

Commissioner Riggle inquired how long the Overlook connection has been on the City's General Plan. He has lived in Riverside for 20 years now and can remember driving up along Alessandro and turning right on Overlook noticed that Overlook didn't go through. Overlook is not a cul-de-sac, and it appears that when it was built, the connection of Overlook at some point is evident. When you look at the other end of Overlook where it connects into Washington it is built to four lanes and every time it has been extended, it was built to four lanes. It appears Overlook has been on the City's radar for a long time. He was not advocating either way but just commenting that there are two 50' pieces of road left and the talks are about not including these, which looked like it was always intended to do just that.

Ms. Smith said that the intent to have Overlook put through is probably spanning 30 plus years. She believed it was on the 1980 General Plan and has always been carried over. As mentioned by Mr. Boyd, it has also been on the Circulation Plan. It was on the 1994 General Plan and it was also then brought forward because it is on the Masterplan of roadways. The City Council has not taken up this issue, nothing has ever been done and it may never be built. This is a decision the City Council needs to make and that is the purpose of this document.

Commissioner Riggle referred to the "C" Street connection that goes around and through the orange groves. It seems pretty simple but was there an analysis that looked at that being connected to Madison Street. The shortest distance between two points is a straight line and it seems this is building a 40 million dollar road to go around. Was this street in the circulation element?

Ms. Smith stated that the General Plan mentions a connection of Overlook built through to Madison but she did not think it was very specific as to where it was going to be. The design included in scenario 4 was determined to be the least impactful design at this point in time and is what is before the Board and Commission now. She understood what Commissioner Riggle was referring to; going straight to Madison but it would have been more problematical from an environmental standpoint. This is the reason it was designed this way.

Commissioner Riggle were there any other alternatives looked at for the "C" Street route and how did staff end up at this scenario?

Ms. Lind added that the EIR does require a review of alternatives to the project. In this case the 4 scenarios do represent alternatives. The first three scenarios; 1, 2 and 3 would not construct the proposed "C" Street or any other road in that vicinity as an extension of Washington. Scenario 4 includes a component for this extension and in the alternatives section of the EIR three other proposed routes were reviewed.

Commissioner Riggle indicated that he understood scenarios 1, 2 and 3. Specifically zeroing in on scenario 4, does it mean that as part of the EIR these were analyzed but they are not included in what the Board and Commission is looking at today and why would they not be included?

Ms. Lind they are included in the materials provided to the Board and Commission. The Executive Summary does include alternatives that were considered but rejected. There won't be the same level of detailed traffic analysis on these alternate routes in the west. Again, they were considered early in the process and did not adequately reduce traffic impacts. There were engineering or other cost constraints along with some potential environmental impacts that led to the decision not to analyze them at the same level of detail or further in the EIR section.

Ms. Lind apologized. Her earlier statement was incorrect. The alternatives for other routes in the Executive Summary does not include a full description of the other routes along Madison, widening of Washington or underpass for Victoria. She referred to Chapter 8 of the EIR, alternatives section, and it goes into some detail about these routes and the constraints and environmental impacts of those.

Commissioner Maloney commented as a follow-up to Commissioner Riggle's questions. Assuming that Madison Street does get widened, will that include a grade separation at the railroad tracks? Is there a grade separation proposed for Adams?

Mr. Boyd stated that as he recalled, the EIR did not include a grade separation. The traffic models do not operate at that level of detail. At this time there is not a plan to put a grade separation in at Madison. The City has looked at grade separations at Adams and Madison, Washington and Mary. The last Council decision included a grade separation at Mary Street, however, the project did not receive any funding and consequently has laid dormant for several years.

Commissioner Maloney suggested that the EIR address the grade separation at Madison Street.

Commissioner Zaki said that the public has expressed concerns regarding environmental issues. The workshop tonight is to specifically address traffic, however, there are a total of eleven environmental issues under consideration in the EIR. He asked if the four scenarios presented tonight had all of the environmental issues weighed in for each scenario and were the impacts addressed in terms of their adverse affects towards the community.

Ms. Lind responded affirmatively. Tonight's workshop is only focusing on one section that the environmental impact report analyzes. There are eleven specific chapters that include the issues Commissioner Zaki is concerned about along with others: noise, air quality... etc. For each of those issues they considered different thresholds. They also fully analyzed scenarios 1, 2, 3 and 4 throughout the entire EIR. They are all analyzed at an equal level of detail. She reiterated that they did not weigh one environmental issue over another and they did not come to a conclusion in the EIR, nor are they here tonight with a recommendation of one scenario over another. They are really trying to disclose the environmental impacts in the feasible and recommended mitigation for certain issues or environmental areas for all four scenarios.

Commissioner Zaki agreed but stated he was trying to get an appreciation for what he thought was the public's general concerns, specifically environmental issues and the impact to their quality of life. He would suspect those issues will weigh in, in terms of how they would recommend their scenarios.

Ms. Smith clarified that the consultants have thoroughly analyzed all four scenarios. The issues Commissioner Zaki is raising, is exactly what this EIR did. It is not a recommendation; an analysis was done and if there was a significant impact in one or more of the scenarios it was included in the EIR. Whether or not there were mitigations to reduce those impacts to insignificant is also included in the EIR. Each scenario goes through that same analysis and lays out the impacts whether significant or insignificant. The scenarios have all gone through a thorough detail of the different issues and those issues have been laid out without a recommendation. Again, this is being left to the City Council to make that determination but it is all out there for the City Council to see what impacts that particular scenario will have.

Ms. Lind added that the Executive Summary of the EIR was a good starting point. Table S1 of the Executive Summary provides a list of all the impacts that were analyzed for each of the scenarios.

Chair Allen thanked Ms. Lind. He stated he did read the report and it was just amazing the time that was put into it. He inquired if the train through Madison Street and it's affect to the LOS was taken into consideration.

Mr. Hamrick replied that the presence of the train was not included in the analysis.

Chair Allen asked that it be included because he felt it would have a huge impact on the traffic going down Madison Street.

Mr. Hamrick stated they would address this as part of the response to comments.

Commissioner Wade encouraged everyone to submit their comments by March 1, 2013. When this item comes before the Planning Commission, they will greatly need the public's specific comments and concerns. The Commission needs to hear their specific comments as this will be the only way they can make an intelligent choice. He appreciated their comments and stated he looked forward to seeing them again when the item came before the Planning Commission.

MOTION made by Board Member Hildebrandt; **SECOND** by Board Member Nelson to receive and file the report.

MOTION CARRIED: 9 yes, 1 no, 0 abstentions, 0 disqualified

AYES: Curtis, Rios, Aldana, Nicholas, Hildebrandt, Bellavia, McEntee, Gritton, Angel

NOES: Nelson

DISQUALIFIED: None

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: Bromley,

Chair Allen adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 7:57 p.m.

The Transportation Board continued with the last item on their agenda.