

# AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

Riverside County Administration Center  
4080 Lemon St., Board Chambers (1<sup>st</sup> Floor)  
Riverside, California

**THURSDAY, September 15, 2005**  
**9:00 A.M.**

## MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on September 15, 2005 at the Riverside County Administration Center, Board Chambers.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Simon Housman, Chairman  
Jon Goldenbaum  
Dave Hogan  
Mark Lightsey  
Arthur Butler  
Rod Ballance

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Charles Washington  
Lori Van Ardsdale, Vice Chairman

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Robert Bahen  
Kathleen Peach  
Lester Joslin  
Cindy Roth  
Larry Markham  
Mark Kranenburg  
Ben Parry  
Mathew Addington  
John Guerin  
Emily Hemphill  
Mike Monteleone

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chairman Housman.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken.
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR: June 9, 2005 and August 11, 2005

June 9, 2005: Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners.

Chairman Housman indicated corrections to be made on pages 5, and 28.

Hearing no further corrections Chairman Housman called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Butler made a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion.

August 11, 2005: Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners

B.T. Miller indicated a correction to be made on page 21. Chairman Housman indicated a correction to be made on page 20.

Hearing no further corrections Chairman Housman called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Hogan made a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion.

**ABSTAINED:** Chairman Housman

**\*CONSENT ITEMS:**

Keith Downs opened the consent items schedule for 9:00 a.m.

Keith Downs indicated the consent items as well as continued items would be voted for consistency/continuance 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.

Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners for the consent items; BD-05-113, CH-05-101, FV-05-109, MA-05-124, MA-05-126, MA-05-127, MA-05-128, MA-05-129, MA-05-130 and for the continued items; BD-05-106. Chairman Housman pulled item BD-05-106 to be addressed separately.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no reply he called for a motion to be set on the consent items.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Hogan made a motion of consistency for the consent items, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

V. OLD BUSINESS

**BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

- A. BD-05-106 Robert Ricciardi Architect – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** BD-05-106 – Robert Ricciardi, Architect  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Plot Plan 19953

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project is a plot plan for a 7,740 sq. ft. industrial building on approximately .75 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located south of Country Club Drive, west of 42<sup>nd</sup> Street in the County of Riverside, approximately 100 to 150 ft. north of Runway 10-28 at the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport

Land Use Policy:	RCALUCP (Adopted Dec. 2004)
a. Airport Influence Area:	Zone A and B2, within the approach surface
b. Noise Levels:	Inside 70 dB CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposal is a plot plan for an industrial building/sheet metal fabrication plant consisting of 7,740 sq. ft. on .75 acres. The proposal is within Zones A and B2. Zone A allows no obstructions, however, the building is placed away from the runway. The proposal is consistent with allowed uses within Zones A and B2 subject to noise and height restrictions.

NOISE: The proposal is within 70 CNEL as indicated by the 2003 Existing Noise Impacts Data for Bermuda Dunes Airport. 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.

PART 77: Part 77 approach profiles overlie the property. The highest elevation at the site is approximately 52.4 MSL. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. Structures exceeding 70 feet in height or of a height exceeding a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway require FAA review. The height of the structure is 24 ft. 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 (09/07/05), the applicant's response from the FAA has not been received by staff.**

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff would recommend that the proposal be continued to the October 13, 2005 ALUC meeting in order to receive the FAA 7460 review.

**CONDITIONS:**

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.*

Chairman Housman indicated item has been continued several time waiting for an FAA determination. Chairman Housman inquired if there is something that could be done to facilitate a review from the FAA or could the Commission move without a response from the FAA.

Keith Downs responded that Beverly Coleman has made significant efforts to Mr. Ricciardi and the FAA to obtain a response. Beverly Coleman indicated the applicant has submitted a 7460 review and at this point it appears to be a late response from the FAA. Prior to the last meeting the applicant had informed staff they would be obtaining a response from the FAA within a week. It has been approximately four weeks and a response has not yet been obtained. Chairman Housman voiced his concerned on having an item on the agenda for many months. Chairman Hosman indicated for staff to communicate with the applicant, at the next meeting an action would need to be made on the item, to be taken off calendar or approve without a response from the FAA if possible.

Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners, hearing no response Chairman Housman called for a motion to be made.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Chairman Housman made a motion for continuance to the next scheduled meeting. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**B. BD-05-113 – Design Build Structures Inc. – Consent item see page 2**

**CASE NUMBER:** BD-05-113 –Design Build Structures  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Change of Zone 7156 and Plot Plan 20519

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*The project is a Change of Zone from Residential to Manufacturing and a Plot Plan for a 13,171 sq. ft. industrial/service building on approximately 2 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located north 41st Street and west of Adams Street in the County of Riverside, approximately 1,800 ft. west of Runway 10-28 at the Bermuda Dunes Airport.*

Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport

Land Use Policy: RCALUCP (Adopted Dec. 2004)

a. Airport Influence Area: Zone B-1 within the approach surface

b. Noise Levels: Inside 60 dB CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposal is a Plot Plan for an industrial/plumbing building consisting of 13,171 sq. ft. on 2 acres. There are 36 parking spaces allowing a density of 27 per acre. With the 13,171 sq. at 45% office and 55 % warehouse the density will be 16 people per acre. Both are not within the B-1 density of 25 per acre, the average of the two is 22. The Change of Zone from residential to industrial is Consistent with the ALUCP since the residential lot minimum for Zone B-1 is 20 acres. The proposal is inconsistent with allowed density use within B-1 subject to noise and height restrictions

NOISE: The proposal is within 60 CNEL as indicated by Noise Impacts Data for Bermuda Dunes Airport. The industrial use is acceptable in that noise category if noise reduction measures are utilized for any office portion of the building.

PART 77: Part 77 approach profiles overlie the property. The highest elevation at the site is approximately 85 MSL. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. Structures exceeding 35 feet in height or of a height exceeding a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway require FAA review. The height of the structure is 20 ft. An FAA 7460 review of the proposed building has been completed by the FAA with a finding of No Hazard.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff would recommend that the proposal be found Consistent with the ALUCP.

**CONDITIONS:**

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. No children's schools, day care centers, libraries, hospitals, nursing homes, hazards to flight places of worship, aboveground storage of hazardous materials, critical community infrastructure facilities or outdoor highly noise sensitive activities shall be allowed.

**MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE**

**9:00 A.M.**

- C. MA-05-118 – Transcan Development – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-05-118 Transcan Development (Part of MA-03-122)  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** P05-0613

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A Conditional Use Permit to add a 50,112 sq. ft. restaurant and entertainment center on 5.1 net acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is south of SR 60, east of I-215 north of March Air Reserve Base/MIP.

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.

The countywide effort we have completed for the balance of the airports, but do not include an update to the Airport, but that effort has been imitated by the March JPA for this airport.

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

- 1. The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986

2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Adopted 2004 ALUCP
4. Noise Data from the A.I.C.U.Z. Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 16,000 –16,500 feet north of the north end of Runway 14-32. The proposal consists of a specialty restaurant and attendant uses such as bowling alley, arcade, carousel and amusement rides and individual party rooms. The proposal is near the primary departure track and is within the outer horizontal surface. The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, and noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II, which allows limited commercial, industrial and agriculture. 1984 RCALUP: The 1984 RCALUP with the 1986 map identifies the entire project as within AREA II. Area II, Policy #2 states: "Area II shall have a minimum residential lot size of two and one-half acres. Agricultural, industrial and commercial uses are acceptable."

Density and Coverage: The project is part of a much larger center that was reviewed under MA-03-122 (see attached staff report). The original application had apartments and a theatre associated with the project and was recommended for inconsistency based upon the residential use density and noise sensitivity of the theatres. These were removed and the Commission found the balance of the project consistent. The attached analysis indicates the proponent's estimate of the occupancy load for the various uses and the parking committed to the site. Using the parking of 319 spaces and a factor of 1.5 the occupancy would be approximately 480, but a load factor for the vehicles should be higher for this use and a factor of 2.5-3/vehicle would be more appropriate. This would result in occupancy of roughly 1,000 people. Using the occupancy from the proponent of 2,452 people, it would be approximately 480 people/acre. This use would be considered a HIGH RISK LAND USE as shown on Exhibit B of the current plan. These uses are precluded from Area I, but are not specifically inconsistent with Area II. With the recently adopted ALUCP this use would be allowed in the Countywide Zone E and possibly Zone D.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is between 1,545 and 1,598 MSL feet and the maximum allowed building height is 45 feet. None of the project is within Part 77 obstruction criteria of the outer horizontal surface elevation of 1,888 MSL. The highest structure on the entire commercial site is 93 feet on a pad elevation of 1568.5 for high point of 1,662 MSL. Being approximately 16,500 feet from the runway end point anything exceeding 1,700 MSL would need a 7460 review. Part 77 height issues are not a concern.

Noise: The site has been shown to have varying noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1986 Map covered most of the property with 65 CNEL and the balance would have been within the 60 CNEL 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be below 55 CNEL. The project would not be considered a noise sensitive use.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the ALUC CONTINUE this until September 15<sup>th</sup> to obtain responses regarding this proposed use from the March JPA's, March ARB and Caltrans:

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.

2. *Lighting shall be reviewed and approved by an Airport Lighting Consultant/or the airport operator prior to placement.*
3. *No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.*
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 explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*
6. *The attached NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*
7. *The usage of helium filled balloons shall be controlled so that none are released to the outside.*

**APPENDIX: August 11, 2005** *This item was continued to obtain response from the March JPA, MARB and Caltrans. As of the date of the staff report July 29<sup>th</sup> none of these had been received.*

**Appendix: September 15, 2005:** *The attached letter dated August 5<sup>th</sup> was received from the March JPA and recommends a finding of inconsistency.*

Keith Downs indicated the item was continued last meeting awaiting a response from March JPA, which has been obtained and a copy was included in the staff report.

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

Commissioner Ballance inquired on the bowling alley portion of the project not being occupied at all time skewing the occupancy projection. Mr. Downs responded negatively indicating it isn't taking up much space. Commissioner Ballance inquired on the data of the update for the March CLUP. Mr. Downs responded the information is not complete making it inappropriate to use the data at this point.

Hearing no further questions Chairman Housman called for the applicant to come forward and present the case.



Robert Bahen, Transcan Development came forward in response to Chairman Housman's invitation in opposition of the density load factors stated in the staff report. Mr. Bahen referred to staff's exhibit where it shows the project site being in the influence area, but not in the flight path. Mr. Bahen indicated having summer and winter charts showing the project being miles from any proposed flight tracks for the March Air Reserve Base and distributed them to the Commission. Commissioner Goldenbaum inquired where the flight tracks were obtained from. Mr. Bahen responded from the March JPA. Mr. Bahen then indicated the development over all being 7,040 sq. ft. of retail and 144,000 sq. ft. of office. A theater and an apartment complex were removed from a previous proposal in support of the March Air Reserve Base costing ten million dollars. Mr. Bahen then indicated he continues to support March Air Reserve Base and the County of Riverside, but cannot continue to keep getting harmed economically. There is a lot of retail zoning in the area of equal density.

Kathleen Peach, President of the east Hills Division of the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce came forward and voiced her support of Transcan Development's proposal.

Lester Joslin, Riverside Chamber of Commerce, current Chairman of the Military affairs Committee came forward and voiced his support for the proposed project.

Cindy Roth, Riverside Chamber of Commerce, came forward and also voiced her support for the project. Ms. Roth indicated having met with Phil Rizzo, March JPA after the letter had been issued to the ALUC. Ms. Roth and Mr. Rizzo reviewed the flight tracks which show consistency with the project. Mr. Rizzo indicated to Ms. Roth the action needs to be based on the plan currently in place. At this point is a matter of timing and should the new CLUP been in place the letter would not had been issued.

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

Commissioner Goldenbaum requested a visual of the project relating to the flight tracks. Keith Downs illustrated the project being approximately three miles from the runway, but less than 4,500 feet from the predominant area of the flight tracks. Commissioner Goldenbaum inquired on approach tracks. Ken Brody, Mead & Hunt consultant for the update of the March plan indicated the information provided is what has been obtained in regards to the flight tracks. The predominant flow at the March Air Reserve Base is from south to north with very few arrivals.

Chairman Housman inquired if the item could be continued till the Land Use Plan is completed. Keith Downs responded a letter was received requesting an action be determined at today's meeting. Chairman Housman inquired on the type of project found consistent by the Commission in the proposed area in the pass. Keith Downs indicated it was found consistent for a major retail center. Chairman Housman inquired based on an entertainment center as distinguished from a retailer causes a larger occupancy making the proposal inconsistent. Mr. Downs responded positively, based on the numbers provided by the applicant 2,500 people making it 500 per acre resulting in very high density. Chairman Housman voiced his concerned with the method of calculation of the project as standing alone. Commissioner Lightsey interjected giving

an example of a church on a commercial complex previously reviewed for density as a one unit not the entire complex. Staff's calculation of density is based on the proposal as a one unit not based on the entire project. Commissioner Goldenbaum indicated the charter of the Commission is to review projects based on the land use of the airports and nothing more.

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Lightsey made a motion of inconsistency. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion.

**OPPOSITION:** Chairman Housman, Commissioners Ballance, Hogan and Butler

**MOTION FAILED:**

Chairman Housman called for another motion to take place.

Commissioner Ballance made a motion of consistency base on the data presented today.

B.T. Miller interjected indicated the charter of the Commission is to apply the existing plan with the proposal. The Commission does not have jurisdiction to depart from the plan. The Commission could consider the data presented, but would need to provide justifications and findings on why their departing from the plan. B.T. Miller then indicated there is not sufficient evidence to allow the Commission to depart from the existing plan. A discussion ensued between Chairman Housman, B.T. Miller and Keith Downs in regards to the infill policy found in the County Wide Policy. Mr. Downs indicated the infill policy does not apply to the current plan for the March Air Reserve Base. Mr. Downs then indicated if the Commission is unable to obtain 4 votes or chooses not to take action the project is found consistent by default making it the local jurisdiction's decision.

Chairman Housman called for a motion to be made of no action taken.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Ballance made a motion of no action taken by the Commission. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion.

**MOTION PASSED**

**OPPOSITION:** Commissioner Goldenbaum and Commissioner Lightsey.

**RIVERSIDE COUNTY**

**9:00 A.M.**

D. Request from Riverside County – Keith Downs presented the case

**CASE SUMMARY:** *County request for countywide amendment*

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** *County letter (May 6, 2005 received May 24, 2005) requesting amendment to adopted plan*

**BACKGROUND:** At the meeting of June 9<sup>th</sup> the Commission was asked by the County of Riverside to consider an amendment to the ALUCP's County-wide policies. The amendment would allow specific plan, tracts, parcel maps or plot plans that were approved prior to the adoption of the ALUCP's County-wide policies to be consistent with the plan if the project's conditions were satisfied and was not within zones A or B-1.

Existing Land Uses: Our adopted plan already defines approved tracts, parcel maps and plot plans as existing land uses and therefore this clause is unneeded for those types of permits.

Countywide policy: Staff has examined all of the airports for this proposal and can see no need for this clause to apply to Banning, Bermuda Dunes, Blythe, Chiriaco Summit, Corona, Desert Center, Flabob, Riverside and Palm Springs. This is because either the County has no jurisdiction or because there are no Specific Plans that are either within the Influence Area or affected by the ALUCP. The Chino, Hemet Ryan and March plans are not completed, but are unlikely to have the issues which the proposed amendment seeks to address. As the representative of the County stated, this leaves only French Valley and Jacqueline Cochran as the two airfields where the language would have any effect. In conclusion, there is no need to change the ALUCP's County-wide policies affecting all airports when the proposed amendment holds practical implication for only two airfields.

Exemption clause: Additionally, the proposed amendment would have the same effect as the "exemption clause" contained in the prior French Valley CLUP which the Attorney General has opined was inappropriate.

Other: At the last meeting, John Guerin from County Planning outlined that further comments and requests will be coming from the county at some time in the near future. If the Commission is interested in pursuing any such amendment to the ALUCP, then staff would recommend that it relate only the French Valley and Jacqueline Cochran airports and with a narrow intent that will not compromise the public safety purpose of the other adopted plans.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that: 1) that any action by the Commission on the proposed amendment awaits the County's further actions relative to the ALUCP; and 2) if the Commission wants to adopt the proposed amendment, that it apply only to French Valley and Jacqueline Cochran airports.

**ADDENDUM September 15, 2005:** As of the writing of this staff report, not further information has been received from the County representatives. Staff recommends that since the item is not an advertised activity that it is taken off calendar until there is additional response from the county.

Attachments: May 6<sup>th</sup> letter received May 24<sup>th</sup>

Keith Downs indicated staff's finding was for the item to be taken off calendar due to no information being received. A verbal discussion was made from Mr. Guerin who indicated the intent to submit information by the end of the month; therefore staff recommends a continuance on the item.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners, hearing no reply Chairman Housman called for John Guerin to come forward and present the case.

John Guerin, Riverside County Planning came forward in response to Chairman Housman's invitation. Mr. Guerin indicated the planning staff is currently reviewing the

Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) policies for an amendment for French Valley, Bermuda Dunes, Flabob and Blythe and those amendments will be presented at the next meeting. Commissioner Hogan inquired if planning is proposing to change the airport plan to match the General Plan or to make changes to the General Plan. Mr. Guerin responded it is likely changes would be made to the County General Plan as a result of an amendment.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called Emily Hemphill to come forward.

Emily Hemphill, Attorney representing Kohl Ranch, came forward in response to Chairman Housman's invitation. Ms. Hemphill indicated being before the Commission in regards to the Kohl Ranch project south of Jacqueline Cochran Airport. Ms. Hemphill distributed an analysis previously requested by the Commission of the impact the new Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) would be to Kohl Ranch.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for Mike Monteleone to come forward.

Mike Monteleone came forward in response to Chairman Housman's invitation and requested Larry Markham to come forward. Mr. Markham representing Mr. Monteleone requested review of Mr. Guerin's proposed changes specifically to the north end of the French Valley Airport for verification the entitlements, such as Specific Plans, Plot Plans, Conditional Use Permits with previous approvals exclusively other non residential approvals will remain consistent.

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

Commissioner Goldenbaum indicated the Riverside County Planning Commission will be holding a hearing on September 28, 2005, regarding a project proposed by Master Craft Homes in the influence area of the Flabob Airport previously reviewed by the ALUC. Master Craft Homes will be seeking approval for 92 medium density residential homes, 9 single family homes on 2.5 acre lots immediately adjacent to the south boundary of the airport. In viewing the County's website there is very little information of the project ever coming to the ALUC or it's adjacent to an airport, also with a reference of the project being approved. Commissioner Goldenbaum then indicated in March, 2004 the project was reviewed by the ALUC and continued for several months awaiting comments from Caltrans. In June, 2004 the project was found inconsistent with the 1984 plan and the 2004 draft compatibility plan for reasons of noise and density issues. Months prior the developer and the airport worked together independently to compromise on a project that would suit both parties. Flabob Airport proposed the 9 homes be developed into an airport community with taxiway access. The intent was to obtain an airport friendly community that would protect the encroachment of the other homes onto the airport. At the time the 2004 draft compatibility plan would also find the compromise inconsistent. ALUC review the proposal along with the compatibility plan and crafted that particular exception into the Flabob Compatibility Plan.

In December, 2004 the developer came before the Commission withdrawing the taxiway along with the airport homes. Mr. Lyon, Flabob Airport representative also withdrew his

support for the project. The ALUC then reverted back to the original draft compatibility plan without the exception and found the project inconsistent. Commissioner Goldenbaum then inquired how the County Planning Commission is going forward without the Board of Supervisors override. Keith Downs responded the staff at the County should be requesting an override if that's the direction they wish to go. A copy of the ALUC's determination could be sent to County Planning reiterating the process to be taken for overruling.

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Hogan made a motion of continuance to the next schedule hearing. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**BY LAWS**

9:00 A.M.

E. Commission By Laws – Keith Downs presented the By Laws

**CASE NUMBER:** RG-05-102 Proposed Bylaws

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*An update of the current 1998 Rules for the Airport Land Use Commission Airports affected are: Banning Municipal, Chino, Bermuda Dunes, Blythe, Chiriaco Summit, Corona Municipal, Desert Center, Jacqueline Cochran Regional, Flabob, French Valley, Hemet/Ryan, MARB/MIP, Palm Springs, Perris Valley, Riverside Municipal and Skylark Airports.*

**BACKGROUND:** *We contracted with our consultant to review the current Rules and this proposal is attached. Staff and Counsel have reviewed the proposal, but need to ascertain the affect they have on the remaining unfinished updated airports (Chino, MARB, and Hemet Ryan). These were continued in order for our outside counsel to review them for any changes needed related to the filing of the complaint.*

**RECOMMENDATION:** *Staff recommends that the Commission and counsel review the proposed bylaws and continue them until the next meeting of August 11 in order to clearly ascertain the effect upon the remaining CLUPs and the Chino Interim Influence Area.*

**Addendum:** **September 15:** *Our legal consultant has reviewed the item and has a few comments.*

*Attachments: Proposed Bylaws with June changes  
Current Rules  
Commissioner Hogan's comments*

Keith Downs indicated all modifications have been made to the By Laws and the Commissioners could recommend additional changes or move for staff to come back with a resolution for adoption.

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

Commissioner Hogan inquired if prior comments made by the Commission have been incorporated into the By Laws. Keith Downs responded positively.

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Hogan made a motion for staff to comeback with a resolution for adoption. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

**CHINO AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

A. CH-05-101 – D.R. Horton – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** CH-05-101 – D. R. Horton

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside

**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Tract Map 32491

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Tract Map for 174 single-family residential lots on approximately 55.6 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is north of Schleisman Avenue and west of Archibald Ave., within the County of Riverside, approximately 9,000-9,600 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*

*b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area*

*c. Noise Levels: See Below*

**BACKGROUND:**

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

- 1. The San Bernardino CLUP for Chino Airport, 1991*
- 2. The Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan: 1984*
- 3. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
- 4. Draft 2004 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 5,000-6,000 feet southeast of Runway 26L. The touch and go flight tracks are overhead to the east and other approaches are northerly of this site*

*The 1991 CLUP places the property within Safety Zone III, in 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. The density of the project is between 3.1-3.6 dwellings per acre and would be allowed in the 'E' Zone.

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 620 MSL feet. The runway elevation is 635 MSL at the east end of the runway. The site is outside the approach surface and in order to exceed obstruction standards a structure would need to exceed approximately 170 feet in height. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern with this project

Noise:

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

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

**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. 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 regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends a finding of consistency 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.*

**FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

A. FV-05-109 – MRC Development – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** FV-05-109 – MRC Development  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Plot Plan

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A retail center consisting of approximately 280,872 sq. ft. on 28.7 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located at the northeast corner and southeast corner of Winchester Road and Thompson Road within the County of Riverside, from approximately 5,400 to 6,500 feet northeast of the runway at French Valley Airport.*

**LAND USE PLAN:**

*Adjacent Airport: French Valley Airport  
a. Airport Influence Area: Zone C, D and B1  
b. Noise Levels: Outside 55CNEL*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE AND DENSITY: *The proposed site is located from approximately 5,400 to 6,000 feet northeast of the runway. The proposal is for a retail center consisting of approximately 280,872 sq. ft. on 28.7 acres.*

*Most of the proposed site and major retail buildings are located within Zone C. The easterly portion of the site and 6 -8 small retail buildings are located within Zone D. A small portion of the site at the southwest end is located within Zone B1. Zone C allows up to 80% lot coverage and a maximum average density of 75 persons per acre, with allowable clustering on a single acre of up to 150 persons. Zone D allows up to 90% lot coverage and an average density of 100 persons per acre, with allowable clustering on a single acre of up to 300 persons. Zone B1 allows up to 70% lot coverage and an average density of up to 25 persons per acre, with allowable clustering on a single acre of up to 50 persons. The proposed maximum density for the entire site is 80.8 persons per acre. Based on the proposed building layout within the safety zones, the proposed density and use is acceptable subject to noise, safety and height issues.*

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



PART 77. The highest elevation of any structure or terrain on the site is 1,421 MSL and the runway elevation is 1347 MSL. FAA 7460 review is required for structures exceeding a height of 35 ft. in Zone B1, 70 ft. in Zones C and D, or a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway.

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

**CONDITIONS:** For the County to Utilize

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the operator of French Valley 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.
3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
4. Children's schools, day care centers, libraries, hospitals, and nursing homes are prohibited in Zones B1 and C. Additional prohibited uses in Zone B1 include places of worship and above ground storage of flammable materials.
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 the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
6. Structures exceeding a height of 35ft. in Zone B1, 70 ft. in Zones C and D, or a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway require FAA 7460 review.
7. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.

**RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

- B. RI-05-127 – Riverside Commercial Investor's Inc. – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-05-127- Riverside Commercial Investor's, Inc.  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Conditional Use Permit P05-0922, 23 and 24

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

An industrial office complex consisting of approximately 170,000 sq. ft. on 11.6 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located at the northeast and northwest corner of Arlington Avenue and Airport Drive within the City of Riverside, approximately 700 - 800 ft. southeast of Runway 16-34 at Riverside Municipal Airport.

**LAND USE PLAN:**

Adjacent Airport:	Riverside Municipal Airport
a. Airport Influence Area:	Zones C, D and B1
b. Noise Levels:	Inside 55CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposed site is located approximately 700 - 800 feet southeast of Runway 16-34 and 1,900 ft. south of Runway 9-27. The proposal is for an industrial office complex consisting of approximately 170,000 sq. ft. on 11.8 acres. Based on information provided by the applicant, the maximum number of persons on the site is expected to be 500, or 43 persons per acre. The proposed site is within Zones C, D and B1. Zone C allows up to 80% lot coverage and an average density of up to 75 persons per acre, with allowable clustering on a single acre of up to 150 persons. Zone D allows up to 90% lot coverage and an average density of 100 persons per acre, with allowable clustering on a single acre of up to 300 persons. Zone B1 allows up to 70% lot coverage and an average density of up to 25 persons per acre, with allowable clustering on a single acre of up to 50 persons. Based on the building layout, Building 12 and a portion of Buildings 9, 10, 11, and 13 appear to fall within Zone B1. Upon review of the square footage of the buildings within Zone B1, the proposed buildings on the western portion of the site may exceed the density standards for Zone B1. Staff has determined that additional information is needed from the applicant on the proposed density to determine if the proposed project meets the applicable density standards.

NOISE: The site will get significant overflight, and is inside 55CNEL.

PART 77. The highest elevation of any object or terrain on the site is 790 MSL and the highest structure height is approximately 31 ft. The runway elevation is 774 MSL. FAA 7460 review is required for structures exceeding 35 ft. in height or a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway. At a distance of 700 ft. from the runway, structures exceeding 781 MSL in elevation require FAA review.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a continuance to the October ALUC meeting to review additional information from the applicant on the proposed building density of the western portion of the site.

**CONDITIONS:** For the City to Utilize

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the operator of Riverside Municipal 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.

3. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
4. *Children's schools, hospitals, day care centers and nursing homes are prohibited.*
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 the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
6. *The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*
7. *No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted. A FAA 7460-1 review shall be completed for any structure of a height that would exceed 781 MSL or a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway.*

Beverly Coleman indicated the applicant is not present and has concurred for a continuance pending on additional information other than what is available in the staff report.

Chairman Housman called for Mark Kranenburg to come forward.

Mark Kranenburg, Riverside Municipal Airport came forward in response to Chairman Housman's invitation and concurred with staff's recommendation for a continuance. Mr. Kranenburg indicated the applicant met with him in regards to the proposal. Mr. Kranenburg referred the applicant to the consultant who created the Master Plan for the airport to assist with the building height restrictions. A new taxiway has been extended to runway 3-4 end and an FAA 7460-1 review is critical, which the applicant is aware.

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Hogan made a motion for a continuance to the next scheduled hearing. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE**

**9:00 A.M.**

- D. MA-05-123 – Nuevo Land Company – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-05-123 Nuevo Land Co.  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Perris  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** GPA 05-0225, Change of Zone 05-0226 and Tentative Tract Map 33338

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A GPA and Change of Zone from Commercial Community to Residential R-6,000 and Tract Map for 75 single-family residential lots on 19+ acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is situated north of Nuevo Road and west of Evans Rd. within the City of Perris, approximately 23,000 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 Study Area  
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area II  
c. Noise Levels: See Below

**BACKGROUND:**

*Staff utilized four resources for review:*

*RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*

- 1. Current Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
- 2. Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004*
- 3. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 25,600-27,000 feet southeast of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for 75 single-family residential lots on 19+ acres. The existing site is vacant and zoned for residential uses. The proposal is under the major flight track and within the approach surface. The present zoning is consistent with the CLUP for Area II.*

*The 1984 Plan 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, which has residential density restrictions of a minimum two and one half acre lots. The proposed land use would not be allowed within this area.*

Density and Coverage: *No structures are currently proposed, however, structural coverage is expected to be less than 25% of the net area.*

Part 77: *The highest elevation at this site is approximately 1,423 MSL feet. The runway elevation is 1,488 MSL at the south end. The height of the structures is unknown at this time, but likely to be less than 35 feet. Any structures over 1,758 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Any structures over 2,088 MSL feet in elevation would be an obstruction. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.*

Noise: The site has been shown to have noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be entirely within the 60 CNEL. ALUC policy is that no new residential be within the 60 CNEL.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of INCONSISTENCY with the CLUP. If the City wishes to override the Commission as per PUC 21676(a) the following conditions should be utilized.

**CONDITIONS:**

Provide Avigation Easements/Deed Notice to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act. (951) 656-7000

1. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure than no lights are above 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.
  - b. 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 given to all prospective buyers or tenants.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners for staff.

Commissioner Hogan inquired if staff is contact with the City of Perris in regards to the proposals that go before the ALUC as well as the development and issues with March. Keith Downs responded positively indicating staff response to the City about the proposals. The City of Perris is also involved in the development of the new plan for March.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for the applicant to come forward.

Jason Keller came forward in response to Chairman Housman's invitation and concurred with the conditions of override.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Hogan made a motion of inconsistency. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

E. MA-05-124 – Century American Development – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-05-124 American Century Development  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Tentative Tract Map 33302

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Change of Zone and Tentative Tract Map for 52 single-family residential lots on 16 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is situated south of Citrus Avenue and east of Dunlap Drive within the County of Riverside, approximately 25,000 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 Study Area*  
b. *Land Use Policy: Influence Area III*  
c. *Noise Levels: See Below*

**BACKGROUND:**

*Staff utilized four resources for review:*

*RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*

- 1. Current Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
- 2. Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004*
- 3. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 25,000 feet southeast of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for 52 single-family residential lots on 16 acres. The existing site is vacant and zoned for residential uses. The proposal is near the major flight track and within the inner horizontal surface.*

*The 1984 Plan 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 III, which has no residential density restrictions. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.*

Density and Coverage: *No structures are currently proposed, however, structural coverage is expected to be less than 20% of the net area.*

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 1,455 MSL feet. The runway elevation is 1,488 MSL at the south end. The height of the structures is unknown at this time, but likely to be less than 35 feet. Any structures over 1,738 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Any structures over 2,088 MSL feet in elevation would be an obstruction. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.

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

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

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

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 avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport (951-656-7000).
  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. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure that no lights are above the horizontal plane.
  4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
    - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
    - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
    - (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
    - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
  5. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.
- F. MA-05-125 – Engineering Solutions – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-05-125 Engineering Solutions  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Perris  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Tentative Tract Map 33720

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A Tract Map for 57 single-family residential lots on 11.9 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is situated south of Sunset Ave. and west of El Nido Rd. within the City of Perris, approximately 23,000 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 Study Area
b. Land Use Policy:	Influence Area II
c. Noise Levels:	See Below

**BACKGROUND:**

Staff utilized four resources for review:

RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986

1. Current Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
2. Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004
3. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 23,000 feet southeast of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for 57 single-family residential lots on 11.9 acres. The existing site is vacant and zoned for residential uses. The proposal is under the major flight track and within the approach surface.

The 1984 Plan 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, which has residential density restrictions of a minimum two and one half acre lots. The proposed land use would not be allowed within this area.

Density and Coverage: No structures are currently proposed, however, structural coverage is expected to be less than 25% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 1,433 MSL feet. The runway elevation is 1,488 MSL at the south end. The height of the structures is unknown at this time, but likely to be less than 35 feet. Any structures over 1,721 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Any structures over 2,088 MSL feet in elevation would be an obstruction. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.

Noise: The site has been shown to have noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be inside the 55 and portion are within the 60 CNEL. The ALUC policy is that no new housing should be placed within the 60 CNEL.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of INCONSISTENCY with the CLUP. If the City wishes to override the Commission as per PUC 21676(a) the following conditions should be utilized.

**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 avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport (951-656-7000).*
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. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure than no lights are above the horizontal plane.*
4. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
  - (a) *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
  - (b) *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
  - (c) *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
  - (d) *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
5. *The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.*

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners for staff, hearing no response Chairman Housman called for the applicant to come forward.

Mathew Addington came forward in response to Chairman Housman's invitation and concurred with the condition of override.

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Hogan made a motion of inconsistency. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

G. MA-05-126 – Engineering Solutions – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** MA 05-126 –Engineering Solutions  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Change of Zone 7169

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A Change of Zone for 26 commercial lots on 63.44 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located west of I-215 and south of Citrus Avenue within the County of Riverside, approximately 19,500 south 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:**

Staff utilized four resources for our review:

1. The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Noise Data from the AICUZ Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
4. ALUCP for Riverside County: 2004

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 19,500 feet south of the south end of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for a Change of Zone (from Industrial Park and Heavy Manufacturing to Industrial Park) and consists of 26 commercial lots on 63.44 acres. The proposal is under or near the major approach and departure track and within the 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 uses.

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 1,518 MSL and the height of proposed structures is currently unknown. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 1888 MSL feet in elevation. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

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

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

**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 avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport (951-656-7000).
4. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any office portions of the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.

5. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure than no lights are above the horizontal plane.*
4. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
  - (a) *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
  - (b) *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
  - (c) *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
  - (d) *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
5. *The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.*
6. *The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*

H. MA-05-127 – Sunset & Dunlap Partners, LLC – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-05-127 Sunset and Dunlap Partners  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Change of Zone 7128 and Tentative Tract Map 33339

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Change of Zone and Tentative Tract Map for 41 single-family residential lots on 11.29 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is situated south of Sunset Avenue and east of Dunlap Drive within the County of Riverside, approximately 25,000 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 Study Area*  
b. *Land Use Policy: Influence Area III*  
c. *Noise Levels: See Below*

**BACKGROUND:**

*Staff utilized four resources for review:*

*RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*

1. *Current Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
2. *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004*
3. *Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 25,000 feet southeast of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for 41 single-family residential lots on 11.29 acres. The existing site is vacant and zoned for rural residential uses. The proposal is near the major flight track and within the inner horizontal surface. The proposed zoning is R-1.

The 1984 Plan 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 III, which has no residential density restrictions. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: No structures are currently proposed, however, structural coverage is expected to be less than 20% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 1,440 MSL feet. The runway elevation is 1488 MSL at the south end. The height of the structures is unknown at this time, but likely to be less than 35 feet. Any structures over 1738 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Any structures over 2088 MSL feet in elevation would be an obstruction. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.

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

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

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

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 avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport (951-656-7000).
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. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure that no lights are above the horizontal plane.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.

- (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
- (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

5. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.

I. MA-05-128 – Rancho Los Lemonitos – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-05-128 Rancho Los Lemonitos  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Change of Zone 7178 and Tentative Tract Map 33521

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A Change of Zone and Tentative Tract Map for 33 single-family residential lots on 9.18 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is situated south of Citrus Avenue and east of Dunlap Drive within the County of Riverside, approximately 25,000 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 Study Area  
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area III  
c. Noise Levels: See Below

**BACKGROUND:**

Staff utilized four resources for review:

RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986

1. Current Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
2. Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004
3. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 25,000 feet southeast of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for 33 single-family residential lots on 9.18 acres. The existing site is vacant and zoned for rural residential uses. The proposal is near the major flight track and within the inner horizontal surface. The proposed zoning is R-1.

The 1984 Plan 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 III, which has no residential density restrictions. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: No structures are currently proposed, however, structural coverage is expected to be less than 20% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 1,440 MSL feet. The runway elevation is 1,488 MSL at the south end. The height of the structures is unknown at this time, but likely to be less than 35 feet. Any structures over 1,738 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Any structures over 2,088 MSL feet in elevation would be an obstruction. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.

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

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

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

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 avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport (951-656-7000).
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. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure that no lights are above the horizontal plane.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
  - (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
  - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
5. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.

J. MA-05-129 – Rancho Los Lemonitos – Consent item see page 2

<b>CASE NUMBER:</b>	<u>MA-05-129 Rancho Los Lemonitos</u>
<b>APPROVING JURISDICTION:</b>	County of Riverside
<b>JURISDICTION CASE NO:</b>	Change of Zone and Tentative Tract Map 33519

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Change of Zone and Tentative Tract Map for 37 single-family residential lots on 9.63 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is situated north of Sunset Avenue and east of Dunlap Drive within the County of Riverside, approximately 25,000 feet southeast of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.*

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

**BACKGROUND:**

*Staff utilized four resources for review:*

*RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*

- 1. Current Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
- 2. Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004*
- 3. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

*Land Use:* *The proposed site is located approximately 25,000 feet southeast of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for 37 single-family residential lots on 9.63 acres. The existing site is vacant and zoned for rural residential uses. The proposal is near the major flight track and within the inner horizontal surface. The proposed zoning is R-1.*

*The 1984 Plan 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 III, which has no residential density restrictions. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.*

*Density and Coverage:* *No structures are currently proposed, however, structural coverage is expected to be less than 20% of the net area.*

*Part 77:* *The highest elevation at this site is approximately 1,440 MSL feet. The runway elevation is 1,488 MSL at the south end. The height of the structures is unknown at this time, but likely to be less than 35 feet. Any structures over 1,738 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Any structures over 2,088 MSL feet in elevation would be an obstruction. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.*

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

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

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

- 1. Provide Avigation Easement/Deed Restrictions to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act. (909) 656-7000*

2. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
3. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure than no lights are above the horizontal plane.*
4. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
  - a. *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
  - b. *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
  - c. *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor, or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
  - d. *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
5. *The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers or tenants.*

K. MA-05-130 – Rancho Los Lemonitos – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-05-130 Rancho Los Lemonitos  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Tentative Tract Map 33422

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Tentative Tract Map for 36 single-family residential lots on 9.74 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is situated north of Lemon Avenue and east of Dunlap Drive within the County of Riverside, approximately 25,000 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 Study Area*
- b. *Land Use Policy: Influence Area III*
- c. *Noise Levels: See Below*

**BACKGROUND:**

*Staff utilized four resources for review:*

*RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*

1. *Current Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*



2. *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004*
3. *Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 25,000 feet southeast of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for 36 single-family residential lots on 9.74 acres. The existing site is vacant and zoned for residential uses. The proposal is near the major flight track and within the inner horizontal surface.*

*The 1984 Plan 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 III, which has no residential density restrictions. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.*

Density and Coverage: *No structures are currently proposed, however, structural coverage is expected to be less than 20% of the net area.*

Part 77: *The highest elevation at this site is approximately 1,440 MSL feet. The runway elevation is 1,488 MSL at the south end. The height of the structures is unknown at this time, but likely to be less than 35 feet. Any structures over 1,738 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Any structures over 2,088 MSL feet in elevation would be an obstruction. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.*

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

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

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. *Provide Avigation Easement/Deed Restrictions to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act. (909) 656-7000*
2. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
3. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure than no lights are above the horizontal plane.*
4. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
  - a. *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
  - b. *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*

- c. *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor, or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
  - d. *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
5. *The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers or tenants.*

## VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

### A. ALUCP Update

Keith Downs indicated having met with Bill Ingraham and James Jenkins, San Bernardino County regarding Chino Airport Master Plan, which will be going to hearing soon. A draft Compatibility Plan for the airport was provided to them and as of this date no response has been received. Once a response is received in regards to changes the changes will be made and posted on the ALUC website and begin hearings for the Riverside County's portion of the Chino Airport.

No progress has been made in regards to the Master Plan for Hemet/Ryan Airport. At this point only factual information regarding the airport will be posted on the website.

B. MARB Status: Review of Existing CLUP and proposed ALUCP (by consultant)  
Ken Brody, Mead & Hunt consultant preparing the Land Use Study for the March Air Force Base came forward and informed the Commission on the status of the draft plan. Discussion papers with preliminary set of criteria and zones were presented to the Task Force who directed the consultant to work with the Planning Technical Committee in regards to issues with existing land uses. After many attempts through different sources no new arrival data in regards to the flight tracks has been obtained. Based on the 1998 and 2005 AICUZ the current data seems to match up fairly well, therefore are moving forward with what is available at this time. The Task Force directed to rely on the 1998 noise contours in generating the 2005 noise contours, which will be release next week. The draft plan is still evolving and was presented to the Task Force back in April. In terms of format it has been encouraged to follow the basic instruction the ALUC is currently using in terms of the composite set of zones, which the Task Force and the Planning Technical Committee have concurred. The difference from the ALUC's Plan is the criteria will be used rather than using the basic table 2A shown in the Compatibility Plan as the primary policy as support. Appendix 'D' County Wide Plan with the extensive list of individual land uses is being proposed for adoption, which is intended for the ALUC's purpose as background information. March Joint Powers Authority (JPA) does not actually have to adopt the Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) other than as it pertains to the property they directly control. The expectations will be for March JPA to adopt a recommendation to the ALUC to approve what will be brought forward as well as to the individual Jurisdictions. The CEQA issue has not been discussed fully and it is not in the JLUS budget to have a CEQA analysis. At some time prior to its adoption by the local jurisdictions it will need to have some type of a CEQA documentation.

### C. Rules for ALUC Administrative Review

Keith Downs indicated the Plan allows for the Executive Director to review items not likely to result in inconsistency. Mr. Downs recommended items that fall under Zones

D, E, Area III and outside of the 60 CNEL to be reviewed administratively by staff with characteristics from the Commission. Commissioner Lightsey inquired if staff will still be providing the Commission with staff reports on the administrative items. Keith Downs responded negatively indicating staff has always reviewed administrative items based on the old rules that were very defined for items outside of the 60 CNEL and Area III a letter is then generated with staff's finding and conditions. Commissioner Lightsey inquired would staff provide a summary of the projects reviewed administratively. Keith Downs inquired if a copy of the letters be adequate, which states information of the projects locations and the area it falls under. Commissioner Lightsey concurred.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for a motion to adopt the Executive Director's recommendation for rules for administrative review pursuant to the Plan 2.3.2.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Ballance made a motion for staff to review administrative items as mentioned above. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

VIII. ORAL COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC ON ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA.  
NONE

IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS  
Commissioner Lightsey voiced his concerned in regards to the override for inconsistent items to obtain stronger language in the staff reports.

X. EXECUTIVE SESSION: Conference with legal counsel regarding existing litigation (Government Code section 54956.9): Silverhawk Land & Acquisitions, LLC v. Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission et al. (Riverside Superior Court case no. RIC 431176).  
B.T. Miller moved to Executive Session at 11:55 a.m.

Reconvene from Executive Session at 12:20 p.m. B.T. Miller indicating no action was taken by the Commission on this item.

XI. ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Housman adjourned the meeting at 12:25 a.m.  
NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: October 13, 2005 at 9:00 a.m.,  
Riverside.