

**AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER  
4080 Lemon St., Board Room (14<sup>th</sup>Floor)  
Riverside, California

**THURSDAY, February 20, 2003**  
**9:00 A.M.**

**MINUTES**

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

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Kathy Rohm, Flabob Airport  
John Lyon  
Jerry Jolliffe  
Joe Monaco  
David Sawyer  
Jim Henderson  
Gary Cassel  
Robert Klotz  
Patti Nahill

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 9:00 a.m. by Chairman Stephens.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken.
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 19, 2002: Commissioner Cobb noted a correction on page 19<sup>th</sup>. Chairman Stephens called for further comments on the minutes, hearing no response he called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Cobb made a motion to approve the minutes with corrections. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Bell and Commissioner Pratt arrived at 9:05 a.m.

Keith Downs briefed the Commissioners on the agenda. Mr. Downs indicated that staff is recommending a continuance on items V.B., V.C. to the next scheduled meeting and keeping item V.A. open. Item V.D. the applicant is requesting a continuance. The items with an asterisk are consent items as long as no members from the Commission or members from the audience wish to speak on a particular item. Riverside Municipal Airport requested a continuance on item VI.J., and an open discussion on item VI.I.

V. OLD BUSINESS

**REGIONAL WIDE**

**9:00 A.M.**

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

Keith Downs indicated that Ken Brody analyzed the January 8<sup>th</sup> 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 and keeping the item open, since there are a number of 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. The ALUC continued the project until the February 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.*

*The MSHCP was filed in late January and the CETAP was filed on February 5. The Planning Commission version of the plan was sent to our consultant and their comments to the individual Area Land Use Plans is attached. We 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 Area Plans**

**RECOMMENDATION:** *Staff recommends that the ALUC find the RCIP as submitted INCONSISTENT with the current CLUP's and notify the Board of Supervisors of that finding with the attached reports, but continue to hold the hearing open and CONTINUE the proposal until the next meeting of March 20, 2003 in order to the review any responses from the County, obtain the latest recommended versions of the plan, text and EIR proposal going to the Board of Supervisors.*

Ken Brody, Mead&Hunt indicated that the review has been divided into two separate memos the previous one from last months meeting and the recent one included in this month's agenda package. The previous memo dealt with the general plan elements, the technical appendices (look it up), and the EIR. The most recent memo is the map oriented looking at the area plans and how it relates in a geographic sense to the policies that are in the various compatibility plans. The most critical information is contained in the countywide elements. One is the overall concept of infill, which the County plan supports also a concept that is in many of the compatibility plans. This needs careful analysis on how it is applied not to exacerbate (look it up) significant compatibility problems around the airports. Within the County plan as well as with the most recent amendments there is discussion about density bonuses in second units. It is unclear on how those numbers relate to the density limits that are indicated in various tables in the General Plan. It can raise conflicts when it comes to a comparison of the ALUC's policy. Another use that might be acknowledged is clustering, from an aviation compatibility stand point clustering is very desirable. It encourage

development to move away from critical parts of the parcel to portions that are less impacted by the noise and safety considerations.

The noise element has the greatest conflicts, and in some degree there is an internal conflict within this element irrespective of the ALUC matters. There is a sixty-five (65) CNEL policy that discourages noise sensitive uses including residential. The table in the noise element indicates that single families in low densities residential are conditionally acceptable up to seventy (70) CNEL. There is a policy in the noise element that calls for restrictions on aircraft hours of operation. It is not acknowledged how it will affect the operations of the airports and whether it is intended for County owned airports. There is little reference to the ALUC within the overall General Plan.

Maps were reviewed on what is an existing land use, something that in the new compatibility plans better defined. An important initial thing to take into account is that the ALUC does not have jurisdiction over existing land use, therefore residential development can be shown in an area where such development is not permitted, but if it already exist it is not an inconsistency. The types of conflicts revised are direct conflict and potential conflict. The direct conflicts are the ones that show up with respect to residential where a medium density residential in an area where the compatibility plans indicates a two-acre parcel. More complicated are the potential conflicts, which show up with non-residential uses, but to some degree can happen with residential also. This raises the issue of usage intensity, which might not be a topic at all to most General Plans, but a critical consideration to the ALUC. Other issues such as height limits and potential for attraction of birds also need to be taken into account. The General Plan does not explicit in any of the area plans indicate where future schools might be, but presuming they will be within residential areas there may be locations where ALUC criteria's would allowed single family residentials and not schools. The potential conflicts high light the fact that none of the policies in the area plans or in the General Plan Element, address the need for avoiding development in the critical locations or in limiting the intensity of other uses in areas near the airports. Something further needs to be done as part of the General Plan to bring it more directly into potential consistency. The table indicates that all but one of the airports has some of its influence area into County jurisdiction. Among the area plans all but three of them contain at least part of one or more influence areas of airports.

Mr. Brody then referred to exhibits and presented to the Commission what has been worked on in various airport mappings. For Desert Resorts Regional Airport the ALUC zones have been labeled and noise contours has they appear in the adopted compatibility plan. The boundaries were defined for places were direct or potential conflict is worth noting. The focus has been more on the maps than the text that went with the various area plans. Other types of issues like in Area I is in a commercial industrial use that may or may not be a conflict depending on the intensity of the use at least within the parcel that's in the zones. Area II is a large area shown as a unspecify community development, it is unsure how it relates to the ALUC criteria. Area VI is within a part of the CNEL sixty (60) contour where the ALUC indicates no residential development. Area VII is agriculture, which is generally acceptable and a good use but with concern of some agriculture activities. This applies in all of the zones where some

agriculture activities might be a problem. Area VIII also industrial is general compatible, but again certain amount of uses that might involve hazardous materials or generate electrical or other interference with the airports that need to be taken into account.

Mr. Brody then presented an exhibit for the Hemet/Ryan Airport and indicated some changes between the April 2002 draft and the most recent one from last month. Some uses were changed that make conflicts that were not conflicts in the original draft. This is particular in the areas south of the airport. In area number four was shown as light industrial in the first draft and its now a medium density residential in the current plan. There is residential shown in the area directly at the end of the runway, which is a conflict since the ALUC's plan for the Hemet/Ryan Airport allows residential in Area I, but prohibits it within a mile from the runway. He then follow with Flabob Airport and indicated that a large area of the state residential is designated for allowing small two dwelling units per acre. Some of those areas will be a conflict with the ALUC, which has a two in a half higher acre requirement. French Valley is much more extensive and actively growing, which was difficult to indicated what developments already exist. The labeled areas that are business park type of uses may or may not be a conflict depending on the intensity of the use. Schools would need to be looked at very carefully, although no specific sites are indicated as discouraged within the traffic pattern zone.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephen called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Bell inquired on the resolution for the conflicting areas. Keith Downs responded that the Commission is the final authority on whether it is consistent. To resolve the inconsistencies the County would need to respond with corrections. Staff is ready and capable to provide assistance to the County in this particular case. Chairman Stephens inquired on the next step if the County does not make the corrections. Keith Downs responded that the County would have to do a major override. Chairman Stephens indicated that he finds this beyond disappointment if awareness of the ALUC cannot be included in the General Plan. Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Jerry Jolliffe, Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency came forward in response to Chairman Stephens invitation and indicated that the Board of Supervisors hearing has been push back one week. The hearing is schedule to meet on March 11, 12 and 13<sup>th</sup>. In the next few days a meeting can be arranged with ALUC staff and consultant to go over the comments and details to determine what will be the best strategy for addressing the raised issues. Mr. Jolliffe indicated that he believes most of the issues can be addressed through the General Plan document by policy revision and in some cases land use mapping revision. The Planning Commission felt that in order to have a more refine General Plan designation was to reflect the define real life styles of people by minimum lot size and rural areas to a great degree. Several of the airports have two in a half-acre minimum lot size as a requirement for safety concern, which is obviously a direct conflict, but not the kind that necessarily needs to become a problem. However there are two possible solutions one would be to revisit the designation classification itself and bring before the Board for discussion and consideration before the plan is adopted. A more appropriate

way of addressing the issue would be to incorporate in the policy of the area plan text along with the mapping for the airport influence areas. Some areas around the county where policies in the plan are even more reflective of the enhance safety considerations of what exist on the existing General Plan. The County does understand the number of policies in the noise element and the land use element that needs to be improved or added in order to provide a better identification of the ALUC roll. The approach that would seem to make the more sense at this point would be after meeting with the ALUC staff, develop the policy changes in the recommendations and maps and present it to the Board of Supervisors. In the outcome of the Board hearings the ALUC would have results to either take action on March 20<sup>th</sup> or to do something else if the Board hearings were not concluded.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for question from the Commissioners for the applicant. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience.

Robert Klotz, Attorney representing Pulte Homes Corporation and Sage Community Group, which is the master developer of the specific plan immediately south of the French Valley Airport came forward in response to Chairman Stephens's invitation. Mr. Klotz referred to the exhibit for the French Valley Airport and pointed out a couple items. The area described as a community center designation, which was changed by recommendation by planning commission to a new designation, referred to as mixed use per adopted specific plan. The explanation in the text indicates that development shall occur in the area with occurrence of the specific plan. The intention of the General Plan is not to alter the approve development plans for existing specific plans in the County. It confirms that development should occur in occurrence with those plans. One major change in terms of the format occurring, which leads to some confusion. In the old General Plan, specific plans were shown only through the community plans and the only place a land use map was available. In the new General Plan the land use category is being taken from the Specific Plan and matching it up and putting it on the overall area plan maps and General Plan maps. The Specific Plan 213 is one that is within the exemption to the general land use of intensity and density limitations of the French Valley Airport plan. The new General Plan proposes no changes what so ever with respect to those allowed land uses. There is no basis with assertion that there is an inconsistency or incompatibility with the ALUC's adopted plan.

Keith Downs commented that the County Commission version of the text adds language to Specific Plans to put a sun set clause on them. Jerry Jolliffe came forward and indicated that the Planning Commission has exhibited some concern over the fact that Specific Plans after they have been adopted generally are not looked at again unless the owner or applicant comes in a later date and request change in the Specific Plan. Many have been on the books for twenty and in some cases nearly thirty years. The recommendation is that there be atleast a twenty year period for the plans that have already been approved and then revisit the plans. Also to be additional requirements for plans that have not reached a certain level of development after fifteen or eighteen years. This issue came in very late in Planning Commission hearing process and is part of the proposal to the Board of Supervisors.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens inquired on the recommendations. Keith Downs, responded that staff recommends that the consultants comments and any thing the Commission wishes to add get forward to the County finding it inconsistent with the two memo reports. If the Commission has a position on the issue of sun setting, which is a good idea to add for those areas that are not build out and are inconsistent. Also holding the hearing open until March 20<sup>th</sup> for this item.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for discussion from the Commissioners, hearing no response, he called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Cobb made a motion of inconsistency and leaving the hearing open until March 20<sup>th</sup>, subject to staff recommendations. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- B. **RG,RI-03-100 – MSCHP** – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE SUMMARY:** *Multi Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP)*

**CASE NUMBER:** *RI and RG-03-100 County of Riverside and BA, FL, PV, SK-02-100, CH-02-104, CO-02-100, FV-02-116, MA-02-181 and RI-02-165*

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** *County of Riverside*

**JURISDICTION CASE NO:**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** *The Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP or Plan) is a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) focusing on Conservation of species and their associated Habitats in Western Riverside County. The MSHCP Plan Area encompasses approximately 1.26 million acres (1,966 square miles); it includes all unincorporated Riverside County land west of the crest of the San Jacinto Mountains to the Orange County line, as well as the jurisdictional areas of the Cities of Temecula, Murrieta, Lake Elsinore, Canyon Lake, Norco, Corona, Riverside, Moreno Valley, Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Perris, Hemet, and San Jacinto. It will provide a coordinated MSHCP Conservation Area and implementation program to preserve biological diversity and maintain the region's quality of life. Airports within the affected area are: Banning Municipal, Chino, Corona Municipal, Flabob, French Valley, Hemet/Ryan, MARB/MIP, Perris Valley, Riverside Municipal and Skylark Airports.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*All areas within the Adopted Influence Areas (see Map Attached) Affected Airports: Banning, Chino, Corona, 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 that review is attached. That text references the MSHCP through much of the document and EIR. This portion of the project was brought in for review on January 31.*

*We 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*

*The purpose of the project is to create open space to preserve species and maintain a quality of life. Generally preserving open space around airports is consistent with airport plans and activities except in two cases:*

1. *The project would create a wildlife attractant that would cause bird strike issues, and*
2. *When the open space protection conflicts with airport development plans.*

*The project as submitted, has many portion within Influence Areas, but two that seemingly conflict with adopted airport plans and consequently the CLUP's. The attached comment from Caltrans reiterates the point regarding the necessity of a USDA Wildlife Services review of the proposal and the necessity of that review for any newly created activity that could include attractants. The project designates certain areas with goals for open space retainment and divides the areas into units and cells for focus. The Hemet Ryan and French Valley Airports and use plans developed for those facilities. Chapter 7 of the plan covers existing uses and describes roads, sewers, water, electrical, gas and solid waste facilities that are included or 'covered activities'. Airports are not included. If they were, the conflict would not likely exist. These cells and areas for conservation are show on the attached exhibits.*

**MAJOR ISSUES:** *Wildlife Attractant, with Hemet/Ryan and French Valley Airport Master Plans and CLUPs*

**RECOMMENDATION:** *Staff recommends that the ALUC notify the County of these concerns and inconsistencies and CONTINUE the proposal until the next meeting of March 20, 2003 in order to complete the review, obtain any text revisions from the County and EIR proposal going to the Board of Supervisors. The consultant has reviewed the proposal with the assistance of staff and the comments are attached.*

Keith Downs indicated that he has done most of the review, but it would be followed by a presentation by the consultant for the organization putting MSHCP together. Mr. Downs indicated that two areas of concern were found; the County's jurisdiction is in the incorporated areas of the County. MSHCP and C.E.T.A.P. jurisdiction is the western Riverside County. The plan proposes to set aside certain lands where there are lands indicated. There also areas where they wish to preserve certain species. There are areas of concern and cells that are broken down into a finer levels. Two airports French Valley and Hemet/Ryan showed up not only in the neighborhood, but covered by two cells. Corona, Riverside, March, Banning, and the other two small airports were either in the cities or unaffected by this procedure. Mr. Downs referred to the maps provided with the staff report and indicated that French Valley is affected by four cells and Hemet/Ryan by three to four cells. Both airports have on the adopted master plans extension of the runways. Both of the CLUP's that have been adopted by the ALUC reflect that extension, but to the extent that this planning effort by MSHCP is inconsistent or incompatible with this effort staff would have to find it inconsistent.

The other incompatibility is that there isn't any reference to a bird strike review both MSHCP and C.E.T.A.P. need to go through this procedure for any project



proposed in any influence area from the ALUC prospective and the federal government prospective. Mr. Downs indicated that the recommendation is to continue this project to next month and asking for it to be reviewed by Caltrans Aeronautics.

Joe Monaco, Dudek, consultant for the County on the MSHCP Plan came forward and indicated the overall purpose of the MSHCP is to provide local control of permitting under the endangered species act for both the state of California and federal government. In order to provide the local control the wild life agencies need to assure that conservation won't be under taken by the local agencies. The plan addresses how conservation will be achieved over the life of the permit, which is proposed for a seventy-five (75) year term within the study area. One point twenty-six million acre study area for multi species habitat is in the western planning area. Within this area approximately three hundred forty-seven acres of existing land has been identified available for conservation. In addition to those areas the plan proposes to conserve an additional one hundred fifty-three thousand acres of private land. There have been concerns expressed in the pass over specific mapping of these conservation areas as in how it relates to land use and property values. In an effort to address those concerns and to provide maximum flexibility in the assembly the plan is criteria base plan. The criteria area is base on one hundred sixty acre quarter section cells that are identify over the areas that are considered desirable for conservation. The entire area of the criteria is about three hundred thousand acres about twice the size of the area that is actually desired for conservation. The Plan includes extensive written criteria that describe each of the one hundred sixty acre cells on what is the intent or the desirable conservation areas. It provides the ability to be flexible in terms of assembling the reserve as oppose to providing for a hard line mapped reserved area. This covers much more area that what is necessary. The two affected airports within the MSHCP plan are the French Valley Airport and the Hemet/Ryan Airport. In the French Valley area it is recognized that the linkage opportunities are extremely limited because of existing and potential development within the area. Redundant linkages have been identified within the area to provide flexibility in terms of where the linkages should be established and how they might get assembled over time. The goal for conservation in this area is to focus more on the southern end enhancing existing open space and conservation areas within the eighty-one sixty-one habitat conservation areas. The Hemet/Ryan Airport southwestern end of the runway is covered almost entirely within the criteria. This is being referred to as an isolated habitat block; within this area there are extensive vernal pool resources, which are seasonal that occur in depression and are not associated with stream courses. Mr. Monican indicated that consistency could be found both in terms of the conservation being desired and the lack of attractive bird resources within the area.

Commissioner Pratt inquired further information on the cells. Mr. Monican responded that the cells consist of quarter section units that are one hundred sixty acres in size. It is intended to identify areas where conservation is potentially desirable, but varies from cell to cell. Chairman Stephens inquired that if a bird strike analysis would be prepared or is part of the program. Mr. Monaco responded that a comment was received from Caltrans Aeronautics Division addressing this issue and the responses to comments to the plan will

address it.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience. Keith Downs commented regarding chapter seven that goes into covered activities. A listing of roads and facilities that are covered under various categories does not mention any airport. An easy solution would be to include at least in the maps and charts the airports with specificity.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Tandy made a motion to continue the project to the next schedule meeting of March 20<sup>th</sup>, subject to staff Conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Cobb seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- C. RI and RG-03-101 – C.E.T.A.P – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE SUMMARY:** Countywide Environmental Transportation Acceptability Program (C.E.T.A.P.)

**CASE NUMBER:** RI and RG-03-101 County of Riverside and BA, FL, PV, SK-02-100, CH-02-104, CO-02-100, FV-02-116, MA-02-181 and RI-02-165

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** E.I.R. SCH 2000101105 AND 6-08-RIV-CR

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), in conjunction with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the County of Riverside, proposes to preserve right-of-ways for a north south multimodal transportation corridor and east west multimodal transportation corridor in western Riverside County. Airports with Influence Areas in the corridors area are: French Valley, Hemet/Ryan, MARB/MIP, Perris Valley and Skylark Airports.

**PROJECT LOCATION:** All areas within the Adopted Influence Areas (see Map Attached) Affected Airports: Banning, Chino, Corona, 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 was completed in January for the RCIP text and the Elements of the Plan. That text references the CETAP through much of the document and EIR. This portion of the project was brought in for review on February 5. The project as submitted has one portion within any Airport Influence Area. That is the March ARB Influence area and the northern alternative of the Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore Corridor between Lake Perris and Barton Road.

We utilize numerous resources for our review:

1. All Adopted CLUPs
2. The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base
3. The CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002

4. Noise data from any source newer than the adopted CLUP

*The Corridor would be from 500 to 1,000 feet in width and include many modes of transportation including pedestrian, bikeway, limited-access-highway, transit and utilities. The section through this area would be no closer than 1 mile from the runway at MARB. No station stops are shown on the plan in this area, but one would expect some servicing the population in this area. There could be water detention /retention facilities added to a project this large and those should be reviewed for their potential as a wildlife attractants. The USDA, Wildlife Services review should either be a part of this project or a required mitigation review for any subsequent project within the Influence Area. That FAA Advisory Circular is attached. Staff could not detect any review by Caltrans Aeronautics and that should be completed prior to action by the ALUC.*

**MAJOR ISSUES:** *Wildlife Attractant, Assembly area at potential transit stations, and Caltrans Review*

**RECOMMENDATION:** *Staff recommends that the ALUC CONTINUE the proposal until the next meeting of March 20, 2003 in order to coordinate the review with the RCIP and MSHCP, obtain the latest recommended version of the plan, text and EIR proposal going to the Board of Supervisors and receive the review from Caltrans Aeronautics. The consultant has reviewed the maps with the assistance of staff and the comments are attached.*

Keith Downs indicated that the CETAP boundaries are the same as the MSHCP boundaries and that the influence areas for the airports were reviewed. There are three issues to this proposal, bird strike, other transit stations or assembly issues and the wild life attractant.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience. Hearing no response or reply, Chairman Stephens called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Cobb made a motion to continue the project to the next schedule hearing of March 20<sup>th</sup>, subject to staff Conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**HEMET RYAN AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

- D. HR-02-105 – Michael Naggar – Keith Downs informed the commission that the applicant requested a continuance.

<b>CASE NUMBER:</b>	<u>HE-02-105 Rico Enterprise/Michael Naggar</u>
<b>APPROVING JURISDICTION:</b>	City of Hemet
<b>JURISDICTION CASE NO:</b>	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:  
Land Use Policy:  
Riverside

Hemet-Ryan Airport  
CLUP 1989: Adopted by City of Hemet and County of

- 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.*

Chairman Stephens asked for the applicant to come forward and present the case. Hearing no response, Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no response or reply, he called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Vice Chairman Graff made a motion to continue the project to the next schedule hearing of March 20<sup>th</sup>. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Keith Downs indicated that he would like the Commission to open the consent items for a group finding. The following consent items are as follow; BD-03-100 Mark Valentino, BD-03-101 Coronel Enterprises, Inc., BD-03-102 Sprint, MA-03-101 Day Street Partners, MA-03-103 Nadel Architects, MA-03-104 and 105 Michael Tseng and TH-03-100 Sprint. These items are being recommended for a finding of consistent. If any of the Commissioners or any one from the audience wishes to address a particular item it will be pulled out and addressed separately.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the commissioners. Chairman Stephens indicated a letter opposing the project for

BD-03-102 Sprint was received. Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens called for a discussion from the Commissioners, hearing no response he called for a motion to be set.

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

## VI. NEW BUSINESS

### BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

#### A. BD-03-100 – Mark Valentino – Consent item see above.

<b>CASE NUMBER:</b>	<u>BD-03-100 – Mark Valentino</u>
<b>APPROVING JURISDICTION:</b>	County of Riverside
<b>JURISDICTION CASE NO.:</b>	PP 18365

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*The project is a Plot Plan for a triplex.*

#### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located at 78-885 Avenue 42, west of Adams Street in the County of Riverside, approximately 3,100 ft. southwest of Runway 10-28 at the Bermuda Dunes Airport.*

<i>Adjacent Airport:</i>	<i>Bermuda Dunes Airport</i>
--------------------------	------------------------------

#### *Land Use Policy:*

- |    |                                |   |
|----|--------------------------------|---|
| a. | <i>Airport Influence Area:</i> | <i>Area III</i>                           |
| b. | <i>Land Use Policy:</i>        | <i>Influence Area</i>                     |
| c. | <i>Noise Levels:</i>           | <i>Outside 60 dB CNEL (February 1996)</i> |

#### **MAJOR ISSUES:**

**LAND USE:** *The proposal is for a 3-unit apartment building located approximately 3,100 feet southwest of the west end of Runway 10-28 at Bermuda Dunes Airport. The proposal is within Area III of the Airport Influence Area. The area of the proposed buildings is 4,992 sq. ft. and the lot area is approximately 13,000 sq. ft. (net). Structural coverage will be less than 50% of the net area. The proposed use is an acceptable use, contingent upon noise and height issues.*

**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.*

*Ultimate traffic with seasonal and weekend peaking will likely produce noise of some annoyance on the site.*

PART 77: The highest elevation at the site is 86.5 MSL and the height of the tallest structure is approximately 17.5 ft. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. At a distance of 3,100 ft. feet from the runway, proposed structures exceeding 104 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.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
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. The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser or tenant.

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

- B. BD-03-101 – Coronel Enterprises, Inc. – Consent item see page 14.

<b>CASE NUMBER:</b>	<u>BD-03-101 – Coronel Enterprises, Inc.</u>
<b>APPROVING JURISDICTION:</b>	County of Riverside
<b>JURISDICTION CASE NO.:</b>	PP 17971

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project is a Plot Plan for a triplex.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located at 41-663 Adams Street, north of Avenue 42 in the County of Riverside, approximately 1,900 ft. southwest of Runway 10-28 at the Bermuda Dunes Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport*

*Land Use Policy:*

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

### **MAJOR ISSUES:**

*LAND USE:* *The proposal is for a 3-unit apartment building located approximately 1,900 feet south west of the west end of Runway 10-28 at Bermuda Dunes Airport. The proposal is within Area III of the Airport Influence Area. The area of the proposed buildings is 5,555 sq. ft. and the lot area is approximately 12,000 sq. ft. (net). Structural coverage will be less than 50% of the net area. The proposed use is an acceptable use, contingent upon noise and height issues.*

*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.*

*Ultimate traffic with seasonal and weekend peaking will likely produce noise of some annoyance on the site.*

*PART 77:* *The highest elevation at the site is 84.5 MSL and the height of the tallest structure is approximately 17.5 ft. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. At a distance of 1,900 feet from the runway, proposed structures exceeding 92 MSL will require an FAA 7460 review. The applicant has been notified that and an FAA review is required on this project.*

*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.*

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

- 1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport.*
- 2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
- 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. The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser or tenant.
  - 5. 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.

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

C. BD-03-102 – Sprint – Consent item see page 14.

**CASE NUMBER:** BD-03-102 – Sprint  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** PUP 00859

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project is a 50-foot monopalm communication tower.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located at 42-360 Adams Street south of Avenue 42 in the County of Riverside, approximately 3,600 ft. southwest of the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport

**Land Use Policy:**

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

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposal is for a 50 foot monopalm communications tower and equipment area located approximately 3,600 feet southwest of the west end of Runway 10-28 at Bermuda Dunes Airport. The proposal is within Area III of the Airport Influence Area. The proposed tower is located within a 670 sq. ft. equipment area on approximately 6.8 acres. The proposed use is an acceptable use, contingent upon noise and height issues.

**NOISE:** The site will be subject to intermittent aircraft noise of some annoyance. The entire site is outside of the 60 CNEI 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. No buildings or public assembly uses are proposed; therefore, noise is not a concern.

**PART 77:** The finish surface elevation of the proposed site is 97.98 MSL ft. The elevation of the top of the monopalm is 126 MSL. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. At a distance of 3,600 ft. feet from the runway, proposed structures exceeding 109 MSL will require an FAA 7460 review. The applicant submitted an application for FAA review on February 5, 2003, and is waiting for a response.

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.

**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. The above ground storage of flammable materials shall be prohibited.
5. 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.

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

D. MA-03-101 – Day Street Partners – Consent item see page 14.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-03-101-Day Street Partners  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Parcel Map

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Tentative Parcel Map for a commercial development on approximately 1.88 acres.*

**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 commercial development on approximately 1.88 acres. 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 25,340 sq. ft. The lot area is approximately 81,846 sq. ft. (net). Structural coverage will be less than 35% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation at the site is 1,601 MSL feet and the height of the structures is unknown at this time. Any structures over 1,679 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review.

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 aviation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport. (Tel. 909- 656-7000)
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portions of the 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.
6. Structures exceeding 1,679 MSL feet in elevation shall be submitted to the FAA for review.

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

E. MA-03-102 – Regional Properties – Consent item see page 14.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-03-102-Regional Properties, Inc.  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** GP 001-001; RZ 001-001; PD 001-001

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A General Plan Amendment, Change of Zone and PD 001-001 for a residential development consisting of 112 units on approximately 9.78 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is situated south of Central Avenue and east of Chicago Avenue within the City of Riverside, approximately 22,000 ft. northwest 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 residential development consisting of 112 units on approximately 9.78 acres. The proposed site is located approximately 22,000 ft. northwest of Runway 14/32. The proposal is 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 residential land use. 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 59,254 sq. ft. The lot area is approximately 426,000 sq. ft. (net). Structural coverage will be less than 25% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest finish floor elevation on the site is 964 MSL, with a building height of approximately 40 feet. Any structures over 1,755 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 than 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 the 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 attached notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential tenant.

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

F. MA-03-103 – Nadel Architects – Consent item see page 14.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-03-103-Nadel Architects  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** DR 027-023

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A commercial development on approximately 5.28 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is situated north of Canyon Springs Parkway and west of Day Street within the City of Riverside, approximately 15,000 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 commercial development on approximately 5.28 acres. The proposed site is located approximately 15,000 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 approximately 63,000 sq. ft. The lot area is approximately 230,000 sq. ft. (net). Structural coverage will be less than 30% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation at the site is 1,645 MSL feet and the height of the tallest structure is approximately 38 ft. Any structures over 1,685 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review.

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 than 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 the office portions of the 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.
  - 6. Structures exceeding 1,685 MSL feet in elevation shall be submitted to the FAA for review.

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

G. MA-03-104 and 105 – Michael Tseng – Consent item see page 14.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-03-104 & 105-Michael Tseng  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Building Permit

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A commercial development consisting of four buildings on 1.88 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is situated both south and north of Canyon Springs Parkway and west of Day Street within the City of Riverside, from approximately 14,400 ft. to 15,000 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 commercial development on approximately 1.88 acres. The proposed site is located from approximately 14,400 ft. to 15,000 north of Runway 14/32. Three of the four proposed structures are located on the south side of Canyon Springs Parkway and the fourth structure is located on the north side, as shown on the attached exhibits. 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 total area of the proposed structures is 39,725 sq. ft. Structural coverage for all proposed structures will be less than 50% of the respective net lot area.

Part 77: The highest elevation at the site is 1,627 MSL feet and the height of the tallest structure is 22 feet. 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 than 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 the office portions of the 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.

## **DESERT RESORTS REGIONAL AIRPORT**

**10:00 A.M.**

H. TH-03-100 – Sprint – Consent item see page 14.

<b>CASE NUMBER:</b>	<u>TH-03-100 –Sprint</u>
<b>APPROVING JURISDICTION:</b>	County of Riverside
<b>JURISDICTION CASE NO:</b>	PP 18228

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** A Plot Plan for a 75 ft. high monopalm communication tower.

**PROJECT LOCATION:** The site is situated south of Avenue 54 and east of SR 86 (Harrison St.) within the County of Riverside, approximately 9,000 feet northwest of Runway 17-35 at the Desert Resorts Regional Airport.

Adjacent Airport:	Desert Resorts Regional Airport (Formerly Thermal Airport)
Land Use Policy:	CLUP 1992: Thermal Airport
a. Airport Influence Area:	Traffic Pattern Zone TPZ
b. Noise Levels:	Outside current 55CNEL

### **MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposal is for a monopalm communication tower located approximately 9,000 ft. northwest of Runway 17-35 within the Traffic Pattern Zone of the Desert Resorts Regional Airport Influence Area. The proposed tower is located within a 1,200 ft. sq. ft. equipment area on an 11.13-acre parcel. The site is zoned for

commercial use. The proposed use is an acceptable use contingent upon noise and height issues.

NOISE: The site is underlying a well-used traffic pattern and will experience annoyance from over flying aircraft. No buildings or public assembly uses are proposed; therefore, noise is not a concern.

PART 77. The highest elevation at the site is -94.9 MSL. The height of the proposed communication tower is 75 ft. to the tip of the palm fronds. The north runway end is at -118 MSL. The site is located within the horizontal surface. Structures exceeding -28 MSL ft. at this location would require FAA 7460 review. The applicant has been notified that an FAA review is required on this project.

**CONDITIONS:** For the County to Utilize

1. Provide Aviation Easements to the Desert Resorts Airport prior to any development of the project, recordation of the map, or sale to an 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 (lights must be downward facing).
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. Above ground storage of flammable materials shall be prohibited.
5. 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.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the Commission find the project consistent with the Thermal Airport Comprehensive Plan subject to the Conditions of Approval listed above.

**HEMET RYAN**

**10:00 A.M.**

- I. HR-03-100 – City of Hemet – Keith Downs presented the case by referring o and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** HR-03-100 City of Hemet (Previously HR-02-103)  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Hemet  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** GPA 02-01 Revised, Draft Supplemental EIR

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Amend the General Plan, Public Health and Safety Element (airport Land Use Compatibility) and related General Plan Elements, to bring the City's General Plan policies regarding safety and land use compatibility into consistency with the Hemet/Ryan Airport Land Use Plan.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The entire Airport Influence Area which is situated northerly of Simpson Avenue, southerly of Eaton Avenue, west of Palm Avenue and easterly of the section line dividing Sections 2 and 3, 10 and 11, 14 and 15, and 22 and 23 within the City of Hemet for Hemet/Ryan Airport. The attached map of the CLUP boundaries indicate the affected area.

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

- a. Airport Influence Area: All three areas: Area III, Area of Moderate Risk; Area II, Area of High Risk; and Area I, Area of Extreme Risk and the Transition Area  
b. Noise Levels: All  
c. Height Issues: Not addressed at this time

**MAJOR ISSUES:** The basis for the ALUC's review of any proposal is whether it is consistent with the Adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan for that airport, assuming one has been adopted. The Hemet/Ryan airport has had Land Use Plans since 1982 and with an update in 1987 and document reprinted in 1992.

As you know, the ALUC has obtained a state grant to update the land use plan for all of the airports within or affecting the county. Our consultants are nearly complete with the 'information gathering' stage of the project at this time. A number of the plans will be developed from Master Plans being prepared for the airports at this time and these include: Palm Springs International, Chino Municipal, Desert Resorts, Regional and Hemet/Ryan. Until these Master Plan are adopted by the airport operator the new Airport Land Use Plan cannot move much beyond this stage. All of these Plans are currently being developed, but none are at the draft stage as of this date. The ALUC will review this Master Plan as part of its statutory obligation when they are available. According to the county, the Draft Master Plan for Hemet/Ryan airport is nearing completion, pending resolution with the state and FAA regarding sailplane and runway issues.

The applicant for this case, the City of Hemet, has filed a General Plan Amendment to amend their Public Health and Safety Element Airport Land Use Compatibility and related General Plan Elements, to bring the City's General Plan policies regarding. The current General Plan for the City reflects and incorporates with some differences the Adopted Plan; however a drafting error indicates that the Influence Area is a half-mile south of where it was adopted.

According to the proposal the General Plan amendment would remove all specific numerical, narrative, and graphically displayed criteria referring to airport safety zones and development densities and intensities from the Public Safety Element Airport Land Use Compatibility section, and related General Plan Elements, and replace these with General Language facilitating consistency with the Hemet-Ryan Airport Land Use Plan. The purpose of the proposed project is to reduce the potential for inconsistencies between the Hemet General Plan and the Airport Land Use Plan. Under this procedure the City is attempting to adopt the plan by a generic reference to the plan. This is similar to an overlay zone, but unfortunately without a designated area. Staff and the public would be expected to rely upon a linkage found nowhere in the City's adopted documents.

If the ALUC finds the project inconsistent, and the City overrules that finding for this project, then no project except legislative items will come before the ALUC until such time that the ALUC adopts a new plan.

**RECOMMENDATION:** At this time staff recommends a finding of inconsistency for the proposal due to the lack of an actual reference to the current Influence Area within the proposed document and recommends continuance to the next meeting until the needed comments from Caltrans Aeronautics are received. The attached comments to the Supplemental document should also be addressed in the Final document.

## **RESPONSES TO SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

A Draft Supplemental EIR includes an analysis of the project with the Airport and this is attached. The following comments relate to that report.

1. Introduction: PAGE 1-4 The second bullet states that the Riverside County Department of Aviation 'accepted' a Master Plan for the development of Hemet/Ryan airport. Normally the jurisdiction, such as the Board of Supervisors approves or adopts these plans. Page 1-8 The Caltrans Aeronautics Division as a state agency and a responsible agency must review the Environmental Document.  
Page 1-11 Third paragraph, second sentence the sentence refers to 'standards' adopted by the state of California in the most recent 2002 Handbook. 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.'
2. Chapter IV SP Environmental Impact Analysis: Page IV-21 SP Federal Aviation Administration: SP An additional issue for land use around airports involves Wildlife Attractants and the FAA has issued an Advisory Circular (AC 150/5200-33) that addresses this issue. While currently not a part of the CLUP, the 'Handbook' advises that development near airports follow the procedures outlined in the Circular (attached) and obtain review of projects from the USDA, Wildlife Services at (916)-979-2675.
3. Noise: Pages IV 42-44 figures IV-8 and 9 This discussion includes a reference to the current effort (RCIP) by the county to update its general plan. The RCIP gives no reference for this noise contour and the source is not clear. New contours will be developed with the Master Plan Update. See staff Report for Item V. SP

## **BUYER AWARENESS MEASURES**

1. *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.*

Keith Downs indicated that when compatibility is reviewed the items looked for is a text numerating what the County needs. There is reference in the Hemet/Ryan land use plan, but there is no linkage in the text or map. This information has been sent to Caltrans Aeronautics and expecting a response by March 12<sup>th</sup>. Keith indicated that this project is inconsistent due to the lack of a map and would like for a continuance to allow time for Caltrans to respond.

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

David Sawyer, City of Hemet came forward in response to Vice Chairman Graff's invitation and indicated that the purpose of this amendment is assure consistency between the cities general plan and the Hemet Ryan's Land Use Plan. As stated in the staff report this amendment removes all land use compatibility criteria from the current general plan language and replaces it with a reference to the Hemet Ryan Airport Land Use Plan. This assures compatibility between the general plan and the airport land use plan as it is currently adopted. It also assures compatibility between the two documents in the future, even after the land use plan could be revised. Staff recommends a finding of inconsistency due to the lack of a map. Mr. Sawyer handed Mr. Downs the map needed in the text to comply with the recommendations.

Vice Chairman Graff called for questions from the Commissioners. Vice Chairman Graff inquired that if the map has the new corrected boundaries staff had indicated. David Sawyer responded that the map is a copy from the Airport Land Use Plan. The red line shown on the map reflects the text description of Area III as it is currently adopted. Hearing no further comments Vice chairman Graff opened the floor for comments from the audience. Hearing no response Vice Chairman Graff inquired to staff if the map meets the requirements or would staff prefer continue reviewing the project further. Keith Downs responded that the map is the correct one, but would like a continuance to receive comments from Caltrans. Hearing no further comments Vice Chairman Graff called for a motion to be set.

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

**ABSTAINED:** Chairman Stephens

## **RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT**

**10:00 A.M.**

- J. RI-02-140 and 165 – Riverside Gateway – Keith Downs informed the Commission that John Sabatello, Riverside Municipal Airport manager requested a continuance for this project.

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-02-140 and 165  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Riverside Gateway

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*The project is a Change of Zone, General Plan Amendment, and Vacation of Doolittle Street west of Van Buren Blvd. and north and south of Jurupa Ave. The project will allow the expansion of the golf course, additional parking, an equestrian facility, open space, and five new commercial structures.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is situated westerly of Van Buren Blvd. and north and south of Jurupa ave. within the City of Riverside and from 1800 to 4800 feet west of the west end of Runway 9-27 for Riverside Airport. The site is underlying an approach and departure flight track centerline.*

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

- a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ), Extended Runway Centerline (ERC) Emergency Touchdown Zone, (ETZ), Inner Safety Zone (ISZ) and Outer Safety Zone (OSZ)*
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area*
- c. Noise Levels: Inside 60 dB CNEL with portions within the 65CNEL*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: *The proposed site is located approximately from 1800 to 4800 feet west of the west end of Runway 9-27. The proposed site is within the Traffic Pattern Zone, Extended Runway Centerline, Emergency Touchdown Zone, Inner Safety Zone and Outer Safety Zones of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The TPZ has few constraints. The ERC and OSZ zones allow surface structures but at limited densities. The ETZ and Inner Safety Zone allow no structures and no significant obstructions. Inappropriate uses in the small center must be limited by the constraints listed in the OSZ.*

NOISE: *the site is near and under the ILS approach and departure traffic pattern for Runway 9-27 and will experience considerable annoyance from overlying aircraft. The site is within the 60 and 65 CNEL.*

PART 77: *The elevation of the surface varies from 730 feet to 744 MSL. The new structures will be placed at elevations ranging from 739 to 741MSL, which is below the approach surface elevation of approximately 810 MSL. The surface of the Runways varies from 757 to 815 MSL. Any structure in the build out area over 40 feet in height will need an FAA 7460 review.*

WILLIFE ATTRACTANTS: *The proposed use with aquatic features of the facility will likely attract wildlife and will need to be reviewed by the USDA Wildlife services prior to placement.*

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**



1. *Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport for the portions of the structures not on Airport property.*
2. *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.*
3. *Subsequent permits for uses within the center shall be reviewed by the ALUC prior to approval by the City.*
4. *Prior to development of any additional facilities the project shall be evaluated by the USDA Wildlife services in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular AC150/5200-38. The contact for California is Patrick Smith at (916)-979-2675.*
5. *Structures and uses in the Outer Safety Zone shall be restricted as outlined the attached matrix (Table 12) from the CLUP.*
6. *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.*

**RECOMMENDATION:** *Staff would recommend a finding of consistency of this project with the Riverside Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan subject to the conditions of approval noted above.*

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Tandy made a motion for continuance to the next scheduled meeting of March 20, 2003. Commissioner Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

### A. CLUP Update: Status and reports (Riverside and Banning)

Keith Downs informed the Commission that not much work has been done in the past two month on the update of the community plans due to the consultant working on the

County plan. Keith indicated that Ken Brody, Mead & Hunt would be doing the presentation of the plans. Ken Brody came forward and indicated the concept approached used a couple of meetings back using Banning Airport as an example. Taking the various noise and safety criteria that are in separate maps in the current plan and using a combined approach to develop a more simplified set of zones in criteria and utilizing them. The intent for a second example was to use Riverside Municipal Airport, but as it was reviewed further the key pieces needed were missing. It was decided that what needs to be move ahead on is the development of new noise contours for many of the airports and look out to at least a twenty-year frame. In some cases it is available as part of ongoing or recently adopted airport master plans in other cases there hasn't been noise contours done in some time. Coffman Associates is to update various noise contours. This was done with Banning, but realized that it was not available for Riverside. Mr. Brody referred to the table included in the agenda packet and indicated that the first two columns lists the forecast activity level as sited in the currently adopted compatibility plan for each of the airports. The next set of columns is the most current or most available data in terms of activity for each of the airports. Mr. Brody suggested that in terms of forecast it be utilized. A typical time frame for an airport master plan is to look twenty years into the future in terms of forecast. Under state law for airport land use compatibility plans it's also a minimum of that distance, but there is nothing that prevents the Commission to look beyond. Indeed if its assume that the airports will be around for more than twenty years that may be an appropriate direction to consider for some of the airports. Therefore what has been done in several cases is to modify the capacity approach, which is indicating that it is unknow when the activity level will be achieved. In several cases the limitation is not the runway capacity, but the number of aircraft that might be based at the airport ultimately.

The current compatibility plan for Banning airport indicates sixty-seven thousand operations as the projected level and its currently ten thousand. The current number was maintained and helicopter activity was added. Bermuda Dunes is currently operating around forty-two thousand. Annual operations and discussions with airport management, the airport expansion as well as additional aircraft parking was review and concluded that it could add another hundred airplanes, bring it up to two hundred fifty from the current hundred fifty. The number was factored up and the operations rounded off and resulted with seventy-five thousand an ultimate reasonable number for this airport. Looking far into the future it needs to be assumed that the louder aircrafts will disappear. There can be a situation where today's noise contours may be larger than the future even though more activity is projected in the future. For some of the airports a composite contour may be done to protect the present situation as well as the future. Using the master plan for Blythe airport it was concluded that it does not have a land use concerned or capacity issue for fifty-six thousand operations. The master plan for Chino airport projects activity at around hundred sixty thousand to two hundred nine thousand, comparing it to almost a hundred thousand in the current compatibility plan. This airport can use a higher number than what the current twenty year projection is showing. Chiriaco Summit has not much activity or key issues. Desert Center is in the same category. The same approach that was done with Burmuda Dunes airport was made with Corona airport. After discussions with Bill Cobb and given their constraints in terms of additional development potentials this airport can grow if some of the unused apron space was converted to hangars. Not assuming there will be another runway or any changes in the existing runway. Fifty-eight thousand estimated operations based on the acoustical calendars from a couple years ago and rounding it off a hundred thousand this airport would probably have to be the one with a larger future contour.

Desert Resorts Regional is in the middle of master planning. As a filler the hundred twenty thousand operations projection that is in the 1999 state system plan was dropped in. It is unknown what the projection will end up as far as the master plan. In any case it may be recommended to look beyond a twenty-year projection even though there is a fairly healthy growth that illustrates from forty-three thousand to a hundred twenty thousand. Flabob is another at this point we have a merely twenty year projection which takes them from twenty seven thousand to forty three thousand. It can be looked at a little beyond, but not very much since it has a limited amount of land so it is unsure if this airport can have future growth. French Valley is currently operating at about seventy thousand the current compatibility plan has a projection of a hundred twenty eight thousand. The most recent forecast that Coffman Associates did as part of the current study looks at a twenty-year number of a hundred thirty thousand. A higher number can be assumed especially if the second runway is kept in plan. Hemet/Ryan Airport currently operating at about seventy thousand. The compatibility plan shows three hundred thirty thousand operations to occur in a couple of years. In the master plan draft that Mead & Hunt is currently working on has a twenty-year projection of a hundred thousand. Again it can be looked at beyond, although it might end up with smaller contours since it no longer has the fire tack aircraft. Another approach is in the compatibility plan, it suggest that the airport take steps to assure its ultimate activity level never generates a contour bigger than the one in the present compatibility plan. The contours will probably be pulled back since it is unsure if today's noise model is used how many operations it would need to get up in order to approach the old contour. It is suspected that it will be beyond the runway capacity. Palm Springs Airport is the least familiar and would need to talk with David Fitz at Coffman Associates whether the hundred seventy thousand projection in the current master plan is adequate or whether there is some potential growth that needs to be reviewed. Riverside Municipal Airport is somewhat similar and might want to use a projection beyond the hundred forty-seven thousand that was looked at has part of the compatibility study. Mr. Brody then indicated that by next month it is expected to complete the noise contour for the ones that have not yet been done.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions or comments from the Commissioners. Vice Chairman Graff indicated that for Banning, Hemet/Ryan and French Valley airports the numbers should be higher, due to the new casinos being built in those areas. The intent is to run the transportation service from the airports to the casinos that will draw possibly commercial flights into Hemet/Ryan or French Valley. Don't really see commercial flights going into Banning because Palm Springs is there, but you might draw the small guide plan as private aircraft going into Banning, Hemet/Ryan and French valley in those areas. Another thing to take into consideration when doing the numbers for Hemet/Ryan and French Valley is that new reservoirs are being built, which will be another big draw for aircraft owners to use the Hemet/Ryan or French valley facilities. Vice Chairman then indicated that representatives from Flabob Airport are present and may come forward if they wish to comment. John Lyon came forward and indicated that for the Flabob airport it is a reasonable approach and that the numbers look reasonable. Work is being done with Caltrans and Mr. Downs to develop a lay out plan and there is a tentative hangar and tie down configuration. Mr. Lyon then indicated that a quick count would be made to see if it's possible to add additional aircraft and if so it will be reported. Chairman Stephens indicated that it's difficult to project far in advance things happen that change the nature of civil aviation. He also indicated that it is ashamed that CETAP is not included in these airports. Keith Downs interjected that March Air Force Base is mention. Chairman Stephens inquired on dates

or a program indicating the reduction in jet engine noise. Ken Brody responded that in respect to commercial aircraft its already in affect to go to stage three but those not apply to business jets at least for the ones under sixty thousand pounds. Mr. Brody then indicated that there have been discussions about potentials for establishing phase out of the older aircrafts, but has not done further research on it. At least one airport has actually put into place a policy prohibiting those types of aircrafts so if that holds it might show up in other airports. There are other things that are going to phase out older aircrafts within the twenty-year frame. When talking about long term contours the best that can be done in the noise modeling is use the quieter aircrafts that are currently existing and assume they will be representative of the whole fleet. There are helicopters in some of the airports and they have separate flight tracks and can be the most annoying noise impacts. Chairman Stephen inquired that if the operations that are projected match or are they below their capacity. Ken Brody responded that in terms of the runway capacity in all cases the numbers are below. In a single runway there have been some air traffic control towers that have gotten over two hundred thousand operations in just one runway. There are different types of capacities and the one being looked at are the based aircraft limitations at several of the airports, being ultimately the most restricted than the aircraft operations. The concentration on several of the airports is the aircraft parking capacity and area development. Keith Downs indicated that the numbers for Chino, French Valley some of Heme/Ryan and Riverside Municipal are to low. All of these if they haven't been will be going back to the Airport Operators for comments. And would like to see capacity issue in those four airports. Vice Chairman commented that other aircraft should be considered in the report not only jets and round engines.

- VIII. ORAL COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC ON ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA. None
- IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS. None
- X. Adjournment: Chairman Stephens adjourned the meeting at 11:10 a.m.  
NEXT REGULARY SCHEDULE MEETING: March 20, 2003 at 9:00 a.m., Riverside