A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on February 10, 2011 at the Riverside County Administrative Center, Board Chambers.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Rod Ballance, Acting Chairman

Arthur Butler Glen Holmes John Lyon Richard Stewart

Sam Toles (Alternate for Greg Pettis)

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Simon Housman, Chairman

Greg Pettis

STAFF PRESENT: Ed Cooper, Director

John Guerin, Principal Planner Russell Brady, Contract Planner Barbara Santos, ALUC Secretary

BT Miller, ALUC Counsel

OTHERS PRESENT: Dave Jeffers, David Jeffers Consulting, Inc.

Ric Welch, Jurupa Community Services District

I. AGENDA ITEM 2.1: ZAP1021HR10 – Leo and Betty Wesselink (Representative: David Jeffers Consulting Inc.) – County Case Nos. GPA 00973 (General Plan Amendment). A proposal to amend the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan's land use designation on a 151.5-acre site, located southerly of Stowe Road, easterly of El Callado, and northerly of Grand Avenue within the unincorporated community of Winchester, from Estate Density Residential - Rural Community (EDR-RC) to Business Park (BP). (Airport Areas I and II and Transition Area of the Hemet-Ryan Airport Influence Area). Continued from January 13, 2011.

II. MAJOR ISSUES

While non-residential uses are more appropriate than residential uses in Airport Areas I and II, the absence of a specific development proposal makes it impossible to determine whether prohibited uses would be proposed at this location. However, the proposed designation is not inherently less consistent than the existing designation. Surrounding property owners have expressed concerns regarding neighborhood compatibility. These concerns will need to be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. ALUC findings relate to airport compatibility issues. A finding of consistency does not necessarily constitute an endorsement of a proposed project.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends a finding of **CONSISTENCY** for the General Plan Amendment.

IV. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

GPA 973 is a proposal to amend the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan's land use designation on a 151.5-acre site from Estate Density Residential - Rural Community (EDR-RC) to Business Park (BP).

As a general plan amendment, this project is not subject to conditions. However, the applicant and owners are directed to the attached excerpts from the HRACALUP for guidance as to land uses that would or would not be found consistent at a given location. Additionally, the owners should be aware that avigation easements will be required at the development stage if the Plan remains in effect at that time.

V. MEETING SUMMARY

The following staff presented the subject proposal:

ALUC Staff Planner: Russell Brady at (951) 955-0549, or e-mail at rbrady@rctlma.org.

The following spoke in favor of the project:

Dave Jeffers, David Jeffers Consulting, Inc., 19 Spectrum Pointe Drive #609, Lake Forest, CA 92630.

No one spoke in neutral or opposition to the project.

VI. ALUC COMMISSION ACTION

The ALUC Commission by a vote of 5-1, found the project **CONSISTENT**. Commissioner Holmes voted no; Absent: Chairman Simon Housman

VII. CD

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD and referenced by the meeting time listed below. For a copy of the CD, please contact Barbara Santos, ALUC Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-5132 or E-mail at basantos@rctlma.org.

ITEM 2.1: TIME IS 9:03 A.M.

I. **AGENDA ITEM 3.1:** ZAP1050RI10 – T-Mobile USA (Representative: Alexis Osborn) – City Case No. P10-0576 (Design Review). A proposal to establish an unmanned telecommunications facility consisting of antennas on a 50-foot high monopalm and associated equipment cabinets on a 3.09-acre church property located at the northeasterly corner of Jackson Street and Colorado Avenue in the City of Riverside. (Airport Compatibility Zones B1, C and D of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area.).

II. MAJOR ISSUES

The Countywide Policies of the 2004 Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, as carried forth into the 2005 Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, cite "critical community infrastructure facilities" as a prohibited use in Airport Compatibility Zone B1. These facilities are listed in Note 12 of Table 2A as including "public communications facilities." Policy 4.2.3.(d) clarifies that such uses are "prohibited unless no other feasible alternative site exists and the facility is designed in a manner that minimizes its susceptibility to damage from an aircraft accident."

It may be noted that the Draft March Joint Land Use Study references cell towers as being distinct from "critical community infrastructure facilities." However, this Study maintains that cell towers are "incompatible" within Zone B1.

Staff has no evidence of FAA submittal as of the writing of this staff report.

Staff has received additional documents from the project applicant that provide some detail regarding the current coverage gap and available sites in the area. However, as of the writing of this staff report, no detailed inventory of appropriately zoned sites in the area, which would indicate the availability of alternative sites, has been provided to staff for review. The applicant has also indicated that City of Riverside staff objects to a relocation of the site closer to either street as it would create a more severe visual impact.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission open the public hearing, consider testimony, and <u>CONTINUE</u> its consideration of this item to March 10, 2011, pending receipt of further information regarding alternative site options and submittal to FAA.

STAFF RECOMMENDED AT HEARING

CONDITIONALLY CONSISTENT, pending FAA review.

IV. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

City of Riverside Case No. P10-0576 proposes to establish an unmanned telecommunications facility consisting of antennas on a 50-foot high monopalm and associated equipment cabinets on a 3.09-acre church property.

CONDITIONS:

- 1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the proposed telecommunications facilities, the property owner shall convey an avigation easement to the City of Riverside as owner-operator of Riverside Municipal Airport.
- 2. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or Page 3 of 15

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. (Such uses include landscaping utilizing water features, aquaculture, livestock operations, production of cereal grains, sunflower, and row crops, artificial marshes, wastewater management facilities, composting operations, trash transfer stations that are open on one or more sides, recycling centers containing putrescible wastes, construction and demolition debris facilities, fly ash disposal, incinerators, and landfills.)
- (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
- 3. Prior to issuance of building permits, the project developer shall submit to Airport Land Use Commission staff evidence that the Federal Aviation Administration has issued a determination of "Not a Hazard to Air Navigation" for the proposed facility.

 (This condition is considered met, as the FAA has already made such a determination for the structure. A copy is attached.)
- 4. Any outdoor lighting that is installed shall be hooded or shielded to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
- 5. Prior to final inspection approval, any lighting for aviation safety shall be installed in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 70/7460-1 K Change 2. Such lighting shall be maintained in accordance therewith for the life of the project.
- 6. The maximum height of the proposed structure, including all mounted appurtenances and obstruction or aviation safety lighting (if any), shall not exceed 50 feet above ground level, and the maximum elevation at the top of structure (or top of highest frond, whichever is greater) shall not exceed 796 feet above mean sea level.
- 7. The specific coordinates, height, top point elevation, and frequencies of the proposed facility shall not be amended without further review by the Airport Land Use Commission and the Federal Aviation Administration; provided, however, that reduction in building height or elevation shall not require further review by the Airport Land Use Commission.
- 8. Temporary construction equipment used during actual construction of the structure shall not exceed the height of the proposed structure, unless separate notice is provided to the Federal Aviation Administration through the Form 7460-1 process. (Separate notice has been provided for a construction crane. See below.)

The following conditions have been added pursuant to the terms of the FAA determination letter issued on February 16, 2011 (and the letter for the temporary construction crane issued on the same date):

- 9. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has conducted an aeronautical study of this proposed antenna tower location (Aeronautical Study No. 2011-AWP-435-OE) and has determined that neither marking nor lighting of the antenna tower is necessary for aviation safety. However, if marking and/or lighting for aviation safety are accomplished on a voluntary basis, such marking and/or lighting shall be installed and maintained in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 70/7460-1 K Change 2. Any failure or malfunction of lighting for aviation safety that lasts more than thirty (30) minutes and affects a top light or flashing obstruction light, regardless of its position, should be reported immediately to (877) 487-6867 so a Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) can be issued. As soon as the normal operation is restored, notify the same number.
- 10. In accordance with the "Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation for Temporary Structure" issued for Aeronautical Study No. 2011-AWP-436-OE on February 16, 2011, during the construction process, the permittee may utilize a crane extending to a height of 70 feet above ground level and to a maximum elevation of 816 feet above mean sea level. Such crane shall be marked and/or lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 70/7460-1 K Change 2, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, flag marker Chapters 3 (Marked) & 12. Any failure or malfunction of lighting for aviation safety that lasts more than thirty (30) minutes and affects a top light or flashing obstruction light, regardless of its position, should be reported immediately to (877) 487-6867 so a Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) can be issued. As soon as the normal operation is restored, notify the same number. (All other temporary construction equipment used during construction and installation of the proposed structure shall not exceed the height of the proposed structure, unless separate notice is provided to the FAA through the Form 7460-1 process.)
- 11. In order to assure that no interference is caused to Federal Aviation Administration facilities, prior to beginning any transmission from the site, the proposed transmitters must provide at least 93 dB of spurious emissions attenuation (13 dB greater than the FCC required 80 dB) in the 108-137 and 225-400 MHz frequency bands.
- 12. Within five (5) days after the proposed monopalm reaches its greatest height, the permittee shall complete FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration (Part II), and submit said form to the Federal Aviation Administration Air Traffic Airspace Branch Obstruction Evaluation Service or online at www.oeaaa.faa.gov. This requirement is also applicable in the event the project is abandoned.

V. MEETING SUMMARY

The following staff presented the subject proposal: ALUC Staff Planner: Russell Brady at (951) 955-0549, or e-mail at rbrady@rctlma.org.

No one spoke in favor, neutral or opposition to the project.

VI. ALUC COMMISSION ACTION

The ALUC Commission by a unanimous vote of 6-0, found the project **CONDITIONALLY CONSISTENT**, pending FAA review. Absent: Chairman Simon Housman

VII. CD

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD and referenced by the meeting time listed below. For a copy of the CD, please contact Barbara Santos, ALUC Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-5132 or E-mail at basantos@rctlma.org.

ITEM 3.1: TIME IS 9:09 A.M.

I. **AGENDA ITEM 3.2:** ZAP1068MA10 – U.S. Veterans Initiative/March Joint Powers Authority (Representative: Sares-Regis Group) – JPA Case Nos: SP08-01, Amendment No. 1 and Plot Plan No. 10-02. A proposal to establish a 323-unit veterans' transitional housing facility on 7.75 acres located southerly of N Street, easterly of 4th Street, and westerly of 6th Street within the March Lifecare Campus portion of the former March Air Force Base (generally located southerly of Cactus Avenue and westerly of Heacock Street), and to amend the March Lifecare Campus Specific Plan so as to provide for the proposed facility and to deviate from parking requirements. The project site is located within the March Joint Powers Authority land use jurisdiction and is within Area II of the March Air Reserve Base Airport Influence Area.

II. MAJOR ISSUES

The project site is located in Airport Area II of the March Air Reserve Base Airport Influence Area. Airport Area II (not to be confused with Accident Potential Zone II, which is in Airport Area I) requires a 2½ acre minimum lot size. While the project does not involve a land division that would result in the establishment of lots, this is a "highest density" residential project, with a density exceeding 40 dwelling units per acre. ALUC's review letter of April 23, 2009, in finding the Specific Plan consistent, included a Condition 2. (e) prohibiting residential "dwellings for permanent occupancy, other than living areas within facilities licensed by either the California Department of Public Health or the California Department of Social Services (or their successors-in-interest), and the relocation of existing transitional housing facilities already present on-site." It may be noted, however, that no restrictions on residential density are proposed for this site in the March Joint Land Use Study.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends <u>CONTINUANCE</u> to March 10, 2011 pending receipt of further information regarding state licensing of the proposed facility, the extent to which the proposed facility constitutes relocation of existing units, and a more comprehensive submittal to FAA.

IV. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

United States Veterans Initiative proposes a 323-unit (401-bed) transitional housing center on 7.75 acres located southerly of N Street, easterly of 4th Street, and westerly of 6th Street in the portion o March Joint Powers Authority's jurisdiction located northeasterly of the runway at March Air Reserve Base. The facility will include 18 two-bedroom units, 45 one-bedroom units, 180 single units, 60 senior units and 20 four-bed "program units."

V. MEETING SUMMARY

The following staff presented the subject proposal:

ALUC Staff Planner: Russell Brady at (951) 955-0549, or e-mail at rbrady@rctlma.org.

No one spoke in favor, neutral or opposition to the project:

VI. ALUC COMMISSION ACTION

The ALUC Commission by a unanimous vote of 6-0, **CONTINUED** the project to March 10, 2011. Absent: Chairman Simon Housman

VII. CD

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD and referenced by the meeting time listed below. For a copy of the CD, please contact Barbara Santos, ALUC Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-5132 or E-mail at basantos@rctlma.org.

ITEM 3.2: TIME IS 9:13 A.M.

I. AGENDA ITEM 3.3: ZAP1014CH10 – Jurupa Community Services District/City of Eastvale (Representative: Eric Norris) - City Case No. 10-0027 (Change of Zone and Plot Plan). A proposal to change the zoning of 16.77 acres located northerly of Schleisman Road and westerly of Harrison Avenue (including the northwesterly corner of the intersection thereof) in the City of Eastvale from A-2-10 (Heavy Agriculture, 10 acre minimum lot size) to R-4 (Planned Residential), and to establish a 34,706 square foot community center ("Eastvale Community Center") on 4.08 acres in the southerly portion of the site. The Community Center will include a gymnasium, a multi-purpose room, multiple activity rooms, and a spacious multi-functional lobby. (Airport Compatibility Zone D of the Chino Airport Influence Area).

II. MAJOR ISSUES

Based on occupancy calculations provided by the applicant, the project could result in a total occupancy of 730 across the 4.08 acre site, which equates to an average intensity of 178 people per acre. This exceeds the maximum average intensity criteria for Compatibility Zone D of the Chino Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan of 150. The City has conditioned the project at a maximum total occupancy of 612, which would meet the average intensity criteria. However, no plan has been presented specifying how this would be achieved. Based on the same occupancy calculations provided by the applicant, the project would result in a maximum single acre occupancy of 347 (gym, platform, exercise room, gym storage, recreation storage, meeting room, platform lobby, and plaza), which would meet the single acre intensity criteria for Compatibility Zone D of the Chino Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan of 450. However, based on ALUC staff's calculations pursuant to the Building Code method, the project could result in a maximum single-acre occupancy of approximately 1,180. Assuming the applicant's occupancy for the gym would be more accurate, this would still result in a maximum occupancy of approximately 559.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission open the public hearing, consider testimony, and <u>CONTINUE</u> its consideration of this item to March 10, 2011, to allow additional time for the applicant to demonstrate compliance with the "450-person" single-acre maximum and/or provide information regarding risk-reduction measures incorporated into building design.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION AT HEARING

CONSISTENT subject to revised conditions.

IV. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

City Case No. 10-0027 is a proposal to establish a 34,706 square foot Community Center on 4.08 net acres, and to change the zoning of the property from A-2-10 (Heavy Agriculture, 10 acre minimum lot size) to R-4 (Planned Residential). Jurupa Community Services District is leasing the property from the landowner, Corona-Norco Unified School District, which plans to develop an intermediate school and an elementary school on other portions of the property. (The property as a whole is 16.77 acres in size.)

CONDITIONS:

- 1. Any outdoor lighting installed shall be hooded or shielded to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. Outdoor lighting shall be downward facing.
- 2. 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 Page 8 of 15

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. (Such uses include landscaping utilizing water features, aquaculture, livestock operations, production of cereal grains, sunflower, and row crops, artificial marshes, wastewater management facilities, composting operations, trash transfer stations that are open on one or more sides, recycling centers containing putrescible wastes, construction and demolition debris facilities, fly ash disposal, incinerators, and landfills.)
- (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
- (e) Highly noise-sensitive outdoor nonresidential uses.
- 3. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers of the property and tenants and concessionaires of the building, and shall be recorded as a deed notice.
- 4. Programming of activities within this Community Center shall be coordinated by the facility operator (Jurupa Community Services District or its successor-in-interest) to be consistent with a total maximum occupancy not to exceed 612 persons at any given time, and with a maximum occupancy within any single-acre area (defined as a square area 210 feet in length by 210 feet in width) not to exceed 450 persons. Compliance with these limits, and the limits specified below, shall be electronically monitored, or assured through video surveillance. If, at any time during the operation of this facility, electronic monitoring is no longer possible, these limits shall be posted at or near facility entrances and within the affected rooms, and compliance shall be monitored by on-site personnel.
 - a. The occupancy of the area identified as Gymnasium/Exercise on the floor plan prepared by Kroh Architects dated October 27, 2010 shall not exceed 300 persons at any given time, except that this occupancy may be increased to 390 if the stage area (identified as Platform on said floor plan) is not in use, and the total number of persons in the Gymnasium, stage, and exterior plaza together shall not exceed 426 persons. If the stage is in use, the occupancy of the Gymnasium and stage together shall not exceed 390 persons (or 426 including the exterior plaza).
 - b. The Main Lobby/Reception area shall be limited to a maximum occupancy of 30 persons when either the Gymnasium or the multi-purpose room is open or in use.
 - c. The smaller Lobby located westerly of the Gymnasium shall be for access only or for use by stage personnel only (when the stage is not fully occupied).
 - d. During those times when the multi-purpose room is in use as an assembly facility (lecture or meeting mode: chairs accommodating up to 250 persons), there shall be

no concurrent use of the east half of the Gymnasium, the east half of the exterior plaza, or the stage. The west half of the Gymnasium and the west half of the exterior plaza may be in use during such times, but their total occupancy shall not exceed 150 persons.

e. During those times when the multi-purpose room is in use as a dining facility (event mode: tables and chairs accommodating up to 100 persons), there may be concurrent use of the Gymnasium, stage, and exterior plaza, but the total occupancy of the east half of the Gymnasium and the east half of the exterior plaza shall not exceed 153 persons, and the overall total occupancy of the Gymnasium, stage, and exterior plaza shall not exceed 315 persons.

V. MEETING SUMMARY

The following staff presented the subject proposal:

ALUC Staff Planner: Russell Brady at (951) 955-0549, or e-mail at rbrady@rctlma.org.

The following spoke in favor of the project:

Ric Welch, Jurupa Community Services District, 7643 Walnut Grove, Eastvale, CA

No one spoke in neutral, or opposition to the project.

VI. ALUC COMMISSION ACTION

The ALUC Commission by a unanimous vote of 6-0, found the project **CONSISTENT** with revised conditions. Absent: Chairman Simon Housman

VII. CD

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD and referenced by the meeting time listed below. For a copy of the CD, please contact Barbara Santos, ALUC Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-5132 or E-mail at basantos@rctlma.org.

ITEM 3.3: TIME IS 9:13 A.M.

I. AGENDA ITEM 4.0: <u>CLOSED SESSION</u>: With respect to every item of business to be discussed in closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9: CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 54956.9: One potential case.

ALUC COMMISSION ACTION:

B. T. Miller, ALUC County Counsel, reported no action was taken by the Commission.

I. AGENDA ITEM 5.1: ZAPEA01PV08 - ALUC Initiative. The Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission will consider whether to adopt a Negative Declaration, prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, for the proposed Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for Perris Valley Airport ("Compatibility Plan"). The Commission will consider whether to adopt a Compatibility Plan, which includes an Airport Influence Area (AIA) with new boundaries, for Perris Valley Airport. The new AIA includes the geographic area in which noise, safety, airspace protection, and/or overflight concerns may significantly affect land uses or necessitate restrictions on those uses. The Compatibility Plan includes policies for determining whether a proposed development project lying within the AIA is consistent with the Compatibility Plan. The intent of the Compatibility Plan is to ensure the continued operation of Perris Valley Airport while simultaneously protecting the public health, safety, and welfare. The Plan includes Additional Compatibility Policies that are tailored specifically to the Airport's land use environs and lessen the effects on densities and intensities of future development proposals (in comparison to a Plan that did not include such policies). Perris Valley Airport is located easterly of Goetz Road and southerly of Ellis Avenue and Case Road in the City of Perris. The proposed AIA would include properties in the City of Perris, City of Menifee, and unincorporated Riverside County; however, most of the affected properties are located in the City of Perris.

II. MAJOR ISSUES

Whether to adopt: (1) the Initial Study/Negative Declaration prepared for the Perris Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan; and (2) the Perris Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. At this time, the Airport Diagram has not yet received approval from the State Of California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission:

<u>CONTINUE</u> consideration of the proposed <u>Negative Declaration and</u> Compatibility Plan to the Commission's <u>March</u> 10, 2011 agenda, <u>as a deferred decision</u>, pending approval of the Airport Diagram by the State Division of Aeronautics as the Airport Layout Plan of Perris Valley Airport for airport land use compatibility planning purposes.

STAFF RECOMMENDED AT HEARING

CONTINUE as deferred decision to March 10, 2011.

IV. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is the Commission's adoption of the 2010 Perris Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan ("PVALUCP"), which includes "Additional Compatibility Policies" specifically tailored to the land use environs of Perris Valley Airport and an Airport Influence Area ("AIA") with new boundaries. An AIA previously was adopted for this Airport in 1975, but no Compatibility Plar text specific to this Airport's environs ever was adopted by the Commission. The new AIA includes the area in which noise, safety, airspace protection, or overflight concerns may significantly affect land uses or necessitate restrictions on those uses, as determined by the Commission. Accordingly the Compatibility Plan includes policies for determining whether a proposed development project lying within the AIA, is consistent with the Compatibility Plan and the objectives set forth in the State Aeronautics Act, which include ensuring the continued operation of public-use airports (such as Perris Valley Airport), while simultaneously protecting the public's health, safety, and welfare. (See Pub. Util. Code, §§21670-21679.5.)

The Commission is required by state law to prepare airport land use compatibility plans for the airport influence areas around public-use airports. Airport officials project that activity levels at

Perris Valley Airport will continue and likely increase over time.

Much of the portion of the City of Perris located westerly of Interstate 215 is in the vicinity of the Airport and is affected by aircraft noise and overflight. The Commission's charge is to protect the public from excessive noise and safety hazards. Therefore, the PVALUCP imposes limits on the density and intensity of future land use development in the AIA.

V. MEETING SUMMARY

The following staff presented the subject proposal: ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or e-mail at jguerin@rctlma.org.

No one spoke in favor, neutral or opposition to the project.

VI. ALUC COMMISSION ACTION

The ALUC Commission by a unanimous vote of 6-0, **CONTINUED** as deferred decision to March 10, 2011. Absent: Chairman Simon Housman

VII. CD

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD and referenced by the meeting time listed below. For a copy of the CD, please contact Barbara Santos, ALUC Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-5132 or E-mail at basantos@rctlma.org.

ITEM 5.1: TIME IS 9:45 A.M.

I. 6.0 ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

6.1 ALUC Strategic Vision Plan Update.

John Guerin, ALUC staff, presented recommendations for potential updates to the ALUC Strategic Vision Plan. A copy of the original Strategic Vision Plan chart was provided, for the Commission's information. Commissioner Holmes questioned the reference to a 5,300-foot runway at Hemet-Ryan, rather than the 6,000 foot runway that had previously been discussed. Mr. Guerin advised that the 5,300-foot reference was directly from the Economic Development Agency. ALUC Director Ed Cooper advised that it was his understanding that the Federal Aviation Administration would not provide funding for a runway extension to a length exceeding 5,300 feet for this airport. Mr. Guerin noted that perhaps Chad Davies of the Riverside County Economic Development Agency (EDA) could provide a briefing regarding the current proposal and the length of the runway. Mr. Cooper indicated that staff would ask EDA to update the Commission. Staff recommended a continuance of this item to the Commission's March meeting for additional discussion. Mr. Cooper indicated that, if there are no objections from the Commission, staff will move forward to recommend adjustments to the priority rankings, update the chart, and present the final proposal at the next Commission meeting. Vice-Chairman Ballance suggested inviting Lori Stone and Dan Fairbanks of March Joint Powers Authority to the next month's meeting. Mr. Guerin noted that the Joint Powers Authority (JPA) had already provided a presentation to the Commission regarding the Draft Joint Land Use Study (JLUS). B. T. Miller suggested that the next presentation focus on implementation concepts. Mr. Cooper indicated that he was focused on working with JPA officials to set up a Technical Advisory Committee meeting to discuss financing of the Environmental Impact Report that likely would be required for adoption of the JLUS as a Compatibility Plan. Vice Chairman Ballance indicated that he was hopeful that there would be little reason for concern about the JLUS, given that it was prepared by ALUC's consultant Mead and Hunt.

6.2 <u>Processing of "No Compatibility Impact" Ordinance Amendments and General Plan</u> Amendments.

ALUC Director Ed Cooper advised that Chairman Simon Housman had requested that the Commission defer action on this item to its next agenda. The Commission agreed to defer its consideration of this matter to its next scheduled meeting (in March).

6.3 Plan for Evaluation of March Joint Land Use Study.

ALUC Director Ed Cooper advised that the March Joint Powers Authority (JPA) had approved the Joint Land Use Study (JLUS), with the approval of the military, and suggested that the Commission might want to establish a subcommittee to evaluate the JLUS. He noted that, if the Commission wishes to do this, it should be comfortable with the recommendations of the subcommittee on an ongoing basis. Vice Chairman Ballance noted that it is imperative that the Plan be moved forward. Commissioner Stewart expressed support for use of the subcommittee process, advising that most of the work is normally accomplished at this level. Any questions or challenges from the subcommittee could be brought to the attention of the full Commission through an interim review process. Such issues would also need to be discussed with March JPA and its consultant. Mr. Cooper confirmed that issues would also be addressed in discussions between JPA staff and ALUC staff. He suggested that the Commission establish the subcommittee at this meeting. At the next meeting, staff will present the broader issues in a briefing, and initial questions from the Commission could be considered. Commissioners advised that they do not yet have copies of the JLUS. Mr. Cooper assured them that staff would mail out the CD version of the JLUS as soon as possible. In his role as Acting Chairman, Mr. Ballance formed the

March Joint Land Use Review Subcommittee, comprised of Commissioner Butler, Commissioner Holmes, and himself, with Commissioner Lyon as an alternate. Mr. Cooper advised that subcommittee meetings could follow Commission meetings. Vice Chairman Ballance suggested that staff may want to consider attending meetings of the March Joint Powers Commission. Commissioner Stewart noted that the Joint Powers Commission meets on the first and third Wednesdays of each month.

II. 7.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The ALUC Commission by a vote of 4-0 approved the <u>December 9, 2010</u> minutes. Abstained: Sam Toles, alternate for Greg Pettis, and Commissioner Richard Stewart

The ALUC Commission by a vote of 4-0 approved the <u>January 13, 2011</u> minutes. Abstained: Commissioner Glen Holmes and Sam Toles, alternate for Greg Pettis

III. 8.0 ORAL COMMUNICATION ON ANY MATTER NOT ON THE AGENDA

Acting Chairman Rod Ballance announced that personnel from Riverside County Human Resources will be available during the lunch hour to collect stipend paperwork and assist Commissioners in submitting forms if they have not previously done so.

IV. 9.0 COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Commissioner Richard Stewart advised that a multi-jurisdictional delegation including representatives from each entity comprising the March JPA will be going to Washington, D.C. in early April, and will join the JPA's lobbyist for meetings with federal officials, including the military, the FAA, and Congressional representatives. He invited Commissioners to contact either him or Lori Stone at the March Joint Powers Authority if they have any issues related to aviation or airports that they would like to discuss with these officials, so that they can pass such information on to their lobbyist.

As Acting Chairman, Mr. Ballance welcomed Mr. Sam Toles, who was attending his first meeting as Mr. Pettis' alternate.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Rod Ballance adjourned the meeting at 10:27 a.m.

VI. CD

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD and referenced by the meeting time listed below. For a copy of the CD, please contact Barbara Santos, ALUC Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-5132 or E-mail at basantos@rctlma.org.

ITEM 6.0: TIME IS 9:48 A.M.