

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

Riverside County Administration Center
4080 Lemon St., Hearing Room (1st Floor)
Riverside, California

THURSDAY, October 14, 2004
9:00 A.M.

MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on October 14, 2004 at the Riverside County Administration Center, Board Room.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Ric Stephens, Chairman
Simon Housman
Arthur Butler
Mark Lightsey
Lori Van Ardsdale, Alternate

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Sam Pratt
Dave Hogan, Vice Chairman
Marge Tandy
Jon Goldenbaum

STAFF PRESENT: Keith Downs, Executive Director
Beverly Coleman, Development Specialist III
B.T. Miller, Legal Counsel
Jackeline Gonzalez

OTHERS PRESENT: Mathew Addington
Michael (Last Name unknown)
Diane Jenkins
Ray Borel
Courtney Wood

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Chairman Stephens.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken.
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR: July 15, 2004

July 15, 2004: Keith Downs indicated that at the previous hearing Chairman Stephens, Vice Chairman Hogan and Commissioner Lightsey gave their approval of the minutes. In order for the minutes to pass, approval is need from Commissioners Housman and Butler.

Chairman Stephens called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Housman made a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Butler seconded the minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Housman then indicated having listened to the tapes of the September hearing.

V. OLD BUSINESS

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT 9:00 A.M.

A. FV-04-103 – Zan Marquis – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: FV-04-103- Zan Marquis
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Murrieta
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Parcel Map 32123, GPA, CZ 004-057 and CUP 004-062
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A General Plan Amendment, Change of Zone (from SP265/Business Park, Rural Residential to Regional Commercial, Open Space) and Parcel Map for 454,789 sq. ft. of commercial retail usage on 79 gross acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located east of Briggs Road, west of Winchester Road and south of Thompson Road in the City of Murrieta, from approximately 3,150 to 6,000 ft. north of Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. *Airport Influence Area: Emergency Touchdown Zone (ETZ), Outer Safety Zone (OSZ), Extended Runway Centerline (ERC), and Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)*
b. *Noise Levels: Mostly Outside of 55 CNEL for 2013*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposal is for a commercial retail center, to include retail stores, garden center and restaurants totaling 454,789 sq. ft. along with open space/wetlands on 79 gross acres. Based on information submitted by the applicant, proposed structures are located within the ETZ, OSZ, ERC and TPZ. Structures are prohibited within the ETZ. As shown in the attached Table 7A to the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan, prohibited uses with the OSZ include hotels, restaurants, bars, schools, hospitals, government services, auditoriums and uses involving as the primary activity the manufacture or distribution of explosives or flammable materials. Uses involving the manufacture or distribution of explosives or flammable materials are also prohibited in the ERC, and are a discouraged use in the TPZ. The proposed use is inconsistent with allowed land uses in the ETZ and OSZ.*

Density and Coverage: *Based on information submitted by the applicant, 14 of the 17 parcels on the site are currently proposed for development and have a total area of 46.24 acres. The number of proposed parking spaces is 2,338. The remaining three parcels are shown as open space or vacant. Assuming 1.5 persons per parking space, an average project density of 76 persons per acre is calculated. Using UBC occupancy standards for retail stores and dining areas, an average density of 174 persons per acre is calculated. The maximum population density in the OSZ is 25 persons per acre, and within the ERC, the maximum is 100 persons per acre. The estimated population density for the project exceeds the OSZ standard. There is*

no population density standard for the TPZ. Based on the project site plan, structural coverage within the parcels proposed for development is less than 25% of the net area. This is within the allowable standard for the OSZ, ERC and TPZ. The maximum structural coverage allowed in the OSZ is 25% of the net area. Within the TPZ and ERC the lot coverage standard is 65% of the net or 50% of the gross, whichever is greater. The proposed structural coverage and estimated population density for the project is inconsistent with the ETZ standard since structures are prohibited within the ETZ.

Part 77: Most of the site is located within the 34:1 approach surface, although the northerly end of the site is within the horizontal surface. Over-flying aircraft will be coming in low (200-400AGL) over the runway centerline. Structures exceeding 1,439 MSL at the south end of the site would be an obstruction. The highest elevation on the property is 1,355 MSL and the height of the tallest building is 46 ft. The horizontal surface is at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,347 MSL at the north end. An FAA 7460 review will be required for any structure of a height that would exceed a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway. At a distance of 3,150 ft. from the runway, structures exceeding 1,378 MSL at the south end of the site will require FAA 7460 review.

Noise: The site will get significant over-flight especially with GPS approaches, but is outside of the current 55 CNEL. Most of the site is outside the 55 CNEL contour for 2013.

Draft 2004 ALUCP: The draft plan designates the site to be within Zones B1 and C and shows a large portion of the site within the 55 CNEL contour for 2022. An average density of 76 persons per acre is estimated for the project based on the proposed number of parking spaces. Based on UBC building occupancy standards the estimated average density is 174 persons per acre. The maximum allowable density in Zone B1 is 25 persons per acre. In Zone C, the maximum density is 75 persons per acre. Drive-thru restaurants are a generally incompatible use within Zone B1. According to the attached General Plan Consistency Review for French Valley Airport prepared by Mead and Hunt as part of the draft plan, non-residential uses in Zone B1 and Zone C are a potential conflict with the General Plan designation of Heavy Industrial (M2 and M3) due to the intensity limits within Zones B1 and C.

Other: As of the date of this staff report (10/05/04) the applicant has submitted no new or additional information on this proposal.

Conclusion: As submitted, the proposal is inconsistent with the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). Proposed structures within the ETZ and proposed restaurants within the OSZ do not meet the land use and density standards for these safety zones, and would need to be removed or relocated to meet applicable standards.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of inconsistency with the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP).

CONDITIONS OF OVERRIDE:

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. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. The attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.
4. No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.

5. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).*
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 any operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
7. *Schools, churches and uses involving higher densities of population shall be avoided.*
8. *The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*
9. *Any subsequent permits shall be reviewed by the ALUC.*
10. *An FAA 7460 review shall be completed for any structure of a height that would exceed a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway.*

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners for Staff.

Alternate Van Ardsdale inquired in regards to the allowable usage of restaurants.

Beverly Coleman responded indicating restaurants are prohibited usage in the Outer Safety Zone.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for the applicant to come forward and present the case. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens called for a discussion from the Commissioners, hearing no reply he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Lightsey made a motion of inconsistency, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT

9:00 A.M.

- B. BD-04-107 – Robert H. Ricciardi – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: BD-04-107 – Robert H. Ricciardi

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Plot Plan 19257

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A plot plan for a 8,172 sq. ft. industrial building on .758 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located east of Adams Street, south of Country Club Drive in the County of Riverside, immediately north of the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport
Land Use Policy: Area I and II

- a. Airport Influence Area: Area II
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area
- c. Noise Levels: 70 dB CNEL (2003 Noise Data: Mead and Hunt)

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 100 to 150 feet north of the runway and is within Areas I (Approach Surface) and II (Area of Significant Safety Concern) of the current Airport Influence Area. The Approach Surface shall be kept free of all high-risk land uses, such as places of assembly, high patronage services, large retail outlets, residential uses, critical facilities and flammable products. Agricultural, industrial and commercial uses are acceptable in Area II. The proposed industrial use is an acceptable use subject to certain constraints.

NOISE: The proposal is within 70 CNEL as indicated by the 2003 Existing Noise Impacts Data for Bermuda Dunes Airport prepared by Mead and Hunt. The 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 about 20dB.

HEIGHT: Part 77 approach profiles are shown on the attached exhibit and overlie the property. The runway elevation is 73 feet. The highest elevation on the proposed site is 71.54 MSL at the southwest corner. **The height of the proposed structure is 24 feet. An application for an FAA 7460 review of the proposed building has been submitted by the applicant to the FAA. As of the date of this staff report (10/05/04), an FAA 7460 review has not been received.**

Draft Plan: The draft plan designates the site to be within Zones A and B2 and within the 55 CNEL contour. The proposed use is a compatible use under the draft plan subject to certain constraints.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend that the proposal be continued to November 18, 2004 ALUC meeting in order to receive the FAA 7460 review.

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 buildings in this project shall have an active FAA 7460 review at the time of construction and shall not exceed obstruction standards. Structures shall be lighted as per FAA Advisory Circular 70/7460-1K.*
9. *The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*

Beverly Coleman requested continuance in order to allow the applicant time to provide staff with a 7460 review from the FAA.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners for staff. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens called for the applicant to come forward and present the case, hearing no response he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Alternate Van Ardsdale made a motion for continuance to the next schedule hearing. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE

9:00 A.M.

C. MA-04-142 – Rick Engineering – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-142–Rick Engineering
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Perris
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Tract Map 32793, General Plan Amendment P04-0427 and Change of Zone P04-0428

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A General Plan Amendment, Tract Map and Change of Zone (from CC to R-7) for a 54-unit single family residential Development on 12.8 net acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is north of Nuevo Road, east of Evans Road within the City of Perris, approximately 26,000 feet southeast of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

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

BACKGROUND:

Staff utilized four resources for review:

- 1. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*
- 2. Current Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
- 3. Draft Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004*
- 4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 26,000 ft. southeast of Runway 14/32. The proposal is under or near a major approach and departure track. The proposal consists of a 54-unit single-family residential development on 12.8 net acres. The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II of the 1986 Influence Area Map for March Air Reserve Base. Area II requires a minimum of two and one-half acres for residential lots. The proposed lot sizes range from 7,000 to 7,749 sq. ft. The surrounding property adjacent to the site is primarily vacant or agricultural land. The proposed land use designation would be inconsistent with allowed land uses within Area II.*

Density and Coverage: The average gross density is 4.2 DU/acre. The area of the proposed structures is currently unknown, however, structural coverage is expected to be less than 50% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 1,429 MSL. In order to be an obstruction a structure would need to exceed 2,088 feet. The project is not within Part 77 obstruction review criteria.

Noise: The site has been shown to have significant noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be at 60 CNEL. Previous AICUZ reports indicated the property to be at 70 CNEL.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of inconsistency for the project, subject to the conditions noted below, based on the findings that:

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the 1984 RCALUP
2. The proposal is under or near the flight track

Should the City wish to override the ALUC findings the following conditions should be utilized, and PUC 21670(a) should be followed per the attached information regarding overrides of Airport Land Use Commission decisions.

CONDITIONS OF OVERRIDE:

1. Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an aviation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45 CNEL-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 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 attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners for staff. Hearing no reply Chairman Stephens called for the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Mathew Addington, Rick Engineering came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation and concurred with staff recommendations and Conditions of Override then made him self available for questions.

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

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Lightsey made a motion of Inconsistency, subject to staff conditions of approval and recommendations. Alternate Van Ardsdale seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

REGIONAL

9:00 A.M.

- D. RG-04-100 and BA-04-100, CS-04-100, DC-04-100, FL-04-101, BD-04-108, BL-04-100, CO-04-100, FV-04-107, RI-02-127 and PS-100 – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: RG-04-100 and BA-04-100, CS-04-100, DC-04-100, FL-04-101, BD-04-108, BL-04-100, CO-04-100, FV-04-107, RI-02-127 and PS-100

APPROVING JURISDICTION: *Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

An update to the 1984 Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) and the subsequent Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUP) for public use airports in and affecting Riverside County. Jurisdictions affected are: the cities of Banning, Blythe, Corona, La Quinta, Murrieta, Norco, Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Indio, Coachella, Palm Springs, Riverside, Temecula and the County of Riverside and any special district within those Influence Areas.

PROJECT LOCATION:

All areas within the Draft Airport Influence Areas (see Map Attached). Affected Airports are: Banning, Bermuda, Blythe, Chino, Chiriaco Summit, Corona, Desert Center, Flabob, French Valley and Riverside.

BACKGROUND: *The ALUC contracted with the consulting firm of Mead and Hunt to prepare the ALUCP in June of 2002. The ALUC held a workshop for the plan in March in Indio and Riverside. The consultants have met with the affected airports and land use jurisdictions and obtained each of their general plan and zoning ordinances. Our consultant has reviewed the proposal against each of those plans and the review is attached. Staff has called the affected city planning departments in the last weeks.*

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

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends that; the ALUC continue to take testimony from the jurisdictions and the public, continue to hold the hearing open for any individual airport that the ALUC wishes, and CONTINUE those airports until the next meeting of October 14, 2004, direct staff and the consultant to review any additional responses from the Cities and County, to respond to those comments, prepare resolutions for adoption and prepare the necessary revisions to the general provisions to implement the procedures outlined in the new plan.*

Response to Comments: September 16th *at the Hearing of August 12th there were comments given by a few individuals and some sent in since the hearing. Most of these involve the Initial Study sent out by the Riverside County for their Master Plan for Hemet/Ryan Airport. As you*

know the airport sponsor, such as a city or county, develop these plans and the ALUC reviews them for consistency.

The attached letter has been sent to those senders informing them that they need to direct any further comments to the County. Their specific comments have been forwarded to the County EDA/Aviation.

COMMENT: Mr. William Brelliant, Documents submitted at hearing

RESPONSE: His comments are directed toward the Master Plan. His attorney had been told that earlier (See March 15, 2004 letter G. Salomens). The attached letter was sent to Mr. Brelliant.

COMMENT: City of Riverside letter August 27th asking for continuance until after September 28, 2004.

RESPONSE: The Riverside and Flabob should be continued until October 14, 2004.

COMMENT: Flabob letter received August 17, 2004.

RESPONSE: All Airports were sent a copy of the Staff Report.

October 14, 2004, At the September 16th hearing there were three commenters and a request for a further continuance from the City of Riverside.

COMMENT: Mike Smith from Bermuda Dunes Airport desired some changes to the Influence Area and some zones and stated he would provide those comments to staff.

RESPONSE: No comments were received at this time.

COMMENT: Mr. William Devine an attorney representing the Borel family and Mr. Ray Borel in regards to the Borel Airpark Center requesting additional time to respond to the French Valley Airport.

RESPONSE: The item was continued to October 14th. No further information was received. I have attached the ALUC staff report, Minutes and approval letter from July 18, 1991. Additionally I have included a copy of relevant portions of the County approval from October 4, 1994.

City of Riverside: The City had requested another continuance. We were scheduled for a City Council Workshop for the 28th of September, but staff requested to meet with us in our office instead of the workshop with the City Council.

City of Palm Springs: Staff met with representatives of the City on the 28th of September. We had a productive meeting and expect further comments in the near future.

On October 4, 2004 we received the attached letter from the County Planning Director requesting additional time.

Keith Downs indicated that at the previous meeting the hearing was closed for five of the airports (Banning, Blythe, Chiriaco Summit, Corona and Desert Center). Mr. Downs then clarified the airports that are schedule for hearing and are before the Commission today (Flabob, Bermuda Dunes, French Valley, Riverside and Palm Springs). Four of the airports do not have mapping available at this time; Hemet/Ryan, March Air Reserve Base, Chino and Jacqueline Cochran Regional. At the previous meeting there were

individuals requesting additional time for the Riverside Municipal Airport and staff has met with them including the airport manager. Mr. Devine and Mr. Borel requested continuance at the last meeting for the French Valley Airport. A meeting is schedule for staff to meet with them next week to discuss their interest. Mike Smith manager for the Bermuda Dunes Airport has requested boundary changes, which have been distributed to the Commissioners. A letter requesting a 60 day continuance from Palm Springs was received and copies have been distributed to the Commissioners. Staff recommends continuance for Riverside, French Valley and Palm Springs Airports to the next schedule hearing (November 18th). If the Commissioners choose to expand the Bermuda Dunes Airport's boundaries it would need to be re-advertised. An effort has been made to contact all of the local jurisdictions at this time.

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

Michael Harrod, Riverside County Planning came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation and indicated that a letter was sent requesting continuance until December for Blythe, Bermuda Dunes, Flabob and French Valley airports.

Keith Downs interjected indicating hearing being closed for the Blythe Airport.

Diane Jenkins, City of Riverside, Planning came forward and requested continuance till December as well for Riverside and Flabob airports.

Ray Borel came forward requesting continuance for the French Valley Airport.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for a discussion from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Housman indicated that if an effort was made from Mr. Smith to send his request of the boundary changes in writing and provided mapping, the Commission should consider a continuance for Bermuda Dunes airport as well.

Commissioner Lightsey indicated that as what he can see from the map provided from Mr. Smith the changes would not cause inconsistencies and does not see it necessary for a continuance and re-advertising.

Chairman Stephens inquired to Ken Brody, Mead & Hunt if Mr. Smith had commented these changes to him. Ken Brody responded positively indicating that at the previous hearing Mr. Smith briefly commented his concerned for the changes. In respect to the south side jets tend to fly a wider pattern and it's also the landing area for jet aircraft. The expansion what would be Zone E would expand the area of required real estate disclosure, but would not have any effect on land uses.

Commissioner Housman indicated that the northern expansion area is currently vacant, but rapidly filling in. Mr. Smiths concerned probably is being sued in the future and combating efforts to close the airport due to noise. Commissioner Housman then reiterated continuing the Bermuda Dunes Airport and for staff to do the adequate notice to increase Zone E.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for a motion in regards to Bermuda Dunes Airport.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Housman made a motion to continue the Bermuda Dunes Airport to address the increase in Zone E and for staff to proceed with adequate notices. Alternate Van Ardsdale seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Stephens called for motion in regards to the request for continuance from the City of Riverside and County.

Alternate Van Ardsdale inquired in regards to County's comments. Keith Downs responded that workshops, hearings have been held including letters and disks being sent out and had received no comments.

ACTION TAKEN: Alternate Van Ardsdale made a motion to continue French Valley, Riverside Municipal, Palm Springs and Flabob Airports. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Stephens stated that the County and City try to resolve any concerns by the November hearing.

- E. Resolution of Adoption – 04-01,02,03,04,05 and 06 – Adopting Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans for Banning, Blythe, Corona, Chiriaco Summit and Desert Center Airports and a resolution describing procedures.

Keith Downs indicated that the resolutions for the above mentioned airports are before the Commission for adoption, which include history of each particular airport. Resolution 04-06 is considered a generic resolution indicating that the plans will be used for procedures that go before the Airport Land Use Commission has they are adopted.

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

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Housman made a motion to adopt the resolutions. Alternate Van Ardsdale seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

***CONSENT ITEMS:**

Keith Downs indicated that the consent items would be voted for consistency unless any of the Commissioners or any one from the audience has questions on an item. The item will be pulled and addressed separately, otherwise it will be voted as one and no further discussion will be made.

Mr. Downs then indicated that item MA-04-144 be included in the action, but as a continuance pending FAA review 7460.

Consent items are as follows: HR-04-105 AEI-CASC, HR-04-106 AEI-CASC, MA-04-143 Canyon Springs Marketplace, MA-04-144 Pennacle Real Estate Holdings, Inc.

(Continuance), MA-04-145 March Aviation Gallery, MA-04-146 A&S Engineering, MA-04-147 Canyon Springs Marketplace and BD-04-111 HLDG, LLC.

Chairman Stephens abstained for items HR-04-105 and HR-04-106 and turned it over to Commissioner Butler.

Commissioner Butler called for any questions from the Commissioners for staff. Hearing no response Commissioner Butler opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no response he called for a discussion from the Commissioners, hearing no reply he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Housman made a motion of consistency for the consent items and continuance for the continued item. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion.

ABSTAINED: Chairman Stephens

HEMET RYAN AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

A. HR-04-105 – AEI-CASC Engineering – Consent item see pages 12-13

CASE NUMBER: HR-04-105-AEI-CASC Engineering Inc.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Hemet
JURISDICTION CASE NO: TM 31808

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Tract Map for 380 residential lots along with open space and a detention basin on 95.81 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located north of Mustang Way, east of Warren Road, within the City of Hemet, from approximately 3,300 to 5,000 feet south 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 from approximately 3,300 to 5,000 feet south of the runway. The proposal is for 380 single-family residential lots along with open space and a detention basin on 95.81 acres. The proposed site is within Area III (Area of Moderate Risk) of the Hemet-Ryan Airport Influence Area. Area III has no population density limits assigned to it, but requires a discretionary review for certain uses.*

NOISE: *The site is underlying general approach patterns and will experience 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 1,516 MSL. The maximum height of the proposed structures is not expected to exceed 35 feet. Structures exceeding 1,545 MSL at the north end of the site may require FAA Review. A proposed structure within Area III that exceeds the horizontal surface elevation of 1,662 MSL or a*

proposed structure that extends beyond the conical surface would be an obstruction. Part 77 obstruction criterion is not a concern.

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 would be consistent with the plan.

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

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. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into 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. 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. An analysis of the detention basin shall be submitted to USDA Wildlife Services, and any conditions required by the USDA Wildlife letter shall be accomplished by the project.
6. No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.
7. An FAA 7460 review shall be completed for any structure of a height that would exceed a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway.
8. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.

B. HR-04-106 – AEI-CASC Engineering – Consent item see pages 12-13

CASE NUMBER: HR-04-106-AEI-CASC Engineering Inc.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Hemet

JURISDICTION CASE NO: TM 31807

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Tract Map for 237 residential lots and open space on 58.96 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located north of Mustang Way, east of Warren Road, within the City of Hemet, from approximately 1,600 to 3,300 feet south 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 from approximately 1,600 to 3,300 feet south of the runway. The proposal is for 237 single-family residential lots and open space on 58.96 acres. The proposed site is within Area III (Area of Moderate Risk) of the Hemet-Ryan Airport Influence Area. Area III has no population density limits assigned to it, but requires a discretionary review for certain uses.*

NOISE: *The site is underlying general approach patterns and will experience 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 1,516 MSL. The maximum height of the proposed structures is not expected to exceed 35 feet. Structures exceeding 1,528 MSL at the north end of the site will require FAA Review. A proposed structure within Area III that exceeds the horizontal surface elevation of 1,662 MSL or a proposed structure that extends beyond the conical surface would be an obstruction. Part 77 obstruction criterion is not a concern.*

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 would be consistent with the plan.

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

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. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
- 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. No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.
 6. An FAA 7460 review shall be completed for any structure of a height that would exceed a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway.
 7. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.

MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE

10:00 A.M.

C. MA-04-143 – Canyon Springs Marketplace – Consent item see pages 12-13

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-143-Rod Chisessi
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Amended Project Design Review
(Previous Case MA-03-140)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

An amended project design review for a commercial development of 182,250 sq. ft. on approximately 14.72 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 II
- c. Noise Levels: See Below

BACKGROUND:

The ALUC has been active in protecting the airport from intrusion since the inception of the Commission in the early 1970's. The first AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBILITY 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 efforts were prepared utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

Since we have not adopted the CLUP for MARB, we will utilize four 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

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposal is an amended project design review for a commercial development on approximately 14.72 acres. The amendment consists of changes in the number of proposed structures, and an increase in the total building area from approximately 160,000 sq. ft. to 182,250 sq. ft. 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 II, which allows commercial and industrial land use with 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 182,250 sq. ft. The lot area is approximately 14.72 acres (net). Structural coverage will be less than 40% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation at the site is 1,604 MSL feet and the height of the tallest structure is approximately 39 ft. The runway elevation is 1535 MSL. 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.

D. MA-04-144 – Pinnacle Real Estate Holdings, Inc. – Continued item see pages 12-13

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-144 (revision to MA-02-145) Travel Zone
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: CUP 3370

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Conditional Use Permit for a full service travel stop with retail on approximately 11.5 acres and a sign 70' high.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated south of Cajalco Road and west of Harvill Ave., within the County of Riverside, approximately 9,000 ft. south of the south end of RWY 14/32 March Air Reserve Base.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

- a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area II
- c. Noise Levels: 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 three 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. Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
4. Draft 2004 ALUCP

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 9,000 feet south of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for a Conditional Use Permit on 11.5 acres. The proposed use includes a truck stop with retail. The proposal is near one flight track and within the conical surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B.

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

Density and Coverage: The proposed site is 11.5 acres (net). The proposal includes 31,789 sq. ft of buildings and about 54,000 sq. ft. of canopies on 11.5 acres. The structural coverage for the structure will be less than 22%.

Part 77: The elevation at the site is approximately 1,509-1,525 feet. The height of the tallest building is 22.5 ft. The runway end is at 1488MSL and any structures over 1,578 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. The sign will be over that elevation Part 77 obstruction criteria are 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. Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise level was as high as 60CNEL. The proposed use is not a noise sensitive use.

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. An FAA Part 77 review shall be accomplished and any conditions required shall be met..
3. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
4. The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a continuance until the FAA review is complete.

E. MA-04-145 – March Aviation Gallery – Consent item see pages 12-13

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-145 March Aviation Gallery
APPROVING JURISDICTION: March JPA
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Z04-03

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A rezone of two acres to allow a framing gallery in a former building.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located north of 'N' Ave and east of Riverside Dr., within the March Joint Powers Authority approximately 7,000 ft. east of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

- a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area II
- c. Noise Levels: 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 and subsequent activity.

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 98/99 Draft CLUP effort was prepared utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the superceded 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

We will utilize four 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 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004*
- 4. Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposal is to change the zoning to allow a former mini mart to convert to a art framing shop. This would be at a low density of people per acre on 1.5 acres. The proposed site is located approximately 7,000 ft. east of Runway 14/32. The proposal is not under any major flight track, but is under one that is at a high elevation and is within the inner 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 II, which allows commercial and industrial land uses with discouragement of high-risk land uses'. These are defined on attached APPENDIX B the proposed contains an existing structure. Future land uses designations must be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The lot area is 1.5 acres and the structure is approximately 4,000 sq. ft.

Part 77: The finished floor elevation of the parcels is approximately 1,523 MSL feet and the height of the structures is unknown, but single story. The horizontal surface elevation is 1,685 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,535 MSL at the north end. Any structure exceeding 1,605 MSL needs an FAA 7460 review Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.

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.
 - c. 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.
 - d. 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.
 - e. 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. 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.

F. MA-04-146 – A&S Engineering – Consent item see pages 12-13

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-146 – A&S Engineering
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Plan Check P04-0187

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A 10,350 sq. ft., industrial building on 4.6 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 6400 Fischer Road west of I-215 and south of Rivercrest Dr. within the City of Riverside, approximately 15,000 feet northwest of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

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

BACKGROUND:

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

In 1983 the ALUC redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1979 AICUZ. On April 26 of 1984 the ALUC adopted the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan (RCALUP). In May of 1986 the ALUC again redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1983 AICUZ. In 1992 and again in 1998 the AICUZ reports were redone to reflect the mission changes of the two Base Realignment: However, no changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone adopted 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 1999 effort was an update of the 1994 Draft utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

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

1. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Draft Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004
4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 15,000 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The proposal is under a major approach and departure track. The proposal consists of a 10,350 sq. ft. office and warehouse facility on 4.6 acres. The site is used by an irrigation company. The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft expected to use the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area I. Industrial uses are allowed in Area I subject to certain constraints.

Density and Coverage: The area of the proposed structure is 10,350 sq. ft. and the lot area is 205,268 sq. ft. The structural coverage is 5% of the gross lot area.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 1,539 MSL feet and the height of the proposed structure is approximately 28.5ft. The runway elevation at the north end is 1,535 MSL. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 1,888 MSL feet in elevation. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be within 55 CNEL. Previous AICUZ reports indicated the property to be at 65 CNEL.

CONDITIONS:

1. Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an aviation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any office portions of the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Lighting plans for any additional development shall be reviewed and approved by an airport lighting consultant or MARB/MIP prior to placement.
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. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.

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

G. MA-04-147 – Cayon Springs Marketplace – Consent item see pages 12-13

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-147- Rod Chisessi
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Specific Plan Amendment
(Related Case MA-04-143)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Specific Plan Amendment for a freeway-oriented sign and three on-site signs at a proposed 182,250 sq. ft. commercial development on approximately 14.72 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 II
- c. Noise Levels: See Below

BACKGROUND:

The ALUC has been active in protecting the airport from intrusion since the inception of the Commission in the early 1970's. The first AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBILITY 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 efforts were prepared utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

Since we have not adopted the CLUP for MARB, we will utilize four 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

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposal is a Specific Plan Amendment for a freeway-oriented sign and three on-site signs at a proposed 182,250 sq. ft. commercial development (see related case MA-04-143) on approximately 14.72 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 II, which allows commercial and industrial land use with few restrictions. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property outside of the 60 CNEL. The proposed land use would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Part 77: The highest elevation at the site is 1,604 MSL feet and the height of the tallest sign is approximately 75 ft. The runway elevation is 1535 MSL. 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 aviation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport. (Tel. 909- 656-7000)
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures into the building construction to ensure that all light is below the horizontal plane.
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 1,685 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.

BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

H. BD-04-111 – HLDG, LLC – Consent item see pages 12-13

CASE NUMBER: BD-04-111 – HDLG.LLC Voluntary Review
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PP 19548

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a Plot Plan for 8,000 sq. ft. of retail on 1 acre.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located on the north side of Varner Road west of Washington Street in the County of Riverside, approximately 6,600 ft. northwest 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: Inside 60 dB CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: The proposal is for retail located approximately 6,600 feet northwest 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 8,000 sq. ft. and the lot area is approximately 1 acre (net). Structural coverage will be less than 20% of the net area. The proposed use is an acceptable use, contingent upon noise and height issues.

NOISE: The site will be subject to aircraft noise of some annoyance. The entire site is inside of the 55 CNEL according to the current noise study.

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

PART 77: The highest elevation at the site is 98 MSL and the height of the tallest structure is approximately 30 ft. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. At a distance of 6,600 ft. from the runway, proposed structures exceeding 139 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 property purchaser or tenant.
5. The applicant shall complete an FAA 7460 review for all structures over 139 MSL in height prior to building permits and implement any conditions required.

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

DRAFT ALUP: The tentative draft plan designates the area as Zone C and certain use would be prohibited and some discouraged. The existing and future contours for the airport place the site within the 55 CNEL.

JACQUELINE COCHRAN REGIONAL AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

I. TH-04-101 – Master Plan for Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport

Generally bounded by Airport Blvd., Harrison Street, Polk Street and 60th Avenue. The Master Plan is intended to provide a guide for the future of the airport facilities. The draft plan was prepared in accordance with FAA guidelines for such plans. As such, it will provide a basis for any changes and amendments to the adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

Keith Downs indicated that a copy of the Master Plan has been distributed to the Commissioners. Mr. Downs referred to an exhibit indicating that the only significant change is a deletion of a runway. The Master Plan was advertised in the local papers The Press Enterprise and The Desert Sun. The environmental assessment was also advertised and sent out, no comments were received.

Staff recommends that ALUC continues to review the appropriate items within the established CLUP until adoption. Amend the CLUP with the current effort to delete the third runway and prepare additional forecast and noise contours at or greater reasonable capacity to be developed, base upon the findings that the Master Plan will not result in greater noise and safety impacts upon surrounding land uses shown on the 1990 Plan.

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

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Housman made a motion to approved staff recommendations mentioned above. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. ALUCP Update

Jacqueline Cochran Master Plan will go before the Board of Supervisors. Immediately after the ALUCP will become available for this airport. Hemet/Ryan has had numerous requests including the City of Hemet and Mr. Brilliant who testified before the Commission for an EIR. Chino Airport is addressing an Environmental issue with species at the end of the runway.

Additional funding was received, but funding is expected to run out by December.

B. MARB Status

March JPA's Plan is on a separate budget and is expected to come before the Commission within six months.

C. Ontario Airport Master Plan

Staff attended the Ontario Airport Master Plan scoping session. Information with diagrams has been distributed to the Commissioners.

D. Calendar 2005

Keith Downs indicated that the calendar needs approval and adoption from the Commissioners.

Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners, hearing no response he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Lightsey made a motion to approve the calendar for 2005. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- 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 10:35 A.M.
NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: November 18, 2004 at 9:00 a.m.,
Riverside.