

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

Riverside County Administration Center
4080 Lemon St., Board Room (14th Floor)
Riverside, California

THURSDAY, July 17, 2003
9:00 A.M.

MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on July 17, 2003 at the Riverside County Administration Center, Board Room.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Allen Graff, Vice Chairman
Paul Bell
Walter Snyder
Marge Tandy
Sam Pratt
June Stephens, Alternate
Kathy Rohm, Alternate

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Ric Stephens, Chairman
Jon Goldenbaum

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Nick Tavaglione

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Vice Chairman Graff.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken.
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR May 22, 2003 and June 19, 2003

May 22, 2003: Vice Chairman Graff continued the approval of the minutes, due to not having a quorum. Vice Chairman Graff indicated that Commissioner Snyder, Bell and himself are in agreement to the meeting of the minutes of May 22nd.

June 19, 2003: The minutes were unavailable; therefore Vice Chairman Graff continued the approval of the minutes to the next scheduled meeting.

Vice Chairman Graff stated that the Commission would be going into close session and will reconvene at 9: 45 a.m.

V. Government Code

Conference with legal counsel – anticipated litigation: Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 54956.9
Conference took place in close session.

Vice Chairman Graff reconvened the meeting. B.T. Miller indicated that the Commission unanimously took an action at the close session directing staff to seek the opinion of the attorney general, as to whether the Commissions' CLUP may exempt part or all of its provisions of a local agency's adopted specific plan from application.

Due to the hearing running ahead of scheduled the administrative items were heard.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

REGIONAL WIDE

9:45 A.M.

A. RG and RI-03-100 – MSHCP –

Keith Downs indicated that a finding was made two months ago and have not received a response, therefore staff recommends removing it from calendar.

Vice Chairman Graff called for questions from the Commissioners for staff. Hearing no response, Vice Chairman Graff opened the floor for comments from the audience. Hearing no response he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to remove the item from the agenda. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

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 or 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 bid 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 April 17, 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.*

ADDENDUM: *March 20, 2003 At the February hearing a presentation was made by Dudek and Associates, the consultant that prepared the plan. He addressed the issues that are mentioned in the staff report and speculated that the cells may not negatively affect the plans at Hemet/Ryan and French Valley Airports. It was continued in order to review changes the applicant would propose in order to bring it into consistency with the airport land use plans and recognize the wildlife attractant issue. At the time of the staff report writing nothing has been submitted.*

RECOMMENDATION: March 20th *Staff recommends that the Commission find the current project inconsistent with the various Airport Land Use Plans because of a lack of reference to Wildlife Attractants and because the lack of recognition of the planned airport facilities at the Hemet/Ryan and French Valley Plans. As with the RCIP, staff recommends that the applicant*

be advised of this finding and continue to hold the hearings open and continue them until the next hearing on April 17.

ADDENDUM: April 17, 2003 *The item was continued at the request of the applicant (County of Riverside) in order for them to prepared a response or changes to the to the MSHCP. The County representatives met with your staff and our consultant (Ken Brody) on March 27th. As of the writing of the staff report (April 8, 2003), that had not been received. When it is received Ken Brody of Mead and Hunt and staff will review the proposed changes and we will forward a separate staff report.*

RECOMMENDATION: APRIL 17, 2003 *Staff recommends that the Commission find the current project inconsistent with the various Airport Land Use Plans because of a lack of references to Wildlife Attractants and because the lack of recognition of the planned airport facilities at the Hemet/Ryan and French Valley Plans. As with the RCIP, staff recommends that the applicant be advised of this finding and continue to hold the hearings open and continue them until the next hearing on May 22, 2003.*

ADDENDUM: MAY 22, 2003 *The item was continued at the request of the applicant (County of Riverside) in order for them to prepared a response or changes to the MSHCP. The County representatives met with your staff and our consultant (Ken Brody) on March 27th. As of the writing of the staff report (May 12, 2003), that had not been received. When it is received Ken Brody of Mead and Hunt and staff will review the proposed changes and we will forward a separate staff report.*

RECOMMENDATION: MAY 22, 2003 *Staff recommends that the Commission find the current project inconsistent with the various Airport Land Use Plans because of a lack of references to Wildlife Attractants and because the lack of recognition of the planned airport facilities at the Hemet/Ryan and French Valley Plans. As with the RCIP, staff recommends that the applicant be advised of this finding and continue to hold the hearings open and continue them until the next hearing on JUNE 19, 2003.*

ADDENDUM: June 19, 2003 *At the last meeting the Commission found the proposal inconsistent and sent the attached letter. As of the writing of the staff report no response has been received.*

ADDENDUM: July 17, 2003 *The attached comment was received shortly after the last meeting.*

RECEMMENDATION: July 17, 2003 *Staff recommends that the case be taken off calendar.*

B. RG and RI-03-101– C.E.T.A.P. –

Keith Downs indicated that a finding of inconsistency was made two months ago on the wild life components and the locations of transit stations. There was an announcement in the paper recently about the RTA extending the line with the transit station called Alessandro. Staff is recommending removing it from calendar.

Vice Chairman Graff called for questions from the Commissioners for staff. Hearing no response, Vice Chairman Graff opened the floor for comments from the audience. Hearing no response he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Tandy made a motion to remove the item from the agenda. Commissioner Pratt seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

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 5th. 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 April 17, 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.

ADDENDUM: March 20, 2003 At the February hearing staff presented the concerns about, Wildlife Attractant, Transit Stops and Caltrans Review. At the time of the staff report no new information had been received from the applicant.

RECOMMENDATION: March 20th Staff recommends that the Commission find the project inconsistent with the Airport Land Use Plans and that the staff be directed to inform the applicant and continue to hold the hearings over to the next meeting on April 17.

ADDENDUM: April 17, 2003 The item was continued at the request of the applicant (County of Riverside) in order for them to prepared a response or changes to the to the CETAP. The County representatives met with your staff and our consultant (Ken Brody) on March 27th and as of the writing of the staff report (April 8, 2003), that had not been received. When it is received Ken Brody of Mead and Hunt and staff will review the proposed changes and we will forward a separate staff report to the ALUC.

RECOMMENDATION: APRIL 17, 2003 Staff recommends that the Commission find the current project inconsistent with the various Airport Land Use Plans because of a lack of references to Wildlife Attractants, Assembly Area at Potential Transit Stations, and Caltrans Review. As with the RCIP, staff recommends that the applicant be advised of this finding and continue to hold the hearings open and continue them until the next hearing on May 22, 2003.

ADDENDUM: May 22, 2003 The item was continued at the request of the applicant (County of Riverside) in order for them to prepared a response or changes to the CETAP. The County representatives met with your staff and our consultant (Ken Brody) on March 27th and as of the writing of the staff report (May 12, 2003) that had not been received. When it is received Ken Brody of Mead and Hunt and staff will review the proposed changes and we will forward a separate staff report to the ALUC.

RECOMMENDATION: May 22, 2003 Staff recommends that the Commission find the current project inconsistent with the various Airport Land Use Plans because of a lack of references to Wildlife Attractants, Assembly Area at Potential Transit Stations, and Caltrans Review. As with the RCIP, staff recommends that the applicant be advised of this finding and continue to hold the hearings open and continue them until the next hearing on June 19, 2003.

ADDENDUM: June 19, 2003 At the last meeting the Commission found the proposal inconsistent and sent the attached letter. As of the writing of the staff report no response has been received.

ADDENDUM: July 17, 2003: Nothing has been received since the last meeting.

RECOMMENDATION: July 17, 2003: Staff recommends that the item be taken off calendar.

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT

9:45 A.M.

- C. FV-03-102 – Spint PCS – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations

CASE NUMBER: FV-03-102– Sprint PCS
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PP 17367

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Installation of a 43-foot Monopine Cellular Antenna

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated north of Auld Road, west of Pourroy Road within the County of Riverside, approximately 8,400 ft. northeast of Runway No. 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ),
b. Noise Levels: Outside 55 CNEL for year 2013

MAJOR ISSUES:

Noise: The current CLUP analysis was based upon flight tracks in the 1992-93 period of time. Newer contours indicate that the property is currently outside of the 55db CNEL. While the site currently is not within the 55 CNEL, it is possible that the airport at ultimate capacity will likely generate a 55 or 60 CNEL that will encroach upon some portion of the project. The CLUP indicates the proposed use is a compatible use in the 60 CNEL.

Land Use: The proposal is for the installation of a monopine cellular antenna and utility equipment within a 1,500 ft. enclosed lease area on approximately 15.9 acres. The densities and usages proposed within the TPZ are consistent with the plan. Coverage for the site is less than 1% of the net, which is below the TPZ standard of 50% (gross) or 65% (net).

Height: The highest elevation within the proposed lease area is 1,486 MSL and the tallest structure is 43 feet in height. The runway elevation is 1,330 MSL. Structures exceeding 1,414 MSL feet in elevation require FAA 7460 review. The Part 77 horizontal surface is overlying this area at 1,500 MSL, and the proposed cellular antenna intrudes upon that airspace. According to Section 7.3.3 of the CLUP, the imaginary surfaces defined by the F.A.R. Part 77 maps for the airport shall constitute height limits which shall not be exceeded by structures proposed for development beneath them. The applicant provided the attached Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation dated 11/16/01 for an antenna tower at the proposed location. However, the determination expired 5/16/03, and it appears the determination was not based on the antenna tower currently proposed by the applicant since the height of the proposed structure identified in the determination is 92 feet. Staff has concluded that neither an extension of the FAA determination nor a new FAA determination by the applicant based on the proposed structure height would allow for a consistency recommendation due to the height limits contained in the CLUP.

The applicant has requested a new determination from the FAA on the proposed antenna tower and as of the date of this staff report writing (7/10/03) no response has been received. The applicant has requested a continuance of this item until the August ALUC meeting in order to wait for a new determination from the FAA.

Conclusion: The proposal is inconsistent with the adopted CLUP for French Valley Airport since the proposed antenna tower is an obstruction.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff finds the project inconsistent with the adopted French Valley CLUP.

CONDITIONS OF OVERRIDE: For County utilization

1. Provide Aviation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to development of the project, 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. *The above ground storage of flammable materials is prohibited.*
5. *The Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a Form 7460 review on the proposed structure, unless that agency determines in writing that such a review is not required or not applicable.*
6. *The attached notice shall be given to all potential purchasers and tenants.*

Vice Chairman called for questions from the Commissioners for staff. Hearing no response Vice Chairman Graff opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no response Vice Chairman Graff inquired that even with the FAA review the project would still be considered inconsistent, due to the height. Beverly Coleman responded positively. Vice Chairman Graff then called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Tandy made a motion of inconsistency, subject to staffs recommendations and conditions. Commissioner Pratt seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

*** CONSENT ITEMS**

Keith Downs informed the Commission that the following items staff recommends a finding of consistency. VII.A. RI-03-111, VII.B. RI-03-112, VII. D. MA-03-127, VII.E. MA-03-128, VII.F. MA-03-129, VII.G. FV-03-104, VII.H. HR-03-107, and VII.I. BD-03-107. Item VII.C. CH-03-104 was taken in incorrectly it is not within the influence area of the Chino Airport, therefore staff is recommending the item to be withdrawn with a full refund. Mr. Downs then indicated that the remaining items are recommended for consent unless any of the Commissioners or any one from the audience wishes to speak the item will be pulled and discussed separately. Commissioner Tandy asked for item VII.H. HR-03-107 be pulled. Vice Chairman Graff reiterated the consent items and process indicating that the consent items will be found consistent with staff recommendations and conditions with the exception of item VII.H. HR-03-107.

Representative for item VII.F. MA-03-129, came forward and indicated that there is no problem with the conditions, but has some questions and comments. Vice Chairman Graff pulled item VII.F.MA-03-129 for discussion. Vice Chairman Graff then indicated that the remaining items will be found consistent and opened the floor for any one in the audience wishing to pull any of the remaining items. Hearing no response he called for a motion to be made.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Tandy made a motion of consistency for the consent items. Commissioner Pratt seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Vice Chairman Graff called for a motion to remove item VII.C. CH-03-104 – MDS Consulting from the agenda with a full refund.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Tandy made a motion to remove the item. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

V. NEW BUSINESS

RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

A. RI-03-111 – Rehoboth Charter Academy – Consent item see above

CASE NUMBER: RI-03-111 – Rehoboth Charter Academy
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: CUP P03-0593

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Conditional Use Permit for the installation, at an existing school site, of 7 relocatable classroom buildings and a restroom building to accommodate 280 students and 12 additional classrooms to accommodate 492 students.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated west of Jackson Street, north of Colorado Avenue, within the City of Riverside, approximately 3,600 feet south of Runway 16-34 for Riverside Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport

a. Airport Influence Area: TPZ and OSZ
b. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 3,600 feet south of Runway 16-34 and approximately 5,800 feet south of the west end of Runway 9-27. Most of the site is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE (TPZ) of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area, including*

the area of the proposed improvements. A small portion of the site, an existing recreation field, is located within the OUTER SAFETY ZONE (OSZ). The proposal is to install 7 relocatable

classrooms and 1 restroom unit totaling 7,248 sq. ft. (Phase 1), and 12 additional classrooms totaling 11,520 sq. ft. (Phase 2) at an existing school site. Schools are a ‘discouraged’ use in

the TPZ, but preexisting uses are allowed to expand or be modified. The TPZ has no population limits assigned, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% of the net lot. The structural coverage of the site with the additional improvements will be less than 50% of the net lot area.

Part 77: The highest elevation at the site is approximately 754 MSL feet and the height of the proposed buildings is approximately 9 feet. The horizontal surface elevation is overlying this area at 966 MSL. The elevation of the runway ranges from 758 to 816 MSL. Part 77 obstruction criteria at this project is not a concern.

Noise: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport, but is under or near two flight tracks and will receive significant annoyance from overflying aircraft.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45 decibels or provide a noise level reduction of 25 decibels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
5. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers or tenants.

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

B. RI-03-112 – Michael Chen – Consent item see page 9

CASE NUMBER: RI-03-112-Michael Chen.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside

JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Plot Plan P03-0698

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a 17 unit apartment complex consisting of 18,867 sq. ft. on approximately 1 acre.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 3715 Jefferson Street, south of Magnolia, north of Potomac in the City of Riverside, approximately 7,700 feet southeast of Runway 9-27 for Riverside Municipal Airport.

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

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

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 7,700 feet southeast of Runway 9-27. The proposed site is within the Traffic Pattern Zone of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The project is a 17 unit apartment complex consisting of 18,867 sq. ft. on 1 acre. The TPZ has no population limits assigned, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% of the net lot. The structural coverage of the proposed site will be less than 45% of the net lot area.

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

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 910 MSL and the height of the tallest structure is approximately 17 feet. The site is within the horizontal surface elevation of 966 MSL. The surface of the runway varies from 758 to 816 MSL. Structures exceeding 35 feet in height require FAA 7460 review.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport. (909) 351-6113
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 to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. All lighting plans should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.
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 notice shall be given to all prospective buyers or tenants.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in this staff report.

CHINO AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

C. CH-03-104– MDS Consulting – Consent item see page 8

CASE NUMBER: CH-03-104 – MDS Consulting

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: General Plan Amendment (AG/DEV.R. to 2B) Change of Zone (A-2-5 to R-1) and Tract Map 30820

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

General Plan Amendment (AG/DEV.R. to 2B) Change of Zone (A-2-5 to R-4) and Tract Map 30820 for 71 lots on 20 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated south of Orange Street and east of Summer Ave within the County of Riverside, approximately 13,500 – 14,500 ft. southeast of Runway 26L at Chino Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Chino Airport (County of San Bernardino)
 a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area (Adopted March 2, 2000)
 b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area
 c. Noise Levels: See Below

BACKGROUND:

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

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

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 13,500 –14,500 feet east of Runway 26L. The touch and go flight tracks are overhead to the west as is one flight track.

The 1991 CLUP places the property outside of Safety Zone III but is within the Area of Influence Study Area. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues. The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise, type of aircraft and expected type of

aircraft, FAA criteria or a combination of these factors. With the present configuration of the airport the site will likely end up in the TPZ or an approach category.

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is 613 MSL feet and no structures are proposed at this time. The site is outside the conical surface and in order to exceed obstruction standards a structure would need to exceed approximately 300 feet in height. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project. An instrument approach is near the parcel, and this site can expect overflight from aircraft entering the approaches.

Noise:

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

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

CONDITIONS:

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

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff would recommend approval of this project subject to the conditions noted above. The project can be approved based upon the following, as identified in Section 21675.1 of the California Public Utilities Code (PUC).

1. The ALUC is making substantial progress toward the completion of the Chino Airport Land Use Plan; and
2. There is a reasonable probability that the project will be consistent with the plan; and
3. There is little or no probability of substantial detriment to or interference with the plan, if the project is ultimately inconsistent with the plan.

MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE/MIP

10:00 A.M.

D. MA-03-127– Albert Webb Associates – Consent item see page 8

CASE NUMBER: MA-03-127-Albert Webb Associates
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Tract Map 31361

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a Tract Map to subdivide 30.20 acres into 84 residential lots.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located west of Barton Street and south of Krameria Avenue within the City of Riverside, approximately 17,400 ft. west of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

- a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area 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 subdivision of 30.20 acres into 84 residential lots. The proposed site is located approximately 17,400 ft. west 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 residential land uses. 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 size of the proposed lots range from 10,500 to 15,113 sq. ft., and the structural coverage is unknown. A review of subsequent proposals will be required to determine the lot coverage of the proposed site.

Part 77: The highest pad elevation at the site is 1,753.4 MSL feet and the height of the structures is unknown at this time. The runway elevation at the north end is 1535 MSL. Any structures over 1,709 MSL feet in elevation at this location 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 avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport. (Tel. 909- 656-7000)
2. Subsequent permits for development of the proposed site shall be reviewed by the ALUC unless a subsequent action of the County and the ALUC determines that unnecessary.
3. 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. Structures exceeding 1,709 MSL feet in elevation shall be submitted to the FAA for review.
 5. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers or tenants.

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

E. MA-03-127 – Albert Webb Associates – Consent item see page 8

CASE NUMBER: MA-03-128-Albert Webb Associates
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Tract Map 31362

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a Tract Map to subdivide 45.29 acres into 121 residential lots.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located west of Barton Street and south of Krameria Avenue within the City of Riverside, approximately 18,600 ft. west of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

- a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area 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 subdivision of 45.29 acres into 121 residential lots. The proposed site is located approximately 18,600 ft. west 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 residential land uses. 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 size of the proposed lots range from 10,500 to 18,568 sq. ft., and the structural coverage is unknown. A review of subsequent proposals will be required to determine the lot coverage of the proposed site.

Part 77: The highest pad elevation at the site is 1709.6 MSL feet and the height of the structures is unknown at this time. The runway elevation at the north end is 1535 MSL. Any structures over 1,721 MSL feet in elevation at this location 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 avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport. (Tel. 909- 656-7000)
2. Subsequent permits for development of the proposed site shall be reviewed by the ALUC unless a subsequent action of the County and the ALUC determines that unnecessary.
3. 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. Structures exceeding 1,721 MSL feet in elevation shall be submitted to the FAA for review.
 5. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers or tenants.

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

- D. MA-03-129 – Nick Tavaglione – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations

CASE NUMBER: MA-03-129-Nick Tavaglione
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Planned Residential Development

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a Planned Residential Development for 12 residential lots on approximately 3.6 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 5173 Colina Way, north of Central Avenue, South of Monte Vista Dr. within the City of Riverside, approximately 34,000 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 Realignment: 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 Planned Residential Development for 12 residential lots on approximately 3.6 acres. The proposed site is located approximately 34,000 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 residential land uses. 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 size of the proposed lots range from 8,500 to 14,114 sq. ft., and the structural coverage is unknown. A review of subsequent proposals will be required to determine the lot coverage of the proposed site.

Part 77: The highest elevation at the site is 1131 MSL feet and the height of the structures is unknown at this time. The runway elevation at the north end is 1535 MSL. Any structures over 1,875 MSL feet in elevation at this location will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern with this project.

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

CONDITIONS:

1. Prior to project development or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport. (Tel. 909- 656-7000)
2. Subsequent permits for development of the proposed site shall be reviewed by the ALUC unless a subsequent action of the County and the ALUC determines that unnecessary.
3. 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. *Structures exceeding 1,721 MSL feet in elevation shall be submitted to the FAA for review.*
5. *The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers or tenants.*

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

Vice Chairman Graff called for questions from the Commissioners for staff, hearing no response Vice Chairman Graff requested for the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Nick Tavaglione came forward in response to Vice Chairman Graff's invitation and indicated that he is trying to understand the purpose of the ALUC. Mr. Tavaglione then inquired under what conditions would this project be found inconsistent. Keith Downs responded that if its in a noise area, safety area or the height is to high. Mr. Tavaglione indicated that why is it not possible to designate areas based on the fact that it meets criteria of height and noise restriction that can be put on a map to by pass this procedure. Keith Downs indicated that the local jurisdiction would need to incorporate and adopt the plan to add those maps. It is know that the City of Riverside is in the process of doing that in there General Plan update, once done so people would only need to come to the ALUC when it's a legislative item.

Hearing no further comments Vice Chairman Graff called for any one in the audience wishing to voice there concerns, hearing no response he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Bell made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's recommendations and conditions. Alternate June Stephens seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT

10:00A.M.

- F. FV-03-104 – Fernando Mesquita – Consent item see p.8

CASE NUMBER: FV-03-104 –Fernando Mesquita
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PP 18427

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Plot Plan for two industrial buildings consisting of 24,088 sq. ft. on 1.76 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located east of Sky Canyon Drive, south of Technology Drive in the County of Riverside, approximately 4,000 ft. south of Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)
b. Noise Levels: Outside of 55 CNEL for 2013

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposal is for a Plot Plan for two industrial buildings totaling 24,088 sq. ft. on 1.76 acres. The lot coverage standard for the TPZ is 65% of the net or 50% of the gross. The structural coverage of the site is approximately 31% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the property is 1,271 MSL and the height of each building is 24 ft. The horizontal surface is at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,330 MSL at the south end. Structures exceeding 1,370 MSL in elevation at this location will require FAA 7460 review.

Noise: The site will get significant overflight, but is outside of the current and near future 55 CNEL.

Conclusion: The proposal is consistent with the French Valley Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) and subject to the following conditions of approval:

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, prior to recordation of any map, or issuance of any permit, whichever is first.
2. The attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.
3. No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.
4. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).
5. 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 any operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends a finding of consistency with the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan on this project subject to the conditions of approval noted above.*

HEMET/RYAN AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

G. HR-03-107 – Stephen J. Manfredi – No presentation given

Commissioner Tandy clarified the project location being east of Acacia Ave., and south of Lyon Ave. That was the reason for pulling the item otherwise agrees with staff's recommendations. Vice Chairman Graff called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Tandy made a motion to approve the project with the corrections, subject to staff's recommendations and conditions. Commissioner Pratt seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE NUMBER: HR-03-107-Stephan Manfredi
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Hemet
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Change of Zone 03-7

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A change of zone from CM to M-1.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated between the railroad, Acacia Ave. and east of Lyon Avenue, within the City of Hemet, approximately 9,300 feet east of Runway 5-23 for Hemet/Ryan Airport.

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

- a. *Airport Influence Area: Area III, Area of Moderate Risk*
- b. *Noise Levels: Outside 55CNEL, but subject to annoyance levels*

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: *The proposed site is located approximately 8,000 feet east of Runway 5-23. The site is within Area III (Area of Moderate Risk) of the Hemet-Ryan Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for a zone change from CM to M-1. Area III has no population density limits assigned to it, but requires a discretionary review for certain uses and Legislative items. The proposed use is for storage units.*

NOISE: *The site is near traffic patterns and will experience some occasional annoyance from over flying aircraft. The 1989 plan indicates that the area is outside of the 55CNEL.*

PART 77. The runway elevation is 1,512 MSL. The highest elevation on the site is 1,555 MSL. Structures exceeding 1,592 MSL at this location require FAA Review. The highest structures are 12 feet in height.

CONDITIONS: For the City to Utilize

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the operator of Hemet-Ryan Airport prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. All lighting plans should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.
3. Subsequent permits for proposed development of the site shall be reviewed by the ALUC.
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 notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.
6. Structures exceeding 1,592 MSL feet in elevation shall require FAA 7460 review.

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

BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

- I. BD-03-107 – Charles Martin – Consent item see page 8

CASE NUMBER: BD-03-107 Charles Martin
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PP 18616

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a proposal to develop a 13,074 sq. ft. industrial bldg. with a second story at 26' on a 32,344 sq. ft. parcel.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated at the easterly of Adams St. and south of Country Club Drive in the County of Riverside and immediately adjacent to the east end of Bermuda Dunes Airport.

Adjacent Airport:	Bermuda Dunes Airport
a. Airport Influence Area:	Area I and II
b. Land Use Policy:	Influence Area
c. Noise Levels:	60 to 70 dB CNEL (February 1996 future forecasts)

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 125 feet north of the east end of the runway and is within Areas I and II of the Airport Influence Area. The applicant has submitted a

7460 Notice to Construct to the FAA and a copy of it is enclosed Existing structures and lots of similar size are continuous along the north side of the runway. Most of the site is within the Imaginary Surface or Runway Safety Area and the Plan indicates it to be within AREAS II and I. This precludes the following usages:

1. High concentrations of people
2. Critical Facilities
3. Flammable or Explosive Material

Noise: The proposal is within the 60 to 70 CNEL as indicated in the 1996 Noise Report for the airports (See Exhibit C). Any industrial use is acceptable in that noise category if noise reduction measures are utilized for any office portion of the building. That may require more than normal construction, which only attenuates up to 20dB.

Height: Part 77 approach profiles overlay all of the property. The runway elevation at the east end is 49.1MSL feet. The floor level of the buildings is proposed to be 51MSL feet and the height is 26 feet.

CONDITIONS:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act and prior to recordation of the map, whichever is first.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portion 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 (lights must be downward facing).
4. The following uses are prohibited at this site:
 - A. High Concentration of People
 - (1) Places of Assembly: Auditoriums; churches; schools, carnivals; drive-in theaters.
 - (2) High Patronage Services: Bowling alleys; restaurants; theaters; motels; banks; etc.

- (3) Large Retail Outlets: Department stores; supermarkets; drug stores; etc.
 - (4) Residential Uses.
 - B. Critical Facilities: Telephone exchanges; radio/television studios; hospitals; etc.
 - C. Flammable Products: Bulk fuel storage; gasoline and liquid petroleum service stations; manufacture of plastics; breweries; feed and flour mills; etc.
5. The establishment of new land uses involving, as a primary activity, the manufacture, storage, or distribution of explosives or flammable materials are prohibited in this area.
 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.
 7. Any subsequent permit shall require an ALUC review.
 8. The overall elevation of the structure shall not exceed 77MSL and shall be built in accordance with the submitted plot plan.
 9. The lighting required by the FAA shall be included and operational within five days of construction and on any equipment operating at this height or greater.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend that the Commission find the project consistent with the Bermuda Dunes Airport Land Use Plan.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. Draft Plan Chapter II

Keith Downs informed the Commission that the consultant will attend the next meeting and four to five airport plans will be available. Mr. Downs then indicated that there is still time for amendments on chapter 2 if any of the Commissioners have comments. An exemption clause is not being proposed in that document. Items are being listed according to state law are clearly exempt, a vesting tentative map, a development agreement, final subdivision map, use permit or other discretionary permit that have been approved and not expired. This list will be maintained unless the Commission wishes to add additional items to the list.

B. MOATF Committee June 30th

Keith Downs distributed documentation to the Commission from the meeting of July 14th and gave a brief description of what is enclosed. The MOATG and the cities are understanding that a CLUP is the device to use to protect an airport. The main emphasis is the BRAC, is a base realignment advisory committee. BRAC 2005 is where reconsideration for all across the nations closure, modifications or change assignments for military bases. March airport has gone through two BRACs one in 1990 and the other in 1994, which changed it from an active military base to a joint use base with many organizations. The community wants to retain that base and the effort to do this is to have protective land use controls around there. A CLUP can only be amended once a year per airport. The period of most importance of activity and documentation to the federal government and BRAC committee is about October of this year to October of next year. This is a period when information is coming in and being dispersed to what activity or what trends can be promulgated. Then there is a committee of recommendation and essentially an adoption by congress. The MOTAF meets twice a month the Chairman is Ted Wigland and Vice Chairman is Phil Rizzo.

C. SB 1468

Keith Downs informed the Commission of a law created January 1st that give an overall picture of a heavy emphasis on city and counties to recognize the necessity of the military bases in the state of California. In the past it was optional to create a CLUP as of this year it is now mandatory to create one, which makes it eligible from the state of California. There are other activities that ask the local government to chart the military operations area and transit routes as well as other facilities of importance would need to be shown on a General Plan.

D. Meeting Date

Keith Downs informed the Commission that the Chairman has requested to reconsider the calendar dates. June Stephens indicated that Mr. Stephens prefers to leave it up to the Commission on the changing of the hearing dates, but did not give a suggestion. Commissioner Tandy stated that her schedule is set for the remainder of the year, which would make it difficult. Kathy Rohm suggested waiting till the other members are present to determine what date to change the ALUC hearings. Vice Chairman Graff then indicated making a decision on the next scheduled meeting when the regular members are present. He then called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to postpone the meeting date to the next scheduled meeting of August 21st. Commissioner Pratt seconded the motion.

OPPOSITION: Commissioner Tandy.

E. Brown Act

B.T. Miller distributed documentation and briefed the Commission on the Brown Act. It governs the Commission and requires that the hearings be held in a public forum. It forbids the Commission when the majority is together to talk about a business that falls under the jurisdiction without a notice or agenda being set. A serial meeting is when a Commission member relays information to another member and that 2nd member relates information to a 3rd member about a matter within the jurisdiction, they would be in violation of the Brown Act. A hub meeting prohibits any of the Commissioners to talk independently with one another about matter within the jurisdiction. Also staff would have the same kind of prohibited communications. If there is a violation of the act it

subjects the particular subject matter that has been discussed and the ultimate action of the Commission to be set aside. It also subjects the violator to a misdemeanor of charge.

IX. ORAL COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC ON ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA.

X. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Keith Downs indicated that at the May meeting Commissioner Bell requested drafting a letter for the local jurisdiction on the override of the church on Alessandro. Keith Downs then distributed information to the Commission from the handbook on proper procedure on overruling. Mr. Downs proposed writing a generic letter to all the jurisdictions that are participating and to the ones that are not, describing that if an overruling is going to take place there needs to be true findings not generic findings. Commissioner Tandy inquired if the ALUC receives information when an override will take place. Keith Downs responded negatively and indicated that there is no requirement for the local jurisdiction to do so. B.T. Miller clarified that the Commission is modifying its original motion a couple of meetings ago changing as oppose to directing a letter to Riverside. Drafting a more generic letter as to all the jurisdictions with instructional information concerning the overrides. Keith Downs interjected also requesting that the ALUC receives that information. Vice Chairman Graff called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion for staff to draft a letter of overrides to the local jurisdictions. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Keith Downs indicated that ALUC was in addendum on the EDA's website and when it was improved about a year ago it disappeared. It is more appropriate for the ALUC to have its own website to include the plans, maps and text for access to the public. Keith Downs informed the commission that the website has not yet been applied for, but plans to by tomorrow and the first choice of preference and is available is RCALUC.org, which stands for Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission.

Kathy Rohm inquired about letters sent out to the county and cities indicating for plans come to the ALUC for review. Keith Downs responded that two letters went out in 1998 and another in 2001 when Ed Adkison was chairman.

XI. Adjournment: Vice Chairman Graff adjourned the meeting at 10:32 A.M.
NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: August 21, 2003 at 9:00 a.m., Riverside