

# CITY OF PERRIS

*MINUTES:* City Council Work Session  
*Date of Meeting:* 08 January, 2002  
*Time of Meeting:* 4:00 p.m.  
*Place of Meeting:* City Council Chambers-City Hall

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

*4:22 p.m. Called to Order*

**2. ROLL CALL:**

*All Present*

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

Staff Members Present: City Manager Vasquez, Assistant City Manager Apodaca, City Attorney Aleshire, Community Director Gutierrez, Finance Director Rogers-Elmore, City Engineer Motlagh, Public Services Director Owens, Fire Chief Williams, Chief Turley, Project Planner Miller and City Clerk Rey

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**4. WORK SESSION:**

- A. Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP)/Riverside County Regional Comprehensive Project Update.

Community Director Gutierrez indicated the first portion of the session would be an orientation for the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) and the Executive Director from the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) would perform the presentation. The second portion of the session would be the MSHCP. There were two resolutions for Council's adoption and the information could be found in City Council's Agenda, Item B, of the Consent Calendar.

*Community Director Gutierrez's Introduction*

Mr. Bishop, Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG), gave background information in regards to the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) and provided a PowerPoint presentation. The presentation included perspectives on regional growth, transportation and planning programs and funding strategies:

*WRCOG, Mr. Bishop's Presentation*

- Growth Impacts: Significant population growth (7 million) that encompassed six Southern California cities; Riverside County Integrated Project; Community and Environmental Transportation Acceptability Process (CETAP); reauthorization of Measure A; Transit planning activities; TUMF; impacts on transportation system; regional system of highways/arterial master plan (copies of the plan was available); Year 2020 transportation improvements;

- Necessary expenditures for construction of level of improvements throughout Western Riverside County (\$9 Billion over the next 20 years); Measure A and TUMF were responsible for nearly ¾ of the potential monies required to build the system;
- TUMF Program: housed with all local jurisdictions within Western Riverside County; TUMF fee was not the same as local fee programs in place and not superceded by any potential reauthorization of Measure A and they were separate; one prong in a multi-prong strategy to accommodate future growth and meet the transportation infrastructure needs;
- Potential interim TUMF Fee lost: if a region wide fee of \$4,000 per unit had been in place over the last three years, it would had generated over \$60 million.
- TUMF was a separate revenue generating mechanism; an addition to existing local fee programs; an addition to reauthorization of Measure A;
- CETAP: was part of Riverside County's Integrated Project; was another transportation prong.

*Con't. WRCOG, Mr. Bishop's Presentation*

Mr. Bishop recommended to move the program forward to a decision point within the next year and indicated a schedule had been created. The TUMF issue was dependent on local jurisdictions' approval. There was a resolution for Council's approval and was developed in concert with City Managers, who unanimously endorsed it. Mr. Bishop was available to answer any questions Council had.

Ruth An Taylor-Berger, WRCOG Deputy Executive Director, indicated she had been working on the TUMF for three years. She reiterated on revenue lost and was available to answer any questions.

*WRCOG Deputy Executive Director Taylor-Berger's Comments*

**CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION:**

Councilmember Motte asked if cities were turning out ordinances in regards to the TUMF.

*Councilmember Motte's Query*

In reply, Ms. Taylor-Berger said the City of Calimesa was the first city to adopt a resolution and a number of cities had placed a resolution on their agenda. The resolution commits the City to discuss and develop the TUMF.

*WRCOG Deputy Executive Director Taylor-Berger's Response*

Councilmember Motte asked if the City's master plan corresponded with WRCOG's Year 2020 Transportation Master Plan.

*Councilmember Motte's Query*

In reply, Ms. Taylor-Berger, said the project seen on the Master Plan of Highways was developed for eligibility for TUMF dollars. The City would not see every General Plan project on WRCOG's Master Plan. In conjunction with working with the City, most of the projects had been identified on a regional basis.

*WRCOG Deputy Executive Director Taylor-Berger's Response*

City Engineer Motlagh stated extension of Ramona Expressway was included in WRCOG's plan.

*City Engineer Motlagh's Comment*

In regards to the transportation map, Ms. Taylor-Berger said a set of criteria was used to create the map and when needs changed the map, would be reviewed and revised.

*WRCOG Deputy Executive Director Taylor-Berger's Comments*

Mr. Bishop commented it was anticipated that the proposal would be presented to other Cities by early February, 2002. Also, the 'What is the TUMF Regional Informational Brief' was created and the document could be viewed on WRCOG's web site at [wrcog.cog.ca.us](http://wrcog.cog.ca.us). The next City Manager's Meeting for TUMF was scheduled for January 17, 2002. The source would be a per unit fee or square footage based on new housing and non-residential.

*WRCOG, Mr. Bishop's Presentation*

Mayor Pro Tem Yarbrough asked how many other jurisdictions utilized this type of program.

*Mayor Pro Tem Yarbrough's Query*

In response, Mr. Bishop said Coachella Valley had a TUMF in place and was a model. Other counties throughout the State and Nation had similar type programs.

*WRCOG, Mr. Bishop's Response*

Mayor Busch asked if Murrieta had a similar program.

*Mayor Busch's Query*

In answer, Ms. Taylor-Berger said Murrieta had a development impact fee in place and did not have a plan for areas outside of their city boundaries that addressed regional traffic. The City of Corona had a \$10,000-\$12,000 fee per dwelling unit for transportation improvements. They were expected to raise that fee. The electives listed was to address Building Industry Association (BIA) concerns in regards to applying fees across the board on residential and non-residential. About 67-70% of traffic was generated from housing stock and the balance was from a variety of other uses and would be assessed on both uses.

*WRCOG, Mr. Bishop's Response & Comments*

Councilmember Rogers asked if the local jurisdiction would determine the fee structure.

*Councilmember Rogers' Query*

In reply, Mr. Bishop said it would be the City in concert with all the other jurisdictions. The fee would be uniform across the board. Therefore, no unfairness and base the program on a regional basis. The Councils within the County would adopt the fee program and collectively decide what the fee would be and what priority would be made. The determination would be part of the final draft and would be incorporated into an agreement and an ordinance.

*WRCOG, Mr. Bishop's Response & Comments*

City Engineer Motlagh voiced concerns of where the funds would be spent; who would have the final say on disbursement of funds and these were some issues to resolve before the final document was adopted.

*City Engineer Motlagh's Comments*

City Attorney Aleshire intervened and asked, for individual cities, were they going to try to match the revenue raised with the expenditures within a city, or was it just going to be done in a very gross basis across the whole sub-region.

*City Attorney Aleshire's Query*

In answer, Ms. Taylor-Berger said the nexus analysis was the entire network which would give the broadest base to justify a fee and facilities location. Projects had not been selected and there was an issue of equity. Geographic zones were discussed and the money collected within a zone would go back into that zone. The specific amount of money, that would go directly back to a city, had not been determined. The fee was designed to be uniform and cities, indirectly, would receive benefit. The short answer to City Attorney's query was NO, that would not be balanced directly. There may be some credit given for those that had paid some monies into an improvement. The same improvement can not be doubled.

*WRCOG's Deputy  
Executive Director Taylor-  
Berger's Response*

Project Planner Miller requested Ms. Taylor-Berger to cite the range of potential fees discussed.

*Project Planner Miller's  
Request*

In response, Ms. Taylor-Berger said one issue reviewed was to assign cost to the network at about \$5.5 Billion. The bench mark was determined to be 50%; divided houses by \$3 Billion and came up at \$7,500 dwelling unit. That figure was not realistic. Thus, the back-bone system, phase approach, you had a set of improvements that were significant for the entire Western County and figured out at about \$1,500 per dwelling unit. There were a number of formulas to pursue. The range was not split out to types of non-residential uses and staff would review and figure on non-residential land uses.

*WRCOG's Deputy  
Executive Director Taylor-  
Berger's Response*

Councilmember Rogers voiced concern on a blanket fee and the median price of homes, within our jurisdiction, being on the low end, which may keep developers from developing.

*Councilmember Rogers'  
Comments*

Mayor Busch interceded and indicated that the concept of the uniform fee was a developer would pay the same fee whether it be in the City of Perris or any city within Southern California.

*Mayor Busch's Comment*

#### B. Discussion of the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF).

Project Planner Miller pointed out there was a resolution on the City Council's Consent Calendar and that resolution encompassed two areas: 1) endorsement of the need for the TUMF Fee; and 2) conceptual approval of participation in the TUMF. The adoption would set the stage for the same issues with the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The conclusion would be the signature, of each city, to an implementation agreement. The ideal was that all cities would participate and the fee would be uniform throughout the region. With the TUMF and MSHCP Fees would, essentially, double our Capital Improvement Fees, but can be negotiated.

*Project Planner Miller's  
Presentation*

Project Planner Miller presentation included the following:

- Two critical factors were the two resolutions for Council to adopt and a third action was to authorize the Mayor to sign the application for the taking of species that were affected;
- Participation was subject to approval of an Implementation Agreement acceptable to all participating cities;

- Apportionment, of responsibilities, for funding, would be resolved; and the City would agree to participate in an implementation strategy;
- The proposed fee would pay for 1/3 of the total cost of the MSHCP; the other 1/3 would come from other sources (State/Federal Grants);
- Aerial photos presented reflected: 1) Concept A; 2) Alternative A; 3) Alternative F;
- City's concerns, the County agreed to further modifications to extend channelization up the Perris Valley Storm Drain to San Jacinto Avenue.
- Presented colored exhibit of acres identified as conservation areas within the City of Perris; the County 153,000 acres of private lands; 360,000 acres of existing public lands to be set aside for conservation;
- County Flood Control identified, in Alternative F, available land, for active conservation uses (parkland uses/250 acres), located between the Perris Valley Storm Drain and I-215, south of San Jacinto Avenue;
- The City's south corridor was proposed to be widen 250 feet more than what was set aside at 750 feet.
- The City had identified the Perris Valley Storm Drain as a critical issue and identified it as a permitted activity within the MSHCP;
- The release of a map that identified survey areas for the Narrow Endemic Plants; native plants that existed along the San Jacinto River. Fish & Wildlife proposed that plants found in the survey areas would be 100% conserved.
- The County was aware of the concerns the City raised in regards to the storm drain being a permitted activity.

*Con't. Project Planner  
Miller's Presentation*

Community Director Gutierrez indicated that infill development would be impacted and a policy was developed that would be acceptable to the developers. But, the requirement of a survey was in place and those that did not maintain their property may have had plants.

*Community Director  
Gutierrez's Comments*

Continuing, Project Planner Miller said developed property would be exempted; Alternative F was acceptable to resource agencies; and draft documents, to be released, should reflect Alternative F.

*Project Planner Miller's  
Comments*

City Attorney asked, if the City did not follow through with the resolution, which referred to Alternative F, then there would be nothing to prevent the City to drop out of the resolution.

*City Attorney Aleshire's  
Query*

In response, Project Planner Miller said it would all be predicated upon the Council agreeing to sign the Implementation Agreement. To participate a resolution was required and the application required a signature, which would be submitted to Fish & Wildlife. Project Planner Miller indicated the following materials were included in the packet: an Interim Milestones Schedule; draft MOU from the cities of Moreno Valley, Corona and Riverside that fixed their conditions considered for participation; preliminary outline of issues/recommendations related to the imposition of mitigation impact fees; and a property owner initiated habitat evaluation/acquisition negotiation process. In summary, the resolutions, tonight, were endorsement of the need of the program and conceptual approval of participation. The Fish & Wildlife application was a request for the taking of endangered species. If the resolutions were not approved to participate and the application was not signed the City would not be part of the process.

*Project Planner Miller's  
Response & Comments*

Mayor Pro Tem Yarbrough commented on the Draft TUMF Alternative Implementation Strategy #2 and indicated he did not care for the manner the TUMP and MSHCP were associated. Because, in order to be eligible for Subvention Funds, for future measure extension, the County would need to comply with and participate in the TUMF. The MOUs submitted had no impact by the MSHCP for those cities mentioned and they should be reviewed for thresholds and criteria that impact the City of Perris.

*Mayor Pro Tem  
Yarbrough's Comment*

5. **ADJOURNMENT:** By unanimous consent the City Council Work Session was adjourned at 5:45p.m.

*5:45 p.m. City Council  
Work Session Adjourned*

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Margaret Rey, City Clerk