



AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION RIVERSIDE COUNTY AGENDA

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

Thursday 9:00 a.m., January 14, 2010

CHAIR
Simon Housman
Rancho Mirage

VICE CHAIRMAN
Rod Ballance
Riverside

COMMISSIONERS

Arthur Butler
Riverside

Robin Lowe
Hemet

John Lyon
Riverside

Glen Holmes
Hemet

Melanie Fesmire
Indio

STAFF

Director
Ed Cooper

John Guerin
Barbara Santos

County Administrative Center
4080 Lemon St., 9th Floor.
Riverside, CA 92501
(951) 955-5132

www.rcaluc.org

NOTE: If you wish to speak, please complete a "SPEAKER IDENTIFICATION FORM" and give it to the Secretary. The purpose of the public hearing is to allow interested parties to express their concerns. Comments shall be limited to 5 minutes and to matters relevant to the item under consideration. Please do not repeat information already given. If you have no additional information, but wish to be on record, simply give your name and address and state that you agree with the previous speaker(s). Also please be aware that the indicated staff recommendation shown below may differ from that presented to the Commission during the public hearing.

Non-exempt materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Airport Land Use Commission or its staff after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Airport Land Use Commission's office located at 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501 during normal business hours.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if any accommodations are needed, please contact Barbara Santos at (951) 955-5132 or E-mail at basantos@rctlma.org. Request should be made at least 48 hours or as soon as possible prior to the scheduled meeting.

1.0 INTRODUCTIONS

1.1 CALL TO ORDER

1.2 SALUTE TO FLAG

1.3 ROLL CALL

2.0 PUBLIC HEARING: NEW BUSINESS

PALM SPRINGS INTERNATIONAL

- 2.1 ZAP1007PS09 – SCC Rancho Mirage, LLC (Representative: Adkan Engineers) – County Case Nos. CZ06987 (Change of Zone) and TR 32463 (Tentative Tract Map). A proposal to change the zoning of an 80-acre parcel located northerly of Ramon Road, easterly of Da Vall Drive, westerly of Los Alamos Road and Bob Hope Drive, and southerly of Interstate 10 from W-2-20 (Controlled Development Areas, 20 acre minimum lot size) to R-1 (One-family Dwellings), and to divide the property into 206 residential lots, along with a 0.6-acre well site and open space/storm water retention areas. Airport Compatibility Zone E. ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or E-mail at jguerin@rctlma.org.

Staff Recommendation: CONSISTENT

3.0 PUBLIC HEARING: OLD BUSINESS**FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT**

- 3.1 FV-06-113 – AT&T Mobility/Bechtel/Silverhawk Industrial LP (Representative: Kathy O'Connor-Phelps, Bemis Development/Derra Design) – County Case No. PP21164 (Plot Plan) – Development of an unmanned telecommunications facility consisting of antennas on a 70-foot high monoelm, equipment shelter, and GPS antennas on a 2.68-acre site located at 38340 Innovation Court, northwesterly of the terminus of Innovation Court and northeasterly of Technology Drive, in the unincorporated Riverside County community of French Valley, in Airport Compatibility Zone B1. The total height to the “top of frond” will not exceed 75 feet above ground level. ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or E-mail at jguerin@rctlma.org.

Staff Recommendation: INCONSISTENT

NEW HELICOPTER FACILITY

- 3.2 ZAP1062MA09 – Valley Health System/Meniffee Valley Medical Center (Representative: Jeff Wright, Heliplanners) – City Case No. PUP 2009-68 (Public Use Permit) – A proposal to establish an Emergency Medical Service (EMS) Helicopter Landing Site at Meniffee Valley Medical Center, a hospital located at 28400 McCall Boulevard in the City of Meniffee. The medical center campus is located on the north side of McCall Boulevard, easterly of Antelope Road. The facility will consist of a 48 foot square (2,304 square foot) concrete landing pad with associated gurney ramp and wind cone. The facility will be used only for emergency medical services, departures and landings, including patient transfer to higher level or specialized facilities. These activities have traditionally occurred in the parking lot. Provision for a specified location and a facility that complies with FAA criteria would enhance safety. ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or E-mail at jguerin@rctlma.org.

Staff Recommendation: CONSISTENT

NEW HELICOPTER FACILITY

- 3.3 ZAP1012FL09 – Riverside Healthcare System/Riverside Community Hospital (Representative: Jeff Wright, Heliplanners) – City Case No. P09-0694 (Conditional Use Permit) – A proposal to establish a heliport (specifically, a hospital helistop) atop the top deck of the parking structure at Riverside Community Hospital, located at 4445 Magnolia Avenue in the City of Riverside. The hospital campus is located on the west side of Magnolia Avenue, south of 14th Street, north of Terracina Drive, and east of Brockton Avenue. The facility will consist of a 54-foot square (2,916 square foot) elevated metal landing pad with associated gurney ramp, safety net, wind cone, lighting, and painted markings, and the design will comply with FAA requirements. ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or E-mail at jguerin@rctlma.org.

Staff Recommendation: INCONSISTENT

4.0 PUBLIC HEARING: NEW BUSINESS

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT

4.1 ZAP1035FV09 and ZAP1004FV06 – H.G. Fenton Development Co./Fred J. Fleming (Representatives: Allen Jones and Karen Ruggels) - ZAP1035FV09: County Case Nos. CZ07690 (Change of Zone) and SP00265S1 (Substantial Conformance to Specific Plan). ZAP1004FV06: County Case No. PM35212 (Commercial/Industrial Parcel Map). These cases relate to a 56.95-acre site located easterly of Winchester Road, southerly of Sparkman Way (Airport Entrance Road), westerly of French Valley Airport, and northerly of an easterly straight-line extension of Hunter Road, in the unincorporated French Valley area. The site comprises Planning Areas 11.1 and 21.1 along with a portion of Planning Area 21.2, within the Borel Airpark Specific Plan. The site is and would remain zoned SP (Specific Plan), but the allowed land uses and development standards would change from a basis of A-1-10 (Light Agriculture, 10 acre minimum lot size) and C-P-S (Scenic Highway Commercial) to C-O (Commercial-Office) and C-P-S, in accordance with the Specific Plan. Offices, health and exercise centers, and laboratories would be among the permitted uses. PM35212 would divide the site into 20 commercial/industrial lots, with 8.43 acres of road rights-of-way. Airport Compatibility Zones B2 and D. ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or E-mail at jguerin@rctlma.org.

Staff Recommendation: CONTINUANCE to FEBRUARY 11, 2010

4.2 ZAP1036FV09 – Riverside County Economic Development Agency – Aviation Division – Airport Master Plan for French Valley Airport. The Airport Land Use Commission will review the Airport Master Plan document to determine consistency with the French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, as adopted in 2007. French Valley Airport is located easterly of Winchester Road (State Highway Route 79), southerly of Auld Road, and westerly of Leon Road in the unincorporated French Valley area. The Master Plan indicates that the airport would continue to be a general aviation airport. Activity forecasts would not exceed ultimate levels projected in the adopted Compatibility Plan. The Master Plan includes a Capital Improvement Program and recommends 27 actions over the next 20 years to improve the airport, including establishment of an Airport Traffic Control Tower. The Master Plan would supersede the November 1995 Master Plan, which had proposed development of a secondary runway easterly of, and parallel to, the existing runway. Adoption of the new Master Plan would eliminate that previously proposed, but never built, secondary runway. ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or E-mail at jguerin@rctlma.org.

Staff Recommendation: CONDITIONALLY CONSISTENT

5.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 12, 2009

6.0 ORAL COMMUNICATION ON ANY MATTER NOT ON THE AGENDA

7.0 COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM: 2.1

HEARING DATE: January 14, 2010

CASE NUMBER: ZAP1007PS09 – SCC Rancho Mirage, LLC
(Representative: Adkan Engineers)

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside

JURISDICTION CASE NO.: CZ06987 (Change of Zone) and TR32463
(Tentative Tract Map)

MAJOR ISSUES: None.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the change of zone be found **CONSISTENT** and that the tentative tract map be found **CONSISTENT**, subject to the conditions included herein.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Change of Zone Case No. 6987 (CZ06987) proposes to change the zoning of an 80-acre parcel from W-2-20 (Controlled Development Areas, 20 acre minimum lot size) to R-1 (One Family Dwelling). Tentative Tract Map No. 32463 (TR32463) proposes to divide the property into 206 residential lots, along with a 0.6-acre well site and open space/stormwater retention areas.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The project site is located northerly of Ramon Road, easterly of DaVall Drive, westerly of Los Alamos Road and Bob Hope Drive, and southerly of Interstate 10, in unincorporated Riverside County and the sphere of influence of the City of Rancho Mirage, approximately 20,000 feet easterly of the southeasterly terminus of Runway 13R-31L at Palm Springs International Airport.

LAND USE PLAN: 2005 Palm Springs Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

- a. Airport Influence Area: Palm Springs International Airport
- b. Land Use Policy: Airport Compatibility Zone E

- c. Noise Levels: Outside the 60 CNEL (noise level) contour

BACKGROUND:

Land Use/Intensity: The project site is entirely located within Airport Compatibility Zone E of the Palm Springs International Airport (PSP). Residential densities in Airport Compatibility Zone E are not restricted. The proposed density is consistent with the 2005 Palm Springs International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

Noise: The project site is located outside the 60 dB CNEL contour. No 55 dB CNEL contour has been mapped in the Compatibility Plan. Pursuant to Additional Compatibility Policy 2.1 of the Palm Springs International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, “the maximum noise exposure considered normally acceptable for new residential land uses shall ... be 62 dB CNEL.” Therefore, no special noise mitigation will be required.

Part 77: The project site elevation ranges between 280 to 324 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). The highest proposed pad elevation is 315 feet AMSL. The maximum building height in the R-1 zone is 40 feet. Therefore, the top point at buildout would not exceed 355 feet AMSL. The lowest elevation at any point of either runway at PSP is 395.5 feet AMSL. As the highest point on-site would be lower than the runway elevation, FAA review is not required.

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, and shall comply with the requirements of Ordinance No. 655.
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 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 and production of cereal grains, sunflower, and row crops.)

- (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
- 3. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants, and shall be recorded as a deed notice.
- 4. Stormwater retention basins and bio-swales shall be designed to remain totally dry between rainfalls and shall not be designed to provide a maximum detention period exceeding 48 hours. Vegetation in and around such basins or swales that would provide food or cover for bird species that would be incompatible with airport operations shall not be utilized in project landscaping.

**COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**

STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM: 3.1 ~~3.3~~ ~~4.1~~

HEARING DATE: *January 14, 2010 (continued from November 12, 2009 and
← originally considered on September 14, 2006)*

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER: FV-06-113 – AT&T Mobility/Bechtel/Silverhawk Industrial
L.P./Rachel Rodgers/ Bechtel/Polly Johnson
(Representative: Kathy O’Connor-Phelps, Bemis
Development/Derra Design)

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside

JURISDICTION CASE NO: Plot Plan Case No. 21164

MAJOR ISSUES:

~~The 1996 French Valley CLUP designates this property as being within the Inner Safety Zone, which does not allow structures. This is a situation where the “old” Plan was more restrictive than the suspended 2004 Plan.~~

1. *The Countywide Policies of the 2004 Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, as carried forth into the 2007 French Valley 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.

2. *The Economic Development Agency – Aviation Division requested in 2006 that the proposed cell tower be lighted. However, the FAA is not requiring lighting for airspace protection purposes.*

RECOMMENDATION:

~~This project is inconsistent with the 1996 French Valley Comprehensive Land Use Plan if the Specific Plan exemption is not utilized in determining consistency; however, staff would not object to a continuance for two months to allow for the preparation of an Environmental Assessment and re-adoption of the 2004 French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, which would place this property in Airport Zone B1, a zone that would allow unoccupied structures, and to allow for FAA review of the proposed structure.~~

PROJECT UPDATE:

At the November 2008 public hearing, staff recommended Staff recommends a finding of INCONSISTENCY, due to the land use (a public communications facility) being prohibited within Airport Compatibility Zone B1.

There is an exception to the prohibition available in situations where no feasible alternative site exists and the facility is designed in a manner that minimizes its susceptibility to damage from an aircraft accident.

The Commission asked the applicant to provide additional information to demonstrate that no other feasible alternative site exists. The applicant has provided a Power Point presentation depicting twelve alternative sites in the vicinity and indicating that those sites would not feasibly meet the project objectives. In particular, a location at one of the shopping centers at the corner of Winchester Road and Murrieta Hot Springs Road would not provide coverage farther north along Winchester Road because the shopping centers are located at a lower elevation (approximately 230 feet below the elevation of the runway). As this is a terrain issue, this situation may be one where the Commission may wish to consider the possible applicability of Section 3.3.6 of the Countywide Policies. At other sites, the reasons for infeasibility may not be so rooted in the technology. At Mammoth Commerce Center, the issues relate to loss of parking spaces and proximity to a residential neighborhood, as well as "more obstructed coverage." However, the presentation does not provide substantiation for the assertion relating to coverage.

Ultimately, it is up to the Commission to determine whether the applicant has provided sufficient information to demonstrate that no other alternative site is feasible.

As the facility is unmanned, its presence would not increase the number of persons in the area living, working, learning, playing, or worshipping in airport safety zones. While the possibility of an aircraft accident can never be ruled out, there is little or no probability that the installation and operation of this facility would result in substantial detriment to or interference with aircraft operations in the vicinity of French Valley Airport. Additionally, the presence of two facilities of this type in close proximity to each other, provided that there is no resulting interference to communications, may increase the likelihood that some communications could be maintained in an emergency situation (such as an aircraft accident) that resulted in the destruction of, or damage to, one of the facilities.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Plot Plan No. ~~21164~~ 21136 proposes to establish a ~~70-foot high~~ **an unmanned telecommunications facility consisting of antennas on a 70-foot high monoelm, (monoelm) and equipment shelter, and GPS antennas** on a 2.68-acre parcel. **The total height to the “top of frond” will not exceed 75 feet above ground level.**

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located northwesterly of the terminus of Innovation Court, **and** northeasterly of Technology Drive, in the community of French Valley, **within** unincorporated Riverside County, approximately 2,154 feet south-southeasterly of Runway 18-36 at French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN: ~~2007~~ 1996 French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use **Compatibility Plan (2007 FVALUCP) (FVACLUP)**

Adjacent Airport:

- a. Airport Influence Area: French Valley Airport
- b. Land Use Policy: **Airport Compatibility Zone B1** ~~Inner Safety Zone in 1996 Plan (Zone B1 on suspended 2004 Plan)~~
- c. Noise Levels: 55-65 CNEL; site is crossed by 60 CNEL contour

BACKGROUND:

~~Land Use:~~ The site is located in the Inner Safety Zone for the runway as proposed to be extended on the French Valley Airport’s Master Plan. The Inner Safety Zone prohibits structures. The property is located within a Specific Plan, and the 1996 Plan as written exempted properties in specific plans from the land use intensity restrictions applicable to other properties within the Plan boundaries; however, the validity of this exemption is questionable, given an opinion issued by the Attorney General of the State of California in 2004. For this reason, the Airport Land Use Commission has asked staff to disregard this exemption in determining the consistency of proposed projects with the 1996 CLUP. Without this exemption, the project is inconsistent with the 1996 CLUP.

Prohibited Uses: The Countywide Policies of the 2004 Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, as carried forth into the 2007 French Valley 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 feasible alternative site exists and the facility is designed in a manner that minimizes its susceptibility to damage from an aircraft accident.”

The prohibition likely relates to the role that these facilities play in the maintenance of public safety in an emergency situation. There is no general prohibition of new structures in Airport Compatibility Zone B1. Obviously, as an unmanned facility, the project does not present intensity issues.

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.

It should also be noted that there is an existing cell tower located on a property northwesterly of this property. However, that area is within Airport Compatibility Zone C, where cell towers are not a prohibited use.

Extended Runway Centerline: Pursuant to Table 2A, structures in Airport Compatibility Zone B1 should be located a “maximum distance from [the] extended runway centerline.” This project complies with this requirement.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 1,303 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). The elevation of the runway at the southerly end is 1,340 feet. At a distance of 2,154 feet from the southerly end of the runway as extended to the area of the property proposed as the site of the tower, FAA review would be required for structures with top elevations exceeding 1,361 feet. ~~Therefore, FAA review is required in this situation, given the 70-foot height of the proposed facility.~~

AT&T Mobility filed Form 7460-1 in 2008, and received a “Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation” (Aeronautical Study No. 2008-AWP-4221-OE). The determination is for a height of up to 80 feet above ground level, and allows for a top point elevation as high as 1,390 feet above mean sea level. The determination letter includes a statement that any height exceeding 80 feet above ground level (elevation exceeding 1,390 feet above mean sea level) “will result in a substantial adverse effect and would warrant a Determination of Hazard to Air Navigation.”

At the given height and elevation, “the structure does not exceed obstruction standards and would not be a hazard to air navigation.” Therefore, the FAA determined that marking and lighting are not necessary for aviation safety. However, in 2006, the Riverside County Economic Development Agency – Aviation Division, which manages the French Valley Airport, requested that the tower be “lighted.”

Noise: Noise levels on this site from aircraft operations would range from 55 to 65 CNEL, with the 60 CNEL contour crossing the site. However, the proposed use is not a noise-sensitive use.

In the event that the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission finds that *no other feasible alternative site exists and that the facility is designed in a manner that minimizes its susceptibility to damage from an aircraft accident and thereby* finds this project consistent, ~~pursuant to the Specific Plan exemption,~~ or in the event that the Commission finds the proposal inconsistent with the 2007 FVALUCP ~~FVALCLUP~~ but is overruled by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors or its successor-in-interest in accordance with Section 21675.1 of the Public Utilities Code, ALUC staff would recommend that the following conditions be applied, ~~plus such supplemental conditions as may be appropriate to implement the requirements of any letter that may be subsequently issued by the Federal Aviation Administration.~~

Additionally, in the event that the Commission finds this project inconsistent, the following paragraph would be included in the Commission's letter to the Riverside County Planning Department:

Implementation of these conditions assists in mitigating impacts of the project on the airport, but would not render the project consistent with the 2007 FVALUCP and may not be sufficient to mitigate potential safety hazards to below a level of significance pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

CONDITIONS:

1. Prior to issuance of a building permit for the proposed telecommunications facilities, the property owner shall convey an avigation easement to the County relative to French Valley 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 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, **or FAA-approved lighting.**
 - (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, production of cereal grains, sunflower, and row crops, wastewater management facilities, trash transfer stations that are open on one or more sides, recycling centers containing putrescible wastes, construction and demolition debris facilities, fly ash disposal, and incinerators.)**
 - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
3. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.
4. ~~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.

4. 5. Any outdoor lighting that is installed shall be hooded or shielded to assure that no lights are above the horizontal plane **prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky**, and shall comply with Riverside County Ordinance No. 655.
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 80 feet above ground level, and the maximum elevation at the top of structure (or top of highest frond, whichever is greater) shall not exceed 1,390 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.**

**COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**

STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM: 3.2 3-5

HEARING DATE: January 14, 2010 (continued from November 12, 2009)

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: ZAP1062MA09 – Valley Health System/Meniffee Valley Medical Center (Representative: Jeff Wright, Heliplanners)

APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Meniffee

JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PUP 2009-68 (Public Use Permit)

MAJOR ISSUES:

1. Residential uses would be subject to high noise levels during helicopter operations. Single-event noise levels during operations could be as high as 101.8 dB at the nearest residence (on the opposite side of McCall Boulevard from the proposed emergency medical service helicopter landing site). However, the average noise level will be below 60 dB(A) CNEL and below the ambient noise level at the only receptor site where the average noise level would exceed 45 dB(A).

2. *The applicant's representative objected to two conditions in the initial Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) airspace determination letter. One of these was a requirement for marking (with spherical balls) of telephone or electrical lines located on the opposite side of McCall Boulevard. The other was the requirement for contact with CALTRANS Aeronautics for issuance of a heliport permit. Subsequently, the requirement for the spherical balls was changed to a recommendation, and the FAA official advised that the requirement was for contact and that it would be left to the discretion of CALTRANS Aeronautics to determine whether to require a heliport permit.*

3. *Valley Health Systems, a public district, would be both the operator of the helicopter landing site and the public service agency designating the site as "reasonable and prudent" for EMS helicopter use.*

~~2. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has not yet issued its written airspace determination letter. While the Commission has provided determinations of conditional consistency to projects whose obstruction evaluations are pending, airspace determination letters have consistently been a prerequisite to ALUC approval of new helicopter facilities.~~

RECOMMENDATION:

~~Staff recommends that the Commission open the public hearing and consider testimony. At this time, staff recommends CONTINUANCE to January 14, 2010, due to lack of an FAA airspace determination letter. However, this recommendation is subject to change in the event that such a letter is received prior to the hearing.~~

Staff recommends that the proposed emergency medical service helicopter landing site be found CONSISTENT with the Countywide Policies of the 2004 Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, subject to the conditions specified herein.

~~Note: Given that the Commission will not be meeting in December, as an alternative, the Commission may wish to consider a finding of conditional consistency, with a directive that the letter to the City not be issued until the airspace determination letter has been provided to the ALUC Director, and subject to such additional conditions as may be required by the FAA.~~

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Valley Health System proposes to establish an Emergency Medical Service (EMS) Helicopter Landing Site at Menifee Valley Medical Center. The facility will consist of a 48-foot square (2,304 square foot) Touchdown and Liftoff Area (TLOF) on a ~~an~~ concrete landing pad with associated gurney ramp and wind cone. The facility will comply with most FAA criteria, but will not be marked or lighted, as such marking and lighting is prohibited for EMS landing sites by State law, in order to distinguish them from hospital helistops and other heliports. EMS landing sites do not require the issuance of a State Heliport Permit. As such, the facility may only be used for emergency medical services, departures and landings, including patient transfer to higher level or specialized facilities.

The Final Approach and Takeoff Area (FATO) will be 86 feet by 86 feet (7,396 square feet) in area centered on the TLOF, and will be surrounded by a safety area with a width of 16 feet.

PROJECT LOCATION:

Menifee Valley Medical Center, a hospital, has an address of 28400 McCall Boulevard, and its campus is located on the north side of McCall Boulevard, easterly of Antelope Road, in the recently incorporated City of Menifee. The property is not located within an existing Airport Influence Area. While the closest airport to the site is Perris Valley Airport, staff assigned an “MA” case number because the property would be within the March Air Reserve Base Airport Influence Area if the boundaries proposed in the Draft Joint Land Use Study are eventually adopted.

INTRODUCTION – BASIS FOR REVIEW

The Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (RCALUCP) Policy Document, adopted on October 14, 2004, articulates “procedures and criteria” that the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) “shall utilize when evaluating certain types of airport development proposals that...are subject to ALUC review and are addressed by the Compatibility Plan.” In the case of a new airport

or heliport, the proposal may be approved if it is consistent with the specific review policies listed in Section 5.2 of the Countywide Policies.

The ALUCP further states that, in its review of an Airport Master Plan or Airport Layout Plan, the Commission shall focus on the noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight impacts on the surrounding land uses and must base its review on the proposed airfield design. In this regard, one of the critical issues is whether existing and/or approved land uses in the surrounding area would be considered incompatible with the heliport if the heliport were already in existence. Another critical issue is whether the proposal includes measures to mitigate the noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight impacts on surrounding land uses. (Such measures could potentially include the siting of flight tracks so as to minimize impacts, selection of operational procedures to minimize impacts, installation of noise barriers or structural noise insulation, and/or acquisition of property interests on the impacted land.)

With regard to noise, any proposed construction or alteration “that would result in a significant increase in cumulative noise exposure (measured in terms of CNEL) shall include measures to reduce the exposure to a less-than-significant level.” “In locations having an existing ambient noise level of less than 55 dB CNEL, a project that would increase the noise level by 5.0 dB or more” would be considered to result in a significant noise increase. However, in areas with existing ambient noise levels of 55-60 CNEL, a project that would increase the noise level by 3.0 dB or more would be considered to result in a significant noise increase. In areas with existing ambient noise levels greater than 60 CNEL, a project that would increase the noise level by 1.5 dB or more would be considered to result in a significant noise increase.

SURROUNDING LAND USE:

Much of the area north and west of the hospital is vacant, although portions of this area are slated for development in the near future. There is a recently developed subdivision to the south, on the opposite side of McCall Boulevard. The area to the east of the modern suburban subdivision was subdivided many years ago, and development there has occurred on a lot-by-lot basis, rather than through the mass market development process that has characterized home building in the last sixty years.

EMS HELICOPTER LANDING SITES VIS-À-VIS HELIPORTS:

According to an informational document prepared by the State of California Division of Aeronautics, Emergency Medical Service (EMS) Helicopter Landing Sites are exempt from the requirement for State Permits to operate. Rather than being permitted by the State, they are “designated ...by an officer authorized by a public safety agency, as defined in PUC Section 21662.1, using criteria that the public safety agency has determined is reasonable and prudent for the safe operation of EMS helicopters.” (California Code of Regulations, Title 21, Section 3527(g))

In response to staff’s inquiry as to selection of such a public service agency, the project representative noted that the owner of the hospital, Valley Health System, is a “special purpose district authorized to arrange for emergency medical services” and would, therefore, be “able to self-certify the facility.”

Furthermore, EMS Helicopter Landing Sites must not be marked as a permitted heliport and may only be used for emergency medical purposes. There is also an activity limitation. They may not be used, over any twelve-month period, for more than an average of six landings per month with a patient or patients on the helicopter, except to allow for adequate medical response to a mass casualty event, even if that response causes the site to be used beyond these limits. (There does not seem to be a limit on departures.)

The informational document, prepared in 1997, states that the intent of the legislation was to “allow small or rural medical facilities to accept an occasional emergency patient or transfer a patient to a higher care level hospital. The author further opines that “[b]eing designated as an EMS Helicopter Landing Site with the intent of being used on a regular basis seems inappropriate and could be considered an attempt to circumvent the law” and proceeds to encourage hospitals to develop permitted heliports.

NOISE STUDY:

A noise study was prepared by Acoustics Group, Inc. and submitted to ALUC staff. The acoustical study is predicated on an assumption of eight operations per month. Use of the Eurocopter EC-130, which produces a higher noise level than the other helicopter models that might be used, was assumed in the model in order to generate a “worst-case” noise scenario.

The consultant selected three sensitive receptor locations for the analysis. Receptor R1 is located on the opposite side of McCall Boulevard, at the location of the closest residence. Receptor R2 is located to the southwest, at the southwesterly corner of McCall Boulevard and the southerly extension of Aspel Road, directly underlying a flight path. Receptor R3 is located on a ridge northeasterly of the site. Ambient noise levels were measured over a 10-minute period at locations R1 and R3. The Leq was determined to be 64.6 dB(A) at R1 and 49.3 dB(A) at R3. Ambient noise levels were not measured at R2 due to ongoing construction activity at that location.

The noise study utilized the Federal Aviation Administration’s Integrated Noise Model (INM) Version 7.0 to determine the future noise levels from the proposed helistop operations. The model projects that, based on an estimate of four departures and four arrivals per month (two each in day and one each in evening and night hours), the average noise level from helicopter operations would be 58.2 dB(A) CNEL at R1, 45.0 dB(A) CNEL at R2, and 33.0 dB(A) CNEL at R3.

Acoustics Group, Inc. then proceeded to evaluate these levels in light of noise from future traffic. Based on the County Circulation Element designation of McCall Boulevard as a 6-lane Urban Arterial Highway with an ADT (average daily traffic) level of 43,100 vehicles, it was determined that future traffic noise would be 79 dB(A) at R1 and R2, and 66 dB(A) at R3. With average noise levels from helicopter operations below 60 dB(A) CNEL at R1 and below 50 dB(A) CNEL at the other receptor locations, they have no effect on future average noise levels.

The noise study states that the helistop generated CNEL will be below the ambient background CNEL generated by future traffic. The CNEL from helicopter operations will not result in an increase in the CNEL based on existing modeled traffic levels. Furthermore, the CNEL from

helicopter operations will be 6.4 decibels less than the measured ambient noise level.

The noise study does go a step beyond projecting the average noise level to address single-event noise levels and notes that single event noise will be “clearly discernable” at these receptor locations. The SEL levels would be 101.8 dB at R1, 88.6 dB at R2, and 76.6 dB at R3. The single-event or peak noise level is acknowledged to be a major factor in the degree of annoyance generated by aircraft operations. As stated on page 2 of the noise study, the factors of importance in this matter would include the “magnitude of the event sound level with respect to the background; duration of the sound event; number of event occurrences and their repetitiveness; and time of day that the event occurs.”

The study recommends the following noise reduction measures:

- “1. Helicopter idle time should be minimized as much as possible.
2. If noise is expressed as an issue by the community, than noise monitoring should be conducted during the initial stages of operations. In the event that the noise criteria are exceeded, the operations should be reviewed to determine further noise control measures. Alternative flight tracks may need to be implemented if annoyances are encountered.”

FAA AIRSPACE DETERMINATION:

~~The project representative has submitted a Notice of Landing Area Proposal to the Federal Aviation Administration. In a letter dated October 19, 2009, Jeffrey Wright states that an “FAA inspector visited the site on October 8, 2009 and found our plans acceptable from an airspace utilization standpoint.” However, a written airspace determination letter has not been received for this project.~~

On December 7, 2009, the Federal Aviation Administration issued a determination that the proposed project (Airspace Case No. 2009-AWP-817-NRA) is “acceptable from an airspace utilization standpoint and will not adversely affect the safe and efficient use of airspace by aircraft.”

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION STAFF RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:

1. No operations (takeoffs or landings) shall be conducted until such time as an officer of an authorized public safety agency, as defined in Section 21662.1 of the State of California Public Utilities Code, has designated the facility as an Emergency Medical Service (EMS) Landing Site and has issued a written determination that the site is “reasonable and prudent for the safe operation of EMS helicopters.”
2. The heliport shall be designed and constructed in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 150/5390-2B, *Heliport Design*, except that the site shall not be marked as a permitted heliport as described .
3. Establishment and operations shall comply with the recommendations and requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration letter dated _____ **December 7, 2009**, a

copy of which is attached hereto. **Item d. on the first page of this letter shall be interpreted as a requirement to contact CALTRANS Division of Aeronautics and not as a requirement for a State Heliport Permit, unless required by CALTRANS.**

4. Helicopter idle time shall be minimized as much as possible.
5. The Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) requests that Menifee Valley Medical Center consider returning to ALUC to seek advisory comments regarding mitigation of noise impacts on surrounding properties in the event that the average number of monthly operations exceeds eight (8) over any given three-month period.
6. **The applicant shall contact the entity owning the “electric/telephone wires located south of the proposed heliport” and request that “spherical obstruction balls” (in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 7-/7460-2 series) be placed on the wires.**

ADDITIONALLY, THE CITY MAY WISH TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING OR SIMILAR MEASURES TO ADDRESS HELIPORT USAGE IN CONJUNCTION WITH ITS CONSIDERATION OF THE USE PERMIT FOR THE FACILITY:

- A. Heliport usage shall be monitored by Menifee Valley Medical Center so as to limit operations to an average of four arrivals and four departures per month, except in mass casualty or community disaster situations, as recognized by City, State or Federal authorities.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM: 3.3 ~~3-6~~

HEARING DATE: January 14, 2010 (continued from November 12, 2009)

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: ZAP1012FL09 – Riverside Healthcare System/Riverside Community Hospital (Representative: Jeff Wright, Heliplanners)

APPROVING JURISDICTION: State of California Department of Transportation Division of Aeronautics (State Airport Permit); City of Riverside (Conditional Use Permit)

JURISDICTION CASE NO.: P09-0694 (Conditional Use Permit)

MAJOR ISSUES:

1. Residential uses, including apartments and single-family homes, as well as *the Grant Education Center, a community theater, a playground on a former school site* and a cemetery, would be subject to high noise levels during helicopter operations. Single-event noise levels during operations could be as high as 114.3 dB at the southerly end of the grounds of the *Grant Education Center former site of Grant Elementary School* (on the opposite side of 14th Street from the proposed hospital helistop).

2. Future helicopter operations are projected to result in an average noise level of 71.6 dB(A) at the *southerly end of the grounds of the Grant Education Center. former school site.* While this is lower than the future traffic noise level projected for this site (75.6 dB(A)), it exceeds the measured ambient noise level at this site (66.7 dB(A) Leq) by 4.9 dB. When evaluated in light of existing modeled traffic levels, the helicopter operations result in a 2.0 dB increase in noise levels at that site, which is greater than the 1.5 dB increase significance threshold for areas with existing ambient noise levels exceeding 65 dB(A) CNEL. (However, this significance threshold is not reached if the helicopter operations are evaluated in light of projected average noise levels under future traffic conditions.)

~~3. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has not yet issued its written airspace determination letter. While the Commission has provided determinations of conditional consistency to projects whose obstruction evaluations are pending, airspace determination letters have consistently been a prerequisite to ALUC approval of new helicopter facilities.~~

3. *If the proposed hospital helistop were already in existence, and a school and a theater were proposed land uses at their existing locations, those noise-sensitive land uses would be considered incompatible with the existing heliport due to the average noise levels.*

RECOMMENDATION:

While ALUC staff supports the concept of establishing a hospital helistop at Riverside Community Hospital in close proximity to its emergency facilities, staff does not at this time have sufficient evidence to confirm that this site is the only available on-campus option. For example, if the helistop could be established on land located southerly of the hospital's emergency wing, the noise impacts on the Grant Education Center would be considerably reduced.

Staff recommends a finding of INCONSISTENCY, unless the applicant provides conclusive physical proof that no feasible alternative exists on-site.

~~Staff recommends that the Commission open the public hearing and consider testimony. At this time, staff recommends CONTINUANCE to January 14, 2010, primarily due to the lack of an FAA airspace determination letter.~~

~~Additionally, given the noise impact at the former school site across the street from the proposed helistop site, staff would request Commission direction as to whether to ask the project team to evaluate alternative sites on the hospital campus or alternative flight paths.~~

~~In the event that the Commission does not request evaluation of alternative sites or alternative flight paths, as an alternative to a two month continuance, the Commission may wish to consider a finding of conditional consistency, with a directive that the letter to the City not be issued until the airspace determination letter has been provided to the ALUC Director, and subject to such additional conditions as may be required by the FAA.~~

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Riverside Healthcare System proposes to establish a heliport (specifically, a hospital helistop) atop the top deck of the parking structure at Riverside Community Hospital. The facility will consist of a 54-foot square (2,916 square foot) Touchdown and Liftoff Area (TLOF) on an elevated metal landing pad with associated gurney ramp, safety net, wind cone, lighting, and painted markings, and the design will comply with FAA requirements..

The Final Approach and Takeoff Area (FATO) will be 98 feet by 98 feet (9,604 square feet) in area centered on the TLOF, and will be surrounded by a safety area with a width of 18 feet.

The acoustical study prepared by Acoustics Group, Inc. is predicated on an assumption of six operations per week. The Eurocopter EC-130, which produces a higher noise level than the other models that might be used, was utilized to generate the noise analysis. The California Department of Transportation Aeronautics Division requires a new heliport permit application for special-use heliports, which in turn triggered the requirement for Airport Land Use Commission review.

PROJECT LOCATION:

Riverside Community Hospital has an address of 4445 Magnolia Avenue, and its campus is located on the west side of Magnolia Avenue, south of 14th Street, north of Terracina Drive, and east of

Brockton Avenue, at the southwesterly corner of the “downtown” area of the City of Riverside. The property is not located within an existing Airport Influence Area.

INTRODUCTION – BASIS FOR REVIEW

As stated in Section 1.5.1 of the Countywide Policies of the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, any “proposal for a new airport or heliport whether for public use or private use (Public Utilities Code Section 21661.5)” requires referral to the Airport Land Use Commission for a determination of consistency with the Commission’s Plan prior to approval by the local jurisdiction “if the facility requires a state airport permit.” The Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (RCALUCP) Policy Document, adopted on October 14, 2004, articulates “procedures and criteria” that the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) “shall utilize when evaluating certain types of airport development proposals that...are subject to ALUC review and are addressed by the Compatibility Plan.” In the case of a new airport or heliport, the proposal may be approved if it is consistent with the specific review policies listed in Section 5.2 of the Countywide Policies.

The ALUCP further states that, in its review of an Airport Master Plan or Airport Layout Plan, the Commission shall focus on the noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight impacts on the surrounding land uses and must base its review on the proposed airfield design. In this regard, one of the critical issues is whether existing and/or approved land uses in the surrounding area would be considered incompatible with the heliport if the heliport were already in existence. Another critical issue is whether the proposal includes measures to mitigate the noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight impacts on surrounding land uses. (Such measures could potentially include the siting of flight tracks so as to minimize impacts, selection of operational procedures to minimize impacts, installation of noise barriers or structural noise insulation, and/or acquisition of property interests on the impacted land.) With regard to noise, any proposed construction or alteration “that would result in a significant increase in cumulative noise exposure (measured in terms of CNEL) shall include measures to reduce the exposure to a less-than-significant level.” “In locations having an existing ambient noise level of less than 55 dB CNEL, a project that would increase the noise level by 5.0 dB or more” would be considered to result in a significant noise increase. However, in areas with existing ambient noise levels of 55-60 CNEL, a project that would increase the noise level by 3.0 dB or more would be considered to result in a significant noise increase. In areas with existing ambient noise levels greater than 60 CNEL, a project that would increase the noise level by 1.5 dB or more would be considered to result in a significant noise increase.

SURROUNDING LAND USE:

The land uses surrounding the hospital consist largely of urban uses that are not appropriate for areas surrounding airports, such as **a Riverside Unified School District education center** ~~an elementary school (which is no longer in school use, but may still be utilized as a playground and an assembly area for community or neighborhood meetings)~~, apartments, single-family residences, and churches. If this were not a hospital-related heliport, this would be a clearly inconsistent location for an aviation facility due to the associated land use incompatibilities (both safety and noise). However, in this case, the safety and noise hazards must be balanced against the health and safety benefits of the facility. According to the Riverside Community Hospital website, the hospital is a

Level Two Trauma Center, and its Emergency Room, with a 50-bed capacity, is the County's largest. It is expected that the primary situation in which the helistop would be used would be for the transport of critically ill and injured patients from emergency scenes and from other health care facilities.

NOISE STUDY:

A noise study was prepared by Acoustics Group, Inc. and submitted to ALUC staff. The consultant selected three sensitive receptor locations for the analysis. Receptor R1 is the point on the campus of **the Grant Education Center** ~~Grant Elementary School (no longer in use as a school)~~ that is closest to the projected approach/departure track, which is basically at the southerly property boundary along 14th Street. Receptor R2 is located at the Bridgeport Apartments on Pine Street. Receptor R3 is located in a group of residences located on 14th Street, westerly of Brockton Avenue. Ambient noise levels were measured over a 20-minute period at locations R1 and R2. The Leq was determined to be 66.7 dB(A) at R1 and 59.4 at R2.

The noise study utilized the Federal Aviation Administration's Integrated Noise Model (INM) Version 7.0 to determine the future noise levels from the proposed helistop operations. The model projects that, based on an estimate of three departures and three arrivals per week (one each in day, evening, and night hours), the average noise level from helicopter operations would be 71.6 dB(A) CNEL at R1, 40.5 dB(A) CNEL at R2, and 49.8 dB(A) CNEL at R3.

Acoustics Group, Inc. then proceeded to evaluate these levels in light of noise from future traffic. Based on the concept of the adjacent segment of 14th Street being a 4-lane Major Highway with an ADT (average daily traffic) level of 27,000 vehicles, it was determined that future traffic noise would be 75.6 dB(A) at R1 and R3. With average noise levels from helicopter operations below 50 dB(A) CNEL at R3, they have no effect on future average noise levels at that site. As to R1, however, the additive effect of the helicopter operations increases the cumulative noise from traffic and helicopter sources by 1.4 dB – just below the significance threshold. The resulting average noise level is 77 dB(A) CNEL.

The noise study states that the helistop generated CNEL will be below the ambient background CNEL generated by future traffic. However, when evaluated in relation to modeled existing traffic levels, the additive effect of the helicopter operations increases the cumulative noise from traffic and helicopter operations by 2.0 dB – above the significance threshold (1.5 dB).

The noise study does go a step beyond projecting the average noise level to address single-event noise levels and notes that single event noise will be “clearly discernable” at these receptor locations. This is an understatement, in that SEL levels would be 83.2 dB at R2, 92.4 dB at R3, and a whopping 114.3 dB at R1. The single-event or peak noise level is acknowledged to be a major factor in the degree of annoyance generated by aircraft operations. As stated on page 2 of the noise study, the factors of importance in this matter would include the “magnitude of the event sound level with respect to the background; duration of the sound event; number of event occurrences and their repetitiveness; and time of day that the event occurs.”

The single-event noise level at R1 would qualify as a nuisance exterior sound level if generated by a

noise source subject to the City of Riverside's noise ordinance (Title 7 of the Riverside Municipal Code). Section 7.25.010 provides that, "[u]nless a variance has been granted..., it shall be unlawful for any person to cause or allow the creation of any noise which exceeds...[t]he exterior noise standard of the applicable land use category, plus fifteen decibels, for the cumulative period of more than one minute in any hour; or [t]he exterior noise standard of the applicable land use category, plus twenty decibels...for any period of time." The exterior noise standard within the residential land use category is specified in Table 7.25.010A as 55 dB(A) from 7:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M. and as 45 dB(A) from 10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M. The standard is 60 dB(A) for the community support land use category, 65 dB(A) for office/commercial and public recreation facilities, and 70 dB(A) for industrial and nonurban areas.

It would be beneficial if Acoustics Group, Inc. were to determine the average and single-event noise levels at the actual structures at Grant Education Center. It is expected that those noise levels would be lower than the noise level at the nearest point on the grounds of the school site.

The study recommends the following noise reduction measures:

- “1. Helistop operations should not exceed the permitted capacity.
2. The number of evening and nighttime operations should be minimized as much as possible.
3. Helicopter idle time should be minimized as much as possible.
4. Noise monitoring should be conducted during the initial stages of operations to determine compliance with local noise criteria. Alternative flight tracks may need to be implemented if annoyances are encountered.”

Additionally, following the completion of the noise study, the proposed flight path has been revised so that the aircraft would no longer fly directly over the Riverside Unified School District property. The entire approach/departure surface would be clear of that property, although portions of the property would remain within the transitional surface.

FAA AIRSPACE DETERMINATION:

The project representative has submitted a Notice of Landing Area Proposal to the Federal Aviation Administration. In a letter dated October 19, 2009, Jeffrey Wright states that an “FAA inspector visited the site on October 8, 2009 and found our plans acceptable ~~from~~ from an airspace utilization standpoint.” However, a written airspace determination letter has not been received for this project.

On January 4, 2010, the Federal Aviation Administration issued a determination that the proposed project (Airspace Case No. 2009-AWP-1022-NRA) is “acceptable from an airspace utilization standpoint and will not adversely affect the safe and efficient use of airspace by aircraft.”

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS:

This case was originally scheduled for ALUC consideration on November 12, 2009. However, prior to the hearing, ALUC staff was contacted by Janet Dixon, Director of Planning and Development for the Riverside Unified School District, who advised that the District had not received notice of the hearing; she had been advised by a third party, who did receive notice. Staff checked the mailing labels and determined that the District had not been included on the list. Ms. Dixon was also concerned that the District had not been contacted directly by the applicant, and that, partially as a result, the noise study and the staff report were incorrect in addressing the District property simply as a former school site now used as a playground and for meetings. Ms. Dixon also attended the ALUC meeting on November 12 to express similar concerns. The case was continued, with a requirement for re-advertisement.

On November 7, 2009, Michael Fine, Deputy Superintendent of Schools for the District, sent an e-mail to project representative Jeff Wright advising that the “Grant Education Center currently houses two different preschool programs, a child care program, and classes for all age students enrolled in RUSD’s Riverside Virtual School,” and that immediate plans for the facility include “a three-fold increase in child care participants and a small elementary school program operated by ... the Riverside County Office of Education.” Furthermore, he advised that Grant Elementary School had only recently closed after over one hundred years of operation, and that the District envisioned “a fully operating school site” in its “near term multiple year plans.” He reiterated the District’s concern regarding lack of contact and requested a meeting with Hospital officials. At the time of this e-mail, Mr. Fine indicated opposition to the project based on the District’s “unanswered safety concerns for the children and staff at Grant Education Center.”

Subsequently, in a December 21 e-mail, Mr. Fine advised that District and Hospital officials had met twice. District concerns include noise mitigation to Grant Education Center and “safeguarding the District’s long range plans for the Grant Education Center...” Consequently, the District asked that noise studies be updated to “properly disclose the existence of the program uses at Grant.” He further advised that “RUSD does not object to the project, but expects assurances from RCH on the protections for the current and future public uses of the Grant property and of nearby property for which RUSD or its partners have interest.”

In a December 1, 2009 letter to ALUC, the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce issued a letter in support of the proposed helistop, noting that it would “provide faster response times in bringing patients here for treatment and greatly enhance Riverside Community Hospital’s ability to provide emergency treatment for severely ill and injured patients.” The letter states that the “helistop would be a great asset to our community for medical trauma cases [and] would help close the gap in air service available in the four area trauma centers.”

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION STAFF RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:

1. No operations (takeoffs or landings) shall be conducted until such time as the State of California Department of Transportation Division of Aeronautics has issued a Site Approval Permit and subsequent Heliport Permit pursuant to Sections 3525 through 3560 of Title 21 of the California Code of Regulations.
2. The heliport shall be designed and constructed in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 150/5390-2B, *Heliport Design*.
3. Establishment and operations shall comply with the recommendations and requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration letter dated **January 4, 2010** _____, a copy of which is attached hereto.
4. Helicopter idle time shall be minimized as much as possible.
5. The Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) requests that Riverside Community Hospital consider returning to ALUC to seek advisory comments regarding mitigation of noise impacts on surrounding properties in the event that the average number of weekly operations exceeds six (6) within any given monthly period.

ADDITIONALLY, THE CITY MAY WISH TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING OR SIMILAR MEASURES TO ADDRESS HELIPORT USAGE IN CONJUNCTION WITH ITS CONSIDERATION OF THE USE PERMIT FOR THE FACILITY:

- A. Heliport usage shall be monitored by Riverside Community Hospital so as to limit operations to an average of three arrivals and three departures per week, except in mass casualty or community disaster situations, as recognized by City, State or Federal authorities.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM: 4.1

HEARING DATE: January 14, 2010

CASE NUMBER: ZAP1035FV09 and ZAP1004FV06 – H.G. Fenton Development Company/Fred J. Fleming (Representatives: Allen Jones and Karen Ruggels)

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside

JURISDICTION CASE NO.: For ZAP1035FV09: CZ07690 (Change of Zone) and SP00265S1 (Specific Plan No. 265, Substantial Conformance No. 1); For ZAP1004FV06: PM35212 (Commercial/Industrial Parcel Map)

MAJOR ISSUES:

1. **Given that the site is located within a Specific Plan, ALUC staff initially proposed that the zoning ordinance be amended to prohibit places of worship, day care centers, and libraries within the portion of the property in Compatibility Zone B2, and to prohibit children’s schools, hospitals, and nursing homes anywhere within the applicable Planning Areas. Following the issuance of public notices, ALUC staff was advised by Planning staff that the Specific Plan has expired. Thus, it is now likely that the Specific Plan zoning ordinance will be rescinded and conventional zoning applied to properties formerly subject to the Specific Plan. As a result, the nature of CZ07690 will be altered, and re-advertisement will be required once the revised proposal has been selected.**

2. **The project site is split by the boundary between Compatibility Zones B2 and D. The tentative parcel map does not depict the Compatibility Zone boundary and does not provide for a set-aside of open area. Projects of ten acres or greater in Compatibility Zone D must set aside 10% of their gross land area as ALUC-qualified open area. The applicant has proposed an alternative condition formulation whereby the open land area requirement would be addressed in the course of plot plan review.**

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends CONTINUANCE to February 11, 2010, pending resolution of the matters cited above.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The site comprises Planning Areas 11.1 and 21.1, along with a portion of Planning Area 21.2, within the Borel Airpark Specific Plan, as adopted in 1994. As proposed by the applicant, the site would retain its SP (Specific Plan) zoning, but the allowed land uses and development standards would change from a basis of A-1-10 (Light Agriculture, 10 acre minimum lot size) and C-P-S (Scenic Highway Commercial) to C-O (Commercial-Office) and C-P-S, in accordance with the land use designations in the Specific Plan, as reflected in the Southwest Area Plan Land Use Map of the Riverside County Integrated Project (RCIP) General Plan. The applicant proposed to amend the zoning ordinance provisions to provide for offices, health and exercise centers, and laboratories as among the permitted uses. Parcel Map No. 35212 would divide the 56.95-acre site into 20 commercial/industrial lots, with 8.43 acres of road rights-of-way.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The project is located easterly of Winchester Road, southerly of Sparkman Way (Airport Entrance Road), westerly of French Valley Airport, and northerly of an easterly straight-line extension of Hunter Road, approximately 997 feet westerly of Runway 18-36, in the unincorporated Riverside County community of French Valley.

LAND USE PLAN: 2007 French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (FVALUCP)

- a. Airport Influence Area: French Valley Airport
- b. Land Use Policy: Airport Compatibility Zones B2 and D
- c. Noise Levels: 55-65 CNEL

BACKGROUND:

Borel Airpark Specific Plan was adopted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors in 1994. The Specific Plan provided for industrial park, restricted light industrial, office park, and commercial uses within a 783-acre area that included lands on the easterly, westerly, and southerly boundaries of French Valley Airport. Planning Area 11.1 is designated for office park uses, and Planning Areas 21.1 and 21.2 are designated for commercial uses. However, at the time the Specific Plan was adopted, Planning Area 11.1 was entirely located within an agricultural preserve with an active contract, as were portions of Planning Areas 21.1 and 21.2. Therefore, the zoning ordinance adopted for the Specific Plan allowed only those uses permitted within the agricultural preserve (A-1-10 zoning uses and densities) within Planning Area 11.1. For Planning Areas 21.1 and 21.2, the ordinance was written in such a way as to permit only the A-1-10 uses and densities until the agricultural preserve was diminished or disestablished, and to subsequently allow C-P-S uses.

Eventually, the Notices of Non-Renewal for the agricultural preserve contract matured, the contract expired, and the applicable agricultural preserve was disestablished. With this action, the C-P-S base use became applicable in those portions of Planning Areas 21.1 and 21.2 previously subject to the A-1-10 use and density restrictions. There was no automatic rollover for Planning Area 11.1.

To be consistent with Specific Plan land uses, the applicant filed Change of Zone Case No. 07690, which sought to amend the Specific Plan zoning ordinance to allow all of the uses permitted by the County's C-O (Commercial Office) zone, except hotels, resort hotels, and motels, in Planning Area 11.1. Additionally, laboratories "including film, dental, medical, research, or testing" would be permitted in that Planning Area. Development standards would be those of the C-O zone, with revisions to setback requirements. The zoning ordinance would also be amended to allow all of the uses permitted by the County's C-P-S (Scenic Highway Commercial) zone in Planning Areas 21.1 and 21.2. Additionally, offices, "including business, law, medical, dental, chiropractic, architectural, engineering, community planning, and real estate," and health and exercise centers (within an enclosed building) would be permitted in that Planning Area. Development standards would be those of the C-P-S zone. These ordinance changes would enable development of Planning Area 11.1 as an office park and development of Planning Areas 21.1 and 21.2 for commercial uses, as envisioned in the Specific Plan.

The substantial conformance to the Specific Plan related solely to the ordinance changes; no other changes to the text of the Specific Plan document were proposed by the applicant and, therefore, no other changes were submitted for ALUC review.

The parcel map was initially submitted to ALUC for review in 2006, but ALUC was unable to take action due to the court-ordered suspension of the 2004 FVALUCP. Therefore, a "no action" letter was issued by ALUC. However, the applicant at that time failed to obtain approval of the parcel map prior to the adoption of the 2007 FVALUCP. As a result, the matter is once again before ALUC, in conjunction with legislative cases subsequently submitted to the Planning Department.

Following the issuance of the notice of hearing, ALUC staff was advised by Planning Department staff that the Specific Plan has expired. The applicant has the option of either filing a Specific Plan Amendment to extend the Specific Plan or amending the change of zone to provide for conventional zoning on the property consistent with the underlying General Plan designations.

Land Use: The site is located in Airport Compatibility Zones B2 and D of the French Valley Airport Influence Area. Excluding the rights-of-way, the site consists of 28.10 acres within Zone B2 and 22.45 acres within Zone D.

The applicant anticipates that the majority of building square footage at the development stage would be for office uses, along with a hotel, restaurants, and a fitness center. The

land use intensity of this site can only be evaluated at the plot plan or use permit stage; no buildings are proposed through the parcel map process.

Since the applicant's proposed project initially constituted an ordinance amendment within the Specific Plan zone, ALUC staff realized that this proposal represented an opportunity to prohibit through County zoning those uses that are prohibited pursuant to the Compatibility Plan. Specifically, prohibited uses in Compatibility Zone B2 include places of worship, day care centers, and libraries, as well as children's schools, hospitals, and nursing homes. Children's schools, hospitals, and nursing homes are listed as "discouraged" uses within Compatibility Zone D. However, both of the County zones underlying the SP zoning proposal (C-P-S and C-O) allow "churches, temples, and other places of religious worship" and day care centers, subject to plot plan approval, and the C-O zone allows libraries, subject to plot plan approval.

Therefore, ALUC staff recommended that the ordinance be amended to exclude these uses (at least within the portion of the project site within Compatibility Zone B2). However, it is now likely that the applicant will opt for application of conventional zoning, and ALUC staff will provide for the exclusion of prohibited land uses through conditions applied to the commercial/industrial parcel map.

Open Area Requirement: As the proposed site is located partially within Compatibility Zone D and is larger than 10 acres, compliance with ALUCP open land criteria is required. A minimum of 10 percent of the land area within Compatibility Zone D must qualify as open area. ALUC staff requested that this issue be addressed at the parcel map level, as the individual lots are smaller than 10 acres. Other than road rights-of-way, the parcel map does not illustrate or set aside open areas. A minimum of 2.25 acres within the net area within Compatibility Zone D needs to be set aside as ALUC-qualified open area. The applicant is envisioning that the initial plot plan would address an area of at least ten acres, and is requesting that demonstration of compliance be addressed at the plot plan level.

Part 77: The substantial conformance and change of zone are not subject to FAA review, and no buildings are proposed through the parcel map process. However, the applicant filed a Form 7460-1 for a building site located at latitude 33-34-21.360N NAD 83 and longitude 117-07-58.410W with a height of 45 feet above ground level and a maximum elevation of 1,568 feet above mean sea level, and received a Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation.

At a distance of 997 feet from the runway, FAA notice and review would be required for any future structures exceeding a maximum elevation of 1,350 feet AMSL at top of roof.

Noise: The site is located within an area subject to average noise levels of 55-65 CNEL from aircraft operations, and the 60 CNEL crosses the site. As the project is partially located in Compatibility Zone B2, recommended conditions include a requirement for an exterior to interior noise reduction of 25 dB in all office buildings located wholly or partially in that zone.

CONDITIONS (to be applied to the parcel map):

1. 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, including landscaping utilizing water features, aquaculture, production of cereal grains, sunflower, and row crops, trash transfer stations that are open on one or more sides, recycling centers containing putrescible wastes, construction and demolition debris facilities, composting operations, fly ash disposal, and incinerators.
 - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
 - (e) Children's schools, hospitals, nursing homes, and highly noise-sensitive outdoor uses, and within the portion of the site in Compatibility Zone B2, places of worship, day care centers, libraries, and aboveground bulk storage of 6,000 gallons or more of hazardous or flammable materials.
2. Prior to recordation of a final map, the landowner shall convey an avigation easement to French Valley Airport, which shall be recorded. Copies of the avigation easement, upon recordation, shall be forwarded to the Riverside County Planning Department and to the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission.
3. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.
4. Noise attenuation measures shall be incorporated into the office areas of future buildings located wholly or partially within Compatibility Zone B2 to ensure a minimum exterior-to-interior noise level reduction of 25 dB, so as to reduce interior noise levels from aircraft operations to 45 CNEL or below.
5. Any outdoor lighting that is installed shall be hooded or shielded so as to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky, and shall comply with

- Riverside County Ordinance No. 655, as applicable. Outdoor lighting plans shall be transmitted to the Riverside County Economic Development Agency – Aviation Division for review and comment.
6. Stormwater retention areas shall be designed so as to provide a maximum 48-hour detention period for the design storm (may be less, but not more), and to remain totally dry between rainfalls. Vegetation in and around the retention basin that would provide food or cover for bird species that would be incompatible with airport operations shall not be utilized in project landscaping.
 7. No building permits for structures for human occupancy shall be issued prior to approval of a Plot Plan, Conditional Use Permit, or Public Use Permit. The first such Plot Plan or Use Permit shall be for an area at least ten (10) acres in size and shall demonstrate compliance with the ALUC open land area requirements by allocating at least ten (10) percent of that portion of its area within Compatibility Zone D to ALUC-qualifying open land. Each subsequent Plot Plan or Use Permit shall demonstrate that the ALUC open land area requirement for Compatibility Zone D is met either on an individual Plot Plan/Use Permit basis, or as an aggregate of all Plot Plans/Use Permits in process or previously approved within the Parcel Map area.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM: 4.2

HEARING DATE: January 14, 2010

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: ZAP1036FV09 – Riverside County Economic Development Agency – Aviation Division

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside

JURISDICTION CASE NO.: French Valley Airport Master Plan

MAJOR ISSUES:

1. **Limited property acquisition may be required in order to make all of the Master Plan improvements over the course of the next twenty years.**
2. **The adopted Compatibility Plan is based on the existing Master Plan, which anticipated a parallel secondary runway. The proposed Master Plan eliminates the secondary runway. The elimination of this previously planned, but never built, secondary runway has been anticipated for several years; this action would officially wipe the secondary runway off the drawing boards. The elimination of the secondary runway has implications for the boundaries of Compatibility Zones to the east of the airport. Ideally, these boundaries should be amended to reflect this change.**

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of CONDITIONAL CONSISTENCY, subject to the understanding that the Riverside County Economic Development Agency – Aviation Division will work cooperatively with ALUC staff to amend the French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan within the next 18 months to reflect the adoption of this Master Plan.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The French Valley Airport Master Plan, prepared by Coffman Associates for adoption by the County of Riverside, recommends 27 actions over the next 20 years to improve the airport, the most prominent of which would be establishment of an Airport Traffic Control Tower. The airport would continue to be a general aviation airport, and activity forecasts would not exceed projections utilized to develop the Compatibility Plan adopted by the Commission in 2007. The Master Plan would supersede the 1995 Master Plan, which had proposed development of a secondary runway easterly of, and parallel to, the existing runway. Adoption of the new Master Plan would eliminate that previously proposed, but never built, secondary runway.

PROJECT LOCATION:

French Valley Airport is located easterly of Winchester Road (State Highway Route 79), southerly of Auld Road, and westerly of Leon Road in the unincorporated French Valley area of Riverside County, within the sphere of influence of the City of Temecula.

LAND USE PLAN: 2007 French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (2007 FVALUCP)

- a. Airport Influence Area: French Valley Airport
- b. Land Use Policy: Airport Compatibility Zones A, B1, B2, and C
- c. Noise Levels: From over 60 CNEL to above 75 CNEL along runway.

INTRODUCTION – BASIS FOR REVIEW:

As stated in Section 1.5.1 of the Countywide Policies of the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, any proposal for “Adoption or modification of the master plan for an existing public-use airport (Public Utilities Code Section 21676(c))” requires referral to the Airport Land Use Commission for a determination of consistency with the Commission’s Plan prior to approval by the local jurisdiction. An Airport Master Plan must “contain sufficient information to enable the Commission to adequately assess the noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight impacts of airport activity upon surrounding land uses. A master plan report shall be submitted, if possible. (Section 2.4.1, Countywide Policies). The Commission may find the project consistent or inconsistent with its Compatibility Plan, or may (after a duly noticed public hearing) modify the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan to reflect the assumptions and proposals in the Airport Master Plan (Section 2.4.2, Countywide Policies).

In reviewing Airport Master Plans, specific attention should be paid to proposals to “(1) construct a new runway or helicopter takeoff and landing area; (2) change the length, width, or landing threshold location of an existing runway; or (3) establish an instrument approach procedure” and to activity forecasts that are “(1) significantly higher than those in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan or that (2) include a higher proportion of larger or noisier aircraft” (Section 5.1.1, Countywide Policies).

Airport Master Plans are the basis for Compatibility Plans. As such, the Countywide Policies envision a process whereby the adoption or amendment of an Airport Master Plan and an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan occur concurrently.

In the current public sector fiscal environment, this has not been taking place because up to 95% of the cost of preparing an Airport Master Plan is eligible to be funded by the federal government, whereas the preparation of airport land use compatibility plans relies on local (and occasional state) funding.

References to the Master Plan in this report are references to the proposed Master Plan. The existing Master Plan will be referred to as the “1995 Master Plan.”

RUNWAY CONFIGURATION:

The French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (FVALUCP) adopted in 2007 and its 2004 predecessor were based on the 1995 Master Plan, which had recommended the development of a 3,600-foot lighted parallel runway located 700 feet easterly of the existing runway, with a parallel taxiway located between the two runways. The need for the parallel runway was based on a projection that the number of annual operations per year in 2013 (128,000) would reach 71 percent of capacity, measured as an annual service volume of 180,471 operations. The 1995 Master Plan had stated that “FAA criteria recommend consideration of improvements for capacity when operations exceed 60 percent of the annual service volume.” This concept, along with a desire to separate training operations from the main runway, formed the basis for the parallel runway proposal. Both the proposal and the airfield alternatives examined in the 1995 Master Plan provided for a parallel runway.

The proposed Master Plan projects only 110,000 operations in 2013, but 149,200 operations by the year 2030. This exceeds the 1995 Master Plan 20-year volume projection. However, approximately 95 acres of industrially designated land would have to be acquired from adjacent property owners to the east in order to make the parallel runway a reality. As early as the spring of 2006, Robert Field of the Economic Development Agency advised that the parallel secondary runway would likely be deleted from future plans. Although the proposed Master Plan document never mentions this previously proposed runway, it includes a runway needs analysis, which states that the annual “capacity of a single runway configuration normally exceeds 150,000 operations with a suitable parallel taxiway available” and concludes that no additional runways or further runway extensions are required.

Coffman Associates, the authors of the proposed Master Plan, reviewed all “airside facilities,” including runways, taxiways, helicopter parking, and airfield lighting and marking, along with navigational aids, instrument approach procedures, and weather reporting, and advised that these facilities met all Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requirements for airports with an Airport Reference Code (ARC) of B-II, with one exception. The existing holding position markings on the taxiways that intersect the runway, which “identify the location where a pilot should assure there is adequate separation with other aircraft before proceeding onto the runway...do not meet the current standard which is 200 feet from the runway centerline.” (page 3-11)

COMPATIBILITY PLAN IMPLICATIONS:

The elimination of the secondary runway has implications for the boundaries of Compatibility Zones A, B1, B2, and C easterly (and, to some extent, northerly and southerly) of the airport. There is also a possibility that the boundary between Compatibility Zones D and E would be affected, although this is less likely, since that boundary was apparently based on distance from the centerline of the existing runway. (Compatibility Zone D extends 7,000 feet easterly from the runway centerline and 6,000 feet westerly from the runway centerline, but the width difference is largely attributable to the normal traffic pattern, which is primarily easterly of the airport.) The net effect would be that properties would move from more restrictive to less restrictive Compatibility Zones, allowing a wider range or greater intensity of development.

ALUC staff understands that the Economic Development Agency – Aviation Division intends to contract with Mead & Hunt for the preparation of a revised Compatibility Zone map reflecting the deletion of the secondary runway. Once such a map is completed, work on an amendment to the 2007 FVALUCP can commence.

NOISE:

The proposed Master Plan also includes noise contours developed using the FAA-approved Integrated Noise Model. While the Model projects Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contours, only the 65, 70, and 75 CNEL contours are mapped. The future (year 2030) contours indicate that both the 65 and 70 CNEL contours extend beyond the airport onto adjacent privately owned properties; however, none of these properties are proposed for residential uses. All of the land area within the 65 CNEL contour is presently vacant, except for one accessory building at the Southwest Justice Center and for existing uses and/or buildings in the area that is proposed in the Master Plan to be purchased by the airport for hangar development.

It should be noted that these noise contours extend farther from the runway than the ultimate noise contours as depicted in the exhibits included within the adopted Compatibility Plan, which were based on an earlier noise model. Therefore, the more comprehensive Mead & Hunt noise maps, which extend contours to the 55 CNEL level, should also be revised using the new Integrated Noise Model.

AIRCRAFT TYPE DISTRIBUTION:

The Master Plan noise study is based on a slightly different fleet mix (share of operations) than the Compatibility Plan. The Compatibility Plan noise contours assumed the following share of operations: 79% single-engine, 8% twin-engine piston; 5% twin-engine turboprop; 6% business jets; 1% helicopter; and 1% other. In contrast, the Master Plan noise study is based on the following shares of operations: single-engine aircraft, 82.5%; multi-engine, 10%; jets, 4%; helicopters, 2%; and ultralights, 1.5%.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN:

The Master Plan proposes that the County undertake the following actions over the course of the next twenty years:

Years 1-5:

- Provide for Tie-down expansion
- Upgrade existing security fencing
- Slurry seal apron area
- Overlay of runway and taxiways – 95,000 square yards
- Update Automated Weather Observation System (AWOS)
- Install Omnidirectional Approach Lighting System (ODALS)
- Upgrade runway lighting to High Intensity Runway Lighting (HIRL)
- Acquire 20 acres for hangars, and prepare site for hangar development

- Install airport security fencing around acquisition area
- Construct Airport Traffic Control Tower

Years 6-10

- Extend taxiways for access to new T-hangars in acquisition area (Phase I)
- Extend Airport Road to acquisition area, and add parking (Phase I)
- Construct nested hangars (44 units)
- Overlay of ramp and hangar taxilanes
- Acquire airport maintenance equipment
- Rehabilitate airfield lighting and navigational aids
- Overlay of runway and taxiway pavements

Years 11-20

- Extend taxiways for access to new T-hangars in acquisition area (Phase II)
- Extend Airport Road to acquisition area, and add parking (Phase II)
- Construct nested hangars (52 units)
- Update airport security/fencing
- Acquire airport maintenance equipment
- Update fuel storage facility
- Rehabilitate terminal building
- Overlay of runway and taxiway pavements
- Rehabilitate airfield lighting and navigational aids
- Overlay of ramp and hangar taxilanes
- Provide for realignment of Borel Road outside of new exterior airport boundary

FAA REVIEW OF AIRPORT LAYOUT PLAN:

FAA review of the proposed Airport Layout Plan has not yet occurred.

FINDING:

1. The forecasts and development identified in the Airport Master Plan would not result in greater noise, overflight, and safety impacts or height restrictions on surrounding land uses than are assumed in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

CONDITION:

1. Any non-aviation development proposed for locations within the airport boundary (excluding federal- or state-owned property) shall be consistent with the compatibility criteria and policies indicated in the 2007 French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, and any non-aviation development within the airport boundary is subject to ALUC review, pursuant to California Airport Land Use Handbook guidelines.

Staff Report
Page 6 of 6

Y:\ALUC\French Valley\ZAP1036FV09jan10srMstrPlan.doc