

Isom, Sandy J.

From: CindyRAGLM@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2008 3:39 PM
To: LakeMathewsTalks@yahoogroups.com;
GHSchoolRedistrictingCommittee@yahoogroups.com;
Lake_Mathews_Transit@Yahoogroups.com; RAGLMNotice@Yahoogroups.com;
Rolling_Meadows_Road@yahoogroups.com; Watt_LMCOI@Yahoogroups.com;
WoodcrestTalks@Yahoogroups.com
Subject: My Comments From Last Nights Meeting On The RCTC/MCP/Route 9

I don't recall just which statements I did make of my notes, so, I'm placing the whole thing here. I know I covered everything from their Oct. 2006 Measure A 2009 through 2015 needs report.

Good afternoon.

My name is Cynthia Ferry and I reside at 16115 Rocky Bluff Rd. in Gavilan Hills.

I am here today on behalf of the Greater Lake Mathews residents apposed to the Mid County Freeway.

The residents I represent request that this commission either go with the "No Build Option B" in the EIR or go back to the route presented to this commission a few years back ... the 74.

The expense of this freeway is clearly under estimated and we all know it will cost far more then shown in this EIR.

The EIR says that this freeway is to: "Provide a parkway that is compatible with a future multimodal transportation system."

When this freeway isn't set up to conveniently allow area residents access to and from this freeway, how can it be "good" for area residents and what will a "Multimodal Transportation System" do to the rural life of this community?

Multimodal is another term for more then one means of transportation.

Does this open doors to things like future train routes along the Mid County Freeway?

Thou there are laws governing where and how the county and state can require trucks to travel, you can encourage/pressure trucks to use a "Preferred Route."

Rumors are that the Mid County Freeway is the counties preferred route for truck traffic.

With a 4% grade up the hill into the Gavilan Plateau and along Hardford Springs Habitat Park, what kind of on going pollution and noise studies are being required?

In the EIR, page S-3, paragraph 1 it says:

"The MCP has independent utility since the project is a usable and reasonable expenditure even if no additional transportation improvements in the area are made, and does not restrict consideration of alternatives for other reasonably foreseeable transportation improvements."

I contend that it is for the very reason that Riverside County Transportation DOES have a number of plans to improve transportation that in and of themselves eliminate the need for this freeway.

Now lets look at the Measure A, ½ cent per gal. Fuel tax approved by the voters and what is being done with that.

In the 2009 Measure A Program of Project Needs Through 2015 report of Oct. 2006, 53 projects were evaluated.

These projects were listed based on a benefit to cost ratio and a 25 year life expectancy.

The Mid County Parkway (from the 215 to the 15) came in 46th, out of 53.

In this report it was estimated to cost 1.931 billion dollars.

What did the analysis look at?

Value of time saved @ \$10 per hr., which came to \$4,810,000.00

Value of distance Saved @ 40 cents per mile, which came to \$7,990,000.00

Value of energy consumption saved @ \$3.19 gal, which came to \$150,000.00

Value of air pollutants saved @ Cal Trans rates, which came to a negative \$417,788.00 ... and which I have questions about.

Value of accident reduction savings @ Cal Trans rates, which came to \$5,486,232.00

The benefit to cost ratio for the MCP from the 215 to the 15 rated 0.0.

This freeway can only begin to be seen as "useful" if the tunnel is permitted through the National Forest, the other side of the 15.

Guess what came in 52 and 53 on this report?

#52 – A 2 lane each direction tunnel from Cajalco @ the 15 to SR133/SR 241 at a cost of 5.980 billion and

#53 – 3 lane each direction tunnel from the same, at a cost of 8.870 billion

So, can we REALLY say this is a "USABLE and REASONABLE EXPENDITURE?"

From the 215 to the 15 the measure A report shows a 1.931 billion dollar project cost and only a 1.738 million dollar benefit per year.

Taking into account the state of our economy, the amount of time before this freeway will actually be completed and the rising costs, it is clear that this project would cost far more than either of these documents accounts for.

We noted in the EIR that there were a number of visual representations made, yet few were given for this rural area.

Could this be because there was no way to make a freeway look good crossing over roadways in a rural community, along nature parks and preserves, to say nothing of along min. 2 ac. zoning areas?

We are told over and over that this MCP is a 4 lane "parkway", yet the ERI states a 4 to 8 lane freeway.

There are 11 to 15 interchanges, yet how many give area residents access to this freeway?

This is NOT about moving people.

It is about moving goods!

How will the equestrian trails cross over or under this freeway?

The design for infill and tunnels at the over-crossings are not safe nor particle for equestrian road crossings.

The natural springs running under areas of the Gavilan Plateau, along Lake Mathews Dr. will require much more mediation and could damage well water supplies to area residents ... some of which have NO municipal water supply at all and can not afford to bring them in due to cost from the closest pipeline.

You will be placing them at an even higher fire risk and could cost them their homeowners insurance coverage.

What happens to their home values if there is no water?

If blasting is needed, what happens to well water supplies and run-off basins in the area or maybe even septic systems?

To say nothing of damage to homes and panic to horses, dogs and other animals in the area.

The EIR states that in 2035 they expect a 100% increase in traffic demands on Cajalco Rd.

I don't think this addresses the counties plans to improve Cajalco Rd.

This along with other county road improvements should alleviate the need for this freeway all together.

In the M.I.C (Major Investment Study) it states that in 2011 Corona will widen Cajalco to 6 lanes, with a bridge over the 15 to the Eagle Glen area.

The M.I.C also states that the 91 will widen to 14 to 16 lanes.

Looking at the county roadways from downtown Riverside, up and through the Greater Lake Mathews/Gavilan Hills area and down to the 15 in the revised General Plan Circulation Maps there will be many improvements that nullify the need for this freeway.

Looking at the Measure A plans for the 10, 15, 60, 71, 74, 79, 91 and 215 we just don't feel this freeway is needed or is worth the expenditure/financial cost it will place on all that will be made to pay for it.

What limitations will be placed on vehicles using this freeway?

Will 8 foot and wider tucks be permitted to scale that 4% grade?

Will trucks 75 feet and longer be permitted to use this freeway?

It is clear to just about everyone that there is a need to keep the needs of the people local.

This means keeping the agricultural/rural areas of Riverside County is crucial in order to allow for local food availability.

Bringing a freeway through these agricultural areas will end that opportunity and critical need.

Local agriculture plays a vital part in SB 375 Green House Emissions Reduction and traffic impacts from out of area transport of food goods to Riverside residents.

Development of our rural area and placing freeways through them does nothing to protect now and for the future, the food needs of Riverside County residents.

Lets look at the revised General Plan "Healthy Communities Element" and tell me, does a freeway through this area fit a "Healthy Community Element?"

The USC/UCLA studies have been heard around the world and their negative impacts for those within 1,500 feet of this freeway are undeniable.

School children in our area, that will be attending the new school set to go in, will lose about 8 years of lung growth and will suffer breathing complications in their early 30's.

Those of us that moved out into the rural area to get away from the pollution will have that ripped out from under us.

Those of us already suffering from Asthma and living in a rural area for relief will find our health being stolen from us with the building of this freeway.

Where do we go to be pro-active in restoring our health, improving our health, and minimizing our insurance costs due to the number of doctor and or hospital visits due to Asthma related health complications?

The UCLA study said 1,500 feet, yet notice of this proposed parkway has reached very few within this distance.

Let me quote RCTC staff members from a resent RAGLM community meeting, "Long-term mobile emissions associated with the MCP would be lower than if the MCP were not built, due to improved traffic flow in the project area."

How can you try to sell such a line to county residents?

There is no way traffic emissions will be lower in this community if you bring this freeway through here!

We would like to test that theory.

We would like you to test the emissions now in this area, at our heaviest traffic period and then test along the narrowest 4 to 8 lane areas of the 91 freeway and let's compare emission levels.

The nose levels that will be generated from this freeway will be unbearable for many and will greatly impact property values in a negative manner ... which have already suffered greatly this last year.

Noise receptor studies were done, but not in this area.

There will be drastic changes in noise levels, which will negatively impact not only humans, but all the sensitive wildlife habitat in this area.

These tests need to be done and reported to area residents.

We don't like walls out here, and we see no walls shown for this freeway.

Yet the freeway will come very close to a number of homes planned for this area, both in Specific Plan areas and future private home construction.

What added cost impacts will arise from these needed walls having to be constructed at the time of building this freeway?

The night sky ... view of the stars at night ... is the reason many moved to Riverside County and to this area of Riverside County.

What happens to our night sky when you bring a freeway through it?

Reports by those tracking light pollution state that by the year 2024 there will be no more true night sky.

This freeway is going to make sure of that in our community.

Terminology! Which would you rather have coming through your community ... a "Parkway" or a "Freeway"

This is merely semantics!

Call it what it really is ... a freeway with the option of becoming a highway!

It serves to divide this rural community up into pieces, making higher density development even easier and even called for BECAUSE of this freeway.

The General Plan addresses commercial use along freeway routes.

The list is long and they will come along with this freeway, forever changing our rural way of life.

How will this thing pay for itself?

Not that I'm big on toll lanes, but it's my understanding that this freeway doesn't even qualify for toll lanes as a way of trying to recoup some of the construction and or maintenance costs.

Rural people want little to no amenities and in return cost our county very little in financial impacts.

Bringing this freeway through here will require the county to spend thousands of dollars more in this community than has ever been needed and which area residents are not wanting to burden our county legislators with.

We know you want to be closer to March Air Force Base, the planned second largest transportation hub in the United States, next to Long Beach, but not at a cost this county and this community can never overcome.

The fact is, this freeway doesn't pencil out.

The proper choice is the no build option and if you must build a freeway to satisfy some need to spend money, or in some state/county agreement for funds, then put it on the 74 where RCTC staff reported it should go in the first place.

Cindy Ferry



Community Spokesperson for the Greater Lake Mathews area.

Owner/Operator of: LakeMathewsTalks@Yahoogroups.com, GHSchoolRedistrictingCommittee@Yahoogroups.com,
Lake_Mathews_Transit@Yahoogroups.com and Watt_LMCOI@Yahoogroups.com

Member/Monitor of: RAGLMNotice@Yahoogroups.com and WoodcrestTalks@Yahoogroups.com

CindyRAGLM@aol.com (best way to reach me)

[\(951\) 657-6610](tel:(951)657-6610)

[16115 Rocky Bluff Road](mailto:16115_Rocky_Bluff_Road)

[Gavilan Hills, CA, 92570-7471](mailto:Gavilan_Hills_CA_92570-7471)

Make your life easier with all your friends, email, and favorite sites in one place. [Try it now.](#)