

**I-15 Interregional Partnership (I-15 IRP)  
Technical Working Group  
Meeting Summary**  
Thursday, November 13, 2003

**Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions**

Kevin Viera, WRCOG, opened the meeting, asking for self-introductions of those attending the meeting. The names of persons attending this meeting are listed at the end of this meeting summary.

**Agenda Item #2: Summary of the September 11, 2003 I-15 IRP Technical Working Group Meeting**

The Technical Working Group made no corrections to the draft meeting summary.

**Agenda Item #3: Public Comment/Communications.**

Because of construction at Temecula City Hall, this meeting was held in the office of the firm Muni Financial in Temecula. Lyn Gruber, Principal Consultant for Muni Financial, welcomed the TWG, briefing them on the role of the firm is the evaluation, formation and administration of Special Districts.

**Agenda Item #4: Evaluation of I-15 IRP Strategies**

The primary purpose of this meeting is to establish preliminary priorities on long-range strategies to promote a better jobs-housing balance in San Diego County and in southwestern Riverside County. Based on an earlier TWG recommendation, the I-15 IRP Policy Committee (PC) identified long-range strategies for further consideration. The PC previously adopted short-range transportation strategies that are in implementation.

Staff distributed a table that listed the agencies responsible for implementing each long-range strategy, each strategy's effect on balance and a staff-recommended priority. This table is attached.

**Transportation Strategies:** Both T1 & T5 support transportation system expansion that would make the commute into San Diego County more feasible – transportation facility expansion does not encourage a better jobs-housing balance in each region. TWG members noted that some growth in interregional commuting was inevitable. Strategies T1 & T5 would expand Managed (HOV/carpool & toll) Lanes and High Speed Rail service, not general-use freeway capacity.

While the Orange County-SR 91 Corridor IRP did not include transportation strategies, they are being planned by other inter-county agencies. Although initially opposed, economic development groups in Orange County now generally support the proposed transportation improvements in the corridor.

The TWG discussed the need for transit shuttle operations, Strategy T2, focusing on the potential for private sector funding: by employers at the work-end of the trip and developers or homeowner associations at the home-end. As a condition of development, the Harveston Community in Temecula will provide more than \$300,000 that can be used for transit capital or approximately 18 months of transit shuttle operations. Harveston is a 2,000-unit project under development by

Lennar Homes. Descriptions of Strategy T2 should identify both private and public transit operators as potential implementing agencies. A moderate priority is suggested.

**TWG consensus** supported the construction of “alternative” transportation facilities as the highest IRP transportation priority: new Managed (HOV/carpool & toll) Lanes in the medium time frame and High Speed Rail service in the longer range. The TWG suggested a moderate priority for both the preservation of rights-of-way and the promotion of transit shuttle services. The group did not change the low priority for the reduction of required parking suggested by staff.

**Housing Strategies:** Strategy H1, the provision of a range of housing in all cities, is generally required by California housing law. TWG members discussed the implementation of the State Housing Element requirements, including an additional idea of requiring the construction of similar percentages of housing types in all jurisdictions as part of Housing Elements. This type of policy would require denser development in Riverside County; more single family construction in San Diego County. While supporting a range of housing in all areas, TWG members felt that specifying a specific mix of housing is not politically feasible.

Staff said that gentrification of existing moderate cost family housing was a problem with the revitalization of existing neighborhoods, Strategy H2. In addition, the objective of providing moderate cost family housing near San Diego County employment, Strategy H-3, could be achieved without subsidy through inclusionary housing requirements. Inclusionary housing programs should include the construction of smaller single-family homes with fewer amenities on smaller lots.

**TWG consensus** supported a high priority for moderate-income housing incentive programs, Strategy H3. Because it is not an incentive, inclusionary housing programs should be separated from Strategy H3 and retain the high priority recommended. While Strategy H1 is important, the Housing Element process should be strongly supported and monitored by the IRP, but not be given a high priority. Similarly Strategy H2 was considered a low priority in addressing jobs-housing balance.

**Economic Development Strategies:** Strategy ED1, economic development agency (EDA) coordination, could become a short-range strategy. Staff suggested that this coordination already occurs in San Diego County; WRCOG could initiate a similar coordinating effort in western or southwestern Riverside County as part of the current state IRP grant. TWG members insisted that the EDA coordination should include agencies in both counties, although initial organization in Riverside County seemed a reasonable initial step. The creation of an I-15 Website (ED2) and mapping of Broadband service areas (ED3) are activities that would be undertaken by any coordinating group.

Staff reintroduced the concept of locating satellite/back office activities of San Diego employers in Riverside County, Strategy ED4. Kathy Boyer suggested restructuring the strategy to emphasize industrial/employment clustering in the two-County region. SANDAG’s Regional Economic Prosperity Element focuses on the clustering concept. Staff will use the SANDAG policy as a beginning point in drafting a new strategy, ED5, that uses the clustering concept to balance jobs and housing..

**TWG consensus** supported economic development agency coordination (ED1) as a short-range strategy, incorporating the planning for ED2 and ED3. However, the posting of an I-15 Website (ED2) and the mapping of Broadband service (ED3) would probably not occur for at least nine months. TWG will consider the refocus of ED4 in December.

**Jobs-Housing Balance Strategies:** While they should become ongoing efforts, staff suggested that advocacy efforts (JH1) and Community Outreach (JH2) need to be accomplished prior to the end of the grant. Funding activities (JH3) should be incorporated into each strategy.

**TWG supported** the staff recommendation.

**Agenda Item #5: Next Steps/I-15 IRP Work Program Update**

Staff said that they are initiating contacts with implementing agencies not included in the TWG. One member identified a spring 2004 California economic development conference as an outreach opportunity.

**Agenda Item #6: Project/issue Updates**

Because of time constraints, no project or issue updates were given.

**Agenda Item #7: Adjournment and Next Meeting**

The next TWG meeting is scheduled for December 11, 2003 in Escondido; the next Policy Advisory Committee meeting on January 16, 2004 in Temecula.

**November 13, 2003 Meeting Participants  
I-15 Interregional Partnership**

Kathy Boyer, Riverside County EDA/WDC  
Henri Brickey, The Californian (newspaper)  
Paul Dirkson, California Department of Housing & Community Development  
Sharon Fonseca, Friendship Transportation Service  
Ramsey Green, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce  
Jim Mackenzie, City of Murrieta  
Shirley Medina, Riverside County Transportation Commission  
Michael McCoy, Riverside Transit Agency  
Jim O'Grady, City of Temecula  
Laurel Nicholson, 66<sup>th</sup> Assembly District Candidate

**Staff Members -**

Elgeritte Adidjaja, WRCOG  
George Franck, SANDAG  
Jeff Martin, SANDAG  
Kevin Viera, WRCOG