

**AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER  
4080 Lemon St., Board Room (14th Floor)  
Riverside, California

**Thursday, June 20, 2002**  
**9:00 A.M.**

**MINUTES**

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on June 20, 2002 at the Riverside County Administration Center, Board Room (14th Floor).

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: William Cobb, Chairman  
Allen Graff, Vice Chairman  
Judy Stephen, Alternate  
Marge Tandy  
Paul Bell  
Walt Snyder  
B.T. Miller, Legal Counsel

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

OTHERS PRESENT: Charles Hull, City of Blythe  
Dan Wishard, RI-02-127, Wishard Architects  
Kathy Rohm, Flabob  
Kent Norton, Keith Companies  
Lisa Donnell, Urban Futures, Inc.  
Mike Brown, Owner  
Mike Wells, TH-02-103, Fomotor Eng.  
Sandy Moreno, Webb Associates

STAFF PRESENT: Keith Downs, ALUC Executive Director  
Beverly Coleman, Development Specialist III  
Pat Moore, Office Assistant

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chairman Cobb.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken.
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR MAY 16, 2002:

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Tandy made a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

V. OLD BUSINESS

**BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT**

- A. BD-02-104 – Warner Engineering – (Continued from May 16th). Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NUMBER:** *BD-02-104 - Warner Engineering*  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** *County of Riverside*  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** *CZ 6679, TRM 30483*

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*The project is a 29-lot Residential Tract on 10.46 acres with a detention basin.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is situated 650 to 1, 500 feet southwest of the runway northeast of Adams St. and 42 Avenue in the County of Riverside, south of the Bermuda Dunes Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport*  
*Land Use Policy: Area III and II*

- a. *Airport Influence Area: Area III and II*
- b. *Land Use Policy: Influence Area*
- c. *Noise Levels: 0 dB CNEL (February 1996 future forecasts)*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately, 650 feet south of the center of the runway and is within Areas III and II of the Airport Influence Area. Land uses within Area III that produce glare, direct illumination, vapor, smoke and dust which may affect airport operations shall be discouraged. Likewise, uses which would conflict or potentially conflict with the airport in terms of noise sensitivity and safety hazards are discouraged. The area north of Cliff St. is within Area II and preclude residential below 2.5 acres in size. There are 5 proposed lots in that area*

Noise: *The project is partially within the 60 CNEL as indicated in the 1996 Noise Report for the airports (see Exhibit A). This report did not account for the growth, seasonality and newer aircraft mix. The residential use is acceptable in that noise category up to 65CNEL if noise reduction measures are incorporated into the construction in order to achieve an interior annual noise level attributed to exterior sources, not to exceed 45 CNEL. That will likely require more than normal construction, which only attenuates up to 20dB.*

Height: *The elevation on the site ranges from 72 to 83 MSL, and the structures are not expected to exceed 35 feet. The runway ground elevation is from 49-73 feet. The Part 77 horizontal surface is overlying this area at 219 MSL, and no portion of the project intrudes upon that airspace. Any structures or homes on this project will need an FAA 7460 review.*

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff would recommend a finding of inconsistency of this project.

**CONDITIONS OF OVERRIDE:** should the county wish to override as per PUC21675.1(d)

1. *Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act and prior to recordation of the map, whichever is first.*
2. *An acoustical study should include analysis that will yield a noise reduction level of 25.*
3. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
4. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).*
5. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
  - (a) *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
  - (b) *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
  - (c) *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
  - (d) *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
6. *An FAA 7460 review shall be filed and any resultant conditions shall be incorporated into the project.*

Keith Downs indicated that the Staff Report from the last time recommended approval on this item; however, it was in error. Closer examination of the plan revealed that, as indicated by the State letter, the area north of the green line, which is towards the airport, is within the area that requires 2-1/2-acre lots. The portion south of it is acceptable. There are noise contours very close to the property and on one corner. The applicant has requested continuance to the next meeting. Staff is recommending approval but suggests the request for continuance be honored by the Commission.

Chairman Cobb called for comments or questions. Hearing no response, Chairman Cobb asked for a motion to continue to the July 18, 2002 Airport Land Use

Commission meeting.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Graff motioned to continue BD-02-104 – Warner Engineering to the meeting on July 18, 2002. Marge Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## HEMET/RYAN AIRPORT

- B. HE-02-100 – AEI-CASC Engineering – (Continued from March 21<sup>st</sup>). Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

### CASE SUMMARY

**CASE NUMBER:** HE-02-100 - AEI-CASC (Peppertree)  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Hemet  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Specific Plan 01-03 and Vesting Map 29843

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** *The project is a Specific Plan and Vesting Tentative Map for Senior Oriented Development. The residential project will include 458 dwelling units and a hotel on 84.79 acres.*

### PROJECT LOCATION:

*The site is situated northerly of Menlo Ave. and west of Cawston Avenue, within the City of Hemet and 8,000-10,000 feet northerly of the of Runway 5-23 for Hemet/Ryan Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport: Hemet-Ryan Airport  
Land Use Policy: CLUP 1989: Adopted by City of Hemet and County of Riverside*

- a. Airport Influence Area: Area III, Area of Moderate Risk  
b. Noise Levels: Outside 55CNEL, but subject to annoyance levels*

### MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: *The proposed site is located approximately 8,000-10,000 feet north of the of Runway 5-23. The proposed site is within Area III (Area of Moderate Risk) of the Hemet-Ryan Airport Influence Area. The total site is approximately 84.79 acres and the lot coverage is XX% for buildings with additional structures occupying XX% of the site. Area III has no population density limits assigned to it, but requires a ‘discretionary’ review for legislative items such as the Specific Plans.*

NOISE: *The site is not underlying any specific traffic pattern but will experience annoyance from over flying aircraft. The 1989 plan indicates that the area is outside of the 55CNEL.*

PART 77. *The surface elevation varies from 1,510 to 1,840 and the Hotel site is approximately 1,610 MSL and the height of that facility (30’) is over the level (1,592MSL) at which it needs an FAA Review. The site is within the Horizontal Surface of 1,662MSL. Staff has requested that the applicant submit a Notice to Construct review to the FAA for a response.*

*The text and plan in its current version does not discuss the CLUP and the mitigations necessary to be consistent with the plan.*

**CONDITIONS:** *For the City to Utilize*

1. *Provide Avigation Easements to Hemet-Ryan Airport prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.*
2. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
3. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.*
5. *That the document and any environmental documents be adjusted to include references and mitigations to the CLUP.*
5. *That an FAA 7460 review be completed prior to action on this proposal.*

**RECOMMENDATION:** *At this time staff recommends a continuance in order for the applicant and City to: 1) revise the text, and 2) obtain the Caltrans review.*

*This item was continued from the last hearing in order for the applicant to revise the text to reflect and implement the C.L.U.P. The applicant's representative has indicated that a continuance to June 20, 2002 is in order.*

Keith Downs indicated the Peppertree plan is almost identical to this one as originally submitted. He referred to the location of the airport in proximity to the project (which is at the northern extremity of the Commission's Area of Influence). The project includes a portion of the hills. Originally, a hotel was planned but it was deleted so the project is a completely residential site. Some conditions need to be added to the text. On page one, Figure 1-2, the airport needs to be labeled. On page 2-5, the middle paragraph does not belong under the CLUP description. In Chapters 5 and 6, the development standards need to be added to the text. Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the project.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Legal Counsel, B. T. Miller, asked if there was a continuance requested. Keith Downs said he was not aware of one. Mr. Miller further asked if the additions to the Specific Plan is a condition for approval. Mr. Downs clarified that was his intention in the letter, specifically as pertains to Condition #4. Hearing no response from the Commissioners, he requested the applicant to come forward and present the case. Kathryn Laufenberger, representing AEI-CASC, confirmed agreement regarding all conditions and requirements as presented in the referenced text.

Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case, and after hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's. Commissioner Graff requested that Condition #5 be added to deal with rentals and apartments—"All prospective tenants shall be given notice explaining the noise from the airport and/or over flights due to close proximity of an airport, and all tenants shall sign a notice information them that the

annoyance and the traffic shall likely increase significantly in the future. Also, that avigation easements are in place for that property.” Marge Tandy and Allan Graff asked for clarification from the applicant representative regarding the issue of rental units. Ms. Laufingerger was not certain as to presence of rental units on the project but indicated that most were to be ownership structures; however, that disclosure to renters regarding aircraft noise could be included in the rental agreement.

Legal Counsel Miller asked if this was a specific plan. Keith Downs affirmed and that it was also a tract. Mr. Miller asked if such conditions have been added in previous/similar types of projects. Keith Downs indicated the Commission had done so in the May 2002 meeting. He added that Staff would not ask for it “this distance out.” Mr. Miller asked if there would be complications if it were to be included in a specific plan. Mr. Downs responded that these conditions are intended to be in both as part of the tract. He clarified that the tract does not appear to cover all of the project and, even if there were all condominiums and single-family dwellings, that does not preclude an individual from renting out their structure or home. However, inquiry would not be made on an individual basis. He perceived the Commissioner to be anticipating the possibility of institutionalized rentals which is uncertain. Ms. Laufinberger clarified that the project site is comprised of a retirement community only. Commissioner Cobb asked if the unit is buying or renting. Ms. Laufinberger responded they will be purchased by new residents coming into the area. Paul Bell responded that three to five dwelling units per acre **are apartments**. Mr. Miller reiterated that he wanted to make sure it was a specific plan as opposed to a use and that Commissioner Graff’s proposed addition to the conditions could be included as a condition for purchasers and lessees as opposed to renters. The conditions run with the land so to add a condition that all renters be given notice would be inappropriate in a specific plan.

Chairman Cobb called for any further comments or questions. Hearing no response, Chairman Cobb asked for a motion to continue.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Chairman Bell made a motion regarding HE-02-100 – AEI-CASC Engineering to include Commissioner Graff’s addition to Condition #5, notification to purchasers and lessees, as follows: “All prospective tenants shall be given notice explaining the noise from the airport and/or over flights due to close proximity of an airport, and all tenants shall sign a notice informing them that the annoyance and the traffic shall likely increase significantly in the future. Also, that avigation easements are in place for that property.” Commissioner Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously **Judy Stephens abstained**.

## **FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT**

- C. FV-02-103 – Riverside County – (Continued from April 18th). Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

### **CASE SUMMARY:**

**CASE NUMBER:** FV-02-103 – Riverside County  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** PP17666  
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A request for PP 17666 for construction of a 240,000 sq. ft. Business Park with multiple buildings for offices, restaurants, health and exercise center, mini-warehouse, nursery, trailer, boat storage, blueprinting and duplicating services on approximately 61.75 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located at the northeast corner of Briggs Road and Auld Road, southerly of Benton Road in the County of Riverside, 460 – 2,600 ft. north of the north end of Runway 18/36 at the French Valley Airport.*

**LAND USE PLAN**

Adjacent Airport: French Valley  
a. Airport Influence Area: Inner Safety Zone (ISZ), Emergency Touchdown Zone (ETZ), Outer Safety Zone (OSZ) and Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)  
b. Noise Levels: Inside 55 and 60 CNEL for year 2013

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Noise: *The current CLUP analysis was based upon flight tracks in the 1992-93 period of time. Newer contours indicate that a portion of the property is currently inside of the 55db CNEL, with a smaller portion inside of the 60 CNEL. The CLUP indicates that noise sensitive commercial uses in the 60 CNEL are compatible with the appropriate mitigation for noise.*

Land Use:

*The site is located 460 – 2,600 ft. north of the north end of Runway 18/36, and 1200 ft. north of the north end of the proposed runway, to be located 600 ft. east of Runway 18/36. The proposed land use is commercial, and consists of a 240,000 sq. ft. business park with multiple buildings for offices, restaurants, health and exercise center, mini-warehouse, nursery, trailer, boat storage, blueprinting and duplicating services on approximately 61.75 acres.*

*The site consists of six Planning Areas, zoned Manufacturing Service Commercial (M-SC), as shown on the attached exhibit. Planning Area 1 (4.93 ac.) is located within the Inner Safety Zone (ISZ) and Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ). Planning Area 2 (15 ac.) is within the ISZ for Runway 18/36 and is also within the ETZ and Outer Safety Zone (OSZ) for the proposed runway. Planning Area 3 (8.59 ac.) is primarily within the OSZ of the proposed runway, although the southeast corner is within the TPZ. Planning Area 4 (7.86 ac) is within the ISZ of Runway 18/36, and is also within the ETZ and OSZ for the proposed runway. Planning Areas 5 (9.4 ac.) and 6 (13.4 ac.) are within the ISZ and ETZ for Runway 18/36. The proposed buildings on the site or a portion of the proposed buildings are either within the ISZ for Runway 18/36, the ETZ for the proposed runway, or the OSZ for the proposed runway.*

*A portion of the building within Planning Area 1 is in the TPZ, with the remaining portion in the ISZ.*

### *Prohibited and Discouraged Uses*

*Structures and land uses involving petroleum, explosives or above-grade powerlines are prohibited within the ISZ. Structures, land uses involving concentrations of people, and significant obstructions are prohibited within the ETZ. Prohibited land uses within the OSZ include residences, public assembly uses, hotels, restaurants, bars, schools, hospitals, government services, public utility stations, plants, public communication facilities and uses involving, as the primary activity, manufacture, storage or distribution of explosives or flammable materials. Discouraged uses within the TPZ include schools, auditoriums, amphitheaters, stadiums, churches, and uses involving, as the primary activity, manufacture, storage or distribution of explosives or flammable materials.*

*Building coverage for Planning Areas 2, 3 and 4 is less than 25% (net), which is below the OSZ standard of 25% (net). The maximum population density within the OSZ is 25 persons per acre for uses in structures.*

*There is a GPS approach over the site (non-precision). A 34:1 approach would typically place an approaching aircraft 200 feet  $\pm$  over the proposed site.*

*Height: The highest elevation on the site is 1354 MSL. The building, signs and lighting at the proposed site are not expected to exceed 35 feet. The proposed site is located within the Part 77 approach surface overlying this area at 1,350 – 1,410MSL. The runway elevation is 1,347MSL. The distance from Runway 18/36 to the closest building on the proposed site is approximately 950 ft.*

*Planning Areas 5 and 6, and the western portion of Planning Area 4 lie to the west of the Building Restriction Line (BRL) established in accordance with FAR Part 77 criteria. Buildings to be constructed within Planning Areas 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 on the proposed site are restricted to those portions of the site east of the BRL. The BRL does not extend into or lie adjacent to Planning Area 1.*

*The applicant has submitted a 7460 Notice to Construct to the FAA at the request of staff, and as of the date of this staff report (May 7<sup>th</sup>) is awaiting a response.*

***RECOMMENDATION:*** *Staff recommends continuance of the item until June in order to obtain the 7460 review and any comments from Cal Trans Aeronautics.*

Beverly Coleman referred to a handout pertaining to the FAA 7460 review. There has been a determination of no hazard to air navigation with the condition for lighting. She discussed one of the questions that came up previously as to the proximity of safety zones to the buildings within the planning area. Ms. Coleman used the overhead to overlay those safety zones over the building locations to better clarify the locations. She referred to the buildings in red and the inner safety (the boundaries of this zone) and portion of Planning Area One in the building within Planning Area One that falls within the inner safety zone. In addition, there is a portion of the buildings, in this portion of the site, containing two commercial buildings that also fall within the inner safety zone. She referenced the safety zones for Runway 18-36. She also presented another overlay that shows the safety zones for the proposed runway. The traffic pattern zone was shown and reference made to a building that partially falls within the inner safety zone and partially within the traffic pattern zone. There are buildings that fall within the inner safety zone for



Runway 18-36. Overlaying the proposed Runway, Ms. Coleman referred to the emergency touch down zone for the proposed runway, the outer safety zone, and the traffic pattern zone. Referencing the 7460 review, Ms. Coleman indicated that was received after the staff report had been generated and was, therefore, not reflected in the report. Comments from CalTrans Aeronautics are still pending. The Planning Department recently sent their request for comments which have not yet been received by Staff.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Tandy inquired as to possible restaurants and health and exercise centers planned within the buildings. Ms. Coleman responded that there are no specifics at this point. Commissioner Tandy asked about trailer and boat storage and the safety issues surrounding fuel for these items. Ms. Coleman responded that because portions of the planning areas are within the Emergency Touch Down Zone, Inner Safety Zone and/or Traffic Pattern Zone, at this point in time it is uncertain as to the locations. She added, however, that the Conditions can address that matter. Commissioner Bell asked for clarification as to whether the plan referred to a nursery for plants or people. Beverly Coleman indicated it was a plant nursery and showed the location, stating it is located within the Emergency Touch Down Zone and in that area structures are prohibited. There are no structures proposed in the nursery. Marge Tandy referenced the restrictions relative to the ETC. Ms. Coleman stated that the restrictions for the ETC indicate no structures or significant obstructions but does not define height as it might pertain to a significant obstruction (i.e., a tree might be considered a significant obstruction).

Hearing no further responses, Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case, and upon hearing no reply, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. After hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's, and upon hearing no reply or response, he called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Graff made a motion for a continuance of FV-02-103 – Riverside County to the next regular scheduled meeting of July 18th. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously. Judy Stephens returned.

**RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT**

- D. RI-02-127 – Wishard Architects (Continued from May 16<sup>th</sup>). Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE SUMMARY**

<b>CASE NUMBER:</b>	<u>RI-02-127 – Wishard Architects</u>
<b>APPROVING JURISDICTION:</b>	City of Riverside
<b>JURISDICTION CASE NO.:</b>	DR-095-012

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*Construction of a Two-Story Industrial Building on 25,374 sq. ft.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located at 6400 Columbus Ave., east of Jasmine St. and 3,900 ft. northeast of Runway 9/27 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport*

- a. Airport Influence Area: TPZ*
- b. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

*Land Use:* *The proposed site is located approximately 3,900 ft. northeast of Runway 9-27 and is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for the construction of a two-story industrial building on 25,374 sq. ft. The proposed use of the building includes office, warehouse and storage. The TPZ has no population limits assigned, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% on the net lot. The lot coverage of the buildings at the site is 35.82% of the gross area.*

*Part 77:* *The elevation at this site is approximately 811 MSL feet and the maximum building height is approximately 31 feet. The site is well below the horizontal surface at this location, which is approximately 966MSL.*

*Noise:* *The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. This is acceptable for the usage proposed with the appropriate mitigation for noise.*

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

- 1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.*
- 2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
- 3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.*
- 4. The following uses shall be prohibited:*
  - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
  - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*

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

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the conditions outlined above.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Upon hearing no reply, he requested the applicant to come forward and present the case. The Applicant responded that he was in agreement with the conditions of approval. Chairman Graff inquired as to the intended use for the facility (storage, office, etc.). Dan Wishard, Wishard Architects in Riverside, and Mike Brown, owner of the business, responded it would be a construction office to store tools and supplies necessary for a lath and plaster business; i.e., chicken wire, paper, etc. It would be for business application and would involve approximately seven office employees and 150 field employees, and very few would be visiting the office. Chairman Graff clarified his concern was with the possibility of employees on the site 24/7 and the type of storage housed at the facility. Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's, and upon hearing no reply or response, he called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Tandy motioned to approve RI-02-127 – Wishard Architects. Commissioner Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## **BLYTHE AIRPORT**

- E. BL-02-101 Blythe Energy Project – Phase II – An application for a 520 MW Expansion of the Energy Facility, north of Hobson Way, south of Riverside Drive and immediately east of the airport, and west of the original facility.

Keith Downs indicated that Greystone, Consultant for this project, has requested a further continuance until the July 18, 2002 meeting.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Upon hearing no reply, he opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case, and after hearing no reply from the audience. Upon hearing no reply, he called for motion to continue to the July 18, 2002 Airport Land Use Commission meeting.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Graff motioned to continue BL-02-101 – Blythe Energy Project - Phase II to July 18<sup>th</sup>. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Due to the meeting running ahead of schedule the Administrative Items were covered. See Item VII, below:

VI. NEW BUSINESS

**BLYTHE AIRPORT**

- A. BL-02-102 – Blythe Redevelopment Agency Area #1, Amendment #4 – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE SUMMARY:**

**CASE NUMBER** BL-02-102 – Blythe Redevelopment Agency Area #1, Amendment #4

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** *City of Blythe Redevelopment and County of Riverside Redevelopment Agencies*

**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** *CEC: Docket #02-AFC-1, Related Cases BL-02-106, BL-00-102, BL 01-100, BL-02-100 and BL-02-102*

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** *The project is the addition of two areas to the current Redevelopment Areas. One is the community of Mesa Verde and the other is the Blythe Energy Plan site. The total size of the additional area is 347 acres (See Attached Summaries).*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The City portion of the project is located north of Hobson way, west of Buck Boulevard, from 3,900-5,400 feet easterly of the east end of RWY 8/26 and approximately five miles west of Downtown. The County site is south of I-10 east and west of Mesa Verde Drive.*

**ENVIRONMENTAL:**

*The proposal is being processed by the Redevelopment Agencies and they have developed a Program Environmental Impact Report. Comments to that are on Page 3 of the report.*

**LAND USE PLAN:**

*The current Land Use Plan (CLUP) designations for the expansion areas include the: Outer Safety Zone, Extended Runway Centerline (ERC,) and Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ).*

**NOISE:**

*All of the areas are outside of the 60 CNEL for 1992. The 2000 plan contours for long-range capacity do cover the Blythe Energy site with 55CNEL and 60CNEL. That project is by its nature a source of noise and not a sensitive receptor. The Mesa Verde site has portion of the Capacity 60CNEL over approximately 30 existing residences. Many of these homes and mobile homes would not currently be well insulated from noise.*

**PART 77 OBSTRUCTION:** *The current project (annexations) does not need an FAA review. Any project exceeding the FAA criteria for a 7460 review shall obtain one prior to construction.*

**PURPOSE AND SCOPE:** *Chapter I, Paragraph 1.1 states the purpose of the plan:*

*“The Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Blythe Airport is intended to protect and promote the safety and welfare of residents of the airport vicinity and users of the airport while ensuring the continued operation of the airport. Specifically, the plan seeks to protect the public from the adverse effects of aircraft noise, to ensure that people and facilities are not concentrated in areas susceptible to aircraft accidents, and to ensure that no structures or activities encroach upon or adversely affect the use of navigable airspace.”*

*While this annexation project does not adversely affect the public with aircraft noise, the sites are in an area with higher incidences of aircraft accidents and the activity or structure may encroach upon or adversely affect the use of navigable airspace. The degree that it does is not likely to be high with the conditions as required, but that is not clearly insignificant.*

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding for consistency for the project.

**CONDITIONS:**

*The following condition shall apply to this project:*

1. *The project proponents (Redevelopment Agency) shall obtain an aviation easement to the Blythe Airport for all projects that it participates in within the Airport Influence Area.*
2. *All outdoor lighting shall be hooded or shielded to prevent either spillage of lumens shall be reflections into the sky (downward facing).*
3. *Incorporate noise attenuation measure into any of the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
4. *No obstruction of the “FAR Part 77 Conical Surface” shall be permitted.*
5. *The following conditions shall be required with this application:*
  - 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.*

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Vice Chairman Graff asked if the project is east or west of the existing power plant (unable to locate on drawings). Keith Downs responded this project is the existing power plant and is an addition to the redevelopment area to the south and east of the Airport. The area to the west is already in the redevelopment zone. Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward. Charles Hull, City of Blythe, indicated his availability to answer any questions. Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. After hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner’s, and upon hearing no reply or response, he called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Tandy made a motion to approve BL-02-102 – Blythe Redevelopment Agency Area #1, Amendment #4 subject to Staff conditions

of approval (finding of consistency). Commissioner Judy Stephens seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## **FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT**

- B. FV-02-104– Konrad Rieger – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

### **CASE SUMMARY:**

**CASE NUMBER:** FV-02-104 – Konrad Rieger  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** PP17268  
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*Construction of a Jewelry Store on approximately .75 acres.*

### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located north of Margarita Road and West of Date Street, approximately 5,700 ft. southwest of Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.*

### **LAND USE PLAN:**

Adjacent Airport: French Valley  
a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)  
c. Noise Levels: Outside 55 CNEL for year 2013

### **MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposal is the construction of a 8,550 sq. ft. jewelry store on approximately .75 acres. The TPZ only has restrictions for 'discouraged' uses. Coverage for the site is less than 30% of the project, which is below the TPZ standard of 50% (gross) or 65% (net). The densities and usages proposed within the TPZ are consistent with the plan.*

Part 77: *The highest elevation on the property is 1039.3, and the height of the building at the tallest point is 34 ft. The horizontal surface elevation is 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,347MSL. Structures over 1404 MSL in elevation will require an FAA review. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern.*

### Conclusion:

*The proposal is consistent with the French Valley Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) and will not have a significant effect on the Airport subject to the following conditions of approval:*

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. *Provide Avigation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, prior to recordation of any map, or issuance of any permit, whichever is first.*
2. *No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.*

3. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).*
4. *The following uses 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.*

**RECOMMENDATION:**

*Staff recommends a finding of consistency with the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan on this project subject to the conditions of approval noted above.*

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Tandy inquired if there was senior facility in the area, to which Beverly Coleman replied that there were two properties on Streeter that were adjacent. Hearing no further questions from the Commissioners, Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case.

The Applicant came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation, and voiced his concurrence with staff's Conditions of Approval. Chairman Cobb then called for questions from the Commissioners, and upon hearing no response or reply, he opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case

Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Bell made a motion to approve FV-02-104 – Konrad Rieger, subject to Staff's Conditions of Approval (finding of consistency). Commissioner Judy Stephens seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- C. FV-02-105 – Ashby USA, LLC – Roripaugh Ranch – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE SUMMARY:**

**CASE NUMBER:** *FV-02-105 - Roripaugh Ranch  
(Previous cases FV-99-103 and 01-105)*

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** *City of Temecula*

**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** *Revised Specific Plan; Roripaugh Ranch EIR and  
Specific Plan and Tract 29661*

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A request for a master-planned project that consists of 2058 dwelling units on 804.7 acres of which approximately 160 acres are within the airport influence area consisting of approximately 509 dwelling units, 5.1 acres of parks, and 34 acres of open space. The Tract is for 417 residential lots on 144 acres and entirely within the Influence Area.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located south of Murrieta Hot Springs Road, east of Leon Road and 5,000-10,000 feet southeasterly of Runway No. 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.*

**LAND USE PLAN:**

*Adjacent Airport: French Valley*

*a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ),*

*c. Noise Levels: outside 55 CNEL for year 2013, but under flight track*

**MAJOR ISSUES:** *The Commission on August 2, 2001 found the previous project consistent with the plan and the letter and staff report are attached. The present project does not include the school. The text has been revised to reflect some of the previous concerns and the condition are reflected on Page 2-6 conditions 8-13. The conditions listed below should be added to the Tract and Specific Plan.*

**PLANNING AREAS 1A, 2,3, and 4A and B:** *These residential units are within the TPZ and the uses proposed would be consistent with the Comprehensive plan.*

**PLANNING AREA 5 and 6:** *The park sites have a potential to have uses that would be 'discouraged' such as a stadium, lighted ballfields or amphitheaters. By excluding these uses from that area the project could be considered consistent.*

**PLANNING AREAS 7, 8, and 9:** *Open Space Areas: These areas are clearly consistent with the CLUP and are largely buffers to adjoining areas or very steep slopes.*

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: for the City to utilize**

- 1. Provide Avigation Easements to the French Valley Airport for those portions of the project within the Influence Area prior to final approval by the City Council.*
- 2. Incorporated additional noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
- 3. Installations hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).*
- 4. The Plan and EIR are amended to recognize the approved CLUP and the airport and are included in the appropriate text and graphic illustrations.*



5. *No obstruction of the PART 77 “Conical Surface shall be permitted.*
6. *The following uses shall be precluded:*
  - *stadiums*
  - *amphitheaters*
  - *lighted ballfields*
  - *churches*
7. *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.*

**RECOMMENDATION:**

*Staff recommends that the Commission find the project as submitted found to be consistent with the French Valley Airport CLUP subject to the above conditions.*

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response from the Commissioners, he requested the applicant to come forward and present the case. Upon hearing no response or reply, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case, and after hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner’s, and upon hearing no reply or response, he called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Bell made a motion to approve FV-02-105 – Roripaugh Ranch, subject to staff’s Conditions of Approval. Commissioner Judy Stephens seconded the motion. Motion carried. Commissioner Tandy abstained.

- D. FV-02-106 – Land Tech Engineering – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE SUMMARY:**

**CASE NUMBER:** *FV-02-106 – Land Tech Engineering*  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** *County of Riverside*  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** *Tentative Parcel Map 30595*

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Parcel Map for proposed commercial/industrial use on 161.33 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located south of Borel Road, west of Leon Road, approximately 600 to 4,300 ft. southeast of Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.*

**LAND USE PLAN:**

*Adjacent Airport: French Valley*  
*a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ) and Inner Safety Zone (ISZ)*  
*c. Noise Levels: N/A*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

*Land Use: The proposal is for a Tentative Parcel Map for a commercial/industrial use. No specific usage is proposed at this time. The lot coverage standard for the TPZ is 65% of the net or 50% of the gross. The TPZ only has restrictions for ‘discouraged’ uses. Prohibited uses in the ISZ are uses which include petroleum, explosives or above grade power lines. The Zoning for the site is restricted light industrial under Specific Plan 265. Subsequent permits would need a further review when they are submitted.*

*Part 77: The highest elevation on the property is 1459.8 MSL. The horizontal surface is 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,347 MSL. The northwest portion of the site is within the primary surface. The remainder of the site is either within the transitional surface, which ranges between 1450 - 1499 MSL, or the horizontal surface at 1500 MSL. The distance from Runway 18/36 to the northwest corner of the proposed site is approximately 600 ft. Any future structures proposed on the site may require FAA review.*

*Conclusion:*

*The proposal is consistent with the French Valley Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) and will not have a significant effect on the Airport subject to the following conditions of approval:*

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

- 1. Provide Avigation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, prior to recordation of any map, or issuance of any permit, whichever is first.*
- 2. Any subsequent use proposed shall be reviewed by the ALUC.*
- 3. No obstruction of the “FAR Part 77 Conical Surface” shall be permitted.*
- 4. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).*

5. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*

- (a) *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
- (b) *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
- (c) *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
- (d) *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to any operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*

6. *The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*

**RECOMMENDATION:** *Staff recommends a finding of consistency with the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan on this project subject to the conditions of approval noted above.*

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners.

Hearing no further responses from the Commissioners, Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case. Upon hearing no response or reply, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case, and after hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's.

Upon hearing no further comments or discussion from the Commissioner's, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Vice-Chairman Graff made a motion to approve FV-02-106 – Land Tech Engineering, subject to Staff's Conditions of Approval. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously

Keith Downs continued with Administrative updates until the time scheduled for Item E, Hemet/Ryan Airport.

## **HEMET/RYAN AIRPORT**

E. HE-02-102 – Wendy's International – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

## **CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NUMBER:** HE-02-102 Wendy's International  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Hemet  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** CUP 02-02  
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The project is a Conditional Use Permit for a 3,184 sq. ft. restaurant on .62 acres.

### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is situated north of Florida Avenue and west of Sanderson Avenue, approximately 8,900 ft. northeast of Runway 5-23 for Hemet/Ryan Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Hemet-Ryan Airport  
Land Use Policy: CLUP 1989: Adopted by City of Hemet and County of Riverside

a. Airport Influence Area: Area III, Area of Moderate Risk  
b. Noise Levels: Outside 55CNEL, but subject to annoyance levels

### **MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposed site is located approximately 8,900 feet northwest of Runway 5-23. The proposed site is within Area III (Area of Moderate Risk) of the Hemet-Ryan Airport Influence Area. The total site is approximately .62 sq. ft. and the lot coverage is 12%. Area III has no population density limits assigned to it, but requires a discretionary review for certain uses.

NOISE: The site is not underlying any specific traffic pattern but will experience annoyance from over flying aircraft. The 1989 plan indicates that the area is outside of the 55CNEL.

PART 77: The highest elevation on the site is 1,525 MSL and the height of the tallest structure is 21 ft. Any structures exceeding 1,601 MSL at this location needs to be reviewed by the FAA. The site is within the Horizontal Surface of 1662MSL.

**DISCRETIONARY REVIEW:** Pages 35 and 37 of the Hemet-Ryan CLUP include the discretionary review procedures and require us to review: 1) **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:** structure height, 2) population density, 3) nature of the land use activity, 4) noise, 5) relevant safety factors, 6) institutional uses, and 7) places of assembly. The present proposal would be consistent with that density and the plan.

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Hemet-Ryan Airport prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of consistency with the Hemet-Ryan Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan on this project subject to the conditions of approval noted above.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Graff referenced Runway 5-23 and the map of the proposed site.

Upon hearing no further responses from the Commissioners, Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case.

John Defrenza, representing applicant, came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation. He indicated that Map Quest selected the site (which was inaccurate).

Upon hearing no further comments from the applicant, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. After hearing no reply from the audience, he called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's. Upon hearing no reply, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Marge Tandy made a motion to approve HE-02-102 – Wendy's International subject to Staff conditions of approval. Commissioner Judy Stephens seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**Keith Downs stated alt. Information needed; need letter on file??**

**Cert—passed. ???**

~~continue the case for the next scheduled meeting of June 20<sup>th</sup>, subject to staff's change of recommendation from consistency to continuation in order to review Caltrans letter requesting CEQA Environmental Documentation. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion.~~

## **CHINO AIRPORT**

Keith Downs req. consent items w/COA.????

Chairman Cobb—Asked commissioners if questions or comments.

Commissioner Graff-- F - Discussion due to prox. Chairman Cobb-- reit.

G-J – Consent

Chairman Cobb asked for applicant to step forward.

J-owner pres. – no objection COA

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Tandy motioned (w s.r. & COA). Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

F. CH-02-100 – Trip Hord Associates – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

## **CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NUMBER:** CH-02-100 – W.L. Homes/Trip Hord Associates  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Tract Map 30975, General Plan Amendment #620 and Change of Zone #6678

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A General Plan Amendment from Agriculture/Development Reserve to 2B Residential [2-5 D.U] acres and a Change of Zone from A-2-10 to R-4 Single-Family Residential, and a request to divide 40 acres into 152 lots.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is situated east of Harrison Ave., and south of Cloverdale Road, within the unincorporated County of Riverside approximately 11,000 – 12,000 feet easterly of the east end of Runway 26L at Chino Airport.*

Adjacent Airport: Chino Airport (County of San Bernardino)  
a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area  
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area  
c. Noise Levels: See Below

**BACKGROUND:**

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

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

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 11,000 – 12,000 feet east of Runway 8-26. The existing site is a vacant dairy. The touch and go flight tracks are overhead to the west approximately one-half mile as is one flight track. The generalized flight tracks are described on Exhibit B.*

*The 1991 CLUP places the property outside of Safety Zone III, but is within the Conical Surface. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues. The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise, type of aircraft and expected type of aircraft, FAA criteria or a combination of these factors. With the present configuration of the airport the site will likely end up in the TPZ or an approach category.*

Part 77: *The elevation at this site varies from approximately 647 to 655 feet and the maximum building height is less than 40. The site is largely underlying the approach zone and in order to exceed obstruction standards a structure would need to exceed approximately 150 feet in height. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern with this project. An instrument approach is over the parcel, and this site can expect overflight from aircraft entering the approaches.*

Noise:

1991 Report: *The site is outside the 65 CNEL contour developed for the airport in 1991, and likely to be within the 55 CNEL. Page 2-3 of the report discusses these concerns and*

discusses **prohibiting** residential development within the 60 and 55 CNEL where overflights are conducted, particularly where flights are below 500 feet above ground level.

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

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the County of Riverside and Chino Airport prior to the recordation of the tract, issuance of any permit, or sale of any portion to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky or above the horizontal plane.
3. Should any additional facilities be included at a subsequent date that they are reviewed by ALUC until such time that a CLUP is adopted for the Airport by RCALUC.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
  - (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
  - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff would recommend approval of this project subject to the conditions of noted above. The project can be approved based upon the following, as identified in Section 21675.1 of the California Public Utilities Code (PUC).

1. The ALUC is making substantial progress toward the completion of the Chino Airport Land Use Plan; and
2. There is a reasonable probability that the project will be consistent with the plan; and
3. There is little or no probability of substantial detriment to or interference with the plan, if the project is ultimately inconsistent with the plan.

Keith Downs: Per James Jenkins, no problem w/s.r. to COA.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners.

Keith Downs – depicted on exhibit.

Commissioner Tandy – SB building at end of runway (thought)...

Keith Downs: No opposition – okay'd s.r. and COA.

Applicant: Trip Hord, Rep. John Lange...

Homes—supports consistent w/previous s.r. and COA

Commissioner Tandy: Does Rep the reside there?

Trip Hord; Sure. Reviewed Comm. – nice – no A/P. Grew up in Canyon Crest area.

Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case, and after hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioners.

**??ACTION TAKEN:??** Commissioner Snyder ??motioned ?(s.r. and COA).

Commissioner J.S.??seconded?? the motion. Chairman Cobb recomm. consent items on calendar adj. Calendar accord. – compress

Commissioner Snyder - Spec. time

Keith Downs – Adv. Time

Commissioner Snyder – Window of time, i.e., 10 – 12 p.m.

B.T. Miller – No time for ea. Item.

Keith Downs – Comm. Desires

Commissioner Cobb – Compress.

Keith Downs – Streamline



Commissioner Bell: Non-problem (not in past)

Keith Downs – Noted PHN CHN.

Chairman Cobb – mentioned other issue.

Audience vs. ALUC (Comm. complaining - Abatement, noise, traffic, etc.)

Keith Downs? – Staff conferred w/COR? – 3 A/P's effect – FL, RI and MA. FL at next meeting, if successful.

Ment.-minor admin. Items, letter status.

Regul. Most cases re?rm?rn? addtn – det. = AE and noise issues. Occasional obstruction -

Group permit within TPZ (City LTDs of Riverside)

Letter: RI-02-133

B.T. Miller – Poss. Blanket rule

Adj's – addr. Submission of items. Delegate to review to cities.

Keith Downs – confirmed.

B.T. Miller – Mech. In place. Review rules and stat? State? ? prov. Of ALUC.

Keith Downs – Sunset clause – CLUP 2...YrI?? Out. Not delegate – Pre-approval:  
- if Clup ctn's?

Chairman Cobb – ALUC not reviewing unless preview of CNEL 60?, etc.

B.T. Miller – rules to admin – conform

Commissioner Graff – well-defined lines (STS?)

Keith Downs – outlined on exhibit.

Commissioner Graff – concerned w/interpretation – if “st.” not defined - - coinc?

Misinterpretation. City “blanket” permit relative to A/P.

Chairman Cobb – not understood as “blanket”, but if fell? W/COA #2.

Commissioner Graff – concerned ...noted COT – drafted letter.

Chairman Cobb – recomm. Information only.

Chairman Cobb ??called for any further questions or concerns from the Commissioners.??

John S.(Sabatello?), Cor-Plng Dept. – init. per conversation with Keith Downs. – abide w/. Interp. – lines plotted un. GIS – 60 CNEL to safety zone? Stored? and reviewed.

Comm.? – no response.

Discussion –

Commissioner Graff – Legal counsel w/w/ written – Staff re-work w/legal – agreeable sit.

Keith Downs – ment. – reviewed MA?

Chairman Cobb – GIS – plotting answers ? By Commissioner Graff (definition – definitive).

H. – W/bring back after further discussion w/ legal.

Keith Downs – impacting Staff..

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners.

Hearing no further responses from the Commissioners, Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case. Upon hearing no response or reply, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. After hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's.

After hearing no further comments from the Commissioners, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner [LAST NAME] made a motion to continue the project, subject to staff's recommendations for a continuance to the next scheduled

meeting of June 20th. Commissioner [LAST NAME] seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE**

G. MA-02-139 – William Snell –

**CASE SUMMARY:**

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-02-139 – William Snell  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Tract Map 30613

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A Tract Map for 22 dwelling units on 2.58 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located north of Central Avenue and east of Canyon Crest Blvd., approximately 26,400 feet northwest of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

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

**BACKGROUND:**

Staff utilizes five resources for our review:

1. The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993
3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
4. Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
5. Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 26,500 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The proposal is a Tract Map for 22 condominium units on 2.58 acres. The existing site is vacant and zoned for residential uses. The proposal is under one major track and within the outer horizontal surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B.

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area III, which has no residential density restrictions. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property inside of the 65 CNEL. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The site is 2.58 acres, and the structural coverage of the site is less than 50%.

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 1,094 MSL feet and the maximum building height is 21.5 feet. Any structures over 1800 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be outside the 55 CNEL and is near one major flight track. Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise level was as high as 65CNEL.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Additional noise insulation shall be included in all homes within this subdivision to achieve at least an NLR of 25.
4. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure that no lights are above the horizontal plane.

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

H. MA-02-140 – Adkan Engineers

**CASE SUMMARY:**

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-02-140 – Adkan Engineers  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Tentative Tract Map 29628

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A Tentative Tract Map for 35 Residential Family Lots on 72 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is situated north of Berry Road west of Via Vista Drive, approximately 25,000 feet west of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

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

**BACKGROUND:**

Staff utilizes five resources for our review:

- b. The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
- c. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993
- d. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
- e. Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
- f. Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 25,000 feet west of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for 35 residential units on 72 acres. The existing site is vacant and zoned for residential uses. The proposal is under one major track and within the outer horizontal surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B.

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area III, which has no residential density restrictions. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property inside of the 65 CNEL. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues. The surrounding property is developed at a similar density.

Density and Coverage: The lots range from 1 to 5 acres and coverage would likely be less than 50%.

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 1,530 MSL feet. The height of the structures is unknown at this time. Any structures over 1,785 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be inside the 55 CNEL and is near one major flight track. Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise level was as high as 65CNEL.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

- 1. Provide Avigation Easements to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
- 2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
- 3. Additional noise insulation shall be included in all homes within this subdivision to achieve at least an NLR of 25.
- 4. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure that no lights are above the horizontal plane.

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

I. MA-02-141 – Webb Associates

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-02-141 – City of Riverside  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Specific Plan Amendment

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Specific Plan Amendment and Change of Zone from MP to C-3 on approximately 25 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is situated north of Box Springs Road and east of Sycamore Canyon Blvd., within the City of Riverside, approximately 15,500 ft. northwest of March Air Reserve Base.*

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

**BACKGROUND:**

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

*In 1983 the ALUC redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1979 AICUZ. In April of 1984 the ALUC adopted the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan (RCALUP). In May of 1986 the ALUC again redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1983 AICUZ. In 1992 and again in 1998 the AICUZ reports were redone to reflect the mission changes of the two Base Realignments: however, no changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone created in 1986.*

*In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The current 98/99 Draft CLUP effort was prepared utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.*

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

- 1. The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*
- 2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993*
- 3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994*
- 4. Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*
- 5. Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP*

## **MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 15,500 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for a Specific Plan Amendment and Change of Zone from MP to C-3 on 24.97 acres. The proposed zoning and specific plan amendment will place the site in the C-3 land use designation. The proposal is under one major track and within the outer horizontal surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B.

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, the type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area III, which has no residential density restrictions. Industrial uses are allowed subject to certain constraints. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property inside of the 60 CNEL. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The proposed site is 24.97 acres (net). Proposed structures currently include a 25,176 sq. ft. auto facility on 5.21 acres. The structural coverage for the structure will be less than 20%.

Part 77: The elevation at the site is approximately 1,540 feet. The height of the proposed structure is 22.5 ft. Any structures over 1,690 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the noise level at the property to be 65 CNEL. Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise level was as high as 80CNEL. The proposed use is not a noise sensitive use.

## **CONDITIONS:**

1. Prior to project development or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.
2. Any structures over 35 feet in height will require further review.
3. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
  - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.

- d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
- 4. The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.

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

**DESERT RESORTS REGIONAL AIRPORT**

J. TH-02-103 – Fomotor Engineering

**CASE SUMMARY**

**CASE NUMBER:** TH-02-103 –Fomotor Eng.  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Parcel Map 30370

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** A Parcel Map to make two lots from a 39-acre parcel.

**PROJECT LOCATION:** The site is situated east of Polk St., and north of 62 Ave. in Thermal.

Adjacent Airport: Desert Resorts Regional Airport  
 Land Use Policy: CLUP 1992:  
 a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone TPZ  
 b. Noise Levels: Outside current 55CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposed site is located 5,500-6,000 southeast of Runway 17-35. The proposed site is within the Traffic Pattern Zone of the Desert Resorts Regional Airport Influence Area and the total site is 39 acres.

NOISE: The site is underlying a well-used traffic pattern and will experience annoyance from over flying aircraft.

PART 77. The surface elevation varies from –152 to –155MSL. The south runway end is at –125MSL. The site is within the Horizontal Surface, but does not need any FAA review at this time due to the distance from the runway.

**CONDITIONS:** For the County to Utilize

1. Provide Aviation Easements to the Desert Resorts Airport prior to any development of the project, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into all residential construction and the office portions of any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below



45-decibel levels.

3. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).*
4. *The following uses 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.*

**RECOMMENDATION:** *Staff recommends that the Commission find the project consistent with the Thermal Airport Comprehensive Plan.*

## **RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT**

K. RI-02-133 – City of Riverside

**CASE SUMMARY:**

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-02-133 – City of Riverside

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** *A request for a group permit for all future administrative permits within the Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ) and not within the 60 CNEL*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is all of the area within the adopted TPZ and not within the 60CNEL for the Riverside Municipal Airport. This is generally two miles from the airport runways.*

- a. Airport Influence Area: TPZ
- b. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: This Permit includes all residential permits within the area that are administratively reviewed by the City staff (See Exhibit A). Any permit going to a hearing body such as the City Council or Planning Commission would not be included within this review.

Part 77: The elevation over this site varies and the maximum building height is allowed is 35 feet AGL. The site is under the horizontal and conical surface at these locations, which is 966MSL. Any structure over 35 feet AGL would still need an ALUC review.

Noise: By definition the site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. This is acceptable for the usage proposed with the appropriate mitigation for noise.

**BACKGROUND:**

In conformance with the Rules adopted by the ALUC, staff routinely reviews the projects on a one by one basis. This use is an excessive amount of time for a task that the city would normally do when they adopt the plan. Due to the forthcoming update of the CLUP the city has chosen to wait until the plans are complete. The City of Riverside is the only city affected by more than one airport. Your staff will provide training and technical backup for the city staff.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Information only

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. This permit applies to any residential permit that is only reviewed by staff and is not advertised for public hearing. Examples would be: new construction, room additions, and Mobile Home installations.
2. Permits already exempt are: garages, carports, patios, re-roofs, wall, plumbing, electrical, heating, air-conditioning, retaining walls, pools, spas, interior remodeling, accessory buildings and satellite dish.
3. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.
3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
4. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
5. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - i. 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.

- ii. 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.
- iii. 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.
- iv. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

7. This permit does not apply to any structure over 35' in height.

**MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE**

**L. MA-02-142 – City of Riverside**

**CASE SUMMARY:**

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-02-142– City of Riverside  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Numerous

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** A request for a group permit for all future administrative permits within the Areas II and III of the adopted Influence Area and not within the 60 CNEL of the AICUZ

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is all of the area within the adopted Airport Influence Area for the March Air Reserve Base Airport and not within the 60CNEL of the current AICUZ. This is generally two to five miles from the airport runways.

- a. Airport Influence Area: Areas II and III
- b. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: This Permit includes all residential permits within the area that are administratively reviewed by the City of Riverside staff (See Exhibit A). Any permit going to a hearing body such as the City Council or Planning Commission would not be included within this review. These sites are within areas II and III of the March Air Reserve Base Airport Influence Area

Part 77: The elevation over this site is varies and the maximum building height is 35 feet AGL. The site and is under the horizontal and conical surface at these locations, which is 1,888MSL. Any structure over 35 feet AGL would still need an ALUC review.

Noise: The site of the effected permits is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. This is acceptable for the usage proposed with the appropriate mitigation for noise.

In conformance with the Rules adopted by the ALUC, staff routinely reviews the projects on a one by one basis. This use is an excessive amount of time for a task that the city would normally do when they adopt the plan. Due to the forthcoming update of the CLUP the city has chosen to wait until the

plans are complete. The City of Riverside is the only city affected by more than one airport. Your staff will provide training and technical backup for the city staff.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Information Only

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. This permit applies to any residential permit that is only reviewed by staff and is not advertised for public hearing. Examples would be: new construction, room additions, and Mobile Home installations.
2. Permits already exempt are: garages, carports, patios, re-roofs, wall, plumbing, electrical, heating, air-conditioning, retaining walls, pools, spas, interior remodeling, accessory buildings and satellite dish.
3. Provide Avigation Easements to March JPA.
4. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
5. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
6. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - i. 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.
  - ii. 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.
  - iii. 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.
    - (a) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
7. This approval does not apply to any structure over 35' in height.

## VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Keith Downs indicated Staff's request that the Commission act on Items A, B, C, and D as consent items unless there is someone in the audience that wishes to speak or a Commissioner that has a question.

### A. Reappointments and Status of Alternates

On May 13, the City Selection Committee could not form a quorum so there was no replacement for Mr. Williams. That matter will be agendized for the anticipated meeting in July.

Commission terms were discussed. Commissioner Graff's term is until May 2005, and Commissioner Bell's term is until May 2006.

### B. Staff Meeting: City of Murrieta

Annexation will take place on July 1, 2002. All items pertaining to the County of Riverside will be submitted. The French Valley Airport item regarding the need for obstructions lighting for the antenna in the Hogbacks area immediately west of the Airport will become an item for the City of Murrieta.

### C. County of Riverside Letter

There has been no response regarding the letter sent/authorized by Commissioner Cobb.

### D. CLUP Update: Status

Regarding the notebooks/photos distributed to the Commissioners, they have been assembled and currently include approximately 60 percent of the airports. Some of the photos have been updated to 2002. Keith Downs is coordinating efforts with Bermuda Dunes and other airports to obtain update photography. As additional ones are obtained they will be included, as well. The Commissioners should bring these notebooks along with the State guidelines to every to every meeting.

Commissioner Snyder expressed appreciation for the efforts to obtain these aerial photographs. Mr. Downs clarified that the photos include most of the areas surrounding the airports but not to the periphery of all of them. Most were obtained from master plans which focus on airports and the immediate surroundings. Commissioner Bell concurred.

Keith Downs indicated that he met with Commissioner Snyder, Consultant Ken Brody from Shutt& Moen, the Airport Manager of Bermuda Airport, and Phil Drell, City of Palm Desert. The Consultant mt with Banning Planning and the Airport Staff. He also met with the City of Hemet Staff and continuously with the

Hemet/Ryan Airport Staff as well as the City of Coachella. Further, he attended the Desert Resorts Master Plan discussion at the Desert Resorts JPA.

The contract for our second consultant, Coffman & Associates, will be on the Board Agenda for next Tuesday, after which there will be a kick off regarding the remaining Airports. Ken Brody will be returning in July to work on more facets to the CLUP. There will be a team from the County GIS regarding all the underlying data on property lines--GIS data for 18 layers from the County GIS. There has also been a meeting with the City of Corona, the Airport Manager, and the Planning Staff. Funds are secure at the State level (in spite of considerable cuts in CalTrans budget) because the grant has already been allocated. Money for March Air Reserve Base has not yet been obtained. Congressman Calvert is attempting to obtain funding for the Base.

Commissioner Snyder commented that having the Director and Contractor meet with the City resulted in the City having a better understanding regarding what is being attempted. He observed that there was very good reception from the City of Palm Desert, and the City has agreed to continue to work with the Commission.

Keith Downs referred to an agenda packet from the City of Temecula (a transmittal with a map of the French Valley Airport). A church application is being processed to be located at the periphery of the Plan, and part of it is outside the influence area. It is in the area near Nicholas Middle School. and there will be some noise annoyance. Temecula is still not in conformance with the codes and is not participating in the Commissions efforts to review items. Mr. Downs recommended a letter be sent to them similar to that sent to Murrieta. (They will be reminded via the CLUP which letter will be sent out next week as soon as the Board approves the contract for the second consultant. In this letter they will be informed regarding our consultant and will be requested to submit their general plan.). Commissioner Tandy inquired about senior housing in the area. Keith Downs responded that they did not send **the \_\_\_\_\_ to ALUC**, and they have even expanded on the original proposal. He stated that the line actually goes through these properties. William Cobb discussed the possible need for additional incentives to encourage follow-through. He requested that Staff include a draft of the letter in the July agenda packet for Commissioner perusal. B. T. Miller recommended a motion on that request.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Chairman Cobb motioned to draft a form to submit to the City of Temecula regarding conformance with codes for the church project near French Valley Airport. Commissioner Graff seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Aviation-related Legislation

Keith Downs referred to other items of concern:

Airport's Land Use-regarding airport's land use plans within two

years of a former military airport transferred to new ownership. Keith Downs indicated that type of situation is not anticipated.

AB-2776 – Disclosure Notice for Airport Noise

SB-1468 By Night

A requirement for cities and counties to include military airports in their plans and to show the consistency between the compatibility plans and general plans—incorporating it into the land use element.

F. OTHER BUSINESS

Keith Downs announced that the current ALUC Office Assistant, Pat Moore, was transferring to another position and a replacement is being sought. Commissioner Cobb, on behalf of the Commission, expressed appreciation for Pat Moore's assistance and wished her the best in her new endeavor.

VIII. ORAL COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC ON ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA.

There was no response from the public.

IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

X. ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Cobb adjourned the meeting.

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: July 18, 2002 at 9:00 a.m., Riverside.