

# ***CITY OF PERRIS***

*MINUTES:* Joint Work Session of the City Council,  
Redevelopment Agency,  
Perris Public Finance Authority &  
Perris Public Utilities Authority

*Date of Meeting:* 29 November 2005

*Time of Meeting:* 4:30 p.m.

*Place of Meeting:* City Council Chambers

---

**1. *CALL TO ORDER:***

The Honorable Mayor Busch called the Joint Work Session of the City Council, Redevelopment Agency, Perris Public Finance Authority and Perris Public Utilities Authority to order.

*4:30 p.m. Called to Order*

**2. *ROLL CALL:***

Council Members Present: Yarbrough, Landers, Motte, Rogers, Busch

*Council Members present*

Staff Members Present: City Manager Apodaca, City Attorney Dunn, Community Development Director Barnes, City Engineer Motlagh, Finance Director Carr, Public Works Director Ansari, Assistant to City Manager Madkin, Planning Manager Belmudez, Police Chief Kestell, Fire Chief Williams, and City Clerk Rey.

*Staff Members Present*

**3. *WORK SESSION:***

**A. I-215 and 4<sup>th</sup> Street Interchange Project.**

*I-215 and 4<sup>th</sup> Street Interchange Project*

Introduced by: Habib Motlagh, City Engineer

City Engineer Motlagh explained that several months prior, the City Council gave responsibility to Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) to start the project to look at the I-215 & Hwy 74 Interchange. As far as funding is concerned, Mr. Motlagh noted that the City had a local TUMF fund of just a little over \$1 million, plus \$1 million from Measure A. In addition, the City's lobbyist in Washington, D.C. recently notified the City that there was \$800,000 earmarked for this project.

*City Engineer Motlagh gave a brief background on this project.*

There was currently a \$10 million TUMF project identified for this Interchange. It was indicated that an increase had been proposed, which would bring the figure to about \$22 million.

*TUMF funding*

Mr. Motlagh introduced Hideo Sugita, Deputy Executive Director of RCTC, to make a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Sugita stated that this project was part and parcel included in the 1988 Measure Program. It was projected to be funded through that program, but the Commission was currently working on a strategic plan update for the new measure, the 2009 Program. As part of that, they would be looking at what was left to be completed of the 1988 Program, currently called the 1989 Measure. That would take place in the next 6-7 months.

*Mr. Motlagh introduced Hideo Sugita, Deputy Executive Director of RCTC, to make a PowerPoint presentation regarding the Interchange. Mr. Sugita stated that this project was included in the 1988 Measure Program, now called the 1989 Measure.*

Mr. Sugita turned the presentation over to Richard Hart of David Evans & Associates, Project Manager for this project. Mr. Hart said his company was a consulting engineering firm in Ontario that contracted with RCTC to provide the engineering and the environmental documentation for this project, including the delivery and assessment of the different alternatives. He said they would be presenting six alternatives. Of those six, they would like to focus it down to the viable alternatives so they would have a focused study group of what they could go forward with for both the engineering and the environmental processing. Mr. Hart explained that the project report would document the engineering for Caltrans, to make sure that the highway design standards and criteria were met, and the environmental document would be prepared to satisfy both the California requirements under CEQA and the Federal requirements under the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

*Mr. Sugita turned the presentation over to Richard Hart of David Evans & Associates, Project Manager for this project. Mr. Hart said they would be presenting six alternatives.*

Mr. Hart outlined the Six Alternatives:

*The Six Alternatives*

Alternative 1 - No Building (Existing Interchange)

*Alternative 1 – No Building (Existing Interchange)*

The off ramp would be reconfigured. This interchange would be constructed to accommodate the ultimate 215 freeway. Mr. Hart said that currently the 215 was programmed for four lanes plus an HOV lane through this corridor. This alternative would avoid the Denny's Restaurant and would require reconfiguring one of the off ramps. This alternative would retain all of the existing access along Redlands Avenue.

Alternative 2 - Diamond IC: Full Access (Cost: \$16.2 million) (Extrapolation of 1992 Caltrans Project Study Report [PSR])

*Alternative 2 – Diamond IC: Full Access*

Alternative 2A - Diamond IC w/Roundabout: Full Access

*Alternative 2A – Diamond IC w/Roundabout: Full Access*

Alternative 3 - Diamond IC: Modified Access (Cost: \$22.3 million) (Extrapolation of 1992 Caltrans PSR)

*Alternative 3 – Diamond IC: Modified Access*

Redlands would be relocated to the south of the existing bridge. This would require the relocation of Denny's.

Alternative 4 - Diamond IC: Modified Access/New Road Circulation (Cost: \$27.0 million) (Extrapolation of 1992 Caltrans PSR)

*Alternative 4 – Diamond IC: Modified Access/New Road Circulation*

Alternatives 2, 3 & 4 were the alternatives that were developed in the Caltrans Project Study Report (PSR) that was prepared in 1992. Alternative 2A is just a modification RCTC is looking at as a Roundabout option. This would require the removal of Denny's.

Alternative 5 - Partial Cloverleaf IC: Modified Access/New Road Circulation (Cost: \$28 million +) (Estimate based on similar alternatives)

*Alternative 5 - Partial Cloverleaf IC: Modified Access/New Road Circulation*

This is a new alternative, separate from the Caltrans PSR. This is a cloverleaf interchange that could be used if it were necessitated by a much higher demand of traffic and if left-turn cues could not be accommodated at the interchange over the bridge. (With the diamond interchange, there would be a left turn.) This would have a greater impact to the properties north of 215 and would also require the removal of Denny's.

Alternative 6 - Diamond IC: Modified Access/4<sup>th</sup> Street Cul-de-Sac (Cost: \$22 million +) (Estimate based on similar alternatives)

*Alternative 6 - Diamond IC: Modified Access/4<sup>th</sup> Street Cul-de-Sac*

This alternative essentially would create a cul-de-sac on 4<sup>th</sup> Street, rerouting the traffic around the project to the south, east, and then north. It basically would take Redlands and continue it south, precluding access to 4<sup>th</sup> Street at that location. This alternative would also require that Denny's be removed.

Following are the next steps to be taken:

*Next Steps*

- ◆ Focus on viable alternatives
- ◆ Prepare Traffic Study for 2030 Forecast - February 2006
- ◆ Prepare Draft Project Report - Summer 2006 (Engineering documents to satisfy Caltrans and FHWA requirements for evaluating the highway design criteria)
- ◆ Prepare Environmental Studies and Draft Environmental Document - Summer 2006
- ◆ Approve Mitigated Negative Declaration by City - Winter 2006
- ◆ Approve Finding Of No Signification Impact (FONSI) by FHWA - Winter 2006
- ◆ Proceed to Design/Construction Phases - Winter 2006-07
- ◆ Day of Opening - 2010

Mr. Sugita said that Caltrans had looked at the 215, and in June they would come out with a Project Study Report, making the 215 a 6-lane facility all the way from the "Y" near Murrieta through "D" Street. He said there were a number of improvements scheduled over the coming years. This project was already funded, and RCTC looked forward to moving it forward in an expeditious manner. He said they had placed a very aggressive environmental document schedule on the project manager.

*Mr. Sugita said that Caltrans would be presenting a Project Study Report in June.*

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Gary Bauer, Vice President of Commercial Development for Lewis Retail Centers, which is the developer of the property adjacent to these proposals, said they were looking for a little better timing than 2010 for this project, so wanted an alternative that would have less impact.

Dave Stuart said that one thing he had noticed about Alternative 2A was that the new bridge over the highway was entirely separate from the old bridge. He asked if that meant this alternative could be built with a minimum disruption to the existing bridge during construction. The response was that each of the alternatives would take that matter into consideration. The existing bridge would not accommodate the future ultimate freeway expansion; it would have to be replaced. The plan would be to replace it, put the new bridge adjacent to the existing one, and when the new bridge was ready, switch the traffic to the new one. The premise of the project would be to maintain traffic through the Interchange, retaining access through all legs of the Interchange as much as possible during construction.

Irwin Belcher, owner of property on 4<sup>th</sup> Street, asked if any of the projects required eminent domain on 4<sup>th</sup> Street in order to widen the road. He also asked if eminent domain was going to be required on the land adjacent to the Chevron station. The answer was that some of the alternatives would require more eminent domain than others, but that RCTC was very sensitive about the use of the process and it was not something they recklessly apply. Most likely very little would be required on 4<sup>th</sup> Street; about the same as would have been required for the Roundabout. City Engineer Motlagh said the concern should not necessarily be the additional right-of-way, but the access.

## COUNCIL QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Since the Traffic Study would not be done until February 2006 but the Council was being asked for alternative preferences at this meeting, Councilmember Rogers asked if RCTC could give them a ballpark estimation of traffic flows. Mr. Sugita said they were actually trying to get Council's ideas on alternatives that absolutely wouldn't work, even without traffic data, in order to narrow down the selection and not have to include so many alternatives in the Environmental Document. Ms. Rogers asked which alternatives would take out Denny's. The response was that numbers 3, 4, 5 and 6 would all do that. Alternate 2 would retain it.

It was agreed that No. 6 should definitely be eliminated.

Mayor Busch asked how much the process would be expedited if they were able to come up with a definite selection. Bill Hughes, RCTC's Special Project Manager, said this project was on a very tight schedule, and it

## *Public Comment*

*Gary Bauer of Lewis Retail Centers, developers of the property adjacent to these proposals, said they wanted to see the project happen sooner than 2010.*

*Dave Stuart asked, since in Alternative 2A the new bridge over the highway was entirely separate from the old bridge, if the alternative could be built with a minimum disruption to the existing bridge. The answer was that a new bridge would have to be built adjacent to the old one, and when the new one was ready, traffic would be switched to that one.*

*Irwin Belcher asked if any of the projects required eminent domain on 4<sup>th</sup> Street. The answer was that if it was necessary, RCTC would apply that option very carefully. Most likely there would be very little required on 4<sup>th</sup> Street.*

## *Council Questions/Discussion*

*Councilmember Rogers asked about the traffic flow. Mr. Sugita said they would like to have Council's opinion, even without traffic data, on alternatives that absolutely would not work. In response to Ms. Rogers' query, it was said that Alternatives 3, 4, 5 and 6 would all take out Denny's.*

*It was agreed that No. 6 should definitely be eliminated.*

*Mayor Busch asked if an immediate selection would expedite the project. Bill Hughes of RCTC responded.*

would probably still be 2010 before the Interchange would be completed, due to all the processes that were involved.

Councilmember Landers had a question about the Roundabout on Alternative 2A. Mr. Hart said it would essentially be a two-lane Roundabout that would provide circulation at that location to access all four legs of the intersection. Instead of having to stop, the traffic would continue at a 20-25 mph flow. This alternative was merely a variation of Alternative 2, but would allow the traffic to continue, as opposed to creating a left-turn pocket, resulting in stopped traffic. Mr. Landers asked if that would impede Denny's, the egress at the Chevron station, or the auto center. Mr. Hart did not believe it would. Mr. Landers also asked about the cul-de-sacs on Alternative 3. Mr. Hart said those were necessitated out of the Caltrans report because of locating the alignment to the south of the existing bridge and going through the Denny's area, the object of which was to create a continuous route 74, 4<sup>th</sup> Street, into Redlands, with no stopping on this route going to the north.

Mr. Landers asked which of the alternatives would be expedited more effectively, from the design standpoint. Mr. Hart said that design would take about the same amount of time for any of the alternatives, but because Alternative 2 required less right-of-way and would not require taking Denny's, it would probably have the better chance of being a cleaner processing through the right-of-way acquisition process. Mr. Landers asked if Denny's or RCTC owned the land. Mr. Hart said Denny's did.

Councilmember Yarbrough asked how much money was budgeted for this project to date. Mr. Motlagh said there would be approximately \$25 million.

Mr. Yarbrough asked if there were any time frames that had been established on the various alternatives. Mr. Motlagh responded that the environmental process would take about 18 months, regardless of which alternative was used.

Mr. Yarbrough asked how this could be expedited. Mr. Motlagh said that money talks, so if the City had the money in hand and the project ready and would stay on top of it, it may be able to push the project along.

Mr. Yarbrough said he was concerned mostly about the safety issue, but also about the fact that the economic development would be hinging on what was going to be done with this project. He also was curious to know if this project was in any way like the Mid-County Parkway project, in that the Council would not really have a say in the final decision. Mr. Motlagh responded that this was the City's project and there were no other agencies involved, but the City had to do its due process, including the environmental process. But if the City had the money and the political ambition behind it, any of the alternatives could be delivered.

*Councilmember Landers asked about the Roundabout on Alternative 2A and the cul-de-sacs on Alternative 3. Mr. Hart responded.*

*Mr. Landers asked which alternative would be expedited more effectively. Mr. Hart said it would probably be Alternative 2.;*

*Councilmember Yarbrough asked how much money had been budgeted for this project to date. Mr. Motlagh said it was approximately \$25 million.*

*Mr. Yarbrough asked about time frames for the various alternatives. Mr. Motlagh said the environmental process would take about 18 months for any of the alternatives.*

*Mr. Yarbrough asked how it could be expedited. Mr. Motlagh said if the City had the money and the project ready, it would probably help to move it along.*

*Mr. Yarbrough was concerned about the safety issue first, but also about the fact that economic development was hinging on what was done with this project. He also wanted to know if the Council was really going to have any say in the decision. Mr. Motlagh said there were no other agencies involved and*

*any of the alternatives could be accomplished as long as the City had the money and political ambition behind it.*

Mr. Yarbrough thought that Alternative 2A would probably be the best and fastest, a good compromise overall.

*Mr. Yarbrough preferred Alternative 2A.*

Mayor Pro Tem Motte concurred with Mr. Yarbrough's opinion. He was just concerned that traffic would not back up on the off ramps and onto the freeway. He asked if the Traffic Study would indicate if that would happen. Mr. Hart said it would, also indicating that the off ramps would be designed and the traffic signal layouts set up so as to keep the ramps clear so there would be no backup onto the freeway.

*Mr. Motte concurred with the opinion regarding Alternative 2A but asked about possible traffic backup on the off ramps.*

Mayor Busch said he also preferred Alternative 2A. He asked, however, if they could also select Alternative 2 as an alternate, in case the Traffic Study indicated that it would be better. Mr. Sugita said they had not yet had a meeting with FHWA, and being an interstate facility, that agency would have a say. He said that RCTC would certainly put forth the City's viewpoint on the alternatives.

*Mayor Busch also preferred Alternative 2A, but asked if they could select Alternative 2 as an alternate, in case the Traffic Study indicated it would be better. Mr. Sugita said they would present the City's viewpoint to FHWA.*

City Attorney Dunn asked if, based on the Council's comments, any of the alternatives would be formally dropped from further consideration, or if FHWA required RCTC to study six alternatives. Mr. Hart said that if the Council was opposed to any of the alternatives, they could go on record as being opposed to them.

*City Attorney Dunn asked if any of the alternatives would be formally dropped from further consideration. Mr. Hart said the Council could go on record as being opposed to the other alternatives.*

Mr. Motlagh suggested that by the next Council Meeting perhaps they could bring a Resolution to formally adopt an alternative or a substitute alternative. That Resolution could then be formally submitted to RCTC in writing. Mr. Sugita suggested that the Council might want to wait until the Traffic Study had been completed, to make sure their choice would work. Mr. Motlagh said they would wait until March.

*Mr. Motlagh suggested preparing a Resolution to formally adopt an alternative or a substitute alternative. Upon Mr. Sugita's suggestion, Mr. Motlagh said they would wait and bring it forward in March.*

Mr. Motlagh announced that they would have a signup sheet available for anyone who would like to be notified of future public meetings regarding this project.

*Mr. Motlagh announced that a signup sheet would be available for anyone wishing to be notified of future public meetings regarding this project.*

**ADJOURNMENT:**

By unanimous consent, the Joint City Council, Redevelopment Agency, PPFA and PPUA Work Session was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

*5:40 p.m. Joint City Council, Redevelopment Agency, PPFA and PPUA Work Session was adjourned.*

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Margaret Rey, City Clerk

