



# 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., June 10, 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  
Russell Brady  
Barbara Santos

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

[www.rcaluc.org](http://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, 9<sup>th</sup> 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](mailto: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

### FLABOB AIRPORT

- 2.1 ZAP1015FL10 – Riverside County Economic Development Agency, for Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District – (Representative: Jill Efron/RHA Landscape Architects Planners Inc.) - Rancho Jurupa Sports Complex (Amended proposal) – A park with soccer fields, including lighted soccer fields, picnic shelters, playground with play structures, restroom/concession building, and storage building, on a 36.54-acre site located northerly of Crestmore Road and 46th Street, westerly of Loring Ranch Road, and southerly of Flabob Airport in the unincorporated Riverside County community of Rubidoux. ALUC Staff Planner: Russell Brady at (951) 955-0549, or e-mail at [rbrady@rctlma.org](mailto:rbrady@rctlma.org). or John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or e-mail at [jguerin@rctlma.org](mailto:jguerin@rctlma.org).

Staff Recommendation: CONDITIONALLY CONSISTENT

**MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE**

- 2.2 ZAP1064MA10 – Christian Singletary (Representative: SDH & Associates, Inc. – Steve Sommers) – City Case No. P10-0021 and P10-0234. The applicant proposes to develop nine industrial buildings with a total gross floor area of 76,520 square feet on a 6.7 gross acre site located easterly of San Gorgonio Drive, southerly of Mt. Baldy Drive, northerly of Alessandro Boulevard, and westerly of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard in the City of Riverside, and to change the zoning of the site from Commercial Retail (CR) to Business and Manufacturing Park (BMP). Airport Area II within the March Air Reserve Base Influence Area. ALUC Staff Planner: Russell Brady at (951) 955-0549, or e-mail at [rbrady@rctlma.org](mailto:rbrady@rctlma.org). or John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or e-mail at [jguerin@rctlma.org](mailto:jguerin@rctlma.org).

Staff Recommendation: CONSISTENT

**HEMET RYAN AIRPORT**

- 2.3 ZAP1020HR10 – T-Mobile West Corporation (Representative: James A. Rogers) – County Case No. PP24486. PP24486 is a proposal to construct a 65-foot tall monopalm wireless facility including twelve panel antennas, microwave dish, one parabolic antenna, equipment cabinets, and 6-foot high chain link fence on a 4-acre property located southerly of State Highway Route 74 and easterly of Cordoba Road in unincorporated Riverside County. (Hemet Ryan Airport: Area III). \*Note: Recommendation subject to change on date of hearing. ALUC Staff Planner: Russell Brady at (951) 955-0549, or e-mail at [rbrady@rctlma.org](mailto:rbrady@rctlma.org). or John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or e-mail at [jguerin@rctlma.org](mailto:jguerin@rctlma.org).

Staff Recommendation: CONTINUANCE to August 12, 2010

**3.0 PUBLIC HEARING: OLD BUSINESS**

**FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT**

- 3.1 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](mailto:jguerin@rctlma.org). (Continued from January 14, February 11, and March 11, 2010)

Staff Recommendation: CONSISTENT

**BLYTHE AIRPORT**

- 3.2 ZAP1006BL10 – Palo Verde Solar I, LLC – California Energy Commission Docket No. 09-AFC-6. The project proposes to construct a nominal 1,000 megawatt solar thermal electric generating facility on 9,400 acres of BLM managed land, including four units of north-south oriented tracking parabolic trough mirrors, four 120-foot tall air-cooled condensers, a 230 kV transmission line with maximum 145-foot tall monopoles, and a four-inch diameter 9.8-mile long natural gas pipeline. (Blythe Airport: Zones B1, C, D, and E). ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or e-mail at [jguerin@rctlma.org](mailto:jguerin@rctlma.org) or Russell Brady at (951) 955-0549, or e-mail at [rbrady@rctlma.org](mailto:rbrady@rctlma.org).  
(Continued from April 8 and May 13, 2010)

Staff Recommendation: Direct staff to prepare a letter to the California Energy Commission

**PERRIS VALLEY AIRPORT**

- 3.3 ZAP1003PV10 – City of Perris (Representative: Brad Eckhardt, Planning Manager) – City Case No. SPA 08-08-0004 (Specific Plan Amendment). The City proposes to adopt a comprehensive revision to the Downtown Specific Plan. The plan designates allowable land uses and densities and prescribes development standards within the 735-acre Downtown Perris area, which is located southerly/southwesterly of Interstate 215, northerly of Ellis Avenue, westerly of Redlands Avenue, and easterly of “A” Street. The existing Specific Plan was adopted in 1993 and allows for a mix of residential, commercial, industrial, and public land uses at various densities. The comprehensive revision is designed around a Regulating Code that focuses on the form and placement of buildings, with the intent of developing a Transit-Oriented Community (focusing on the future Metrolink Station) with a mix of land uses at densities that support transit and meet Housing Element requirements. (Perris Valley Airport: Zones I, II, III on current map; A through E on proposed plan). ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or e-mail at [jguerin@rctlma.org](mailto:jguerin@rctlma.org) or Russell Brady at (951) 955-0549, or e-mail at [rbrady@rctlma.org](mailto:rbrady@rctlma.org). (Continued from April 8 and May 13, 2010)

Staff Recommendation: CONTINUANCE to August 12, 2010

**4.0 ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

- 4.1 Director's Approvals
- 4.2 Election of At Large Commission Member

**5.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
May 13, 2010

**6.0 ORAL COMMUNICATION ON ANY MATTER NOT ON THE AGENDA**

**7.0 COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS**

Y:\ALUC\ALUC Commission Agendas\2010 Agendas\ALUCAGDA-6-10-10.doc

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION  
STAFF REPORT

**AGENDA ITEM:** 2.1

**HEARING DATE:** June 10, 2010

**CASE NUMBER:** ZAP1015FL10 – Riverside County Economic Development Agency, for Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside

**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Rancho Jurupa Sports Complex (amended proposal)

**MAJOR ISSUES:** Children will comprise the majority of persons enjoying the use of this facility in the “sideline” B2 zone. The intensity of use in that zone could potentially exceed the 200 person per single-acre standard; however, the area of greatest single-acre intensity within the B2 zone consists primarily of open fields with unobstructed ingress and egress, such that the equivalent of a risk-reduction design bonus for multiple emergency exits and single-story construction (the sections of the intensity bonus relating to ease of evacuation) is appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of **CONDITIONAL CONSISTENCY** for this project, subject to the conditions herein and such additional conditions as may be required pursuant to the terms of Federal Aviation Administration obstruction evaluations for the structures and light poles whose locations were not previously reviewed.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The County is proposing to establish a park with fifteen soccer fields, including six lighted soccer fields, picnic shelters, playground, restroom/concession building, and storage building on a 36.54-acre site. An earlier edition of this project was reviewed in the summer of 2008. This is back before the Commission due to a change in the site plan, as it was determined during the environmental process that the portion of the project closest to the airport would need to be maintained in an open condition as habitat.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located northerly of Crestmore Road and 46<sup>th</sup> Street, westerly of Loring Ranch Road, and southerly of (and adjacent to) Flabob Airport, in the unincorporated Riverside County community of Rubidoux.

**LAND USE PLAN:** 2004 Flabob Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (2004 FALUCP)

- a. Airport Influence Area: Flabob Airport
- b. Land Use Policy: Airport Zones A, B2, and D
- c. Noise Levels: From below 55 CNEL to above 65 CNEL

**BACKGROUND:**

Land Use/Intensity: The site is located in Airport Zones A, B2, and D. No structures are proposed within Airport Zone A. Airport Zone B2 would include six small picnic shelters with a combined capacity of 48 people. All other buildings and six of the soccer fields, including all lighted soccer fields and those used by children at least ten years of age would be in Airport Zone D. However, the applicant proposes unlighted soccer fields that would extend into Airport Zone B2. These would include most of the fields that would be used by children under the age of ten.

A total of 441 parking spaces are proposed to be provided. Given that the site would be used for team sports, a high vehicle occupancy may be expected, but even if each vehicle had five occupants, the total intensity would not exceed 2,205 persons, whereas the site would be permitted over 3,000 persons within the overall acreage. The average intensity would be considerably less than the average intensity limit of 100 people per acre in both Airport Zone B2 and Airport Zone D.

Staff's concern is with the single-acre intensity limits: 200 persons in Airport Zone B2 and 300 persons in Airport Zone D, although the lack of a structure implies that the portions of the risk-reduction design bonus relating to ease of evacuation could potentially be granted. A 15 percent design bonus would increase the numbers to 230 and 345 persons, respectively.

Based on the information provided by a representative of the American Youth Soccer Organization (AYSO), the number of people on or near a soccer field during a game may be expected to be from 50 to 70 persons.

Within Airport Zone B2, staff projects that the most intensely used acre would be the acre that includes all or portions of three "U6" fields (30 yards in length and designed for use by the preschool age group – ages 4-5), portions of a "U8-U10" field (75 yards in length and designed for use by the elementary school age group – ages 6-9), and two small picnic shelters accommodating a total of 16 persons. It is estimated that 60 persons would be on or near each "U8-U10" field and that 50 persons would be on or near a "U6" field. If all of these areas were in use at the same time, the single-acre intensity could be as high as 226 persons. This exceeds the Airport Compatibility Zone B2 standard of 200 persons by 13 percent. However, with a 15 percent design bonus based on ease of evacuation (equivalent of 100 percent access to emergency exits and single-story design of the only structures), with most of the concentration of persons occurring on open fields

with no structures, walls, or other obstructions, this level would be acceptable in Zone B2.

Within Airport Zone D, staff projects that the most intensely used acre would be the acre that includes the primary group picnic shelter (a 3,360 square foot area with a capacity of 150), the restroom/concession building (capacity not specified), a storage building (approximately 1,500 square feet), and a portion of one “U12” field (100 yards in length and designed for use by the middle school age group – ages 10-12). It is estimated that 70 persons would be on or near a “U12” field during a game. Staff estimates the intensity of this single-acre area as 260 persons (assuming a capacity of 35 persons in the restroom/concession building), which is an acceptable intensity in Airport Zone D. In order to assure compliance with the single-acre standard of 300 persons in Zone D, a condition is included herein limiting the occupant load capacity of the restroom/concession building to 75 persons.

Part 77: The maximum on-site elevation, according to the Riverside County Land Information System, is 756 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). The runway elevation at its westerly end is 750.3 feet AMSL. Structures at this site require FAA review. Determinations of No Hazard to Air Navigation were made in 2008 for six light poles, three shelters, two play structures, and a restroom; however, these determinations have expired. The individual structures and light poles are being reviewed pursuant to Aeronautical Study Nos. 2010-AWP-3799-OE through 2010-AWP-3845-OE.

Noise: The site is subject to high noise levels, but the use is not noise-sensitive; therefore, no noise mitigation is required.

Open Land: The majority of the site would constitute “open land” as defined in Section 4.2.4 of the Countywide Policies of the 2004 Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

#### **CONDITIONS:**

1. Prior to issuance of building permits, the landowner shall convey an avigation easement to Flabob Airport, which shall be recorded. Copies of the avigation easement shall be retained by both parties and shall be available for inspection by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission, upon request.
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.
  - (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, lessees, and tenants.
- 4. 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.
- 5. Prior to issuance of building permits for any structure, the applicant shall file a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (Form 7460-1) with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and shall have received a determination of “No Hazard to Air Navigation,” or shall have received a determination using the Notice Criteria Tool at [www.oeaaa.faa.gov](http://www.oeaaa.faa.gov) that notice criteria are not exceeded.
- 6. No walls, trees, or poles greater than 4 inches in diameter at a height 4 feet above the ground shall be constructed, installed, or planted within the portion of this property within Airport Zone A.
- 7. The maximum height of the proposed light poles shall not exceed seventy (70) feet above ground level, and the maximum elevation at the top of such structures shall not exceed 822 feet above mean sea level.
- 8. The maximum height of all other proposed structures, including shelters, buildings, restrooms, and play structures, including all roof-mounted appurtenances (if any), shall not exceed 16 feet above ground level, and the maximum elevation at the top of such structures shall not exceed 768 feet above mean sea level.
- 9. Any marking and/or lighting provided for aviation safety purposes shall be installed and maintained in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 70/7460-1 K Change 2.
- 10. Temporary construction equipment used during actual construction or installation of the light poles shall not exceed the height of the light poles, unless separate notice is provided to the FAA through the Form 7460-1 process.



11. The restroom/concession building shall have a maximum occupant load capacity not exceeding 75 persons.

Y:\ALUC\Flabob\ZAP1015FL10junsr.doc

# COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

## STAFF REPORT

**AGENDA ITEM:** 2.2

**HEARING DATE:** June 10, 2010

**CASE NUMBER:** ZAP1064MA10 – Christian Singletary (Representative: SDH & Associates, Inc. – Steve Sommers)

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside

**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** P10-0021 (Design Review) and P10-0234 (Rezone)

**MAJOR ISSUES:** Based on the January 2008 draft Joint Land Use Study for March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport, the proposed project would be located within Compatibility Zone B1, outside of APZ II. The proposed project is inconsistent with the draft standards of this zone, specifically the population density average of 50 people per acre and single acre of 100 people per acre. However, the Joint Land Use Study has not been adopted, so, at this time, determinations are based on the 1984 County Plan.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of CONSISTENCY for the change of zone and the plot plan, subject to the conditions specified herein for the plot plan.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant proposes to develop nine industrial buildings with a total gross floor area of 76,520 square feet on a 6.7 gross acre site. The buildings range from 6,800 square feet to 8,460 square feet in floor area. The floor area for each building would be expected to be split between office, warehouse and manufacturing type uses.

The applicant also proposes to change the zoning of the site from Commercial Retail (CR) to Business and Manufacturing Park (BMP).

### PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located easterly of San Gorgonio Drive, southerly of Mt. Baldy Drive, northerly of Alessandro Boulevard, and westerly of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard, in the City of Riverside, approximately 10,300 feet northwesterly of Runway 14-32 at March Air Reserve Base.

**LAND USE PLAN:** 1984 Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan, as applied to March Air Reserve Base

- a. Airport Influence Area: March Air Reserve Base
- b. Land Use Policy: Area II
- c. Noise Levels: Between 60-65 CNEL, according to the draft March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport Joint Land Use Study

**BACKGROUND:**

Non-Residential Land Use Intensity: The site is located in Area II of the current March Air Reserve Base Land Use Plan. Land use intensity is not limited within Area II based on the 1984 Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan.

Based on the draft Joint Land Use Study for the March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport, the site is located within Compatibility Zone B1, but outside of APZs I and II (which applies additional limitations to Zone B1). The draft land use intensity within Compatibility Zone B1 is 50 people per acre on average and 100 people on a single acre. Based on the anticipated tenants' use of the buildings noted by the project materials, an average intensity of 65 people per acre and a maximum single acre intensity of 156 people would be anticipated. These levels would be inconsistent with the draft Compatibility Zone B1 land use intensity standards.

Prohibited and Discouraged Uses: The applicant does not propose any uses prohibited or discouraged in Area II or the draft Compatibility Zone B1 (children's schools, day care centers, hospitals, nursing homes, highly noise-sensitive outdoor nonresidential uses, critical community infrastructure facilities, and hazards to flight) within the project.

Noise: The site underlies the north-south traffic pattern. Future patrons, customers, and employees will experience annoyance from over-flying aircraft. The property lies outside the area that would be subject to average exterior noise levels of 65 CNEL or greater under ultimate airport development conditions. Therefore, as a non-residential land use, no special mitigation of noise from aircraft is required.

Part 77: The elevation of the site ranges from 1,554 to 1,556 feet above mean sea level (1554-1556 feet AMSL). The elevation of Runway 14-32 at its northerly terminus is approximately 1535 feet AMSL. At a distance of approximately 10,300 feet from the runway, FAA review would be required for any structures with top of roof exceeding 1638 feet AMSL. The project plans indicate that building heights will not exceed 35 feet. Therefore, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) obstruction evaluation review will not be required for the proposed buildings.

Open Area: Area II of the 1984 Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan does not have any requirements for provision of open space. In addition, the draft B1 zone (outside of APZ I) does not

have any requirements for provision of open space or restriction of lot coverage.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the landowner shall convey an avigation easement to the March Inland Port Airport Authority. (Contact March Joint Powers Authority at (951) 656-7000 for additional information.)
2. 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.
3. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
  - (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area. (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) Children's schools, hospitals, nursing homes, and highly noise-sensitive outdoor nonresidential uses.
4. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.
5. Any ground-level or aboveground water retention or detention basin or facilities shall be designed so as to provide for a detention period for the design storm that does not exceed 48 hours (may be less, but not more) and to remain totally dry between rainfalls. Vegetation in and around such facilities that would provide food or cover for bird species that would be

Staff Report

Page 4 of 4

incompatible with airport operations shall not be utilized in project landscaping. Landscaping shall utilize plant species that do not produce seeds, fruits, or berries. Trees shall be spaced so as to prevent large expanses of contiguous canopy, when mature.

Y:\ALUC\March\ZAP1064MA10sr.doc

**COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**

**STAFF REPORT**

**AGENDA ITEM:** 2.3

**HEARING DATE:** June 10, 2010

**CASE SUMMARY:**

**CASE NUMBER:** ZAP1020HR10 – T-Mobile West (Representative: James A. Rogers)

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside

**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** PP 24486

**MAJOR ISSUES:** FAA obstruction evaluation review is required.

**RECOMMENDATION:** At press time (May 27), staff had not received documentation that the Federal Aviation Administration was processing a Form 7460-1 review for the proposed structure. Therefore, at this time, staff recommends CONTINUANCE to the meeting of August 12, 2010; however, in the event that such evidence is received prior to the hearing, staff would recommend that the Commission find the proposed project conditionally consistent.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Plot Plan No. 24486 is a proposal to construct a 65-foot tall monopalm wireless facility including twelve panel antennas, a microwave dish, one parabolic antenna, equipment cabinets, and a 6-foot high chain link fence on a 4-acre property

**PROJECT LOCATION:** The project site is located southerly of State Highway Route 74 and easterly of Cordoba Road in unincorporated Riverside County, approximately 6,336 feet northwesterly of the runway at Hemet-Ryan Airport. The site contains an existing feed store, storage sheds, barns and outdoor storage. The proposed wireless facility would be located near the southeastern corner of the property.

**LAND USE PLAN:** 1992 Hemet Ryan Airport Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan

Adjacent Airport:

a. Airport Influence Area: Hemet-Ryan Airport

b. Land Use Policy: Airport Area III

c. Noise Levels: Below 55 CNEL

**BACKGROUND:**

Noise: The site is located outside the area subject to average aircraft noise levels exceeding 60 CNEL, and the use is not noise-sensitive; therefore, no special measures to mitigate aircraft-generated noise are required.

PART 77: The applicant's maximum proposed pad elevation on site is 1,507 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) with a maximum structure height of 65 feet. The runway elevation at its nearest point to the project boundaries is also 1,507 feet AMSL. At an approximate distance of 6,336 feet and relevant slope of 100:1, any structure above 1,570 feet AMSL would require FAA review. The proposed structure would have an elevation at top point of 1,572 feet AMSL; therefore, FAA review is required.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. 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.
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 trash transfer stations that are open on one or more sides, recycling centers containing putrescible wastes, construction and demolition debris facilities, incinerators, fly ash disposal, production of cereal grains, sunflower, and row crops, aquaculture, and landscaping utilizing water features.)
  - (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, and nursing homes.
3. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and lessees of the property and tenants of the buildings.

Staff Report

Page 3 of 3

4. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the landowner shall convey an avigation easement to the County of Riverside as owner-operator of Hemet-Ryan Airport.
5. Prior to issuance of a building permit for the proposed structure, the permittee shall provide evidence that the Federal Aviation Administration has issued a “Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation” for the proposed structure. Once such a determination has been issued, the latitude, longitude, coordinates, and height of such structure shall not be changed, and the site elevation of the structure at top point shall not be increased without further notice to, and review by, the Federal Aviation Administration through the Form 7460-1 process.

Y:\ALUC\Hemet-Ryan\ZAP1020HR10sr.doc



COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION  
STAFF REPORT

**AGENDA ITEM:** 3.1 4-1

**HEARING DATE:** June 10, March February 11, 2010 (re-advertised; previously considered on March 11, continued from February 11, and 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.~~
1. 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.~~

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION: STAFF HAS PREPARED A CONDITION TO REQUIRE THAT THIS BE ADDRESSED EITHER THROUGH DELINEATION ON THE PARCEL MAP'S ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINT SHEET OR DELINEATION IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE FIRST PLOT PLAN OR USE PERMIT PROPOSING STRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT.**

*UPDATE: The issues relating to the expiration of the Specific Plan and the applicant's revised course of action have not yet been settled.*

*UPDATE II: There has been no further progress since the February meeting.*

~~RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends CONTINUANCE OFF-CALENDAR to February March 11, 2010, pending resolution of the matters cited above.~~

**UPDATE III: THIS PROJECT IS LOCATED WITHIN A LARGE SPECIFIC PLAN, BOREL AIRPARK, WHICH WAS ADOPTED IN 1994. THE ORIGINAL SPECIFIC PLAN INCLUDED A CONDITION OF APPROVAL THAT REQUIRED THE FILING OF A SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT PRIOR TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANY PORTION OF THE PROJECT NOT DEVELOPED PRIOR TO THE 15-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE SPECIFIC PLAN ADOPTION. A SEPARATE LANDOWNER WITHIN THE SPECIFIC PLAN HAS FILED AN APPLICATION TO DELETE THIS CONDITION OF APPROVAL. PROVIDED THAT THIS REQUEST IS APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, THE APPLICANT'S SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REQUEST AND CHANGE OF ZONE MAY PROCEED AS ORIGINALLY PROPOSED.**

**RECOMMENDATION: STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THIS SPECIFIC PLAN SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REQUEST AND CHANGE OF ZONE BE FOUND CONSISTENT WITH THE 2007 FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN.**

**STAFF FURTHER RECOMMENDS THAT THE PARCEL MAP BE FOUND CONSISTENT, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS INCLUDED HEREIN.**

**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 proposes ~~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 proposes ~~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. **A finding of consistency for the parcel map does not necessarily imply that any given plot plan will be found consistent; intensity levels will have to be reviewed at the plot plan stage. Consequently, project**

**conditions of approval require all plot plans and use permits proposing structural development within the parcel map boundaries to be subject to ALUC review.**

Since the applicant's proposed project **constitutes** ~~initially constituted~~ an ordinance amendment within the Specific Plan zone, ~~ALUC staff realized that~~ this proposal **provides** ~~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). **The amendments recommended by ALUC staff have been incorporated into the most recent draft of the proposed zoning ordinance.**

~~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 **requested** ~~is requesting~~ that demonstration of compliance be addressed at the plot plan level.

**The text of Condition No. 7 provides for two options for demonstrating compliance with the open land area requirement: delineation of at least 2.25 acres of open land area on an Environmental Constraint Sheet (ECS) to be recorded with the final map, with such ECS to be reviewed and approved by the ALUC Director prior to recordation; or, delineation of at least 2.25 acres of open land within the portion of the parcel map in Compatibility Zone D in conjunction with approval of the first plot plan within the parcel map boundary proposing development of one or more structures.**

**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 1,368 ~~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. **All plot plans and use permits proposing development of structures within the boundaries of this parcel map shall be subject to Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) review.** The first such Plot Plan or Use Permit shall be for an area at least ten (10) acres in size. **In conjunction with this first plot plan or use permit (or multiple plot plans developed concurrently), the permittee shall identify and delineate on an exhibit an area of not less than 2.25 acres within the portion of the parcel map in Compatibility Zone D that would qualify as open land area in accordance with Section 4.2.4 of the Countywide Policies of the 2004 Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (unless such area has already been delineated on an Environmental Constraint Sheet (ECS) of the recorded parcel map, following approval of the ECS by the ALUC Director.)** 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:** 3.2 ~~3.1~~ 2.3

**HEARING DATE:** ~~June 10, 2010~~ ~~May 13, 2010~~ (continued from ~~May 13 and~~ April 8, 18, 2010)

**CASE NUMBER:** ZAP1006BL10 – Palo Verde Solar I, LLC  
(Representative: Howard Balentine)

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** California Energy Commission

**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** 09-AFC-06

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

~~Materials submitted with the application include analysis of the proposed project's impacts from structure heights, radio frequency interference, reflectivity/glare, and thermal plumes. While the analysis addresses each impact at length, substantial information is not provided to determine the actual anticipated impacts on the Blythe Airport. In addition, information on provision of a minimum 10% open space area within Compatibility Zone D and analysis on cumulative impacts of hazards to flight were not included. ALUC staff prepared a letter (attached to this staff report) to the applicant on March 22nd requesting the specific additional information needed by staff to make a recommendation of consistency to the Commission.~~

- ~~1. Proposed aboveground line extends through Compatibility Zones ~~BI~~ and C;~~
- ~~2. Possible visible plume from Power Block 4 partially within AIA boundary;~~
- ~~3. Effect on radio communications used by pilots;~~
- ~~4. Reflectivity/glare from Heat Conducting Element tube;~~
- ~~5. Thermal plumes from air-cooled condenser and auxiliary cooling tower; and~~
- ~~6. Compliance with Zone D Open Area requirements; and;~~
- ~~7. Cumulative impacts of multiple energy projects.~~



**RECOMMENDATION:**

~~At the time of the writing of this staff report, staff has not received the requested information from the applicant or their representative. The applicant's representative has indicated that the requested information would not be able to be provided by the April 8th hearing and has requested a continuance. Staff recommends that the Commission CONTINUE this matter without discussion to the meeting of May 13, 2010, pending submittal, review, and adequacy of the requested information.~~

~~At this time, ALUC staff believes that available data is not adequate to enable a finding of consistency for this project.~~

*The California Energy Commission staff has requested an independent review of the effects of this project on the operation of Blythe Airport, but the results of these studies will not be available in time for the June 10 public hearing. The applicant's representative has provided additional information in an attempt to demonstrate that the project does not present a flight hazard. That information is included herewith for your review. ALUC staff does not claim expertise in analysis of this information.*

*If the Airport Land Use Commission is satisfied that the information that the applicant has provided is sufficient to determine that the project will not individually constitute or cumulatively contribute to a hazard to flight, the Commission should direct staff to forward a letter to the California Energy Commission advising of such a finding, along with the recommended conditions (that could be incorporated into the project environmental document as mitigation measures). This action would conclude ALUC review and be the equivalent of a finding of conditional consistency (pending completion of FAA Form 7460 reviews).*

*If the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) is not satisfied that the information that the applicant has provided is sufficient to demonstrate that the project will not individually constitute or cumulatively contribute to a hazard to flight, staff recommends that ALUC, after consideration of any additional testimony at the June 10 hearing, direct staff to forward a letter to the California Energy Commission (CEC) advising CEC of the concerns that are yet to be satisfied. In this situation, ALUC may decide to continue the matter to a forthcoming hearing (either in August or through the establishment of a special hearing in July, which could include other items continued from this agenda).*

*If ALUC finds that the project would individually constitute or cumulatively contribute to a hazard to flight, staff recommends that ALUC direct staff to forward a letter to the CEC advising of such a finding and recommending that the portion of the array within the Airport Influence Area be excluded from the project.*

~~*enable a finding of consistency, it would seem logical to open the public hearing and consider testimony, but CONTINUE this matter with discussion to the Commission's*~~

~~*June 10 hearing. (It should be noted that there is a possibility that the results of the independent studies will not be available in sufficient time to allow ALUC staff analysis prior to the June meeting.)*~~

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project proposes to construct a nominal 1,000 megawatt solar thermal electric generating facility on 9,400 acres of BLM managed land, including four units of north-south oriented tracking parabolic trough mirrors, four 120-foot tall air-cooled condensers, a 230 kV transmission line with maximum 145-foot tall monopoles, and a four-inch diameter 9.8-mile long natural gas pipeline.

### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

The project site is located northwesterly of the Blythe Airport, with the closest parcel located approximately 4,650 feet northwesterly of the north end of Runway 17-35, in Sections or portions of Sections 1-5, 8-15, 23-24 of Township 6 South, Range 21 East and in Sections or portions of Sections 6, 7, and 18 of Township 6 South, Range 22 East. Blythe Airport is located northerly of Interstate 10 and Hobsonway and easterly of Mesa Drive, in unincorporated Riverside County.

### **LAND USE PLAN: 2004 Blythe Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan**

- a. Airport Influence Area: Blythe Airport
- b. Land Use Policy: Airport Compatibility Zones B1, C, D, and E
- c. Noise Levels: Outside the 55 CNEL contour

### **BACKGROUND:**

California Energy Commission: Due to the project being a thermal solar project exceeding 50 Megawatts, the project's review falls under the jurisdiction of the California Energy Commission (CEC). At this time, the CEC has released a Staff Assessment and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which includes analysis of the project's impact on the Blythe Airport. In order for the CEC to better determine the project's consistency with applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards (LORS), the EIS recommended that the proposed project file an application with the RCALUC to determine consistency with the Blythe Airport Compatibility Plan. ~~The~~ Any determination of consistency by the ALUC is would be advisory to the CEC.

**The issue of airport land use compatibility was addressed at a public workshop held by California Energy Commission staff in Palm Springs on April 28.**

Flight Hazard Issues: Structure height, electrical interference, reflectivity/glare, and thermal plumes are among the issues that renewable energy facilities in the airport

influence area must address. The majority of structures proposed by the project are located outside of the Blythe Airport ***Influence*** Area. The southeasterly most portion of the project, Solar Unit #4, is located within Zones D and E. The majority of structures of substantial height are located at the center of the solar unit, known as the power block. Within this power block is located the 120 foot air cooled condenser (ACC). According to the materials provided, the ACC is located just outside of the Airport Influence Area and, therefore, would not be subject to its height restrictions. ~~Staff has requested a more detailed map showing the boundaries of the AIA in relation to the precise location of the ACC.~~ **The applicant team has provided a diagram depicting the location of Power Block 4 in relation to the Airport Influence Area (AIA) boundary. The applicant team estimates that the actual air cooled condenser location is approximately 135 feet outside the boundary of the Airport Influence Area, and is willing to accept a condition that a registered land surveyor confirm that the facility is located outside the AIA boundary.**

The 230 kV transmission line generally crosses southerly from the main project site across Compatibility Zones E, D, ***and C***, ~~and B1~~ perpendicular to runway 8/26 before turning westerly to its connection with the SCE substation. The maximum height of the transmission poles ~~to be 145 feet spaced 1,000 feet apart~~ **would be not exceed 145 feet in height. Poles would not exceed a height of ninety (90) feet in Zone D and seventy (70) feet in Zone C. It should be noted that the transmission line pole locations would likely be the same within Zones C and D whether or not the portion of the array within the Airport Influence Area is developed.**, ~~with a portion of the transmission line's poles being limited to 90 feet in height and spaced 800 feet apart. No map-based information was provided with the application showing the height of the transmission poles in relation to the Airport Compatibility Zones. This information has been requested to determine consistency with height restrictions for each applicable Compatibility Zone as well as flight path clearance of the transmission poles.~~ All other structures associated with the project meet the height restrictions of the applicable Compatibility Zones. **The applicant has provided an exhibit and table identifying the height and Compatibility Zone location of each proposed pole.**

At the April 8 public hearing, Commission Chairman Simon Housman advised that the transmission lines passing through Airport Compatibility Zones B1 and C should be sited underground. He expressed concerns that the airport maintain at least one unobstructed approach, noting that there are already obstructions easterly of the runway.

The applicant maintains that undergrounding a 230kV line would be prohibitively expensive and that “dissipation of heat from the power line into the surrounding dry sands would seriously reduce the amount of power able to be transmitted along the underground segment of the transmission line during the hottest days of the summer, precisely the time of the peak summer load on the California power grid.”

ALUC staff raised the option of re-routing the line westerly of its proposed location to avoid areas within Compatibility Zones B1 and C. The applicant team responded

that this would be “potentially counter-productive,” as a more westerly route would place the line at a much higher base elevation closer to the McCoy Mountains located westerly of the airport. These mountains basically delineate the westerly edge of the Palo Verde Valley. The applicant team maintains that poles at such locations would “pose a greater hazard to aviation than that posed by the proposed pole locations in Zones B1 and C” due to the greater elevation above sea level.

*However, upon further review, the applicant agreed to amend the location of the line so as to avoid traversing Zone B1. For topographic reasons, avoidance of Zone C is not feasible.*

The electromagnetic signal/noise emanating from the operation of electrical equipment of the project will be at base frequency 60 hertz with less intense higher frequencies from harmonics. ~~Navigation and communication signals typically utilized are substantially higher in frequency and therefore would not be impacted by electrical equipment proposed by the project. Information has been requested to confirm the signals in use at the Blythe Airport.~~

**The applicant team has provided information indicating that gap noise and corona noise associated with the transmission line and the conductors will not result in interference with the use of the Blythe VORTAC signal or with communications ~~ALUC staff has requested that the applicant team also address potential for interference at frequencies used by pilots to communicate with the airport and with other aircraft in the area.~~**

The project proposes to collect thermal solar energy via reflective parabolic troughs that redirect the sun’s light to a Heat Conduction Element (HCE) that absorbs the heat generated and distributes it for conversion to steam energy for electricity generation by turbine. Although the majority of the reflected light is focused directly onto the HCE, some scattering of light may occur from the HCE, but not directly from the mirrored trough.

The materials submitted with the application include diagrams of how the parabolic trough functions and sample photographs from the solar array at ~~Kramer Junction~~ **Harper Lake** of light reflection and scattering from the HCE. These indicate that at a specific geometry of the HCE and the observer, there is a concentrated scattering of light from the HCE. The proposed project will construct a 25 foot tall windscreen which will block the scattering from observers from ground level.

In addition, the materials submitted include a sample analysis done for the Victorville 2 Hybrid Power Project (VV2), which is proposed to be located adjacent to the Southern California Logistics Airport (SCLA). As part of the review of this project, **staff members from the California Energy Commission and CALTRANS Aeronautics Division conducted a test over-flight of ~~utilizing~~ the solar array at Kramer Junction, including simulation of ~~and simulating~~ an approach to land, based on the proposed layout of the VV2 project and its relation to the SCLA. Comments were also included**

from staff from the CEC and City of Victorville that participated in the test. Their comments indicated that there was no glare created by the solar array based on the flight simulation conducted. Although this test and the comments received from it indicate there is little concern for substantial glare to occur that would create a significant hazard to flight, there was no information provided to compare the layout of the VV2 project to the proposed Blythe project to determine if its conclusions are applicable.

**Reflectivity, glint, or glare has been the central issue of concern for solar arrays such as the Blythe Solar Power Project. At the May 13 hearing, ALUC asked the project representative whether it would be possible – and, if so, at what times of day and seasons of the year – for reflection or glint from any element of the solar array to intersect Runway 26 or its centerline extended easterly at a height of 1,000 feet or less above ground level. (The concern relates to the potential for a flash or beam of light that would affect a pilot on a final approach to a landing on that runway – coming from the east and making a westbound landing.)**

**The project representative has concluded that the “variation in the sun azimuth and elevation angles during the year would be insufficient to produce the required alignment of the pilot on final approach, the normal to an HCE tube, and the sun.” He also examined a scenario whereby the “sun is reflecting at a glancing angle off the side of a joint in the HCE tube” and determined that, while “the required solar geometry for the reflected ray to cross the approach to Runway 26 occurs for about ten weeks near sunrise on either side of the summer solstice,” such “reflected ray will strike the ground approximately 350 feet from the reflection point.”**

The project proposes to cool waste heat from the steam cycle in each power block utilizing an air-cooled condenser (ACC). The ACC is basically a large open air radiator that dissipates heat to the atmosphere through air convection. Due to it being a dry cooling system rather than utilizing water, no visible plumes will be formed. However, the project will still result in the creation of thermal plumes which could result in a hazard to flight. Project materials note that a temperature rise less than 10°C (18°F) is anticipated for the ACCs. Based on the proposed fans utilized for the ACCs and the dimensions of the structure, a vertical velocity of 4.5 meters per second (m/s) is anticipated. The CEC utilizes a threshold of 4.3 m/s as a threshold of significance for the production of turbulence that could interfere with aircraft operation. The velocity of the plume typically decreases as it rises. In addition, as illustrated by project materials, none of the aircraft traffic pattern envelopes for the Blythe Airport take aircraft over the ACCs to be affected by the thermal plumes. **In this regard, the critical question may be at what heights above the top of the stacks does the vertical velocity remain at or above 4.3 meters per second. The plume velocity analysis prepared by William Walters and included in the Draft (CEC) Staff Assessment indicates that, under calm wind conditions, the average velocity would exceed 4.3 meters per second at heights up to 1,670 feet above ground level. Peak velocity could be twice the average velocity.** **The meaning of this statement is that the velocity would vary within the plume, with the velocities generally highest at the center (presumably directly over the facility) and lower as distance from the center point increases.**

**It is the applicant's contention that the analysis is based on "flawed assumptions and modeling techniques."**

**The applicant has also commissioned a flyover of an air cooled condenser at a Nevada Power generation facility in Primm, Nevada. The pilot will be present at the June 10 hearing to indicate the results of the flyover.**

At the April 28 workshop, James Adams of CEC staff noted that Runway 17-35, the north-south runway, could experience a greater proportion of operations once Blythe 2 (the second conventional energy facility easterly of east-west Runway 8-26) becomes operational. In order to mitigate impacts of potential turbulence from thermal plumes from the Blythe 2 project, the CEC had required that the following conditions be satisfied prior to construction:

- that a "remark [be] placed on the Airport's Automated Surface Observation System (ASOS), or equivalent broadcast, advising pilots to avoid low-altitude direct overflight of the power plant";
- that "the VFR traffic pattern to runway 26 [be] changed from left-hand turns to right-hand turns; and"
- that a "runway, other than runway 26 [be] designated as the primary calm wind runway."

Greater use of Runway 17-35 could ~~would~~ increase the likelihood of flyover of the Unit #4 power block. **However, as depicted on Figure 5 of the applicant's response dated May 27, 2010, conversion of Runway 26 to a right-hand pattern would not result in flyover of ACC-4 for the majority of aircraft (presuming that the right-hand pattern would be a mirror image of the left-hand pattern), although it would result in flyover of transmission lines farther to the south.**

The project also proposes to have one auxiliary two-cell wet cooling tower for each of the four power blocks. This cooling tower would be utilized to cool waste heat from the auxiliary boiler during startup and other non-routine startup operations. ~~No information was provided on how often, for how long, and what time of day these are to be used as well as the amount of temperature rise and velocity of the plumes to determine how these would affect aircraft operations.~~ The materials noted that these were not of concern as hazards to flight during the CEC's analysis. **While the rates of air flow and water circulation would be miniscule in comparison to the steam cycle cooling towers proposed at the Palmdale and Victorville energy plants, the "temperature of the exhaust air from the auxiliary cooling tower would be comparable to that for the steam cycle cooling tower since both plumes would essentially be saturated with water upon release and the temperature would be determined by the ambient temperature and relative humidity,"** according to the applicant team's statement.

**The project representative has asserted that the potential for a hazard to aviation from the cooling tower is negligible because (1) the facility is much smaller than the cooling tower of the Blythe Energy Project I tower and operates under a much reduced load;**

**(2) the facilities would be located outside the Airport Influence Area (AIA) and any plumes that may form would be “highly unlikely” to reach the AIA boundary; and (3) “under most circumstances, the plume from the auxiliary cooling tower will not extend above the top of the nearby air cooled condensers.”**

Open Area: Countywide land use compatibility criteria require that a minimum of 10% of land area in Airport Compatibility Zone D consist of open land as defined in Policy 4.2.4 of the ALUCP. Based on the materials submitted, it appears that the 10% requirement can be met. However, information has yet to be provided on the project's proposed developed area within Zone D and the area to qualify as open space. **The applicant team was has been asked to submit a diagram demonstrating that at least 10 percent of the area within the proposed Blythe Solar Power Project right-of-way would be maintained as open land, in order to verify compliance with the open area requirements, and responded with a diagram demonstrating that 94.4 percent of the portion of the project within Zone D would remain as open land.**

Part 77: Federal Aviation Administration obstruction evaluation review has commenced on the project. At the time of the submission of the application to ALUC, the FAA **had** has issued Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation letters for the two easterly ACCs (ACC-1 and ACC-4) and for 39 transmission poles. Additional information was requested by the FAA on 15 transmission poles which are pending FAA's clearance.

**Subsequently, two major changes to the routing of the transmission line have been made, and new Form 7460-1 applications have been made. Due to the large number of poles associated with this project and the size of this staff report packet, FAA's Letters of Determination and Requests for Additional Information are not attached to this staff report. However, staff has included copies of the status summary reports submitted by the applicant team.**

Noise: The site is located outside the area projected to be subject to average noise levels from aircraft operations in excess of 55 CNEL.

**Public Comment: Two letters (in fax form) have been submitted in support of the proposed project.**

#### CONDITIONS:

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.
  - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
2. Any outdoor lighting installed shall be hooded and shielded to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
  - ~~3. If the panels are mounted on a framework, said framework shall have a flat or matte finish so as to minimize reflection of sunlight.~~
  - 3. Prior to construction of Power Block #4, the permittee shall submit a statement from a licensed land surveyor verifying that the air cooled condenser within that Power Block is located outside the boundaries of the Blythe Airport Influence Area, as adopted in 2004.**
  4. In the event that any incidence of glare or electrical interference affecting the safety of air navigation occurs as a result of project operation, the permittee shall be required to take all measures necessary to eliminate such glare or interference.
  - 5. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers, and shall be recorded as a deed notice for those parcels within the project located wholly or partially within an Airport Influence Area.**



**COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**

**STAFF REPORT**

**AGENDA ITEM:** 3.3 2.2

**HEARING DATE:** ~~June 10, 2010~~ ~~May 13, 2010~~ (continued from May 13 and April 8, 2010)

**CASE NUMBER:** ZAP1003PV10 – City of Perris (Representative: Brad Eckhardt, Planning Manager)

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Perris

**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** SPA 08-08-0004

**MAJOR ISSUES: Assumptions for airport configuration and Compatibility Zone boundaries**

**MAJOR ISSUES UPDATE II:** *In order to provide for future compatibility, two members of the Perris Valley subcommittee of the Airport Land Use Commission (Chairman Housman and Commissioner Butler) met with City and airport officials on May 25 to consider whether it may be possible to amend the proposed Draft Perris Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan in such a manner that the Downtown Specific Plan Amendment may be approved as having a “reasonable probability” of being consistent with the Compatibility Plan as ultimately approved. At this time the draft Perris Valley Airport Compatibility Plan has not been sent out for public review of its environmental determination nor received formal review and approval by the Commission. Therefore, the criteria of the Draft Perris Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and the boundaries of the proposed zones are subject to revision.*

*Substantial progress was made in terms of agreement with concepts relating to allowance for infill residential development, elimination of the open area requirements, allowance for additional nonresidential intensities in Zones B1 and D consistent with State Handbook guidelines, use of the revised method of calculation of retail intensities, and requirements for expanded buyer awareness measures. City officials had originally requested elimination of Zone D throughout the Downtown Specific Plan area, but were willing to allow some areas to remain in Zone D, provided that the primary corridors (properties fronting on D Street and 4<sup>th</sup> Street) would be located in Zone E. They were also amenable to maintaining Zone B1 in areas directly northerly of the airport. Additionally, they are willing to add an overlay addressing ALUC intensity and notice criteria in future editions of the Specific Plan document. Airport officials expressed concern that the proposed layout plan and declared distances not interfere with airport operations.*

*It may be possible to review this project will be reviewed based on the existing 1979 Perris Valley Airport Land Use Plan; however, – The 1979 Perris Valley Airport Land Use Plan does*

**~~not define any Airport Influence or Compatibility Zones, simply an Airport Influence Area Boundary. Furthermore, the 1979 Map was based on a cross-runway system, but only In fact, only one runway exists, and there are no plans to build a crosswind runway.~~**

***UPDATE I: Staff met with Brad Eckhardt, Nick Johnson (the City's aviation consultant), Keith Downs of Mead & Hunt, and three representatives of Perris Valley Airport ownership and management on April 14 to discuss the impacts of the Draft Perris Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (PVALUCP) on the future development of the Downtown Perris area. (Commissioner Rod Ballance was also present at the meeting.) After considerable discussion, it was agreed that Mr. Johnson would prepare an alternative Compatibility Zone map based on Airport Land Use Planning Handbook safety zone guidelines and utilizing declared distances so as to allow Zone A to be limited to areas southerly of Ellis Avenue, which borders the airport on the north. This would serve as the City's alternative as CEQA documentation moves forward. The City would like the Commission to endorse its proposed Compatibility Map in concept so as to allow the Commission to then proceed with an approval of the Downtown Specific Plan as consistent with its forthcoming Plan that would be substantially based on the City's alternative. Mr. Johnson submitted the City's proposal on April 28, a copy of which is included with this staff report. As of the writing of this staff report, airport representatives have not indicated whether the revisions are acceptable to them.***

***The City alternative does not propose any changes to the boundaries and criteria of Draft Perris Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan zones in areas southerly of the airport, such as the site of the Green Valley Specific Plan. That Specific Plan has not yet been developed and may be able to be amended in such a manner as to comply with the criteria of the Draft PVALUCP, without necessarily reducing the number of dwelling units that the Plan would accommodate. The major issues associated with the City alternative include:***

***The use of declared distances: the northerly 1100 feet would not be available for landings from the north or takeoffs toward the north;***

***Treatment of Perris Valley Airport as an urban airport relative to the portion of its Airport Influence Area northerly of Mountain Avenue, with no limits on densities or intensities within the Traffic Pattern Zone: areas northerly of Mountain Avenue that would normally be in Zone D would be depicted as being in Zone E;***

***Delineation of areas that would be in the Inner Approach/Departure Zone pursuant to State Handbook guidelines as Zone C, rather than Zone B1.***

***RECOMMENDATION: ~~At this time staff has not completed their review of the specific plan. Staff is hopeful confident that progress is being made toward a win-win solution that will benefit both the airport and the City of Perris. However, as of press time (June 1), the amended Compatibility Plan "concept for discussion" maps are not available for Commission consideration. additional time is needed to study the proposal.~~***

**Staff recommends that the Commission open the public hearing, consider testimony, and CONTINUE this item to August 12, 2010 June 10, May 13, 2010 WITH without discussion (or to July 8, 2010 if the Commission decides to hold a hearing in July to address the Blythe Solar Power Project also on the June 10 agenda).**

**A continuance would also enable staff to work with City officials to identify parcels that would meet the proposed special infill intermediate residential density provisions.**

**~~Staff also recommends that the Commission ask its Perris Valley Subcommittee (Messrs. Housman, Ballance, and Butler) to meet with the affected parties in the immediate future so as to enable a Commission decision on June 10 regarding the acceptability of the City alternative as the basis of a future Compatibility Plan for Perris Valley Airport and, if found acceptable, a decision on a recommendation for the Downtown Specific Plan, as amended.~~**

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The City of Perris proposes to adopt a comprehensive revision to the Downtown Specific Plan. The plan designates allowable land uses and densities and prescribes development standards within the 735-acre Downtown Perris area, which is located southerly/southwesterly of Interstate 215, northerly of Ellis Avenue, westerly of Redlands Avenue, and easterly of “A” Street. The existing Specific Plan was adopted in 1993 and allows for a mix of residential, commercial, industrial, and public land uses at various densities. The comprehensive revision is designed around a Regulating Code that focuses on the form and placement of buildings, with the intent of developing a Transit-Oriented Community (focusing on the future Metrolink Station) with a mix of land uses at densities that support transit and meet Housing Element requirements. (Perris Valley Airport: A through E on draft proposed plan).

### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

The area included within the proposed Specific Plan is located southwestly of Interstate 215, northerly of Ellis Avenue, westerly of Redlands Avenue and easterly of “A” Street in the City of Perris, and, at its closest point, approximately 200 feet northerly of the northerly end of Runway 15/33 of the Perris Valley Airport.

### **LAND USE PLAN: 1979 Perris Valley Airport Land Use Plan**

- a. Airport Influence Area: Perris Valley Airport
- b. Land Use Policy: **1984** Riverside County Airport Land Use ~~Compatibility~~ Plan ~~Countywide Policies~~

### **BACKGROUND:**

Land Use: The specific plan regulation utilizes what is referred to as a “form-based code” utilizing

“transects” which regulates more the style and look of the development rather than the specific uses allowed within a designation. The specific plan does give some basic guidance on preferred land uses and basic development standards, including maximum number of building stories, but not specific building height or development intensity. This makes it difficult to determine whether what the specific plan allows is consistent with the regulations of any the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

A portion of the specific plan is located within the 1979 Perris Valley Airport Influence Area. *Keith Downs (ALUC's former Executive Director, now with Mead & Hunt) has unearthed a map depicting the “planning boundary” of the Perris Valley Airport Influence Area. This map depicts the “planning boundary” as including the southeasterly quadrant of the Downtown Specific Plan, consisting of areas located southerly of 7<sup>th</sup> Street and easterly of Perris Boulevard. Areas I, II, and III extend into this quadrant. This “planning boundary” map differs from the Airport Influence Area map that has been posted on the ALUC website since 2006.*

*If the proposed project were to be evaluated based on the “planning boundary” map, together with the 1984 Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan, the proposed Specific Plan would be considered to be inconsistent with the 1984 Plan, in that Area I includes properties designated for Employment Center uses and Area II includes properties designated for residential uses. However, the “planning boundary” map was prepared prior to the adoption of the 1984 Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan.*

~~Since the existing plan for the Perris Valley Airport does not delineate individual zones, the Countywide Policies of the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan are solely applicable to staff's and the Commission's review of the specific plan. These policies do not provide any specific restrictions or requirements for land use intensity, including residential density, population density, non-residential floor area ratio, or structure height since these are dependent on specific compatibility zone designations. FAA Part 77 regulations would still be applicable to any implementing project proposing specific buildings.~~

The entire specific plan is located within the airport influence area of the draft Perris Valley Land Use Compatibility Plan. All Zones would be affected by the specific plan excluding the B2 Zone of the draft plan.

Part 77: The Specific Plan does not itself authorize the development of structures, however when specific projects are proposed, they may be required to be reviewed by the FAA pursuant to Part 77.

**Declared Distances:** The existing surface of the runway at Perris Valley Airport extends northerly almost to the right-of-way line of Ellis Avenue. While Perris Valley Airport is not a “federally obligated” facility, as a safety matter, it is recommended that all public-use airports strive to comply with Federal Aviation Administration airport design requirements relating to safety. One such requirement is the establishment of a Runway Safety Area extending beyond each end of a runway that is to be maintained object-free. The Runway Safety Area allows for the potential of runway overruns to occur, without resulting in disaster. Implementation of

declared distances in the manner proposed by Johnson Aviation would require the airport to limit northbound takeoffs and southbound landings to the southerly 4,000 feet of the runway, but would allow use of the full runway length for southbound takeoffs and northbound landings.

The use of these declared distances results in the Runway Protection Zone (the basis for delineation of future Airport Compatibility Zone A) being confined to areas southerly of Ellis Avenue, which, in turn, allows non-airport properties to be developed for low person intensity nonresidential uses, rather than having to be set aside as open space. The airport owners have advised that they would not be interested in purchasing properties northerly of Ellis Avenue.

**Proposed Airport Configuration:** *Review of the declared distances proposal led to a need to review the proposed airport configuration documents in the Draft Perris Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. It was determined that, in order to establish a runway protection zone that does not extend northerly onto the ultimate paved surface of Ellis Avenue, the northerly terminus of the runway would have to be moved 130 feet to the south, and a displaced threshold of approximately 1,007 feet from the relocated runway end would be required. This would be greater than the 650-foot displaced threshold presently marked on the runway, but would still be less than the 1,900-foot displaced threshold reflected in the airport's current permit. The configuration diagram also provides for relocation of the southerly runway terminus 112 feet northerly of its present location. As a result of these changes, the operational length of the runway would be approximately 4,850 feet, with declared distances of approximately 3,843 feet landing distance available on Runway 15 and 3,843 feet takeoff run available on Runway 33. Such configuration would allow the Runway Protection Zone to be pulled southerly of Ellis Avenue and thereby relieve both the airport owner and the City from any requirements to purchase land northerly of Ellis Avenue. Airport officials have some qualms about this proposal, as they would prefer a scenario that did not limit their options for full use of the entire runway length.*

**Urban Airport in an Urban Setting:** The Downtown Specific Plan, as amended, envisions Downtown Perris as an urban center characterized by multi-story structures and downtown character, rather than the standard suburbanization characteristic of Riverside County. Residential areas could have densities exceeding thirty (30) dwelling units per acre – densities that are encouraged and, to some extent, mandated by the State of California Department of Housing and Community Development in its review of the adequacy of Housing Elements. In light of this, the City of Perris *initially requested* ~~is requesting~~ that the Airport Land Use Commission depart from its usual practice and designate areas northerly of Mountain Avenue that would be considered to be in the “Traffic Pattern Zone” pursuant to State Handbook safety zone guidelines as Airport Compatibility Zone E, rather than Airport Compatibility Zone D. These areas, then, would not be subject to residential density or nonresidential intensity limitations. The basis for this would be Table 9C in the Handbook (“Safety Compatibility Criteria Guidelines”), which indicates “No limit” on average number of people or dwelling units per acre in the “Traffic Pattern Zone” of airports in heavily developed, urban settings.

With regard to noise, other than the 127-unit residential subdivision approved by the City of Perris in 2007, only seven residentially designated parcels with a total area of 2.57 acres would be located either partially or wholly within the 60 dB CNEL noise contour. These are properties that would be located in Airport Compatibility Zone C (or B1) pursuant to the City's proposal. Areas in proposed Zone E would be located outside the 60 dB CNEL contour. Pursuant to Table 7C of the Handbook, use of the 60 dB CNEL noise contour is suitable for new development around most airports, other than airports in quiet, rural locations.

*After further discussion, the City amended its request, indicating that maintaining some portions of the "Traffic Pattern" in Zone D would be acceptable, provided that the major commercial corridors (including properties fronting on D Street and 4<sup>th</sup> Street) be located in Zone E. A "concept for discussion" map is being prepared illustrating this compromise proposal. It should be noted that ALUC's aviation consultant, Mead & Hunt, has expressed concern regarding allowance for unlimited intensities within portions of this area that would normally be assigned to Zone D.*

#### CONDITIONS:

1. In accordance with this Specific Plan, prior to the issuance of building permits for any new development within this area, the landowner shall convey an aviation easement to the Perris Valley Airport.
2. 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.
3. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
  - (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area. (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.
4. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.
5. Any retention basin 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.
6. Noise attenuation measures shall be incorporated into the design of office areas of structures, as necessary to ensure interior noise levels from aircraft operations are at or below 45 CNEL.
7. **Prior to consideration by the City Council, the City of Perris shall submit a revised draft version of the proposed Specific Plan to the ALUC Director demonstrating that the revised draft includes an overlay reflecting the intensity and notice criteria established through mutual agreement in the course of this process.**
8. **Until such time as the new Compatibility Plan is adopted, proposals for new development in areas depicted as proposed Compatibility Zones B1 and C, and proposals for new nonresidential development for uses having Building Code occupancies of less than 30 square feet per person in Zones B1, C, and D located southerly of 7<sup>th</sup> Street and easterly of Perris Boulevard shall be submitted to Airport Land Use Commission for review.**

# RIVERSIDE COUNTY AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

## STAFF REPORT

### ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

- 4.1** Director's Approval. As authorized pursuant to Section 1.5.2(d) of the 2004 Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, ALUC Director Ed Cooper has approved one non-legislative case determined to be consistent with Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans. Staff is attaching copies of the determination letter, for your Commission's information.
- 4.2** Election of At Large Commission Member: Airport Land Use Commissions organized in accordance with Section 21670 of the California Public Utilities Code consist of seven members: two representing the cities in the county and appointed by the City Selection Committee; two representing the county and appointed by the County Board of Supervisors; two having expertise in aviation and appointed by airport managers; and a seventh member representing the general public, appointed by the other six members of the Commission. In 2006, Mr. John Lyon was selected for a four-year term, which ends in 2010.

Y:\ALUC\ALUC Administrative Items\Admin. 2010\ADmin Item 06-10-10.doc