

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

RIVERSIDE TRANSIT AUTHORITY
700 Scaramella Circle (off Wentworth)
Hemet, California

THURSDAY, April 17, 2003

10:00 A.M.

MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on April 17, 2003 at the Riverside Transit Authority, Conference Room.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Ric Stephens, Chairman
Allen Graff, Vice Chairman
Marge Tandy
Paul Bell
Walter Snyder
Sam Pratt

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Keith Downs, A.L.U.C. Executive Director
B.T. Miller, Legal Counsel
Beverly Coleman, Development Specialist III
Jackeline Gonzalez, Office Assistant II

OTHERS PRESENT: Nat Hardy
Art Cleary
Kathy Rohm
Tom Turner
Laura Bremer

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Chairman Stephens.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken.

B. AT LARGE: NOMINATIONS

Keith Downs informed the Commission that Commissioner Cobb is not interested to be renewed for the at large membership. The at large member is appointed by the six Commissioners and serves at the will of the six Commissioners. Mr. Downs indicated that a resume has been received from Jon Goldenbaum, Kathy Rohm is present and is asking the Commission to nominate Mr. Goldenbaum. Vice Chairman Graff asked Kathy Rohm to come forward and comment. Kathy Rohm came forward and indicated that Mr. Goldenbaum is very knowledgeable in Aviation. He is the owner of Poly Fibers, which does coverings for small aircrafts. He was a fighter pilot in Vietnam and has been involved in aviation since his

youth. He is also very communicate minded, he helps with the youth programs out at Flabob Airport. Kathy Rohm then indicated that she highly recommends Mr. Goldenbaum.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens indicated if the Commission wishes to make a decision now or can come back to this item at the end of the agenda. Commissioner Snyder indicated he would like to appoint Mr. Goldenbaum.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to appoint Mr. Goldenbaum has the new Commissioner. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR February 20, 2003 and March 20, 2003

February 20, 2003: Chairman Stephens called for comments or corrections from the Commissioners. Hearing no response, Chairman Stephens called for a motion to be set.

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

March 20, 2003: Due to corrections to the minutes being distributed at the meeting the minutes were continued to next schedule meeting of May 22, 2003.

ACTION TAKEN: Vice Chairman Graff made a motion to continue the minutes to next schedule meeting. Commissioner Snyder seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Keith informed the Commission that items V.A. RG-02-100 Riverside County, V.B. RG-03-100 MSHCP and V.C. RI-03-101 C.E.T.A.P. were requested for continuance from the applicant.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Tandy made a motion to continue items V.A. RG-02-100, V.B. RG-03-100 and V.C. RI-03-101. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

V. OLD BUSINESS

REGIONAL WIDE

9:00 A.M.

A. RG-02-100 – Riverside County – Continued

CASE NUMBER: RG-02-100 County of Riverside and BA, DC, FL, PV, SK-02-100, CH-02-104, BD-02-113, BL-02-103, CO-02-100, FV-02-116, MA-02-181, RI-02-165 and TH (DRRA)-02-104

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: GPA 618 and EIR 441

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

2002 Riverside County General Plan (General Plan), Comprehensive General Plan Amendment No. 618 and Environmental Impact Report No. 441 (SCH# 2002051143). The

General Plan is the comprehensive planning document that provides guidelines for growth and land-use related decisions made by the County, expresses the community's goals with respect to both the human-made and natural environment, and sets forth the policies and implementation measures to ensure the safety and welfare of those who live, work, and do business in Riverside County. General Plan area plans which would be affected by airports under ALUC jurisdiction include: Desert Center; Eastern Coachella Valley; Eastvale; Harvest Valley/Winchester; Jurupa; Lake Elsinore; Mead Valley; Palo Verde Valley; San Jacinto Valley; Southwest; Temescal Canyon; The Pass; and Western Coachella Valley Plan. Airports affected are: Banning Municipal, Chino, Bermuda Dunes, Blythe, Chiriaco Summit, Corona Municipal, Desert Center, Desert Resorts Regional, Flabob, French Valley, Hemet/Ryan, MARB/MIP, Perris Valley, Riverside Municipal and Skylark Airports.

PROJECT LOCATION:

All unincorporated area within the Adopted Influence Areas (see Map Attached) Affected Airports: Banning, Chino, Bermuda, Blythe, Chiriaco, Corona, Desert Center, Desert Resorts, Flabob, French Valley, Hemet/Ryan, MARB/MIP, Perris, Valley, Riverside, and Skylark.

BACKGROUND: *The County filed their new General Plan effective December 24, 2003. We have contracted with our consultant to review the proposal and the first review is attached. The ALUC continued the project until the February in order to:*

- 1. Obtain up to date copies of the proposal in order to respond to the proper document.*
- 2. Provide further comments and proposed additions to the text in order make it consistent with the CLUPs and*
- 3. Obtain copies of the CETAP and MSHCP the Transportation and Multi Species in order to review them in light of the General Plan.*

The MSHCP was filed in late January and the CETAP was filed on February 5. The Planning Commission version of the plan was sent to our consultant and their comments to the individual Area Land Use Plans is attached. We utilize numerous resources for our review:

- 1. All Adopted CLUPs*
- 2. The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base and Chino*
- 3. The CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
- 4. Noise data from any source newer than the adopted CLUP*

MAJOR ISSUES: Noise Element, Community Plans and Land Use Element Area Plans

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends that the ALUC find the RCIP as submitted INCONSISTENT with the current CLUP's and notify the Board of Supervisors of that finding with the attached reports, but continue to hold the hearing open and CONTINUE the proposal until the next meeting of March 20, 2003 in order to the review any responses from the County, obtain the latest recommended versions of the plan, text and EIR proposal going to the Board of Supervisors. The Board held public hearing regarding the project on March 10, 11 and 13.*

ADDENDUM: *March 20, 2003 The attached letter outlining the findings was sent to the County on February 24, 2003. As mentioned in the letter, we spent a few hours with the Transportation and Land Management Agency (TLMA) staff discussing the findings and different methods and items to correct those deficiencies. At the time of the staff report the ALUC staff had received no new information and recommends that it be continued to the April 17, 2003 meeting.*

ADDENDUM: *April 17, 2003 The item was continued at the request of the applicant (County of Riverside) in order for them to prepared a response or changes to the proposed RCIP. The*

County representatives met with your staff and our consultant (Ken Brody) on March 27th and prepared an outline of changes needed to correct the deficiencies enumerated in the consultants memo's of January 15 and February 13 (attached). As of the writing of the staff report (April 8, 2003), that had not been received. When it is received Ken Brody of Mead and Hunt will review the proposed changes and we will mail a separate staff report to the ALUC Commission. At the Board Hearing there were requests by constituents for deviation or changes to the Planning Commission version (January 8, 2003) or the original draft (April 5, 2002) that we had reviewed. As of this date, neither staff nor the consultant has reviewed these so no finding can be made regarding those changes.

B. RG and RI-03-100 – MSHCP – Continued

CASE NUMBER: RI and RG-03-100 County of Riverside and BA, FL, PV, SK-02-100, CH-02-104, CO-02-100, FV-02-116, MA-02-181 and RI-02-165

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP or Plan) is a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) focusing on Conservation of species and their associated Habitats in Western Riverside County. The MSHCP Plan Area encompasses approximately 1.26 million acres (1,966 square miles); it includes all unincorporated Riverside County land west of the crest of the San Jacinto Mountains to the Orange County line, as well as the jurisdictional areas of the Cities or Temecula, Murrieta, Lake Elsinore, Canyon Lake, Norco, Corona, Riverside, Moreno Valley, Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Perris, Hemet, and San Jacinto. It will provide a coordinated MSHCP Conservation Area and implementation program to preserve biological diversity and maintain the region's quality of life. Airports within the affected area are: Banning Municipal, Chino, Corona Municipal, Flabob, French Valley, Hemet/Ryan, MARB/MIP, Perris Valley, Riverside Municipal and Skylark Airports.

PROJECT LOCATION:

All areas within the Adopted Influence Areas (see Map Attached) Affected Airports: Banning, Chino, Corona, Flabob, French Valley, Hemet/Ryan, MARB/MIP, Perris Valley, Riverside, and Skylark.

BACKGROUND: The County filed their new General Plan effective December 24, 2003. We have contracted with our consultant to review the proposal and that review is attached. That text references the MSHCP through much of the document and EIR. This portion of the project was brought in for review on January 31.

We utilize numerous resources for our review:

1. All Adopted CLUPs
2. The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base and Chino
3. The CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
4. Noise data from any source newer than the adopted CLUP

The purpose of the project is to create open space to preserve species and maintain a quality of life. Generally preserving open space around airports is consistent with airport plans and activities except in two cases:

1. The project would create a wildlife attractant that would cause bid strike issues, and
2. When the open space protection conflicts with airport development plans.

The project as submitted, has many portion within Influence Areas, but two that seemingly conflict with adopted airport plans and consequently the CLUP's. The attached comment from Caltrans reiterates the point regarding the necessity of a USDA Wildlife Services review of the proposal and the necessity of that review for any newly created activity that could include attractants. The project designates certain areas with goals for open space retainment and divides the areas into units and cells for focus. The Hemet Ryan and French Valley Airports and use plans developed for those facilities. Chapter 7 of the plan covers existing uses and describes roads, sewers, water, electrical, gas and solid waste facilities that are included or 'covered activities'. Airports are not included. If they were, the conflict would not likely exist. These cells and areas for conservation are show on the attached exhibits.

MAJOR ISSUES: Wildlife Attractant, with Hemet/Ryan and French Valley Airport Master Plans and CLUPs

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the ALUC notify the County of these concerns and inconsistencies and CONTINUE the proposal until the next meeting of April 17, 2003 in order to complete the review, obtain any text revisions from the County and EIR proposal going to the Board of Supervisors. The consultant has reviewed the proposal with the assistance of staff and the comments are attached.

ADDENDUM: March 20, 2003 At the February hearing a presentation was made by Dudek and Associates, the consultant that prepared the plan. He addressed the issues that are mentioned in the staff report and speculated that the cells may not negatively affect the plans at Hemet/Ryan and French Valley Airports. It was continued in order to review changes the applicant would propose in order to bring it into consistency with the airport land use plans and recognize the wildlife attractant issue. At the time of the staff report writing nothing has been submitted.

RECOMMENDATION: March 20th Staff recommends that the Commission find the current project inconsistent with the various Airport Land Use Plans because of a lack of reference to Wildlife Attractants and because the lack of recognition of the planned airport facilities at the Hemet/Ryan and French Valley Plans. As with the RCIP, staff recommends that the applicant be advised of this finding and continue to hold the hearings open and continue them until the next hearing on April 17.

ADDENDUM: April 17, 2003 The item was continued at the request of the applicant (County of Riverside) in order for them to prepared a response or changes to the to the MSHCP. The County representatives met with your staff and our consultant (Ken Brody) on March 27th. As of the writing of the staff report (April 8, 2003), that had not been received. When it is received Ken Brody of Mead and Hunt and staff will review the proposed changes and we will forward a separate staff report.

RECOMMENDATION: APRIL 17, 2003 Staff recommends that the Commission find the current project inconsistent with the various Airport Land Use Plans because of a lack of references to Wildlife Attractants and because the lack of recognition of the planned airport facilities at the Hemet/Ryan and French Valley Plans. As with the RCIP, staff recommends that the applicant be advised of this finding and continue to hold the hearings open and continue them until the next hearing on May 22, 2003.

C. RG and RI-03-101– C.E.T.A.P. – Continued

CASE SUMMARY: Countywide Environmental Transportation Acceptability Program (C.E.T.A.P.)

CASE NUMBER: RI and RG-03-101 County of Riverside and BA, FL, PV, SK-02-100, CH-02-104, CO-02-100, FV-02-116, MA-02-181 and RI-02-165

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: E.I.R. SCH 2000101105 AND 6-08-RIV-CR

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: *The Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), in conjunction with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the County of Riverside, proposes to preserve right-of-ways for a north south multimodal transportation corridor and east west multimodal transportation corridor in western Riverside County. Airports with Influence Areas in the corridors area are: French Valley, Hemet/Ryan, MARB/MIP, Perris Valley and Skylark Airports.*

PROJECT LOCATION:
All areas within the Adopted Influence Areas (see Map Attached) Affected Airports: Banning, Chino, Corona, Flabob, French Valley, Hemet/Ryan, MARB/MIP, Perris Valley, Riverside, and Skylark.

BACKGROUND: *The County filed their new General Plan effective December 24, 2003. We have contracted with our consultant to review the proposal and the first review was completed in January for the RCIP text and the Elements of the Plan. That text references the CETAP through much of the document and EIR. This portion of the project was brought in for review on February 5th. The project as submitted has one portion within any Airport Influence Area. That is the March ARB Influence area and the northern alternative of the Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore Corridor between Lake Perris and Barton Road.*

We utilize numerous resources for our review:

1. *All Adopted CLUPs*
2. *The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base*
3. *The CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
4. *Noise data from any source newer than the adopted CLUP*

The Corridor would be from 500 to 1,000 feet in width and include many modes of transportation including pedestrian, bikeway, limited-access-highway, transit and utilities. The section through this area would be no closer than 1 mile from the runway at MARB. No station stops are shown on the plan in this area, but one would expect some servicing the population in this area. There could be water detention /retention facilities added to a project this large and those should be reviewed for their potential as a wildlife attractants. The USDA, Wildlife Services review should either be a part of this project or a required mitigation review for any subsequent project within the Influence Area. That FAA Advisory Circular is attached. Staff could not detect any review by Caltrans Aeronautics and that should be completed prior to action by the ALUC.

MAJOR ISSUES: *Wildlife Attractant, Assembly area at potential transit stations, and Caltrans Review*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends that the ALUC CONTINUE the proposal until the next meeting of April 17, 2003 in order to coordinate the review with the RCIP and MSHCP, obtain the latest recommended version of the plan, text and EIR proposal going to the Board of Supervisors and receive the review from Caltrans Aeronautics. The consultant has reviewed the maps with the assistance of staff and the comments are attached.*

ADDENDUM: March 20, 2003 At the February hearing staff presented the concerns about, Wildlife Attractant, Transit Stops and Caltrans Review. At the time of the staff report no new information had been received from the applicant.

RECOMMENDATION: March 20th Staff recommends that the Commission find the project inconsistent with the Airport Land Use Plans and that the staff be directed to inform the applicant and continue to hold the hearings over to the next meeting on April 17.

ADDENDUM: April 17, 2003 The item was continued at the request of the applicant (County of Riverside) in order for them to prepared a response or changes to the to the CETAP. The County representatives met with your staff and our consultant (Ken Brody) on March 27th and as of the writing of the staff report (April 8, 2003), that had not been received. When it is received Ken Brody of Mead and Hunt and staff will review the proposed changes and we will forward a separate staff report to the ALUC.

RECOMMENDATION: APRIL 17, 2003 Staff recommends that the Commission find the current project inconsistent with the various Airport Land Use Plans because of a lack of references to Wildlife Attractants, Assembly Area at Potential Transit Stations, and Caltrans Review. As with the RCIP, staff recommends that the applicant be advised of this finding and continue to hold the hearings open and continue them until the next hearing on May 22, 2003.

*** CONSENT ITEMS ON THE AGENDA:**

Chairman Stephens indicated that if any of the Commissioners or any one from the audience wishes to speak on any of the consent items it would be pulled and addressed separately. Vice Chairman Stephens read the following consent items: VI.A. FV-03-100 – Bob Fallon, VI.B. MA-03-110 – KCT Consulsntants, VI.C. MA-03-111 – John Egan & Associates, VI.D. MA-03-112 – Laura Bremer, VI.F. HR-03-103 – Russell Rumnasoff, VI.G. HR-03-104 – Blaine Womer Engineering, VI.H. HR-03-105 – Best Western/Hampton Inn, VI.I. RI-03-103 – Al Aguirre & Associates, VI.J. RI-03-104 – Stephen Reeder and VI.K. RI-03-105 – Ramcam Corporation. Vice Chairman Graff indicated that item VI.K. RI-03-105 be pulled. Commissioner Tandy indicated that item VI.H. HR-03-105 be clarified that it's a Hampton Inn hotel not a Best Western. Keith Downs indicated that those corrections have been made on the agenda seventy-two hours prior to the meeting.

Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no response Chairman Stephens called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Bell made a motion to approve the consent items, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

- A. FV-03-100 – KB Homes/Bob Fallon – Consent item see above

CASE NUMBER:	<u>FV-03-100 – KB Home/Bob Fallon</u>
APPROVING JURISDICTION:	County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.:	Tentative Tract Map 31007 and condominium plot plan
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	

A Tract Map for residential use on 19.1 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located north of Benton Road, west of Pourroy Road, approximately 8,000 to 8,800 ft. northeast of Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)
b. Noise Levels: N/A

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposal is for a Tentative Tract Map for a residential use. The lot coverage standard for the TPZ is 65% of the net or 50% of the gross. The site is approximately 26% since the flood channel is 24% of the site.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the property is 1,368.8 MSL. The horizontal surface is 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,347 MSL

Noise: The site will get significant overflight, but is outside of the current and near future 60 CNEL

Conclusion: The proposal is consistent with the French Valley Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) a 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. The attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.
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.

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.

MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE/MIP

10:00 A.M.

B. MA-03-110 – KCT Consultants – Consent item see page 7

CASE NUMBER: MA-03-110 KCT Consultants
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Parcel Map 31139

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Parcel Map and Specific Plan Amendment on 96.21 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated north of Sierra Ridge Drive and West of Sycamore Canyon Blvd. within the City of Riverside, approximately 16,800 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 I
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: 2002
3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
4. Noise data from Airport 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 16,800 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for a Parcel Map and Specific Plan Amendment. The existing site is vacant and zoned for industrial uses. The proposal is underlying the Runway 14-32 PART 77 approach and departure tracks and within the approach 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 I, and would preclude residential uses. Industrial uses are allowed subject to certain constraints. The proposed land use is industrial business park. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The parcels range from 3.2 acres to 20.89 acres. Information on proposed structures is not available at this time. A review of subsequent proposals will be required to determine the lot coverage of the proposed site.

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 1,545 MSL feet. The height of the structures is unknown at this time. Any structures over 1,703 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review.

Noise: The site has been shown to have significant noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have 65-70 CNEL and is overlain with various flight tracks. Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise levels were as high as 80 CNEL.

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. (909) 656-7000
2. Subsequent permits for development of the proposed site shall be reviewed by the ALUC unless a subsequent action of the County and the ALUC determines that unnecessary.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure than no lights are above the horizontal plane. All lighting plans should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
5. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers or tenants.
6. The above ground storage of flammable materials is prohibited.

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

C. MA-03-111 – John Egan and Associates – Consent item see page 7

CASE NUMBER: MA-03-111 John Egan and Associates
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Parcel Map 31032

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Parcel Map for 3 lots on 3.27 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated east of Mary Street, south of Frances Street in the City of Riverside, approximately 27,000 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: 2002
3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
4. Noise data from Airport 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 27,000 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The proposal is a Parcel Map for three residential lots. The existing site is zoned for residential use, and has an existing single-family home and two small structures. The proposal is located within the outer horizontal surface. The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, 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 outside of the 55 CNEL. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The lots range from 1.02 to 1.14 acres and coverage would likely be less than 50%.

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 1,010 MSL feet. The height of the structures is unknown at this time, but likely to be less than 35 feet. Any structures over 1,805 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

Noise: The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be outside the 55 CNEL. The site will experience occasional annoyance from overflying aircraft.

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. (909) 656-7000
2. Subsequent permits for development of the proposed site shall be reviewed by the ALUC unless a subsequent action of the County and the ALUC determines that unnecessary.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. All lighting plans should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
5. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.

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

D. MA-03-112 – Laura Bremer – Consent item see page 7

CASE NUMBER: MA-03-112-Laura Bremer
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Conditional Use Permit P03-0083

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Conditional Use Permit for an agricultural field office.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated south of Hermosa Avenue, east of Adams Street within the City of Riverside, approximately 39,000 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:

1. The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
4. Noise data from Airport 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 39,000 feet west of Runway 14-32. The proposal is a Conditional Use Permit for an agricultural field office. The existing site is zoned for agricultural uses. The proposal is within the outer horizontal surface.

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area III, which allows commercial and agricultural uses. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The proposed building is 1,700 feet and the proposed site is approximately 40 acres. The proposed lot coverage is less than 1%.

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 1,090 MSL feet. The height of the proposed structure is approximately 12 feet. Any structures over 1,925 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

Noise: The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be outside the 55 CNEL. The site will experience occasional annoyance from overflying aircraft.

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. (909) 656-7000
2. Subsequent permits for development of the proposed site shall be reviewed by the ALUC unless a subsequent action of the County and the ALUC determines that unnecessary.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure that no lights are above the horizontal plane. All lighting plans should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.

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

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

HEMET RYAN AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

E. HR-03-102 – Sanderson Lakes Page Ranch – Continued

CASE NUMBER: HE-03-102 Sanderson Lakes Page Ranch
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Hemet
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Specific Plan 79-93 and Vesting Map 29843

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project is a Specific Plan Development. The residential project will include 428 dwelling units, four lakes and five pocket parks on 102.8 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:
 The site is situated northerly of Salt Creek and east of Sanderson Avenue, within the City of Hemet and 4,200-8,200 feet southeasterly 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: Inside 60CNEL for fire days, but subject to annoyance levels and under flight tracks

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: The proposed site is located approximately 4,200-8,200 feet south of the 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 102.8 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 underlying specific traffic patterns and will experience annoyance from over flying aircraft. The 1989 plan indicates that the area is outside of the 55CNEL for normal operation, but within the 60CNEL on fire days.

PART 77. The surface elevation varies from 1,525 to 1,534 and the height of the structures (35') is over (1,554MSL) 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 (7460) for the northerly parcels to the FAA for a response.

WILDLIFE ATTRACTANT: The project has four lakes totaling 9.75 acres and 5.9 acres of lake esplanade that could be a wildlife attractant. Being under an approach and departure flight track this could be a major concern and needs to be reviewed through the procedures outlined by the FAA in AC 150-5200-33. These should be included in the plan.

The text amendment 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 the operator of 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.
4. 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.
6. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective tenants and buyers.

RECOMMENDATION: At this time staff recommends a continuance to the May 22 meeting in order for the applicant and City to: 1) revise the text to reflect the CLUP and 2) complete the wildlife attractant review.

Keith Downs indicated that staff is recommending a continuance for two reasons. The lack of a Caltrans letter and the document does not address the airport. Primarily since there are lakes proposed in this facility it could be a wild life attractant and it needs to go through the FAA review, which is done with the USDA a wild life services and Patrick Smith is the agent responsible for the review.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioner, hearing no response he asked for the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Nat Hardy, Stowe-Passco Development came forward in response to Chairman Stephen's invitation and indicated that this is an on going project that was ready to go

before the city planning commission in March, but was unable do to the ALUC review that he was unaware was needed. Mr. Hardy started the ALUC process and was unable to get on the agenda for March. The City would not hold a hearing on the project before the ALUC's hearing and now the ALUC is continuing the project, which is very frustrating. Mr. Hardy then indicated that he contacted Patrick Smith, which indicated that they are not at the regulatory process for approval on this project or any project. They have no regulatory authority to say yes or no all they can do is recommend. Mr. Hardy indicated that the lakes proposed will not be for fishing, swimming, boating and there will be a strict monitoring requirement on the home owner association (HOA) along with all the land scaping that will be maintained by the HOA. Mr. Hardy then gave a non-technical response that they are not creating anything that is going to be hazard to airport traffic. He then asked the Commission to please consider the project on its merit today so he can be scheduled for the May 6th hearing with the Planning Commission.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for any question from the Commissioner's. Mr. Hardy interjected and inquired to the Commission if they have had the opportunity to read the response from Cotton Beland. Mr. Downs interjected and responded negatively. Mr. Hardy indicated that is a critical piece of information before the Commission can make a decision to continue the project. Vice Chairman Graff indicated that he is not comfortable with reading a letter and having to make a decision within five minutes he would like to comprehend it and think about it before making a decision. Mr. Graff then indicated that he would like to know what the FAA has to say regarding the wildlife attractant before he can make a decision.

B.T. Miller indicated that the Commission would only act on information that is provided and at this point the project has incomplete information. Mr. Hardy interjected that he disagrees, a biologist has already written a letter and rendered an opinion. This project is going to provide housing for people there is water around residential all over southern California. Mr. Hardy then indicated that he would prefer that the Airport Land Use Commission turn down the project because he is unaware what else needs to be done. Chairman Stephens indicated that the two items as recommendations are one to revise the text for the document to reflect the land use plan for the airport. The second item is the wildlife attractant review. Chairman Stephens then indicated that if the Commission finds the project inconsistent it might cause some problems that should be taken into consideration. The request for the continuance is till May 22nd that would be enough time to complete the two items needed. Mr. Hardy interjected that that would put him all the way till July before he goes to the City Council. He then indicated that he cannot wait till May 22nd. Chairman Stephens indicated sympathetically that it is ashamed that he was not informed early enough of this process and that reading the letter would not make a difference. Commission Snyder indicated that the Airport Land Use Commission was created to protect the airports and the people around the airports. The Commission cannot act on a project that does not have sufficient information. The Commission receives the agenda a week in advance that gives the Commission the opportunity to go out and look at the project and make what ever research is needed to make a decision.

Chairman Stephen indicated that a motion should be set, if there are no further discussions from the Commissioners.

ACTION TAKEN: Commission Snyder made a motion to continue the project, subject to staff conditions of approval recommendations. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

F. HR-03-103 – Russell Rumansoff – Consent item see page 7

CASE NUMBER: HR-03-103 Russell Rumansoff
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Hemet
JURISDICTION CASE NO: AUP 03-2 & SDR 03-8

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: *The project is a retail center expansion consisting of 13,835 sq. ft. on 1.53 acres.*

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated south of Florida Avenue, east of Kirby Street, within the City of Hemet approximately 7,200 feet 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 7,200 feet northeast 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 1.53 acres and the structural coverage is approximately 21% of the net area.*

NOISE: *The site is underlying specific traffic patterns and will experience annoyance from over flying aircraft. The 1989 plan indicates that the area is outside of the 55CNEL.*

PART 77. *The site elevation is 1,525 MSL and the height of the tallest structure is approximately 27 feet. The runway elevation is 1,512 MSL. Structures exceeding 1,584 MSL at this location will require FAA Review. The site is within the Horizontal Surface of 1,662MSL.*

CONDITIONS: *For the City to Utilize*

- 1. Provide Avigation Easements to the operator of 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. All lighting plans should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.*
- 4. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*
- 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.

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

G. HR-03-104 – Blaine Womer Civil Engineering – Consent item see page 7

CASE NUMBER: HR-03-104 – Blaine Womer Civil Engineering
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Hemet
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Change of Zone 03-2 and Tract Map 31188

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Change of Zone from Agriculture to R-1 Residential, and Tract Map for a 53 lot single-family subdivision on 13.9 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated south of Eaton Street, west of Palm Avenue, within the City of Hemet approximately 14,000 feet northeast of the 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 14,000 feet northeast of Runway 5-23. The proposed site is within Area III (Area of Moderate Risk) of the Hemet-Ryan Airport Influence Area. The project is a Change of Zone from Agriculture (A-1-C and R-A) to Residential (R-1). The total site is approximately 13.9 acres with a proposed density of 3.81 dwelling units per acre. Area III has no population density limits assigned to it, but requires a discretionary review for legislative items such as a Change of Zone.

NOISE: The site is underlying specific traffic patterns and will experience annoyance from over- flying aircraft. The 1989 plan indicates that the area is outside of the 55CNEL.

PART 77. The site elevation is 1,562 MSL and the height of the structures is approximately 25 feet. The runway elevation is 1,512 MSL. Structures exceeding 1,652 MSL at this location will require FAA Review. The site is within the Horizontal Surface of 1,662MSL.

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW: Pages 35 and 37 of the Hemet-Ryan CLUP include the discretionary review procedures and require us to review: 1) 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.

CONDITIONS: For the City to Utilize

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the operator of Hemet-Ryan Airport prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. All lighting plans should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.
3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
4. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.
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.

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

H. HR-03-105 – Best Western/Hampton Inn – Consent item see page 7

CASE NUMBER: HR-03-105 – Best Western
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Hemet
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Misc. Project/3-Story Hotel

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project is a three-story hotel consisting of approximately 17,000 sq. ft. on 3.31 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site located at 2800 Florida Avenue, north of Florida Avenue, east of Kirby Street within the City of Hemet, from approximately 7,200 to 7,500 ft. northwest 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 7,200 to 7,500 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 3.31 acres net) and the structural coverage is less than 15%. Area III has no population density limits assigned to it, but requires a discretionary review for certain uses, including structures with a height of 35 feet or higher.

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

PART 77. The highest surface elevation at the site is 1516 MSL and the height of the proposed structure is approximately 43 feet. The runway elevation is 1512 MSL. Structures exceeding 1,584 MSL in elevation will require FAA Review. The site is within the Horizontal Surface of 1,662MSL.

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. All lighting plans should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.
4. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers.
5. No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted. Structures exceeding 1,584 MSL in elevation shall require FAA Review.
6. 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 for the project, subject to the conditions noted above.

RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

- I. RI-03-103 – Al Aguirre and Associates – Consent item see page 7

CASE NUMBER: RI-03-103 – Al Aguirre and Associates
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Tract Map 31067

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a subdivision of 6 lots on 1.95 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated north Campbell Avenue and east of Crest Avenue within the City of Riverside, approximately 9,600 feet southwest of Runway 9-27 for Riverside Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport
 Land Use Policy: CLUP adopted April 1998

- a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area
- c. Noise Levels: Outside 60 dB CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 9,600 feet southwest of Runway 9-27. The proposed site is within the Traffic Pattern Zone of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The TPZ has no population limits assigned, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% of the net lot. Information on proposed structures is not available at this time. A review of subsequent permits will be required to determine the lot coverage of the proposed site.

Noise: The site is near under the ILS approach and departure traffic pattern for Runway 9-27 and will experience considerable annoyance from overflying aircraft.

Part 77: The highest elevation at the site is 800 MSL. The site is within the horizontal surface elevation of 966 MSL. The surface of the runway varies from 758 to 816 MSL. Structures exceeding 912 MSL in elevation at this location will require FAA review.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport. (909) 351-6113
2. Subsequent permits for development of the proposed site shall be reviewed by the ALUC unless a subsequent action of the County and the ALUC determines that unnecessary.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. All lighting plans should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
5. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers or tenants.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in this staff report.

J. RI-03-104– Stephen Reeder – Consent item see page 7

CASE NUMBER: RI-03-104 – Stephen Reeder.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Conditional Use Permit P03-0099

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a Conditional Use Permit for 22 apartments consisting of approximately 9,125 sq. ft. on .55 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated south of Magnolia Avenue, west of Madison Street in the City of Riverside, approximately 8,400 feet southeast of Runway 9-27 for Riverside Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport
Land Use Policy: CLUP adopted April 1998

- a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area
- c. Noise Levels: Outside 60 dB CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 8,400 feet southeast of Runway 9-27. The proposed site is within the Traffic Pattern Zone of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The project is a 22-unit apartment complex with garages/covered parking and consisting of approximately 9,125 sq. ft. on .55 acres. The TPZ has no population limits assigned, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% of the net lot. The structural coverage of the proposed project is less than 40% of the net area.

Noise: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. The site is near an approach and departure flight track and will experience annoyance from overflying aircraft.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 814 MSL. The site is within the horizontal surface elevation of 966 MSL. The height of the tallest structure is approximately 31 feet. The surface of the runways varies from 758 to 816 MSL. Structures exceeding 900 MSL in elevation will require FAA review.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport. (909) 351-6113
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. All lighting plans should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
5. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in this staff report.

- K. RI-03-105 – Ramcam Corporation – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: RI-03-105-Ramcam Corporation.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: TM 31283

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a Tract Map for subdivision of 5 lots on 1.12 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 1234 Chamber Street, South of Audrey Avenue in the City of Riverside, approximately 3,600 feet south of Runway 16-34 for Riverside Airport.

*Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport
Land Use Policy: CLUP adopted April 1998*

- a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)*
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area*
- c. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 3,600 feet south of Runway 16-34. The proposed site is within the Traffic Pattern Zone of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The project is a Tract Map for subdivision of 5 lots on 1.12 acres. The TPZ has no population limits assigned, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% of the net lot. Information on proposed structures is not available at this time. A review of subsequent permits will be required to determine the lot coverage of the proposed site.*

Noise: *The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. The site is near an approach and departure flight track and will experience annoyance from overflying aircraft.*

Part 77: *The highest elevation on the proposed site is 745 MSL. The site is within the horizontal surface elevation of 966 MSL. The surface of the runway varies from 772 to 748 MSL. Structures exceeding 784 MSL in elevation at this location will require FAA review.*

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. *Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport. (909) 351-6113*
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. All lighting plan should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.*
4. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - a. *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged*

in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.

- b. *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
- c. *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
- d. *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*

5. *The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in this staff report.*

Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioner's. Hearing no response, Chairman Stephens asked the applicant to come forward and present the case, hearing no response. Chairman Stephens called for discussion from the Commissioner's. Vice Chairman Graff indicated that this item was pulled due to no mention of runway 927, which is the primary runway at Riverside. This project site is directly under runway 927. Vice Chairman Graff then indicated that he would like the staff report to reflect runway 927. Also Mr. Graff indicated that he would like an additional condition of approval added as item six to indicate (additional noise package should be available to first time home buyers at the home buyers expense). B.T. Miller indicated that he recommends it not be attach to the finding of consistency, but as a simple recommendation for the City to impose it as a condition.

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

ACTION TAKEN: Vice Chairman Graff made a motion of consistency with the additional recommendation for further noise impacts. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

- L. BD-03-105 – Pine Mountain Investments – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER:

BD-03-105 Pine Mountain Investments

APPROVING JURISDICTION:

County of Riverside

JURISDICTION CASE NO.:

General Plan Amendment 645, Change of Zone 6739 and Tract 30966

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a proposal to change the General Plan Designation and Zoning from commercial to residential on a 40-acre parcel consisting of 216 dwellings and 8 acres of open space.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated westerly of Adams Street and north of 40 Avenue Road and northwesterly of the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

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

- a. Airport Influence Area: Area III*
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area*
- c. Noise Levels: Outside 60 dB CNEL (February 1996) see compatibility study*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 2,400-2,800 feet northwest of the west end of the runway near flight tracks 2 and 3 and is within Area III of the Airport Influence Area. Policies in the CLUP indicate that residential land uses would be allowed.*

Noise: *The site will be subject to aircraft noise of some annoyance. The entire site is outside of the current 60CNEL (1996), but those noise projections considered less traffic than is now being experienced and were annualized over the entire year. Ultimate traffic with seasonal and weekend peaking will likely produce noise of significant annoyance on the site.*

Part 77: *The highest elevation on the site is currently 97MSL and the tallest structure proposed is 18 feet. The airport elevation is 73MSL and at a distance of 2000 feet any structure exceeding 97MSL feet in height will require an FAA 7460 review. Structures within the project will need FAA review.*

Lighting intensity and patterns can adversely affect pilot visibility near airports. Any light that would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber other than an FAA approved system can cause confusion. Bermuda Dunes currently has a VASI system.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

- 1. Provide Avigation Easements to Bermuda Dunes airport.*
- 2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels and assure a total NLR reduction of 25dba.*
- 3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.*
- 4. An acoustic analysis shall be conducted assuming a 60CNEL over the property and shall mitigate sleeping areas of the homes to 35dbCNEL*
- 5. Any structure over 93MSL feet in height shall have an FAA 7460 review completed and any conditions recommended shall be completed and adhered to prior to construction.*
- 6. The attached NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY shall be included in all property transactions within the project area and given to any buyer or tenant prior to sale or lease.*

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend a continuance of this project to the May 22 meeting in order to obtain a Caltrans review.

Chairman Stephens called for any questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response, Chairman Stephens called for the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Art Cleary came forward in response to Chairman Stephens's invitation. Mr. Cleary indicated that this project was zoned for commercial and the people from Sun City, at fifty-five hundred homes indicated that residential was preferred, due to the increase of noise commercial buildings would bring. It was decided to reconstruct the tentative tract map from commercial back to residential. The RCIP has approved for this project to be residential. This project is identical to the Sun City's two hundred twenty casual units. The easement has been signed and all the other conditions will be met. The international night skylights system is in place.

Chairman Stephens inquired about the international night skylights system. Mr. Cleary responded that there is an international committee through out the world, Night skylights. They have come out with suggested lighting fixtures, shield screens that force the lights down. Chairman Stephens inquired to Mr. Cleary if he agrees with staff's recommendations. Mr. Cleary responded negatively, he does not believe a continuance is necessary since a similar project was approved twenty-three feet from this project. Keith Downs indicated that this project requires a 7460 review. Vice Chairman Graff indicated that the problem is not lighting, but noise complaints, which could close down an airport or restricting flights to an airport. Mr. Cleary indicated that every piece of paper given to anyone states that this project is in the boundaries of the Bermuda Dunes Airport. Vice Chairman Graff indicated that as a developer he cannot stop anyone from calling in complaints. Mr. Cleary then indicated that there is fifty-five hundred residents in the same pattern and have not had a problem. Commissioner Snyder commented that the homes being built around the airports are completely noise proof. Commissioner Tandy interjected that people also have the need to be outside, to many homes are being built to close to airports. Chairman Stephens inquired if there is sufficient information to make a decision. Commissioner Snyder interjected that he moves to continue the project until the Caltrans letter is received.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to continue the project, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. CLUP Update: Status and reports

Keith Downs indicated that the Consultants has finished chapter two for the CLUP and it will be on the next agenda for discussion.

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

Chairman Stephens called for anyone who wishes to speak on any item related to Riverside County airports. Pat Wolfe, Blythe Airport came forward and distributed photographs to the Commissioners of a power plant that moved in next to the Blythe airport. Mr. Wolfe indicated that he is not speaking for the City of Blythe, but as the FBO. A couple of years ago a meeting was held when this project was being

proposed, Mr. Wolfe attended that meeting and indicated at the meeting that the power plant could not be in the middle of the runway as shown on the picture presented at the time. The applicant for the power plant project then indicated that the plant would not be in the middle of the runway and that the pictures had some mistakes. A year ago the project begun its development and the towers started coming up underneath the airplanes. Mr. Wolfe immediately contacted the City to indicate that these towers could not be put up in front of the runway. The City's response was that the airport model would only go fifty feet. About six weeks ago it rained in Blythe and it created a visible cloud of at least six to seven hundred feet. Mr. Wolfe complaint again to the City and was able to arrange a board meeting. The power commission of the light energy plant attended the meeting and once the meeting started the plant commission indicated that the T6 report had already been signed and it will not be reopened. There is an eight thousand (8,000) foot altitude density inside that rise and it is one hundred seventy (170) degrees. Mr. Wolfe then indicated that he flew in and it is tremendously rough, coming back in he slide off the plane one side in and one side out and it spinned his 172 twice. It will roll a plane if the pilot is not ready for it and that person will only have three seconds to pull the plane out. Chairman Stephens indicated that Mr. Wolfe has the Commission's full support. Vice Chairman Graff indicated to Mr. Wolfe that he supported the power plant. Mr. Wolfe responded that he was in support as long as the tower would not be built in front of the center of the runway.

Mr. Wolfe then indicated the reason he attended this meeting was to bring it to the commissions attention and to see if its possible to get some kind of assistance on whom to go to before someone gets hurt. There are only two options the plant gets moved or the runway gets closed. Vice Chairman Graff suggested getting a lawyer and talking to AOPA for support. Mr. Graff then indicated that he has phone numbers of people he spoke with when the power plant was first being proposed and he would be able to provide Mr. Wolfe with those names and numbers. Mr. Wolfe indicated that if the power plant opens the runway would need to be closed and Blythe airport would not make it financially. Commissioner Pratt indicated that he was in the power plant business and that cooling towers can be moved. Mr. Wolfe inquired that if the Airport Land Use Commission would have turned down the power plant project, would someone else been able to override the ALUC. Chairman Stephens responded positively.

IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Commissioner Pratt inquired if it's possible for the County to have something in writing where it clearly advises all the applicants of the ALUC. Keith Downs responded that in 1998 staff send a letter to all jurisdiction in the Cities and Counties, but that half the cities are not participating. About two years ago when Mr. Adkinson was Commissioner he also send a letter to all cities reminding them of submittals to the ALUC.

- X. Adjournment: Chairman Stephens adjourned the meeting at 11:30 A.M.
NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: May 22, 2003 at 9:00 a.m., Riverside