

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

COMMUNITY RECREATION CENTER
30875 Rancho Vista Rd., Multipurpose Room
Temecula, California

THURSDAY, January 23, 2003
10:00 A.M.

MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on January 23, 2003 at the Community Recreation Center, Multipurpose Room.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Allen Graff, Vice Chairman
William Cobb
Marge Tandy
Paul Bell
B.T. Miller, Legal Counsel
Walter Snyder
Sam Pratt

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Ric Stephens

OTHERS PRESENT: Kathy Rohm, Flabob Airport
John Lyon
Art Peterson
Jeffrey A. Ehrnman
Deborah Sanlina, KCT
Jen Mc Skimming, Robinson Helicopter
Maria Rawlins
Rogelio A. Rawlins
Maranda Itchener
Paul Huddleston
Ronald H. Welcox
Joy Defenbaugh
Dan Fairbanks, March JPA
Arthur Gomez
Steve Anderson
Michael Morris
John Silver
Leo Doiron, Flabob Airport
Bob Mackinnon
Leeanne Brock

STAFF PRESENT: Keith Downs, A.L.U.C. Executive Director
Beverly Coleman, Development Specialist III
Jackeline Gonzalez, Office Assistant II

I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:55 a.m. by Chairman Cobb

II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.

III. ROLL CALL was taken.

B. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN

Chairman Cobb called for nominations for a new Chairman and Vice Chairman for this coming year. Chairman Cobb called for a motion to elect a new Chairman. Vice Chairman Graff made a motion to elect Ric Stephens as Chairman. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Cobb called for a motion to elect a Vice Chairman. Former Chairman Cobb made a motion to elect Allen Graff for Vice Chairman. Allen Graff interjected that he would like to nominate Commissioner Snyder for Vice Chairman. Chairman Cobb called for a vote to nominate Vice Chairman Graff for Vice Chairman. There were four votes in favor for Allen Graff and one vote in favor of Commissioner Snyder. Allen Graff will continue to be the Vice Chairman.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR December 19, 2002

Due to the minutes being distributed at the meeting Vice Chairman Graff continued the approval of the minutes for the next schedule meeting of February 20, 2003.

Keith Downs suggested going to the consent items. Mr. Downs then indicated that the following consent items are recommended for approval under the new business as follows: VI.A. RI-02-162 Steven Walker Homes, VI.B. RI-02-163 KCT Consultants, Inc., VI.F. MA-02-180 Target Store, VI.G. MA-03-100, and VI.H. CH-02-103 Hunsaker Associates. Mr. Downs then indicated that the consent items are recommended for approval unless the Commissioners or any one in the audience wishes to address an item separately. Vice Chairman Graff called for any questions from the Commissioners, hearing no response from the Commissioners. Vice Chairman Graff called for any comments from the audience, hearing no response or reply, He called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to approve the consent items, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Cobb seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Pratt arrived at 10:00 A.M.

V. OLD BUSINESS

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT

9:00 A.M.

A. FV-02-115 – Solid State – (Continued from December 19th) Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

The Commissioners, Keith Downs and ALUC Assistant met at 9:00 A.M. at the Helipad site and tour the surrounding area. The representative Jen Mc Skimming, Robinson Helicopter and Brad Adams, Owner of the project property and helicopter were present. Keith Downs indicated that close by are two hearing rooms, but are not within the flight

pad. He also mentioned that the Helipad would require some lighting and will require four permits, which are the FAA, State, Caltrans, and City of Temecula. Jen Mc Skimming indicated that the City of Temecula would put weight restrictions on the Helipad. The Helipad will be use for business purposes. The owner needs easy access to airports such as John Wayne and LAX for picking up and dropping off clients. Brad Adams made himself available for any questions the Commissioners or ALUC staff may have. Commissioners and ALUC staff returned to the place of the hearing at the Community Recreation Center located at 30875 Rancho Vista Rd., Temecula, California.

CASE NUMBER: FV-02-115 – Solid State
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Temecula, State of California
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PA 02-0478

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Conditional Use Permit for a Rooftop Helipad in the City of Temecula at 42580 Rio Nedo near the intersection of Calle Empleado.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located north of Rio Nedo, east of Winchester Road and south of Calle Empleado within the City of Temecula.

LAND USE PLAN: *None: the Commission, like most others, has no standards for new airports or helipads. This is an example of a duty that the ALUC has to review new airports that are filing for a special use permit with the state. Sections of the Airport Land Use Planning Handbook to read include pages 4-8, 3-37, 2-4 and 9-50.*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Noise: *Any Noise sensitive uses must be identified within the approach and departure tracts. Staff visited the site and examined the flight paths to ascertain whether any noise sensitive uses were in or near the flight paths. The hearing room for the Rancho California Water District is about 1200 ft. from the site, but not under the flight path.*

Land Use: *Any hazardous or flammable storage site, school, assembly area, or noise sensitive use needs to be identified. None were found within the proposed flight paths.*

Density: *Any assembly area or land use with a high density of people needs to be identified*

Height: *The finished floor elevation of the building is 1050 MSL. The proposed height of the tallest structure is at 1084 MSL. The applicant has submitted an FAA 7480 Notice of Landing Area Proposal to the FAA for review and it is attached.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the proposal subject to the following conditions.*

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: *For City and State utilization*

Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).

2. *The following uses shall be prohibited on this site and within the flight paths:*
 - a. *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber colors associated with heliport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at the helipad, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
 - b. *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
 - c. *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
 - d. *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
3. *The above ground storage of flammable materials on the site shall be prohibited.*
4. *All structures must comply with F.A.R. Part 77 height standards and all conditions of the FAA letter dated October 22, 2002.*
5. *Any noise sensitive uses shall be prohibited in the flight path as indicated on exhibit C.*
6. *Uses which include residences, concert halls, auditoriums, stadiums, arenas, hotels, motels, restaurants, bars, schools, hospitals, government services, public utility stations, plants, public communication facilities shall not be permitted in the approved flight path as shown on Exhibit C.*
7. *Any subsequent permit for the uses listed in condition 6 for property and within 500 feet of the flight path shall be reviewed by the ALUC prior to construction.*

Keith Downs indicated that the Commission and the ALUC staff visited the Heliport Site at 9:00 a.m. and was reviewed for approach patterns. He then indicated that hearing rooms, churches and hazardous uses are not within the flight path. This particular project takes four permits, which are the FAA and goes to the ALUC for review, State of California, City of Temecula and Caltrans.

Commissioner Pratt inquired about the purpose for the Helipad. Jen Mc Skimming, Robinson Helicopter came forward and responded that the purpose for the Helipad is for business purposes only. The applicant has numerous business people who come to the facility and purchase the manufactures. This will make it easier to pick up and drop off clients in the big airports.

Vice Chairman Graff called for questions from the commissioners, hearing no response, he opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no response or reply, Vice Chairman Graff called for discussion from the Commissioners, hearing no response, he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Cobb made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's recommendations. Commissioner Snyder seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

B. HR-02-105 – Michael Nagggar – (Continued from December 19th) Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: HE-02-105 Rico Enterprise/Michael Nagggar
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Hemet
JURISDICTION CASE NO: CUP 02-07

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: *The project is a 240-unit home for the aged*

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated northerly of Acacia Avenue and south of Florida Avenue and west of Sanderson within the City of Hemet and 2,900-3,600 feet northeasterly of the east end of Runway 5-23 for Hemet/Ryan Airport.

*Adjacent Airport: Hemet-Ryan Airport
Land Use Policy: CLUP 1989: Adopted by City of Hemet and County of Riverside*

- a. Airport Influence Area: Transition Area*
- b. Noise Levels: Outside 55CNEL, but subject to higher noise levels with fire suppression operations, sailplane operations and certain instrument approaches (NDB)*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 2,900-3,600 feet northeast of the east end of Runways 5-23/ 4-22. The proposed site is within the Transition Area, which extends for 660 feet beyond the edge of the Area II Area of High Risk of the Hemet-Ryan Airport Influence Area. The total site is approximately 9.73 acres, but the reviewed site is 5.8 acres. The portion of the project north of the residential is not a part of this review. The lot coverage is 27% for buildings with additional structures occupying 3% of the site. The Transition Area has no direct population density limits assigned to it, but requires a ‘discretionary’ review for Commercial Uses and Residential uses of this nature. It has a dwelling unit maximum of 20/acre. The site would include approximately 360 people as residents with a peak and on weekends with visitors’ occupancy of 450 people. The parking requirements for the facility are for 116 spaces, but the applicant is proposing 169 spaces. This project would have occupancy densities ranging from 56 to 83 people per acre.*

Noise: *The site is underlying traffic patterns for runway 5-23 and will experience some annoyance from overflying aircraft approach. The 1989 plan indicates that the area is under a 55CNEL.*

Part 77. *The height of the building is 25 feet on a surface elevation of approximately 1520 MSL. The PART 77 horizontal surface is overlying the site with at 1662 MSL. Structures closest to the airfield may require a 7460 review.*

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW: *Pages 35 and 37 of the Hemet-Ryan CLUP include the discretionary review procedures and require us to review: 1) structure height, 2) population density, 3) Nature of the land use activity, 4) Noise, 5) relevant safety factors, 6) institutional uses, and 7) places of assembly. The present proposal falls under that category in the plan. Page 12-13 defines institutional uses and lists ‘Motels, Nursing Home, Care Homes and*

Convalescent Facilities' as examples and requires a discretionary review.

TRANSITION AREA: The Policies of the CLUP for the Transition Area are on Page 28 (C-3) of the plan and state, "**Residential density in the Transition Area is limited to not more than 20 dwelling units per acre and may be less pending a discretionary review**". This project is proposed at 43 dwelling units per acre.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend that the Commission find the project inconsistent with the Adopted CLUP for Hemet/Ryan Airport and the project would increase the public's exposure to safety hazards.

CONDITIONS OF OVERRIDE: Should the City wish to override as per PUC 21675.1 the Commission the following conditions should be applied.

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Hemet-Ryan Airport prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into of any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
4. That the ALUC and the airport operator review and approve any lighting plans prior to construction of any subsequent permits on the property.
5. That a FAA 7460 review be completed prior to action on this proposal.
6. The attached NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY shall be included in all property transactions within the entire project area.
7. The following uses shall be prohibited in all airport safety zones:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or vapor or which could attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of the aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

Keith Downs indicated that a message was received via telephone. The applicant went to the wrong location for the hearing and is requesting a continuance.

Vice Chairman Graff called for discussion from the Commissioners hearing no response, he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Cobb made a motion to continue the project to the next schedule meeting of February 20, 2003. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE

10:00 A.M.

C. MA-02-177 – Lennar Partners – (Continued from December 19th) Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: MA 02-177-March Business Center Specific Plan
APPROVING JURISDICTION: March JPA
JURISDICTION CASE NO: EIR SCH 2002071089 General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan and Tentative Tract 02-01

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is planned as an industrial business park including land uses such as Business Park, Industrial, Office, Mixed use, Commercial and Transportation Center. The project consists of the adoption of the Specific Plan, a tentative map, zoning regulation, a General Plan Amendment, and a development agreement for the 1,290-acre industrial business park.

The Specific Plan area would include 990 acres on 150 developable lots. Approximately 300 acres will be allocated for parks, landscape buffers, sensitive resource setbacks, drainage basins, and roads. The land uses for the Specific Plan are shown in the attached exhibit. The General Plan Amendment would eliminate the Destination Recreation (DR) land use from the North Campus Area and substitute Industrial land uses in a portion of the area south of Van Buren Blvd., previously designated as Park/Recreation/ Open Space. The General Plan amendment will also include a multi-modal transportation center land use to be located north of Van Buren Boulevard.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The proposed project is situated west of I-215 and south of Alessandro Blvd., on approximately 1,290-acres of land that was formerly a part of the March Air Force Base and now a part of the March Joint Powers Authority Land Use Area. The 1999 March JPA General Plan, (unreviewed by the ALUC) divided the March JPA in to planning sub areas. The March Business Center is located in the northern portion of West March Planning Sub area. The proposed project consists of two elements. The northern portion, referred to as the North Campus, comprises approximately 660 acres, is located south of Van Buren Boulevard and west of an existing golf course and cemetery. The site varies in distanced from the runway approximately 3,000-13,600 feet westerly of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

*Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area I and II of ALUP and Clear Zone, APZ I and II of AICUZ
c. Noise Levels: 55, 60, 65 and 70 CNEL*

BACKGROUND:

The ALUC has been active in protecting the airport from intrusion since the inception of the Commission in the early 1970's. The first AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBILITY USE ZONE (AICUZ) protection was initiated by a Board of Supervisors request in November of 1971. The

original Interim Influence Area was designated in February of 1972 and was redrawn in 1975 based upon a 1972 AICUZ.

In 1983 the ALUC redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1979 AICUZ. In May of 1986 the ALUC again redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1983 AICUZ. In 1992 and again in 1998 the AICUZ reports were redone to reflect the mission changes of the two Base Realignments: however, no changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone created in 1986.

In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and the CLUP was consequently never adopted. The 1999 effort was an update of the 1994 Draft utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook. Currently, ALUC has obtained a grant to update the non-federal airports within the County. The text will relate to all of the airports.

Since we have not adopted the CLUP, we utilize four resources for our review:

1. The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base
2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Draft CLUP's for March Air Force Base: 1994, 1998
4. Noise Data from A.I.C.U.Z.: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: (See figure IV.A-1 and A-2) page IV 2 and 5 Draft EIR Volume I) The proposed site is located approximately 3,000- 13,600 feet west of Runway 14-32 approach and departure tracks within the conical surface and inner horizontal surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B.

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type airport, to use the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise, type of aircraft and expected type of aircraft or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area I and II, and would require residential lots to be at least (2.5) two and one-half acres in size. Industrial, Agricultural, and Commercial uses are allowed subject to certain constraints. The 1993 Draft CLUP placed the property outside of Safety Zone III, but within the approach and departure profiles for Runway 14/32. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise, safety and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The workforce at the site at one time could be in the range of up to 9,620 with an overall density of 10 people per acre over the developed 962 acre site. Population densities would range from XX /acre to upward of XX/acre. The total square footage of the buildings is estimated at 15,470,000 sq. ft (Table IV.B-1). The structural coverage proposed for the site ranges from 25-50%.

Part 77: The elevation at this site, after grading varies from approximately 1,544 to 1,760 feet and the maximum building height is 80 feet. Construction higher than 50 feet will require ALUC review. In order to be an obstruction a structure would need to exceed 1,688-1,885 MSL feet in elevation over most of the site. Construction above the runway elevation of 1,535 at a ratio of 1 ft in elevation/100 in distance will require an FAA 7460 review.

Noise: The site has been shown to have significant noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have 55,60, 65 and 70 CNEL and is overlain with various flight tracks. California law (Title 24) requires any residential project within the 60 CNEL to prepare an acoustical analysis to prescribe the necessary measures to achieve allowable interior noise levels. The same regulation list uses that are deemed incompatible include:

1. residences
2. Public and private schools

Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise levels were as high as 75+ CNEL.

Other: The Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ) of other CLUP's define facilities such as churches, amphitheaters, community halls, sports facilities, and outdoor lighting as 'discouraged uses' and require the evaluation of alternative sites.

Wildlife Attractant: The 32 acre detention pond and 1-acre drain may be a significant wildlife attractant and requires a USDA review for potential bird strike. See the December 17, 2002 letter. (Received December 19, 2002).

Caltran Aeronautics: See letter dated January 6, 2003

FAA: A Notice to Construction been submitted by the applicant to the FAA.

RECOMMENDATION: (December 19, 2002)

Staff recommends that the ALUC CONTINUE the project to the next meeting in order to obtain responses from:

1. Caltrans Aeronautics,
2. USDA wildlife attractant review
3. FAA 7460 review and
4. Applicant's revisions to Draft EIR or responses to requests for additional information.

Additionally, staff would like to get together with the applicant and the March JPA staff to assist them in adjusting the texts to reflect the ALUC's adopted criteria and reflect the current Land Use Handbook.

ADDENDUM: January 23, 2003 staff has met with the applicant's representative and the March JPA staff and the Specific Plan has been revised. Please Chapter III and Appendix B of the "Specific Plan and the included Section IV.A, IV.E and IV.J of the Draft focused EIR.

RECOMMENDATION: January 23, 2003 That the Commission approve the project and find it consistent with the RCALUP and the Handbook with the following conditions:

1. An acoustical analysis shall be required that includes the following components:
 - a. A description of the components necessary to achieve a noise reduction level (CRL) of 25 and 30 for each of the project's components with noise sensitive uses (i.e., school, housing, and audio visual production).
 - b. Inclusion of all surrounding noise sources (highway, industrial) at their ultimate design and buildout capacity.
2. Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.
3. No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted. The following procedure shall be utilized in order to make a determination as to whether a project would result in such obstruction:
 - a. The application for such a proposal shall also provide evidence to the March JPA that the proposed has been submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration for review and comment relative to the provisions of FAR Part 77, or written

documentation from the Federal Aviation Administration that such review is not required.

- b. The Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a Form 7460 review, unless that agency determines in writing that such a review is not required or not applicable.*
- 4. The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited, except gas and diesel of 500 gallons or less.*
- 5. This finding does not include any approval, review, or acceptance of any heliport anywhere on this site.*
- 6. Any Heliport or change in proposed use shall be subsequently reviewed by the ALUC.*
- 7. Any 'Avoided' or 'Discouraged' use shall be reviewed by the ALUC.*
- 8. All such items or action within the plan shall be submitted and reviewed by the ALUC, until such time as the Master plan and development code of the JPA has been reviewed.*

Vice Chairman Graff called for question from the Commissioners. Hearing no response he asked for the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Dan Fairbanks, March Joint Authority came forward and indicated that March business center is a 1,290-acre development. The requirements from the ALUC have all been met. We have also worked with Caltrans Aeronautics and have a favorable letter on this proposal. There is a detention base that will hold water for a short period of time. Relating to the staff report would like to point out a couple of things. In stipulation number three would like to have it recognize that the FAA will review this development and have them determine the safety of any construction within the area. Mr. Fairbanks suggested changing stipulation number three as follow. "No hazardous of the FAR Part 77 Conical Surface shall be permitted. The following procedure shall be utilized in order to make a determination as to whether a project would result in such hazard". Stipulation number eight requires all projects in the specific plan to come back before the ALUC, which March has already incorporated and would like for it to be deleted. Mr. Fairbanks then made himself available for any questions the Commissioners may have.

Vice Chairman Graff inquired if there would be problems with the changes on number three and eight. Keith Downs responded negatively and indicated that changes on number three the language "there shall be no obstruction" is not in the CLUP for March therefore changing it would not make it inconsistent with the plan. Item number eight it's the statement of the law it can be deleted, but would not change anything. Commissioner Cobb inquired if the applicant has a master plan. Dan Fairbanks responded that March does have an approved master plan, which was review by the ALUC in 1998 incorporated comments and approved it in 1999. Keith Downs indicated that the ALUC never saw the master plan for the JPA. There were comments made, but there was never an application submitted for the Commission to review. Counsel Miller indicated that these projects will still be require by law for submittal and stipulation number eight is just reinstating that fact.

Vice Chairman called for further discussion. Michael Morris came forward and reiterated the changes in stipulation number three and the deletion of stipulation number

eight. Hearing no further response Vice Chairman Graff called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Cobb made a motion to approve the project, subject to the following conditions. Item number three the wording will be changed from “no obstruction” to no hazardous. Item number eight whether deleted or not by law it still applies. Commissioner Pratt seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

A. RI-02-162 – Steven Walker Homes – Consent Item See Pages 2-3

CASE NUMBER: RI-02-162 –Steven Walker Homes
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: TM 30951

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Tract Map 30951 for 5 lots on 1.32 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at the intersection of Faith Street and Sherwood Place, west of Crowell Avenue, east of Adams St. within the City of Riverside, approximately 7,400 feet south of Runway 9/27 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport
a. Airport Influence Area: TPZ
b. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 7,400 feet south of Runway 9-27 and is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The project is a tract map for 5 lots on 1.32 acres. The TPZ has no population limits assigned, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% of the net lot. Review of subsequent permits will be required to determine the lot coverage of the proposed site.*

Part 77: *The elevation at this site is approximately 800 MSL feet. Information on proposed structures is not available at this time. The site is well below the horizontal surface at this location, which is approximately 966 MSL.*

Noise: *The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. The site is near an approach and departure flight track and will experience annoyance from overflying aircraft.*

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport (Tel. 909-826-5341).
2. Subsequent permits for development of the proposed site shall be reviewed by the ALUC unless a subsequent action of the County and the ALUC determines that unnecessary.

3. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.*
4. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - (a) *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
 - (b) *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
 - (c) *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
 - (d) *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
5. *The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the conditions outlined above.*

B. RI-02-163 – KCT Consultant – Consent Item See Pages 2-3

CASE NUMBER: RI-02-163–KCT Consultants, Inc.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Conditional Use Permit

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a conditional use permit to construct a fire station.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at the east corner of Hillside Avenue and Arlington Avenue in the City of Riverside, approximately 1,800 feet southeast of Runway 9/27 at the Riverside Airport.

*Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport
 Land Use Policy: CLUP adopted April 1998*

- a. *Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)*
- b. *Land Use Policy: Influence Area*
- c. *Noise Levels: Outside 60 dB CNEL*

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: *The proposed site is located approximately 1,800 feet southeast of Runway 9/27. The proposed site is within the Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ) of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is a conditional use permit for construction of a fire station,*

consisting of an approximately 9,500 sq. ft. building on 1.2 acres of vacant land. The zoning for the proposed site is R-1-65, Single Family Residential. The TPZ has no population density assigned, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% of the net lot. The lot coverage of the buildings at the site is less than 30% of the net area. The proposed use is an acceptable use, with the appropriate mitigation for noise.

NOISE: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. This is acceptable for the usage proposed with the appropriate mitigation for noise.

PART 77: The elevation at the site is 770 MSL. The height of the structure is 23 feet. The site is within the horizontal surface at this location, which has a surface elevation of 966 MSL. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport (Tel. 909-826-5341).
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45 decibel levels.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend a finding of consistency of this project subject to the conditions of approval noted above.

- C. BD-02-111 – World Development Inc. – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: BD-02-111 – World Development, Inc.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Tract Map 30866

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a Tentative Tract Map for 13 lots on approximately 11 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated south of Avenue 41 and west of Adams St. in the County of Riverside, and from 1,800 to 2,400 ft. west of the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport

Land Use Policy:

- a. Airport Influence Area: Areas II and III
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area
- c. Noise Levels: Outside 60 dB CNEL (February 1996)

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: The proposed site is located from approximately 1,800 to 2,400 feet west of the west end of the runway and is within Areas II and III of the Airport Influence Area. Policies in the Bermuda Dunes Airport Land Use Plan indicate that residential land uses would be allowed in Area III, but are only allowed in Area II with a minimum residential lot size of 2 ½ acres. Lots 1,

13 and the northern portions of lots 2 and 12 of the proposed site are located within Area II. All of the proposed lots located within Area II have a lot area of less than 1 acre.

NOISE: The site will be subject to intermittent aircraft noise of some annoyance. The entire site is outside of the 60 CNEL according to the 1996 noise study, but those noise projections considered less traffic than is now being experienced and were annualized over the entire year. Current and future noise contours for the airport submitted for another project (FV-02-112) show this project between the 55 and 60 CNEL. Ultimate traffic with seasonal and weekend peaking will likely produce noise of some annoyance on the site.

PART 77: The pad elevations for the proposed project range from 98 to 106 MSL. The height of the proposed structures is unknown at this time. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. At a distance of 1,800 to 2,400 ft. feet from the runway, proposed structures exceeding 91 MSL will require an FAA 7460 review.

Lighting intensity and patterns can adversely affect pilot visibility near airports. Any light that would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber other than an FAA approved system can cause confusion. Bermuda Dunes currently has a VASI system.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport.
2. Subsequent permits for development of the proposed site shall be reviewed by the ALUC.
3. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract a large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to any operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
4. Proposed structures higher than 91 MSL feet in elevation shall be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration for review and comment relative to the provisions of FAR Part 77.
5. The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser.

ALUP CONSISTENCY CONDITONS:

6. *Portions of the proposal within Area II, Area of Significant Safety Concern, shall have a minimum residential lot size of 2 ½ acres.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends the following findings for the proposed project:*

- 1) *Those portions of the proposal located within Area III are consistent with the Bermuda Dunes Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP), subject to the Conditions of Approval noted above.*
- 2) *Those portions of proposal located within Area II are inconsistent with the ALUP.*

Vice Chairman Graff called for any questions from the Commissioners. B.T. Miller inquired that everything north of the line, which is Area II is considered inconsistent. Beverly Coleman responded positively. Hearing no further response, Vice Chairman Graff requested the applicant to come forward and present the case.

John Silver, World Development came forward in response to Vice Chairman Graff's invitation. Mr. Silver indicated that the letter that was handed to the commission is inquiring for a modification on this particular case. He then presented the Commissioners with an exhibit illustrating that a previous property aligned to this particular project site was found consistent with same conditions. This site should also be found consistent as well. Commissioner Cobb inquired if the lots being proposed are less than an acre. John Silver responded positively. Mr. Silver indicated that if the density would be reduced to less than one third (1/3) there would be thirteen lots.

Hearing no further comments, Vice Chairman Graff opened the floor for comments from the audience. Hearing no response or reply, he called for discussion from the Commissioners. B.T. Miller inquired that if the conditions of approval for the portion being found inconsistent have a condition of override. Beverly Coleman responded positively. Keith Downs interjected that more lots can be added to the south. Vice Chairman Graff indicated that the developments around the airports that should not be there were built before the commission's time.

Hearing no further discussion Vice Chairman Graff called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Cobb made a motion to approve part of the project located in Area III, and the portions located in Area II were found inconsistent subject to staff's Conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- D. BD-02-112 – Del Webb California Corp. – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

Keith Downs indicated that this project is similar to the project for March JPA. This report has a complete analysis of the noise and its relationship to the airport land use plan, indeed a very good report. Mr. Downs also indicated that comments were made on the EIR, which were included with the staff report.

CASE NUMBER: *BD-02-112 Del Webb California Corp.*
APPROVING JURISDICTION: *City of Indio*
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: *Specific Plan 02-10-22, General Plan Amendment 02-10-47 and EIR*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a proposal to change the General Plan Designation and Adopt a Specific Plan on a 771.2-acre parcel consisting of 3,102 dwellings and 12 acres of commercial/mixed use.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated easterly of Jefferson Street, north of 42 Avenue Road, west of Monroe St. and south of 40th Avenue in the City of Indio and northeasterly of the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

*Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport
Land Use Policy: Area III*

- a. Airport Influence Area: Area III*
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area*
- c. Noise Levels: Outside 60 dB CNEL (February 1996) See compatibility study*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 2,000-9,600 feet northwest of the east end of the runway near flight tracks 1 and 3 and is within Area III of the Airport Influence Area. Policies in the CLUP indicate that residential land uses would be allowed. Approximately one/half of the project is within the currently adopted Influence Area of the airport and all of it is within two miles of the airport.

Noise: The site will be subject to intermittent aircraft noise of some annoyance. The entire site is outside of the 60CNEL (1996), but those noise projections considered less traffic than is now being experienced and were annualized over the entire year. Ultimate traffic with seasonal and weekend peaking will likely produce noise of some annoyance on the site.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the site is currently 71MSL and the tallest structure proposed is 27 feet. The airport elevation is 73MSL and at a distance of 2000 feet any structure exceeding 20 feet in height would require an FAA 7460 review. Structures within Planning Areas 1,4 and 7 will need FAA review.

Lighting intensity and patterns can adversely affect pilot visibility near airports. Any light that would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber other than an FAA approved system can cause confusion. Bermuda Dunes currently has a VASI system.

Environmental: An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for the project and an extensive study was completed in regards to the current Airport Land Use Plan and the prospective analysis utilizing the 2002 Handbook.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

- 1. Provide Avigation Easements to Bermuda Dunes Airport for those portions of the project within the Influence Area.*
- 2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels and assure a total NLR reduction of 25dba.*
- 3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.*

4. Any subsequent permit for projects within the mixed-use area shall have ALUC review.
5. Any structure over 20 feet in height in Planning Areas 1,4 and 7 shall have an FAA 7460 review completed and any conditions recommended shall be completed and adhered to prior to construction.
6. The attached NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY shall be included in all property transactions within the entire project area.
7. The attached comments to the Draft EIR shall be addressed with the additional exhibits added to the Report.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend a finding of consistency of this project subject to the conditions of approval noted above and to include the attached comments to the Draft EIR.

RESPONSES TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

A section (5.1) of the Technical Appendices of the EIR includes an analysis of the compatibility of the project with the Airport and this is attached. This is a very well done report that: 1. introduces the reader to the issues, 2. analyzes both composite and single event noise impacts, and 3. compares the project to the developed information. The following comments relate to that report.

1. *Introduction:* The second sentence from the end indicates that 'Riverside County' is in the process of updating the ALUP for the airport. The Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) is in the process; the county is the contract vehicle, but not the responsible entity.
2. *Safety Zones and Land Use Compatibility:* This section describes the relationship of the project and the existing ALUP and then speculates upon, the relationship between an unadjusted depiction of a newer ALUP and the project. Tables and Charts from the Caltrans Land Use Handbook are used and the text but, Table 9A and the text (attached) are not included. According to the Handbook 'These examples are intended to provide general guidance for establishment of airport safety compatibility zones. They do not represent California Department of Transportation standards or policy.' The depictions are not to be construed as a new adopted plan.
3. *Noise Considerations:* This section describes the current noise situation and an estimate of noise 10 years in the future. Comparing the new contours with the 1996 forecast by Aviation Systems indicates a significant increase in operations and noise from the previous forecast. This is largely based upon the increase in operations from 1996 (26,332) versus the new 2012 forecast (47,800). The flight tracks utilized for the noise study are not included and should be included. I have attached the 1996 flight track exhibit and a copy of the airports pilot guide depicting these flight patterns. As can be seen from these exhibits the project site will get overflight of some volume.

The supplemental section regarding SEL is very good and is the type of information that should be included in any noise study where these would be of any significance. The Matrix that is included as Figure 12 is from FAR Part 150, but figure 5.4-3 is from the state general plan guidelines is the appropriate planning document for noise guidance in this state. For ALUC planning a 20+-year forecast is required and will be prepared for the upcoming revision to the ALUP. Additionally we will be including a seasonal component and a peak day or days noise contour to illustrate the noise levels for shorter than a full years composite.

The Draft EIR has a section regarding noise (5.4) and land use (5.1). The following comments pertain to that document.

LAND USE

1. *Page 5.1-23 Line 6 This erroneously states that the current Bermuda Dunes ALUP has six safety zones. It has three.*
2. *Beginning of paragraph 2 States that the County of Riverside has begun an update of the Bermuda Dunes ALUP. It is the Airport Land Use Commission that is doing the update.*
3. *Paragraph 4 describes some factors that adjust zone boundaries. This list is deficient in that the items in Table 9A of the Handbook are also utilized and the location or the aeronautical activities of the aircraft operations are also factors.*

NOISE

1. *Page 5.4-1 Lists the airports, railroad and Interstate as primary noise sources for the city. The airport is covered in significant detail, but no mention of the effects of the railroad and Interstate noise is to be found in the document. A cursory examination of available information would conclude that these sources would affect the site.*
2. *Table 5.4-1 the insulation ability of dual pane windows may be added since they are generally required in this area.*
3. *Page 5.4-6 Existing Noise Environment the second sentence seems incomplete and inaccurate. SEL depictions in the compatibility study indicate that overflight will affect these residents with some annoyance.*

BUYER AWARENESS MEASURES

AB 2776 was chaptered September and will require the attached notice be included in disclosures for all property transactions and within all Public Reports (B&PC 11010). This should be included in the document.

Vice Chairman Graff called for questions from the commissioners. Commissioner Pratt inquired on the noise level, what would be the maximum planes allow to land. Keith Downs responded that on page twenty-six of the report indicates that business jets will be 40% Multi engines 15% and single engines 45% day time will be 75% evening 22% and night time 32%. Hearing no further comments from the Commissioners Vice Chairman Graff requested for the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Paul Quill, Pulte Homes came forward in response to Vice Chairman Graff's invitation. Mr. Quill thanked Keith Downs for working with Pulte Homes and being able to get this project on the agenda. Mr. Quill then indicated that there is no problem with the conditions of approval. Pulte Home is very concerned with disclosure and are making sure every body is fully aware that they are within the avigation easement.

Vice Chairman Graff called for question from the Commissioners for the applicant. Hearing no response or reply, Vice Chairman Graff opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no response, he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Bell made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval. Commissioner Snyder seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- E. MA-02-179 – Healing Waters Church – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: MA-02-179 Healing Waters Church
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Minor CUP #036-878 rev.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Church within an existing commercial building

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated east of Vista Grande Drive, south of Alessandro Blvd., within the City of Riverside approximately 14,000 feet northwesterly of the north end of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
a. *Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Area*
b. *Land Use Policy: Influence Area II*
c. *Noise Levels: See Below*

BACKGROUND:

The ALUC has been active in protecting the airport from intrusion since the inception of the Commission in the early 1970's. The first AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBILITY USE ZONE (AICUZ) protection was initiated by a Board of Supervisors request in November of 1971. The original Interim Influence Area was designated in February of 1972 and was redrawn in 1975 based upon a 1972 AICUZ.

In 1983 the ALUC redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1979 AICUZ. On April 26 of 1984 the ALUC adopted the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan (RCALUP). In May of 1986 the ALUC again redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1983 AICUZ. In 1992 and again in 1998 the AICUZ reports were redone to reflect the mission changes of the two Base Realignment; however, no changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone adjusted in 1986.

In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The most current effort was an update of the 1994 Draft utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

Since we have not adopted the CLUP, we will utilize four resources for our review:

- 1. The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base*
- 2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
- 3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994/98/99*
- 4. Noise information from the AICUZ Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 14,000 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The site consists of a 1,660 sq. ft. church with a 25-45 seat sanctuary with and parking. The existing site is a mini-mall and is zoned for commercial uses. The proposal is underlying the Runway 14-32 PART 77 approach and departure tracks and within the conical surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B

The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft expected to use the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II, and would require residential lots to be at least two and one-half acres in size. Industrial uses are allowed subject to certain constraints. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property inside of the Traffic Pattern Zone. The proposed land use would be a 'discouraged use.'

Density and Coverage: The number of people on the site at one time could be in the range of 30+ with densities of 435 people per acre in the building , but approximately 110 per acre when averaged over the full site. The currently proposed structural coverage on the site for the current proposal is approximately 25%.

Part 77: The elevation at this site varies from approximately 1,610 MSL feet and the maximum building height is 22 feet. Any structure exceeding 1638 MSL would be an obstruction. Any construction above an elevation of 1675 MSL will require an FAA 7460. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

Noise: The site has been shown to have significant noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have **60-65** CNEL and is overlain with flight tracks. Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise levels were as high as 70+CNEL. California law (Title 24) requires any residential project and any noise sensitive use within the 60 CNEL to prepare an acoustical analysis to prescribe the necessary measures to achieve allowable interior noise levels.

The same regulation lists uses that are deemed incompatible and include:

1. residences
2. public and private schools
3. hospitals and convalescent homes
4. churches, and other places of worship.

Other: The Traffic Pattern Zones (TPZ) of other CLUP's define facilities such as churches, , community halls, sports facilities, and outdoor lighting as 'discouraged uses' and require the evaluation of alternative sites.

Environmental: The City of Riverside Staff has not completed their review for the project, which may include an acoustical analysis.

Conclusion: The proposed project is inconsistent with that proposal. The matrix Table I identifies all the applicable plans and whether the project is consistent with those plans' criteria.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the ALUC find the proposal inconsistent with the RCALUP, the 1994 Draft CLUP and the 1998-99 Draft CLUP based upon:

1. the use proposed,
2. lacks an acoustical analysis, and
3. lacks an alternative site analysis

APPENDIX:

1984 RCALUP: The 1984 RCALUP with the 1986 map identifies the project as within AREA II. Area II, Policy #2 states: "Area II shall have a minimum residential lot size of two and one-half acres. Agricultural, industrial and commercial uses are acceptable." Policy #4 states: "New housing to be constructed within the noise level specified by the ALUC for each airport shall be soundproofed as necessary to achieve interior annual noise levels attributable to exterior sources, not to exceed 45 dB (CNEL of Ldn) in any habited room with windows closed."

The 1994 Draft CLUP for MAFB

The Draft 1994 plan defined the Traffic Pattern Zone outer boundary as the outer edge of the military PART 77 conical surface. Most of the project is within that boundary as shown on Exhibit 8. Section 7.3.2 on Page 7-13 and 14 of the text contains the following language: 'Uses such as schools, auditoriums, and amphitheaters . . . shall be discouraged from being developed in this area.' Section 7.4.2 states: "Within the TPZ safety zone (the area out to the outer edge of the FAR Part 77 Conical Surface - see Figures 14 and 15), a variety of land uses are to be discouraged from being developed. When development of these uses is proposed, the Airport Land Use Commission shall require the applicant to show that alternative locations have been considered and are not feasible. The applicant shall then be directed to consider a development plan that will minimize the exposure to hazard as much as possible. This might involve reducing structure heights, reducing lot coverage, reducing the overall scale of the project, or considering satellite locations for some of the proposed functions of the facility."

The plan places the property within the 60 CNEL and is very close to the 65CNEL. Section 7.3.1 (P.7.4 first bullet states): With the exception of transient lodgings (e.g., hotels and motels) and caretaker residences, all residential uses are considered incompatible with noise above 60 dB CNEL. However, all residential uses could be conditionally compatible in the noise range between 60 and 65dB CNEL, if appropriate noise attenuation measures are incorporated into the construction.

Bullet 4 (P. 7.9) states: "Schools, hospitals, nursing homes, churches, auditoriums, concert halls shall be considered noise-sensitive institutions. While they are compatible with noise levels between 60 dB and 65 dB CNEL, they are not compatible with noise levels above 65 dB CNEL."

Conclusion: The proposal would be inconsistent with the 1994 Draft for both safety and noise, because of a lack of an alternative site analysis and an acoustical study.

1998/99 Draft CLUP:

This DRAFT is an update the 1994 document with changes proposed for components of the text and graphic illustrations depicting:

1. 1998 AICUZ Noise Contours.
2. 1999 adjusted Area I (APZ II) boundary on the north end, and
3. The addition of the 55 CNEL added to the graphic (1999).
4. PART 77 boundaries.

A first draft of the text was completed for review by CalTrans, but no further text has been completed. The graphics are completed. The site is within the Traffic Pattern Zone and High Risk Uses such as the church complex would be a 'discouraged use.' The text would require an acoustical analysis for all projects within the 60 CNEL.

Conclusion: The project as submitted would be inconsistent with the 98/99 Draft CLUP and would require acoustical analysis.

TABLE 1

<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>SAFETY</u>	<u>NOISE</u>	<u>PART 77</u>
1984 RCA.L.U.P.	Not Consistent	Not Consistent **	consistent
1994 Draft CLUP	Not Consistent *	Not Consistent **	consistent
1998/99 Draft CLUP	Not Consistent *	Not Consistent **	consistent

* Needs alternative analysis

** Needs acoustical study

CONDITIONS FOR OVERRIDE

Should the City of Riverside wish to pursue an overrule of the Commission (PUC 21675.1), the following conditions are recommended for inclusion:

1. An acoustical analysis shall be required that includes the following components:
 - a. A description of the components necessary to achieve a noise reduction level (NLR) of 25 and 30 for project.
 - b. Inclusion of all surrounding noise sources (highway) at their ultimate design and buildout capacity.
2. Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.
3. No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted. The following procedure shall be utilized in order to make a determination as to whether a project would result in such obstruction:
 - a. The Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a Form 7460 review, unless that agency determines in writing that such a review is not required or not applicable.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - b. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

5. *The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*
6. *This review only applies to the current proposal for occupancy of 45 people and any subsequent additions shall be reviewed by the ALUC.*

Vice Chairman Graff called for questions from the commissioners. Commissioner Pratt inquired if there are existing buildings on the site. Keith Downs responded positively and indicated that those buildings were never reviewed by the ALUC. Commissioner Pratt inquired that if it's the use itself that its being questioned. Commissioner Tandy interjected that it's the density. Hearing no further response, Vice Chairman Graff called the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Steve Anderson, Healing Waters Church came forward in response to Vice Chairman Graff's invitation and indicated that the City planning commission approved this project on January 17th. He then indicated that there have been several services held at this project site. The business adjacent to the church, which is a restaurant, sits approximately one hundred people. Mr. Anderson indicated that a search for an alternative site was made, but found none and that the church will be burden if the Commission finds it inconsistent. He then indicated that the Liberty Baptist Church is less than a quarter mile from the Healing Waters Church site and has approximately three hundred members and was not required to go to the ALUC. A full year was paid in advance to lease the site. The limitation, such as the acoustical study imposed is unfair. This is limiting the congregation to a small size, which is against the religious tenants of faith. He then indicated that things are being done to help the kids in this area and would like to continue serving this particular area.

Hearing no further comments Vice Chairman Graff open the floor for comments from the audience.

Dan Fairbanks, March JPA came forward and voiced his concerns. Mr. Fairbanks indicated that this project site is some what approximated to the runway itself. There will be a new AICUZ study and this study may modify the location of the APZ zones. The congregation size of this particular church is small, but churches have a tendency to grow over time and that's what raises the concerned with March.

B.T. Miller indicated that the purpose of the Commission is to insure compatibility of the airport and the safety of the public. Mr. Anderson came forward and indicated that the application submitted to the city was less than seven hundred twenty dollars, which was the fees paid to the ALUC. He then indicated that the adjacent businesses have not opposed the church and pleaded the commission to allow them to serve the area. Commissioner Tandy indicated that there must be some way to keep people from going to the wrong place and having to pay multiple fees. B.T. Miller indicated that there is no control over the city on how they send applicants to the ALUC. The obligation of the Commission is to follow the rules as the applicants come forward. Vice Chairman Graff indicated that the problem is that the Commission deals with specific lines of latitude and longitude and must follow them. The buildings adjacent to this project site did not come before the ALUC and the past cannot be changed.

Hearing no further response, Vice Chairman Graff called for any further discussion. Hearing no reply, he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Tandy made a motion of inconsistency, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval and recommendations. Commissioner Snyder seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

F. MA-02-180– Target Store – Consent Item for approval See Pages 2-3

CASE NUMBER: MA-02-180-Target Store
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Building Permit

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Conditional Use Permit for a 134,233 sq. ft. retail center on approximately 350,000 sq. ft.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated north of Campus Parkway and west of Day Street within the City of Riverside, approximately 14,400 ft. north of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

- a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area*
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area III*
- c. Noise Levels: See Below*

BACKGROUND:

The ALUC has been active in protecting the airport from intrusion since the inception of the Commission in the early 1970's. The first AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBILITY USES ZONE (AICUZ) protection was initiated by a Board of Supervisors request in November of 1971. The original Interim Influence Area was designated in February of 1972 and was redrawn in 1975 based upon a 1972 AICUZ.

In 1983 the ALUC redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1979 AICUZ. In April of 1984 the ALUC adopted the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan (RCALUP). In May of 1986 the ALUC again redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1983 AICUZ. In 1992 and again in 1998 the AICUZ reports were redone to reflect the mission changes of the two Base Realignments: however, no changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone created in 1986.

In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The current 98/99 Draft CLUP effort was prepared utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

Since we have not adopted the CLUP for MARB, we will utilize five resources for our review:

- 1. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*
- 2. CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
- 3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994*
- 4. Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*
- 5. Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposal is for a 134,233 sq. ft. retail center on approximately 350,000 sq. ft. The proposed site is located approximately 14,400 ft. north of Runway 14/32. The proposal is near a major flight track and within the outer horizontal surface.

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, the type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area III, which allows commercial and industrial land use with a few restrictions. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property outside of the 60 CNEL. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The area of the proposed structures is 134,233 sq. ft. The lot area is approximately 350,000 sq. ft. (net). Structural coverage will be less than 50% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation at the site is 1,594 MSL feet and the finish floor elevation of the proposed structure is 1,588 MSL. The height of the structure is approximately 38 ft. Any structures over 1,679 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the noise level at the property to be less 55 CNEL.

CONDITIONS:

1. Prior to project development or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport. (Tel. 909- 656-7000)
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into of any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures into the building construction to ensure that all light is below the horizontal plane.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

5. The above ground storage of explosive or flammable materials is prohibited.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the project subject to the conditions outlined above.

G. MA-03-100 – Rogelio Rawlins – Consent Item for approval See Pages 2-3

CASE NUMBER: MA-03-100 – Rogelio Rawlins
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: PUP 00856

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A daycare center for up to 27 children.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 18215 Clark Street north of Nance Street west of Clark Street, within the County of Riverside, approximately 12,000 ft. west of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area II
c. Noise Levels: 55CNEL See Below

BACKGROUND:

The ALUC has been active in protecting the airport from intrusion since the inception of the Commission in the early 1970's. The first AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBILITY USES ZONE (AICUZ) protection was initiated by a Board of Supervisors request in November of 1971. The original Interim Influence Area was designated in February of 1972 and was redrawn in 1975 based upon a 1972 AICUZ.

In 1983 the ALUC redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1979 AICUZ. In April of 1984 the ALUC adopted the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan (RCALUP). In May of 1986 the ALUC again redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1983 AICUZ. In 1992 and again in 1998 the AICUZ reports were redone to reflect the mission changes of the two Base Realignments: however, no changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone created in 1986.

In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The current 98/99 Draft CLUP effort was prepared utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

Since we have not adopted the CLUP for MARB, we will utilize five resources for our review:

1. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
4. Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
5. Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 12,000 ft. south of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for daycare facility consisting of within an existing 1,809 sq. ft. facility. The facility is located on a 2.3 acre site, the remainder of which is vacant. The proposal is under a major flight track and within the conical surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B.

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, the type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II, which allows commercial and industrial land use with a few restrictions. Industrial uses are allowed subject to certain constraints. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property within the 55 CNEL. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: Buildings include a 320 sq. ft. existing storage container. No other buildings are proposed. The structural coverage for the facility will be less than 2.5% of the net area of the facility and less than 3 of the net area of the site.

Part 77: The highest elevation at the site is 1,770 MSL feet. The existing height of the structure is 12 ft. Any structures over 1,635 MSL feet in elevation requires an FAA 7460 review. The conical surface is approximately 1758 MSL at this site.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the noise level at the property to within the 55 CNEL. Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise level was as high as 60 CNEL. The proposed use would require an acoustical analysis if it were in the 60CNEL.

CONDITIONS:

1. Prior to project development or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport. (Tel. 909- 656-7000)
2. Proposals for subsequent development of the vacant portions of the site shall be submitted to the ALUC for review.
3. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to

the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

4. *The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the project subject to the conditions outlined above.*

H. CH-02-103 – Hunsaker Associates – Consent Item for Approval See Pages 2-3

CASE NUMBER: CH-02-103 – Hunsaker Associates

APPROVING JURISDICTION: *County of Riverside*

JURISDICTION CASE NO.: *Tract Map 28684*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Tract Map for 88 lots on 21 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated north of Chandler Street and west of Harrison Ave., within the County of Riverside, and from approximately 13,000–14,000 feet east of the east end of Runway 26L at Chino Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Chino Airport (County of San Bernardino)

a. *Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area*

b. *Land Use Policy: Influence Area*

c. *Noise Levels: See Below*

BACKGROUND:

Since we have not adopted the CLUP for Chino Airport, we utilize three resources for our review:

1. *The San Bernardino CLUP for Chino Airport, 1991*
2. *The Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan: 1984*
3. *The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located from approximately 13,000-14,000 feet east of Runway 26L. The proposal is for 88 lots on 21 acres, including 85 residential and 3 open space lots. According to the 1991 CLUP the property is located outside of Safety Zone III, but is within the Conical Surface. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.*

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise, type of aircraft and expected type of aircraft, FAA criteria or a combination of these factors. With the present configuration of the airport, the site will likely end up in the TPZ or an approach category once a new CLUP is adopted.

Part 77: *The highest elevation at this site is 589.6 MSL and the height of proposed structures is unknown at this time. The site is underlying the horizontal surface, and in order to exceed obstruction standards a structure would need to exceed approximately 150 feet in height. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern with this project. The site is near an approach track and can expect overflight from approaching aircraft.*

Noise:

1991 Report: The site is outside the 65 CNEL contour developed for the airport in 1991, and likely to be within the 55 CNEL. Page 2-3 of the report discusses these concerns and discusses **prohibiting** residential development within the 60 and 55 CNEL where overflights are conducted, particularly where flights are below 500 feet above ground level.

Master Plan: A new Master Plan at Chino Airport was started last year and is expected to be completed later this year. The site can expect single noise events to disturb indoor and outdoor events.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the County of Riverside and Chino Airport prior to the recordation of the tract, issuance of any permit, or sale of any portion to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky or above the horizontal plane.
3. Any additional facilities to the proposal included at a subsequent date shall be reviewed by ALUC until such time that a CLUP is adopted for the Airport by RCALUC.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
5. The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport must be given to each potential purchaser.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project subject to the conditions of noted above. A finding of consistency can be made based upon the following, as identified in Section 21675.1 of the California Public Utilities Code (PUC).

1. The ALUC is making substantial progress toward the completion of the Chino Airport Land Use Plan; and
2. There is a reasonable probability that the project will be consistent with the plan; and

3. *There is little or no probability of substantial detriment to or interference with the plan, if the project is ultimately inconsistent with the plan.*

I. RG-02-100 – County of Riverside – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

Keith Downs indicated that Ken Brody analyzed the January 8th component and what is being recommended in area plans. Mr. Brody will reiterate on items of the last meeting and indicate the inconsistencies or incompatibilities of certain components of the plan and area plans. The intent is to recommend a finding to the Board of Supervisors of anything that needs adjusting to correct the inconsistencies or incompatibilities. The two memos from Ken Brody and anything that the commission wishes to add will be sent to the Board of Supervisors. The item will remain open, since there are a numerous items that need work.

CASE NUMBER: RG- 02-100 County of Riverside and BA, DC, FL, PV, SK-02-100, CH-02-104, BD-02-113, BL-02-103, CO-02-100, FV-02-116, MA-02-181, RI-02-165 and TH (DRRA)-02-104

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: GPA 618 and EIR 441

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

2002 Riverside County General Plan (General Plan), Comprehensive General Plan Amendment No. 618 and Environmental Impact Report No. 441 (SCH# 2002051143). The General Plan is the comprehensive planning document that provides guidelines for growth and land-use related decisions made by the County, expresses the community's goals with respect to both the human-made and natural environment, and sets forth the policies and implementation measures to ensure the safety and welfare of those who live, work, and do business in Riverside County. General Plan area plans which would be affected by airports under ALUC jurisdiction include: Desert Center; Eastern Coachella Valley; Eastvale; Harvest Valley/Winchester; Jurupa; Lake Elsinore; Mead Valley; Palo Verde Valley; San Jacinto Valley; Southwest; Temescal Canyon; The Pass; and Western Coachella Valley Plan. Airports affected are: Banning Municipal, Chino, Bermuda Dunes, Blythe, Chiriaco Summit, Corona Municipal, Desert Center, Desert Resorts Regional, Flabob, French Valley, Hemet/Ryan, MARB/MIP, Perris Valley, Riverside Municipal and Skylark Airports.

PROJECT LOCATION:

All unincorporated area within the Adopted Influence Areas (see Map Attached) Affected Airports: Banning, Chino, Bermuda, Blythe, Chiriaco, Corona, Desert Center, Desert Resorts, Flabob, French Valley, Hemet/Ryan, MARB/MIP, Perris, Valley, Riverside, and Skylark.

BACKGROUND: *The County filed their new General Plan effective December 24, 2003. We have contracted with our consultant to review the proposal and the first review is attached. We expect to continue the project until the next meeting in order to:*

1. *Obtain up to date copies of the proposal in order to respond to the proper document.*
2. *Provide further comments and proposed additions to the text in order make it consistent with the CLUPs and*
3. *Obtain copies of the CETAP and MSHCP the Transportation and Multi Species in order to review them in light of the General Plan.*

We will utilize numerous resources for our review:

1. *All Adopted CLUPs*
2. *The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base and Chino*
3. *The CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
4. *Noise data from any source newer than the adopted CLUP*

MAJOR ISSUES: Noise Element, Community Plans and Land Use Element

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends that the ALUC CONTINUE the proposal until the next meeting of February 20, 2003 in order to complete the review, obtain the latest recommended version of the plan, text and EIR proposal going to the Board of Supervisors, and have the county file the MSHCP and CETAP for their review.*

Keith Downs indicated that the plan is not consistent and will provide comments to the County of ways to fix the inconsistencies. Ken Brody, Mead & Hunt has gone through the General Plan and will provide further information. Ken Brody came forward and presented the case to the Commission. Mr. Brody referred to the memo that was included with the staff report, which is based on the items that were reviewed. The General Plan Volume, which has various elements from Land Use and Circulations. Also the Technical Appendences Volume and the EIR. The pages attached from the State Airport Land Use Planning Hand Book is to give the Commission an idea of the types of thing that need to be looked at as part of the review of general plans. Traditionally it was often thought that by looking at the land use map and comparing it to the ALUC's criteria as long as there are no houses at the end of the runway everything is considered consistent. There is more involved consistency than just that simple comparison of maps. In a Mapping sense there might be criteria regards to industrial and commercial were the intensity is being limited and a typical general plan designation might not have that level of information. It is often impossible to tell in a general plan level what may or may not incur in a particular area. The plan seems to indicate that the County would allow residential uses of up to the sixty-five (65) CNEL. There is little reference to the ALUC in the General Plan. In the area plan is mentioned that it is their content to comply with the compatibility plans that have not yet been adopted, but there is no description on how that will be accomplished. With this review it has been found that the General Plan is not consistent.

In the land use element the tables shown in the memo talks about the densities and intensities. The housing element is not clear how it is being treated in allowing secondary dwelling units. Some discussion in the plan regarding clustering in the land use compatibility stand point will be a very good way of achieving consistency on large parcels. There is another policy that reads as follow; "To provide acoustical insulation for existing land uses in the sixty-five (65) CNEL contour". Mr. Brody indicated that he is unsure of what the intent of this policy is or how it's implemented. Is the County going to pay for insulation of various dwellings and does it apply to County owned airports or County owned land, its unclear on what the expectations are for this policy. In the Technical Volume it does not indicate where the contours came from how many aircraft operations it represents or what the purpose of including this Volume.

Hearing no further comments Vice Chairman Graff called for questions from the Commissioners, hearing no response Vice Chairman Graff opened the floor for comments from the audience.

Art Peterson, representing Flabob Airport came forward in response to Vice Chairman Graff's invitation and voiced his concerns with the General Plan. Mr. Peterson indicated that the General Plan has been study with great care and found that the narrative is very helpful, but the last sentence is not quite accurate. It reads as follow; "In order to minimize land use conflicts with the adjacent uses much of the areas surrounding the airport it is designated in a low density". He pointed out to the Commissioners the area of concern by referring to an exhibit where it shows violation of the Caltran rules.

Hearing no further comments Vice Chairman Graff called for questions from the Commissioner for the applicant. Hearing no response, Vice Chairman Graff called for discussion among the Commissioners. Hearing no response, he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Cobb made a motion to continue the project, subject to staff's recommendations to the next scheduled meeting on February 20th. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Cobb inquired about the sixty-day limit. Keith Downs responded that since the MSCHP was received two days ago and the CETAP has not yet been received the application is considered incomplete. Ken Brody indicated that his staff is working with the GIS data for comparison of each of the airport maps. Further work will be done with Keith Downs for the type of comments that will be passed along to the County. In respect to the General Plan it is anticipated that a complete analysis will be done before the next meeting. In concerned with the other components it is unknown how problematic they might be since they have not yet been reviewed.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. County of Riverside RCIP (See Item I)

B. CLUP Update: Status and reports

The status and reports were continued to next schedule meeting of February 20th.

VIII. ORAL COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC ON ANU ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA.

None.

IX. COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS

None.

X. Adjournment: Vice Chairman Graff adjourned the meeting at 12:20 P.M.

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: February 20, 2003 at 9:00 a.m.,
Riverside