

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

Riverside County Administration Center
4080 Lemon St., Board Room (14th Floor)
Riverside, California

THURSDAY, May 22, 2003
9:00 A.M.

MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on May 22, 2003 at the Riverside County Administration Center, Board Room.

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Marge Tandy

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: Bob Miller
Robert Klotz
Samuel C. Alhadeff
Tim Misto
Bob Stockton
Kathy Rohm
Jerry Jolliffe
Ryan Crowley
Fern Burklin

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chairman Stephens.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken.
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR March 20, 2003 and April 17, 2003

March 20, 2003: Chairman Stephens called for comments or corrections from the Commissioners. Vice Chairman Graff indicated a correction on page 18, hearing no further correction Chairman Stephens called for a motion to be set.

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

April 17, 2003: The minutes were continued to next schedule meeting of June 19, 2003.

V. OLD BUSINESS

REGIONAL WIDE

9:00 A.M.

A. RG-02-100 – Riverside County – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

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.

ADDENDUM: May 22, 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 (May 12, 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 numerous 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.**

ADDENDUM: May 21, 2003:

In March we had met with the county staff and our consultant outlined a set of changes to bring the text into some conformance with the CLUP's. Due to the nature of the original text from the County, he had recommended an overlay zone to cover the Influence Areas with a further requirement to bring all county actions into the ALUC for review until such time that the County had completed the incorporation of the plans into the RCIP.

TEXTUAL CHANGES:

The present proposal attempts do the latter, in that with full incorporation only legislative items will require review by the ALUC. On the 13 of May we received proposed changes to the RCIP from the planning Dept Our consultant, Ken Brody of Mead and Hunt, has reviewed the

proposal along with staff and counsel. His report of May 19 is attached and outlines changes to the text that we recommend be made to make it consistent with the intent of the legislation and the CLUP's. Today we received further revisions to the text. There is no response to Ken's comments regarding: second units, what will be included in the Appendix and the Zoning Code (7.8).

AREA PLAN MAP CHANGES:

The February 13 Memorandum from Mead and Hunt reviewed the Area Plans of the RCIP and noted where there are direct and indirect conflicts with the adopted CLUPs. The Chino Influence Area has no adopted CLUP. The indirect conflicts would be eliminated by the incorporation of the adopted CLUPs into the plan, but the direct ones would need to be eliminated in order to be consistent with the plan. Staff has reviewed the latest proposal and found very few items within the Influence Zones that are direct conflicts. The continuing ones are near: Bermuda Dunes, FLABOB, and Hemet/Ryan Airports. The texts now refer to the usage limitations in those areas, but the map revisions have not, to staff's knowledge, been made.

BOARD CHANGES:

As stated above, the Board of Supervisors considered many changes to the plan proposed by constituents and others. These were not referred to the ALUC until now. Staff reviewed these changes on Friday May 16, and two are within the Chiriaco Summit and Chino Airport Influence Areas and the county staff is addressing Chiriaco Summit issues on page 18 of the May 20 revisions. The Eastvale/Chino Airport language has not been available to your staff.

OTHER ADDITIONS:

Staff is also recommended that language regarding Wildlife Attractant's and Caltrans Review be as the Airport Land Use Planning Handbook outlines and the new disclosure language from AB 2776 be added to the plan. Wildlife has been added to the policies.

RECOMMENDATION: The project can be found consistent, if all of these issues can be explained to the satisfaction of the Commission.

Keith indicated that this item had been continued several months and that the item has been left open in order for the County to come back with changes. The changes were received yesterday about 5:43 p.m. that is the reason the Commission did not receive them in the agenda packet. Mr. Downs referred to the packet of changes that the County provided. The entire plan will be included in their appendix. The land use maps for Bermuda Dunes, Flabob and Hemet/Ryan Airports had a direct conflict that stated fewer acres than the ALUC maps. There were numerous indirect conflicts, this is where a plan can show commercial, but does not show the factors that are utilized in the plan for example no theaters, churches or high density uses. Because of the incorporation of the plan and the area within them all of the indirect conflicts now do not exist. After this item was reviewed by the ALUC it went to the Board hearing where individuals asked for a number of changes to the plan. Mr. Downs and Mr. Jolliffe have reviewed these changes within the influence areas; there were two conflicts Chiriaco Summit and Chino airport. Similar issues to those for Bermuda Dunes, Flabob and Hemet/Ryan airports, the language has been adjusted to where there will be a map that shows units per acre and ETZ or IEZ textual set of changes that shows that there will not be able to exceed the density or build at all in the case of the ETZ and the Inner Safety Zone.

Other additions that the ALUC has asked for was the Wildlife Attractants issues to be addressed it is not from the CLUP, but from the Handbook. Also the Caltrans Review, which is part of the text and for the language of the AB 2776 is used on a regular basis

for buyers' awareness these have been included. The Chino Airport came in so late that Mr. Downs and B.T. Miller have not had a chance to review it. Mr. Downs then indicated that he still has a problem with the language for Chino. Mr. Downs referred to page 7 of the packet and indicated that this is an area that is defined on a map and reads as follow: Residential and/or commercial development proposals shall be considered within the Archibald Avenue/Cloverdale Policy Area and shall be consistent with the criteria contained in the California Department of Transportation, Aeronautics Division's Airport Planning Handbook dated January 2002 and shall be submitted to the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission for review. Mr. Downs indicated that the initial response to the area of concerned reiterated the general statement that all legislative items will go to the Airport Land Use Commission. If the Commission is not ready to accept the maps with direct conflicts the three plans and three areas can be found inconsistent.

Mr. Downs then referred to a letter from Caltrans Aeronautics that was sent to all planning directors back in 1998 and reiterated by the Commission's Staff a few months later. In the letter is a statement requesting that all Cities and Counties as an interested agency send copies of all environmental documents within two nautical miles from an airport. This has not been added to the Plan; although it is not necessary to find it consistent, but it is good legal advise. Mr. Downs proposed that the following language be added to the General Plan. Items added are 14.8 and 14.9 Mr. Jolliffe has not yet seen these additions for the advisory reviews. If the Commission goes with the finding that all the plans have been incorporated, the ALUC will no longer see any items from the County except for legislative items. However if the County wishes to do an advisory review there are occasions where there are definitions or some clarification needed. This can be added as follow; that the County from time to time elect to voluntarily submit proposed actions or projects that are not required to be submitted to the ALUC under the following circumstances. The first would be for clarification of the purpose, intent, interpretation of the CLUP or its provisions. The second would be were there is technical situation and if the County wishes to have the technical expertise from ALUC or Caltrans if assistance is needed concerning a proposed action or project relating to airport land use matters. Item 14.9 is that all development proposals within the airport influence area will be submitted to the affected airport. Mr. Downs then asked for question from the Commissioners and indicated that if the Commission wishes a finding of consistency can be made. Mr. Downs reiterate the major issues maps, direct conflict, Chino Airport and some of the advisory reviews.

Chairman Stephens called for question from the Commissioners hearing no response, he asked the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Jerry Jolliffe, Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency, came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation. He then indicated that the County staff and ALUC staff with consultant have been working diligently to make the required changes to the General Plan to bring it to consistency. There are a number of changes to make sure that the airport and compatibility issues are addressed in the General Plan. In the circulation element will be included a map of all the airports and airport influence areas. First this will serve as a flag to anybody reviewing transportation circulation issue that airports are important part of the County's infrastructure for transportation facilities and also to provide information about the location in general extent of the airport influence areas. Second there are nineteen area plans covering the entire County these are the plans that contain the map land use

designations as well as the policies that guide future development in the County. Each one of them that has an airport or airport influence area will have a reference to and a requirement for review and consistency with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. In addition there will be tables that include the criteria that are used for initial assessment as to whether proposed land uses are compatible within the vicinity of airports with respect to the land use type height and other issues that might pertain to them. There will also be a map with each area plan. The way the plan is structured is a policy areas map that indicates special policies for a variety of different subjects. There will be a separate map with further detail showing where airport influence areas, noise and safety zones are and cross parcels. This map will be incorporated directly into the area plan documents.

Another thing that is trying to be done since the County is very large and complicated has to the public, is to simplify the structure of the General Plan. There are twenty-six different land use designations, which were condensed out of two hundred originally. Several of the airports such as Bermuda Dunes, Flabob and Hemet/Ryan in particular have 2.5 acres minimum lot size requirements for residential uses for substantial areas around the airport in order to insure safety to the public. The closest designation to the 2.5-acre lots under the General Plan is called the estate density residential, which is a two-acre minimum lot size and below that would be a five-acre minimum. The proposed way of addressing this is to leave the estate density residential designation in those areas, but have the policy within the area plan of each of those area plans that have those areas state that it has been modified. The direct land use conflicts have been resolved in areas where it is not an appropriate approach in the vicinity of Hemet/Ryan Airport. There was an area where there is two to five building units to be proposed that will be converted to the estate density residential two-acre minimum lot size. The other area is in the Bermuda Dunes airport vicinity where the minimum lot size proposed in the General Plan is one-acre and it is in an area where lots of changes have been made. The land uses in this area will be changed again to the estate density residential two-acre minimum and also have the modifying policy in the area plan text indicating that the particular geographic areas is really two in a half acre minimum lot size. For the Chino airport issue any General Plan amendment that will be proposed in that airport will come before the Airport Land Use Commission for review. The ALUC consultant and Mr. Downs pointed out that if the County incorporates the language that is in the existing community plan, for Flabob Airport it would resolve the issue respecting the compatibility with the airport in addition with the 2.5 acre policy. This would be incorporated as well.

Mr. Jolliffe informed the Commission of other issues and how the County has constructed it to be adequate to be consistent with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The first one is the second unit permits the County has little discretion on these permits under state law. The County has to provide opportunity for the public to have a second unit on any property that permits residential uses. If it were assumed that a significant number of properties within the influence area would have second unit permits approved at some point, the next logical step would be to reduce the density from 2.5-acre minimum lot size to 5-acres. It is believed that there is adequate protection generally in the plan to provide for safety around airports. Another issue is relating to Caltrans, the County is already required to submit to Caltrans Division of Aeronautics for more significant projects. County Counsel has advised the County that it is not appropriate to include this into the General Plan. Mr. Downs has indicated that this is

not something that is necessary for the Commission to find the General Plan consistent with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Chairman Stephens called for any question from the Commissioners for the applicant. B.T. Miller inquired about the handbook issue and the Chino Airport, and indicated that staff's concerned is the potential conflict of the review process and the results of that review from the Airport Land Use Commission might be different from the ones in the handbook. Mr. Jolliffe responded that it would need to be abided by and perhaps the language needs to be adjusted to reflect this. Chairman Stephens indicated that the Commission has a recommendation of consistency and inquired if Mr. Jolliffe would like to review it further. Mr. Jolliffe responded that the County is asking the board to make a tentative approval on June 3, 2003, it is important to have a finding of consistency from the ALUC today. B.T. Miller inquired that if there would be a problem with the language proposed by Keith Downs regards to advisory and review. Mr. Jolliffe responded negatively and indicated that he does not see a problem incorporating it in the General plan provided that his counsel doesn't later indicate it's a problem.

Chairman Stephens inquired to Mr. Downs if there is a comfortable level to make a finding of consistency today or if he still has something on his shoes. Keith Downs responded that the comfortable level needs to exist among the six commissioners at least between four commissioners today. Jerry Jolliffe indicated that in reality in terms of the review process the County has several other areas through out the County were there is policy areas that have modified lot sizes in them and the County is trying to avoid it as much as possible, to standardized our land use designation in the maps. This is something our staff is going to be trained to do and have been doing it for many years. Mr. Jolliffe then indicated that the instant of that being overlooked is going to be a significant problem because the planners are responsible as well as developers for knowing what is on the map as well as in the policies of the general plan. They are both required by state law under internal consistency to be reflective of each other and one has to be consistent with both and the County will make sure that through training that does occur. Chairman Stephens indicated that per experience with other cities the second unit permit applications is indeed quite rare. The states intent in enforcing the second unit permit was to offer more housing opportunity and don't believe that's in any measure successful. Chairman Stephens then indicated that personally he does not have a problem with the issue of the second unit permit. Commissioner Pratt indicated that he would have to agree with the Chairman and stated that he feels comfortable with the work the County has done. Chairman indicated that he believes it is important for Mr. Downs and B.T. Miller to have a long term relationship with TLMA and there staff to continue refining this process. Chairman called for questions or comments from the audience.

Kathy Rohm, Flabob Airport came forward and expressed her concerned with the designation of addressing 2.5 acres and probably what will be going to the planning commission is 1-2 acres around airports. Mrs. Rohm then indicated that she would not want to see the Commission in the situation that came before them at the hearing in Hemet. A gentleman went to planning for two years and came to the ALUC and was shocked of the finding of inconsistency because it didn't meet the criteria. The verbiage needs to be consistent and clarified so that what is being looked at is the 2.5 acres. Also to consider Flabob Airport as a public facility since it's an educational facility. Chairman Stephens asked for Mr. Jolliffe to clarify the designations. Mr. Jollife came forward and indicated that the designation in the area in question seems that an

assumption is being made. If the area of the designation is called the estate density residential and is 1 dwelling unit per two acres or two acre minimum lot size that is the standard absolute minimum lot size or maximum density. However there will be a policy that will modify this and state that the minimum lot size is either one dwelling unit per 2.5 acres, which actually might make some sense if there are properties where one can cluster to keep actual houses away from area that might be subject to safety hazardous. The designation for the Flabob Airport has been changed in the maps to a public facility. Mrs. Rohm inquired that when the general plan is approved and planning is looking at it they will be looking at no less than 2.5 acres. Mr. Jolliffe responded positively. Chairman Stephens called for discussion from the Commissioners, hearing no response he called for a motion to be set. Mr. Downs interjected and indicated that if Commissioner Goldenbaum wishes to vote he would need to testify before the vote that he read the minutes from the previous meetings. Commissioner Goldenbaum testified that he did indeed read the minutes from the previous meetings. Commissioner Snyder indicated complemented the diligent work between the ALUC staff and the County on the Commission's concerns. B.T. Miller indicated that it is understood that Staff will work with County Staff to resolve minor and lingering problems that have been identified today.

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

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Pratt made a motion to approve the General Plan, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

B. RG and RI-03-100 – MSHCP – Keith Downs presented the case.

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.

ADDENDUM: MAY 22, 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 MSHCP. The County representatives met with your staff and our consultant (Ken Brody) on March 27th. As of the writing of the staff report (May 12, 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: MAY 22, 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 JUNE 19, 2003.

Keith Downs informed the Commission that staff has not received any response regarding the issues of the wild life attractant that could cause bird strikes, and the open space conflict with the airport development plans. Both the French Valley and Hemet/Ryan plans adopted by the County and the Airport Land Use Commission show runway extensions. This MSHCP plan shows both of these airports in areas for open space. There was testimony from the consultant about two or three months ago it was unclear that these were cover projects, which is one way to exempt the two. It is an internal conflict within the County much less within the Airport Land Use Plans. Staff recommendation is for inconsisten due to the lack of references to wild life attractants and lack of recognition of plan airport facilities at Hemet/Ryan and French Valley Airports. The item will be kept open to allow a response.

Chairman Stephens called for question from the Commissioners for staff. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no reply, he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Pratt made a motion of inconsistency and keeping the hearing open, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Snyder seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

C. RG and RI-03-101– C.E.T.A.P. – Keith Downs presented the case.

CASE SUMMARY:

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

CASE NUMBER: RI and RG-03-101County 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, PerrisValley, 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.

ADDENDUM: May 22, 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 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 (May 12, 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: May 22, 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 June 19, 2003.

Keith Downs indicated two minor problems 1) is the transit station, the only airports affected is the March Air Reserve Base (MARB) area. The Ramona, Cajalco express way corridor goes through that area. With any large construction projects there could be detention basins because it's under the approach of MARB. This needs to be recognized that it could be a wild life attractant issue. 2) It wasn't indicated if there would be transit stops specifically, but generically in that area a large aggregation of population at a transit stop for example under the approach would be inconsistent with the planning efforts that the ALUC has at this point and time. No response has been received, staff is recommending a finding of inconsisten of the area do to the wild life attractant issues, assembly area of potential transit stations and the lack of a Caltrans review. Item will be kept open to allow a response.

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

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Pratt made a motion of inconsistency and keeping the hearing open, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

HEMET RYAN AIRPORT

9:00 A.M.

- D. HR-03-102 – Sanderson Lakes Page Ranch – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

Keith Downs informed the Commission that this item was continued due to the lack of Wild Life Attractant and text information. He then indicated that the Commission should have received the comments from Mr. Smith and the text that was given to Mr. Smith regarding the issues. Mr. Downs brief the Commission on the Staff Report.

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 finding of consistency with the Hemet/Ryan Comprehensive Land Use Plan with the above conditions.*

Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners for Staff, hearing no response; Chairman Stephens called for comments from the audience. Hearing no reply he asked the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Bob Stockon came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation and indicated that he agrees to staff's recommendation, and asked for clarification on condition #5. Condition #5 reads as follow; That the FAA 7460 review be completed prior to action by the City on this proposal. Mr. Stockon inquired on the action by the City. Mr. Downs responded that it would be any action. Mr. Stockon inquired if the 7460 review is a result of the statement in the first paragraph that indicates structure over 35' in height. Mr. Downs responded positively. Mr. Stockon then indicated that the project would not have structures over 35' in height. Mr. Downs indicated that a height restriction could be added. Chairman Stephens indicated replacing condition #5 to a new condition. Condition #5 would state that structure height is restricted to 35' or a 7460 review would be implied. Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for discussion from the commissioners. Commissioner Pratt inquired if staff is comfortable with the Wild Life issue. Mr. Downs responded positively and indicated that the reports from the biologist and Mr. Smith state conditions that should be included.

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

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion of consistency with revised of Condition #5, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Pratt seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT

9:00 A.M.

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

Keith Downs informed the Commission that this item was continued due to the lack of Caltrans Letter and the concerns of the potential of noise extending out to the property. The Caltrans letter has been received and Ken Brody, Consultant indicated that the first

draft of the Bermuda Dunes CLUP does not show it extending out to the 60 CNEL. Staff recommends a finding of Consistency. Mr. Downs briefed the Commission on the staff report.

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.*

ADDENDUM: May 22, 2003 *As you know, a new plan will be developed for this and the other airports in the county and our consultant will be developing new noise contours and new safety zones. A first draft of that effort reveals that a portion of the property will likely be within Zone C and within a noise contour of 60 or 65 CNEL. Homes previously found consistent to the west would also be within those areas. These will also be subject to noise from the commercial and transportation activities.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for this project subject to the conditions attached.*

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

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

VI. NEW BUSINESS

* CONSENT ITEMS:

Chairman Stephens read the consent items as follow: VI.A. Michael Todd, VI.B. MA-03-114 Pathway Christian Church, VI.D. MA-03-116 KCT Consultants, VI.E. MA-03-118 Albert Webb, VI.F. MA-03-119 Combs Marr, VI.G. MA-03-120 Carter Redish, VI.H. MA-03-121 KCT Consultants, VI.I. HR-03-106 Lee Entitlements, VI.J. RI-03-108 Beatty Place, VI.K. RI-03-109 Carter Redish and VI.O. CH-03-101 MBK Homes.

Chairman Stephens called for question or an item to be pulled for discussion from the Commissioners. Hearing no response he opened the floor for questions on any of the consent items. Hearing no reply he called for a motion to be set.

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

BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

- A. BD-03-106 – Michael Todd – Consent item see above.

CASE NUMBER: BD-03-106 – Michael Todd

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PP 18559

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a Plot Plan for a 4,200 sq. ft. retail fast food and beverage establishment.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located on the south side of Varner Road east of Washington Street in the County of Riverside, approximately 4,100 ft. northwest of Runway 10-28 at the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport

Land Use Policy:

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

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: The proposal is for a retail building located approximately 4,100 feet northwest of the west end of Runway 10-28 at Bermuda Dunes Airport. The proposal is within Area III of the Airport Influence Area. The area of the proposed buildings is 4,150 sq. ft. and the lot area is approximately 13,000 sq. ft. (net). Structural coverage will be less than 20% of the net area. The proposed use is an acceptable use, contingent upon noise and height issues. No noise sensitive uses are proposed.

NOISE: The site will be subject to aircraft noise of some annoyance. The entire site is outside of the 60 CNEL according to the 1996 noise study, 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 some annoyance on the site.

PART 77: The highest elevation at the site is 98 MSL and the height of the tallest structure is approximately 28 ft. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. At a distance of 4,100 ft. from the runway, proposed structures exceeding 114 MSL will require an FAA 7460 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.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
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 a 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.
- 4. The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential property purchaser or tenant.
 - 5. The applicant shall complete an FAA 7460 review prior to building permits and implement any conditions required.
 - 6. Any subsequent use in the undesignated space shall have an ALUC review.

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

MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE/MIP

10:00 A.M.

B. MA-03-114 – Pathway Christian Church – Consent item see page 17th

CASE NUMBER: MA-03-114-Pathway Christian Church
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: CUP C-35-712

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Addition of a classroom building at an existing church site.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 6755 Victoria Avenue, within the City of Riverside, approximately 37,900 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 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 USE 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. On April 26 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 adopted 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 1999 effort was an update of the 1994 Draft utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

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

1. The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base
2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993/2002
3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
5. 98/99 Draft CLUP

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 37,900 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The site consists of a 1,936 sq. ft. classroom building on an existing church site. The proposal is within the outer horizontal surface. The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft expected to use 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, industrial, agriculture, and residential uses. The proposed use is an acceptable use contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The area of the proposed structure is 1,936 sq. ft., and the total structural coverage of the existing and proposed structures is less than 30%.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the site is 960 MSL feet and the maximum building height is 18 feet. The runway elevation is 1,535 MSL. Any construction above an elevation of 1,914 MSL 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 located outside 55 CNEL.

CONDITIONS:

1. Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an aviation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
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 attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.*

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

F. MA-03-115 – Harry Ericson – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: MA 03-115 Harry Ericson
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: CUP 004-934

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a remodel of an existing retail establishment.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 2646 Alessandro Blvd., north 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 I (AICUZ ADP II)*
- c. Noise Levels: See Below*

BACKGROUND:

Staff utilized 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 AICUZ Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*
- 5. Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 8,500-9,000 feet northwest west of Runway 14-32. The project consists of a remodel of a mini-market and service station and the addition of an above ground propane storage tank and new parking fixtures 1.5 acres. The*

proposal is under the major approach and departure track and within the horizontal surface. The existing structures on and surrounding the site were not reviewed by the ALUC and the existing use seems to have been at the site for some time and the proposed use may not be a significant change from the previous use.

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 I. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property inside of the 65 CNEL. The proposed land use would not be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The lot size is approximately 1.5 acres. The structural coverage of the total site would be approximately 17% of the total acreage. Another retail establishment occupies the parcel.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 1531 MSL and the maximum building height is 15 feet. The runway elevation is 1535 MSL. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 1688 MSL feet in elevation. 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 have over 65 CNEL.

CONDITIONS OF OVERRIDE: For the City to use if they wish to override as per PUC 21676.5

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. (Tel. 909- 656-7000)
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portions building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure that no lights are above the horizontal plane.
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 above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of inconsistency of the project.

Keith Downs indicated that staff has recommended a finding of inconsistency base on a basic premise that it's a new use, which is not. Mr. Downs informed the Commission that he has spoken with the applicant who indicated that the propane tank existed on the property and is not part of the application.

B.T. Miller inquired if staff's recommendation still a finding of inconsistency. Mr. Downs responded that Area I does not permit this kind of use. However there are four or five uses surrounding the property.

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.

Tim Misto, Property Owner came forward in response to Mr. Stephens' invitation and indicated to the Commission that he is doing interior remodeling no exterior. Mr. Misto then indicated that he has permits when the property was purchased back in 2001 that the propane tank existed on the property. B.T. Miller indicated that the extend of the Commission extends to knew uses or existing uses that are already there that are outside of the jurisdiction. B.T. Miller then inquired if staff has not made a determination that this is a significant new uses. Mr. Downs responded positively and indicated that based on the exhibit provided by the applicant it indicates a new propane tank. This is the only issue of inconsistency if he has proof that it was an existing tank and there are no significant changes staff's recommendation can be changed for a finding of consistency. Mr. Misto indicated that unfortunately to limit the scope of work the old site plan was used and submitted. Commissioner Goldenbaum inquired about the permits indicating the propane was an existing use. Mr. Misto handed the permits to the Commission for there review. B.T. Miller indicated that if the Commission agrees to approve it, it would be as a recommendation oppose to consistency.

Chairman Stephens called for a motion stated by B.T. Miller, Counsel.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Bell made a motion to approve the project has a recommendation. Commissioner Pratt seconded the motion, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Motion carried unanimously.

C. MA-03-116 – KCT Consultants – Consent item see page 17th

CASE NUMBER: MA-03-116 – KCT Consultants
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Parcel Map 31335

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Parcel Map 31335 to subdivide a 45-acre parcel into two parcels.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is north of Cottonwood Avenue, west of I-215 within the City of Riverside, approximately 9,600 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 Area
b. Land Use Policy:	Influence Area I (AICUZ APZ II)
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 USE 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. On April 26 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 adopted 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 1999 effort was an update of the 1994 Draft utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

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

1. The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base
2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993/2002
3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
5. 98/99 Draft CLUP

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 13,600 feet west of Runway 14-32. The proposal is under the major approach and departure track and within the horizontal surface. The proposed site consists of an existing warehouse building (Parcel 1) on 24.03 acres and a vacant parcel (Parcel 2) on 20.88 acres. The existing zoning is MP-SP, Manufacturing Park and Specific Plan.

The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft expected to use 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. Industrial uses are allowed in Area I subject to certain constraints. The proposed use is an acceptable use within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The gross area of the proposed site is 45 acres and the area of proposed additional structures on Parcel 2 is unknown.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 1,600 MSL feet and the height of proposed structures is unknown. The runway elevation at the north end is 1,535 MSL. In order

to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 1,688 MSL feet in elevation. Any construction above an elevation of 1,631 MSL feet at this location 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 site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have over 65 CNEL. Previous AICUZ reports indicated the property to be within 75 CNEL.

CONDITIONS:

1. *Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an aviation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.*
2. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any office portions of the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
3. *Lighting plans for any additional development on the vacant lots shall be reviewed and approved by an airport lighting consultant or MARB/MIP prior to placement.*
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 above ground storage of flammable materials is prohibited.*
6. *The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.*
7. *Subsequent permits for proposed development shall be reviewed by the ALUC.*

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

D. MA-03-118 – Albert Webb Associates – Consent item see page 17th

CASE NUMBER:	<u>MA-03-118 – Albert Webb Associates</u>
APPROVING JURISDICTION:	City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO:	Tract Map 31236

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Tract Map 31236 to divide 60.19 acres into 240 residential lots.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated west of Barton Street and north of Krameria Ave. within the City of Riverside, from approximately 13,600 to 15,500 feet west of the north end of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

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

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 USE 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. On April 26 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 adopted 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 1999 effort was an update of the 1994 Draft utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

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

- 1. The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base*
- 2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993/2002*
- 3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994*
- 4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*
- 5. 98/99 Draft CLUP*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located from approximately 13,600 to 15,500 feet west of Runway 14-32. The proposal is a Tract Map to divide 60.19 acres into 240 residential lots. The proposal is under the major approach and departure track and within the horizontal surface.*

The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft expected to use 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, industrial, agriculture, and residential. The proposed use is an acceptable within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The site is 60.19 acres (gross), or 58.71 net acres, and the proposed lot sizes are 7,000 sq. ft. minimum. The area of the proposed structures is unknown, however, structural coverage is likely to be less than 50%.

Part 77: The lot elevations on the proposed site is range from 1,715 to 1,751 MSL feet and the height of the proposed structures is unknown. The runway elevation is at 1,535 MSL. Any construction above an elevation of 1,671 MSL at this location 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 60+ CNEL and is overlain with various flight tracks. Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise levels were as high as 70 CNEL.

CONDITIONS:

1. Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an aviation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
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 attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.

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

E. MA-03-119 – Combs-Marr – Sahlin Architects – Consent item see page 17th

CASE NUMBER: MA-03-119 Combs-Marr – Sahlin Architects
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: CUP P03-0405 and Variance

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A 9,000 sq. ft. addition to a school.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated 6696 Via Vista Drive, north of Berry Road, within the City of Riverside, approximately 19,000 feet northwest of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

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

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 USE 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. On April 26 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 adopted 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 1999 effort was an update of the 1994 Draft utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

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

- 1. The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base*
- 2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993/2002*
- 3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994*
- 4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*
- 5. 98/99 Draft CLUP*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 19,000 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The site consists of a 9,000 sq. ft. building on an existing school site. The proposal is within the outer horizontal surface. The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft expected to use 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 The site is located in Area III, which allows commercial, industrial, agriculture, and residential uses. The proposed use is an acceptable within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.*

Density and Coverage: *The lot is 2.84 acres (net), and the total structural coverage of the existing and proposed structures is less than 40%.*

Part 77: The pad elevation for the proposed building is 109 MSL feet and the maximum building height is 26.5 feet. The runway elevation is 1,535 MSL. Any construction above an elevation of 1,725 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 significant noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have be within 55 CNEL. Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise levels were as high as 65 CNEL.

CONDITIONS:

1. Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an aviation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any office and caretaker portions of building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
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.
5. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.

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

F. MA-03-120 – Carter Redish – Consent item see page 17th

CASE NUMBER: MA-03-120-Carter Redish
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Plot Plan P03-0163

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Four industrial buildings totaling 301,000 sq. ft. on approximately 16 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated south of Eastridge between Lance Drive and River Run within the City of Riverside, approximately 15-16,000 ft. northwest of Runway 14/32 at 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 II
- 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 efforts 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. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
4. Noise Data from the AICUZ Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
5. Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposal is for an industrial development on approximately 16.54 acres. The proposed site is located approximately 15,000 ft. north of Runway 14/32. The proposal is near a major flight track and within the conical surface.

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 II, which allows commercial and industrial land use with a few restrictions. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property outside 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 area of the proposed structures is approximately 301,000 sq. ft. The lot area is approximately 720,482 sq. ft. (net). Structural coverage will be 42% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation at the site is 1,527 MSL feet and the height of the tallest structure is approximately 36 ft. Any structures over 1,685 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review.

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 60+CNEL.

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. (Tel. 909- 656-7000)*
2. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portions of the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
3. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures into the building construction to ensure that all light is below the horizontal plane.*
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 above ground storage of explosive or flammable materials is prohibited.*
6. *Structures exceeding 1,685 MSL feet in elevation shall be submitted to the FAA for review.*
7. *Subsequent use for the property shall be reviewed by the ALUC.*

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

G. MA-03-121 – KCT Consultants, Inc. – Consent item see page 17th

CASE NUMBER: MA-03-121 – KCT Consultants
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Street Vacation P03-0374

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A street vacation of a portion of Mt. Baldy Drive.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated on Mt. Baldy Drive approximately 560 feet east of San Gorgonio Drive within the City of Riverside, approximately 10,300 feet northwest of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

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

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 USE 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. On April 26 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 adopted 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 1999 effort was an update of the 1994 Draft utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

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

- 1. The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base*
- 2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993/2002*
- 3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994*
- 4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*
- 5. 98/99 Draft CLUP*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 10,300 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for a street vacation and no structures are proposed. The proposal is under the major approach and departure track and within the horizontal surface.*

The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft expected to use 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. The proposed use is an acceptable use within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: *No buildings or structures are currently proposed for this project.*

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 1,535 MSL feet and no structures are currently proposed. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 1,688 MSL feet in elevation. The runway elevation is at 1,535 MSL. Any construction above an elevation of 1,638 MSL at this location 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 significant noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have 60+ CNEL and is overlain with various flight tracks. Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise levels were as high as 75-80 CNEL.

CONDITIONS:

1. *Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an aviation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.*
2. *Lighting plans for any additional development shall be reviewed and approved by an airport lighting consultant or MARB/MIP prior to placement.*
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 attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.*

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

HEMET RYAN AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

H. HR-03-106 – Lee Entitlements – Consent item see page 17th

CASE NUMBER: HR-03-106-Lee Entitlements
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Hemet
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Change of Zone 03-5

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A change of zone from A-2-C to R-1-7, 200.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated between Fruitvale and Esplanade, west of Cawston Ave., within the City of Hemet, approximately 9,300 feet north 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 9,300 feet north of Runway 5-23. The portion of the proposed site located south of Eaton Road is within Area III (Area of Moderate Risk) of the Hemet-Ryan Airport Influence Area. The remainder of the site is located outside of Area III but within the conical surface. The proposal is for a zone change from A-2-C to R-1-7, 200 (Residential). Area III has no population density limits assigned to it, but requires a discretionary review for certain uses.

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 runway elevation is 1,512 MSL. The highest elevation on the site is 1,720 MSL. Structures exceeding 1,605 MSL at this location require FAA Review. A proposed structure within Area III that exceeds the horizontal surface elevation of 1,662 MSL or a proposed structure that extends beyond the conical surface would be an obstruction.

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 the plan, however, review of subsequent proposals for the development of the site will be required.

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. Subsequent permits for proposed development of the site shall be reviewed by the ALUC.
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.
6. Structures exceeding 1,605 MSL feet in elevation shall require FAA 7460 review.

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-03-108 – Beatty Place – Consent item see page 17th

CASE NUMBER: RI-03-108-Beatty Place, LLC.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: TM 31333

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a Tract Map for subdivision of 30 lots on 5.84 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located south of Dewey Street, east of Carlo Drive, north of Central Avenue in the City of Riverside, approximately 7,900 feet northeast 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 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 7,900 ft. northeast of Runway 9-27. 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 30 lots on 5.14 acres (net). The TPZ has no population limits assigned, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% of the net lot.

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 794 MSL and the height of proposed structures is unknown. The site is within the horizontal surface elevation of 966 MSL. The

surface of the runway varies from 758 to 816 MSL. Structures exceeding 895 MSL in elevation at this location will require FAA review.

Other: The applicant provided a copy of an avigation easement on the property recorded October 11, 1991 in favor of the City of Riverside. The southwest portion of the proposed site is not included in the legal description of the avigation easement.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements for the entire proposed development 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.

J. RI-03-109 – Carter Redish – Consent item see page 17th

CASE NUMBER: RI-03-109-Carter Redish
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Design Review

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a Design Review for two industrial buildings.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located north of Jurupa Ave., east and west of Rickenbacker Street in the City of Riverside, approximately 3,300 feet northwest 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 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 3,330 ft. northwest of Runway 9-27. The proposed site is within the Traffic Pattern Zone of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for two industrial buildings consisting of approximately 35,000 sq. ft. on two lots totaling 2.3 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 building coverage for the two lots is less than 40% (net).

Noise: The site is immediately 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 approximately 750 MSL and the height of each building is 21 feet. The site is within the horizontal surface elevation of 966 MSL. The surface of the runway varies from 758 to 816 MSL. Structures exceeding 791 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 office portions of 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.

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

- G. FV-03-101 – New Covenant Fellowship – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: FV-03-101 – New Covenant Fellowship.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PP 18437

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A plot plan for a church complex on 69.19 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located north of Commerce Court and east of Sky Canyon Drive within the County of Riverside, from approximately 1,600 to 4,200 ft. southeast of the ultimate Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

- Adjacent Airport: French Valley
- a. Airport Influence Area: Outer Safety Zone (OSZ), Inner Safety Zone (ISZ), Emergency Touchdown Zone (ETZ) and Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)
- b. Noise Levels: Within the 55CNEL for 2013 from the Master Plan

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposal is a plot plan for a 184,000 sq. ft. church complex on 69.19 (net) acres. Based on the site plan submitted by the applicant and the current GIS data for the French Valley Airport, the church complex site is located within the OSZ, ISZ, ETZ and TPZ for Runway 18-36, and the OSZ, ETZ and TPZ for the Proposed Runway, as shown in Exhibit A. The proposed development, which includes a church sanctuary building, church facility building, youth facility building, gymnasium and vehicle maintenance building along with parking and landscape improvements, is located within Lots 1-3 of a 4-lot site. No development is currently proposed for Lot 4. The existing and proposed zoning for the site is I-P/R-5).

Most of the church sanctuary building is located within the TPZ, along with a portion of the landscape area, parking area and undeveloped area of the site. The lot coverage for the proposed development area is 15% (net). The lot coverage standard for the TPZ is 65% of the net or 50% of the gross area. The TPZ only has restrictions for 'discouraged' uses. Discouraged uses within the TPZ include public assembly land uses involving large concentrations of people, such as auditoriums and amphitheaters. For proposed developments that include discouraged uses the CLUP requires that the applicant show alternative locations have been considered and are not feasible. The applicant has not provided information on alternative locations.

A small portion of the church sanctuary is located within the OSZ for Runway 18-36. The vehicle maintenance building, gymnasium, youth facility building and a portion of the church facility building are located within the OSZ for the proposed runway. Prohibited uses in the OSZ include above grade power lines, uses involving as the primary activity, manufacture, storage or distribution of explosives or flammable materials, public utility or communication stations, residential uses, as well as uses involving large concentrations of people, such as hotels, restaurants, schools, auditoriums. The maximum structural coverage and density permitted within the OSZ is 25% of the net area. Building coverage for the portion of the site that falls within the OSZ is less than 25% (net), below the OSZ standard.

The remaining portion of the church facility building is located within the ETZ for the proposed runway, and a portion of Lot 4 falls within the ETZ for Runway 18-36, although no structures are proposed on Lot 4. Structures, land uses involving concentrations of people, and significant obstructions are prohibited within the ETZ.

A portion of Lot 4 also falls within the ISZ for Runway 18-36, although no development is proposed in this area. Structures, uses involving concentrations of people, above grade power lines, petroleum or explosives are prohibited within the ISZ.

The proposed site is located within adopted Specific Plan 213. Policies described in Section 7.4 of the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), included as Exhibit B to this staff report, provide for the exemption of projects located within adopted specific plans from all requirements of the CLUP pertaining to land use, development density and development intensity.

The land use and height standards of the CLUP applicable to the proposed project are shown in the table below:

SAFETY ZONE	APPLICABLE LAND USE AND HEIGHT STANDARDS	
	<i>For Areas Inside Adopted Specific Plan</i>	For Areas Outside Adopted Specific Plan (For Comparison Only)
OSZ	Exempt from CLUP requirements applicable to land use, development density, and development intensity. However, development approval is subject to certain land use restrictions (Table 7 A, Notes A & B) and height standards (FAR Part 77) set forth in the CLUP.	Residences, concert halls, auditoriums, stadiums, arenas, hotels, motels, 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 are prohibited. Max. Density- 25 persons/ac. (in structures) 50 persons/ac. (not in structures). Max. Structural Coverage– 25% of net area. Max. Height – F.A.R. Part 77 standards apply
ETZ	Exempt from CLUP requirements applicable to land use, development density, and development intensity. However, development approval is subject to certain land use restrictions (Table 7 A, Notes A & B), sound insulation (Section 7.3.1) and height standards (FAR Part 77) set forth in the CLUP.	Structures, uses involving concentrations of people, significant obstructions are prohibited. Max. Density – 0 Max. Structural Coverage – 0 Max. Height – F.A.R. Part 77 standards
ISZ	Exempt from CLUP requirements applicable to land use, development density, and development intensity. However, development approval is subject to certain land use restrictions (Table 7 A, Notes A & B), sound insulation (Section 7.3.1) and height standards (FAR Part 77) set forth in the CLUP.	Structures, uses involving concentrations of people, petroleum or explosives, and above-grade powerlines are prohibited. Max. density – 0 Max. structural coverage – 0 Max. height – F.A.R. Part 77 standards
TPZ L	Exempt from CLUP requirements applicable to land use, development density, and development intensity. However, development approval is subject to certain land use restrictions (Table 7 A, Notes A & B), sound insulation (Section 7.3.1) and height standards (FAR Part 77) set forth in the CLUP.	Discourage schools, auditoriums, amphitheaters, stadiums, churches, and uses involving as the primary activity, manufacture, storage, or distribution of explosives or flammable materials Max. Density Not Applicable Max. Structural Coverage– greater of 50% of gross area or 65% of net area. Max. Height – F.A.R. Part 77 standards

and Use Restrictions Applicable to Projects Within Approved Specific Plans (Notes From Table 7A of French Valley Airport CLUP):

- A. The following uses shall be prohibited in all airport safety zones:
- (1) 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.
 - (2) 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.
 - (3) 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.
 - (4) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
- B. Avigation easements shall be secured through dedication for all land uses permitted in any safety zone.

Part 77: The site is within the horizontal surface at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,338 MSL. The distance from the ultimate end of Runway 18/36 to the closest building at the northeast end of the proposed site is approximately 2,100 ft. The height of the proposed structure at the northeast end of the site is 28 ft. with a pad elevation of 1,291.77 MSL. Any structures over the height of 1,359 MSL at this location require FAA review. The height of the tallest structure is 45 ft. with a pad elevation of 1,265.3, at a distance of approximately 2,800 ft. from the ultimate end of Runway 18-36. Any structures over the height of 1,366 MSL at this location require FAA review. All proposed structures are below the maximum heights for which FAA review is required.

Noise: The noise contours for 2013 indicate the site is inside 55 CNEL, however, more recent projections would likely include the site within the 60 to 65 CNEL and at ultimate buildout.

Other: The applicable Safety Compatibility Zone examples depicted in the 2002 California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook are included in this staff report in order to evaluate the proposed site according to current state guidelines pertaining to airport safety zones. The shapes and sizes of the safety zones in the Handbook differ significantly from the safety zones depicted in the CLUP, and are largely based on accident data and analyses presented in the Handbook, along with typical approach and departure flight paths. The appropriate safety compatibility zone examples from the Handbook were applied to the existing and proposed runway at the French Valley Airport based on the existing and/or proposed runway lengths. The depictions of the safety compatibility zones for the existing and proposed runway are shown in Exhibit C, and the Basic Compatibility Qualities for the applicable safety zones from the Handbook are provided in Exhibit D.

Based on the medium general aviation runway example in the Handbook applicable to runways 4,000 to 5,999 in length (Runway 18-36), all of the buildings in the proposed development are located within Zone 3, the Inner Turning Zone. Non-residential uses with moderate or higher usage intensities, such as major shopping centers, buildings with more than three habitable floors, meeting halls and theaters are generally unacceptable in Zone 3. The remainder of the

site is mostly located within Zone 2, the Inner Approach/ Departure Zone, although the northwest corner of the site appears to fall within Zone 1, the Runway Protection Zone. Uses such as shopping centers, most eating establishments, theaters, meeting halls, multistory office buildings and labor intensive manufacturing plants are unacceptable in Zone 2. All residential land uses and new structures are prohibited in Zone 1.

If the large general aviation runway example (for length of 6,000 feet or more) is applied to Runway 18-36, assuming an ultimate runway length of 6,000 feet, all of the proposed buildings are located in Zone 3. The remaining portions of the site are located in Zone 2 or Zone 1.

Based on the short general aviation runway example (less than 4,000 feet) applicable to the proposed runway, the vehicle maintenance building, gymnasium, church sanctuary and a portion of the church facility building are located in Zone 6, the Traffic Pattern Zone. Most non-residential uses are allowed in Zone 6, however, very high intensity uses such as outdoor stadiums are prohibited in Zone 6, and children's schools, large day care centers, hospitals and nursing homes should be avoided. The remainder of the site, including the church sanctuary and a portion of the church facility building are located within Zone 4, the Outer Approach/Departure Zone. Non-residential uses with moderate or higher usage intensities, such as major shopping centers, buildings with more than three habitable floors, meeting halls and theaters are generally unacceptable in Zone 4, and children's school, large day care centers, hospitals and nursing homes are prohibited.

This item has been submitted to Cal Trans Division of Aeronautics for review. As of the date of this staff report writing (5/13), no comments have been received.

CONCLUSION: Pending receipt of comments on the proposal from Cal Trans Aeronautics, staff has concluded the following: 1) Those portions of the proposal within the TPZ and OSZ that include church and public assembly uses are inconsistent with the standards of the CLUP pertaining to land use; 2) Those portions of the proposal within the ETZ that include structures, concentrations of people or significant obstructions are inconsistent with the land use standards of the CLUP; 3) According to Section 7.4 of the CLUP, projects located within adopted specific plans are exempted from the standards of the CLUP pertaining to land use, development density and development intensity; 4) The proposal is within SP 213, and is therefore exempt from the standards of the CLUP pertaining to land use, development density and development intensity that would be otherwise applicable.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends continuance of this item pending receipt of comments from Cal Trans Aeronautics.

CONDITIONS OF OVERRIDE: For County Utilization

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 for the entire map including the remainder.
2. Any subsequent use proposed shall be reviewed by the ALUC unless a subsequent action of the County and the ALUC determines that unnecessary.
3. No obstruction of any "FAR Part 77 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.*
 7. *The attached notice shall be provided to all purchasers and tenants.*

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:

1. *Each entrance to any of the buildings in the project shall have a permanently posted sign with letters one inch in height stating:*

BECAUSE OF ITS PROXIMITY TO AN AIRPORT RUNWAY, THIS PROJECT IS CONSIDERED TO BE WITHIN A SAFETY ZONE. SIXTY TO EIGHTY (60-80%)PERCENT OF NEAR AIRPORT ACCIDENTS OCCUR IN THESE AREAS. USERS ASSUME ALL RISKS.

Beverly Coleman indicated that at the time of preparing the staff report response from Caltrans had no yet been received. Caltrans Comments have been received and a copy has been distributed to the Commission. Mrs. Coleman then indicated that the conclusion reached at the time of the preparation of the staff report was without the comments from Caltrans. Staff is now changing its recommendation of continuance. The portions of the proposal within the Traffic Pattern Zone and the Outer Safety Zones that include the church and the public are inconsistent with the land use standards of the CLUP. Section 7.4 of the CLUP indicates that projects located within specific plans are exempted from the standards of the CLUP. Staff would like to change the recommendation to the conclusion on page 5 of the staff report, 1 thru 4 and add that ALUC direct staff forward section 7.4 of the CLUP policy and land use restrictions as well as the FAR Part 77 standard to the planning department along with any additional comments that the ALUC may have.

Chairman Stephens called for any question from the Commission to staff. B.T. Miller inquired about the recommended conditions. Beverly Coleman indicated that the recommended conditions on page 6 of the staff report also be forwarded to the planning department. Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Samuel Alhadeff came forward in response to Mr. Stephens' invitation and indicated that he agrees with staff's recommendations.

Robert Klotz, Attorney came forward and indicated that the exemption does apply to the proposed project. The suggested condition that indicates that all future proposals be returned to the ALUC for review is not appropriate, the ALUC jurisdiction basically anything legislative terminates at the adoption of the General Plan that is up coming.

Hearing no further response Chairman Stephens called for a discussion among the Commissioners. Commissioner Bell voiced his opposition of the project and indicated that it is a disastrous proposal and when a plane goes crashing into the project it will be on those in support of the proposed project.

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

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to find the project exempt and that all conditions and Caltrans letter be forwarded to the Planning Department for further action. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

H. FV-03-102 – Spint PCS – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: FV-03-102– Sprint PCS
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PP 17367

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Installation of a 43-foot Monopine Cellular Antenna

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated north of Auld Road, west of Pourroy Road within the County of Riverside, approximately 8,400 ft. northeast 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),*
b. *Noise Levels: Outside 55 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 the property is currently outside of the 55db CNEL. While the site currently is not within the 55 CNEL, it is possible that the airport at ultimate capacity will likely generate a 55 or 60 CNEL that will encroach upon some portion of the project. The CLUP indicates the proposed use is a compatible use in the 60 CNEL.*

Land Use: *The proposal is for the installation of a monopine cellular antenna and utility equipment within a 1,500 ft. enclosed lease area on approximately 15.9 acres. The densities and usages proposed within the TPZ are consistent with the plan. Coverage for the site is less than 1% of the net, which is below the TPZ standard of 50% (gross) or 65% (net).*

Height: The highest elevation within the proposed lease area is 1,486 MSL and the tallest structure is 43 feet in height. The runway elevation is 1,330 MSL. Structures exceeding 1,414 MSL feet in elevation require FAA 7460 review. The Part 77 horizontal surface is overlying this area at 1,500 MSL, and the proposed cellular antenna intrudes upon that airspace.

***Conclusion:** The proposal is inconsistent with the adopted CLUP for French Valley Airport because the proposed antenna will be an obstruction within the Part 77 airspace.*

***RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the Commission find the project inconsistent with the adopted French Valley CLUP.*

***CONDITIONS OF OVERRIDE:** For County utilization*

1. *Provide Aviation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to development of the project, or sale to an 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 (lights must be downward facing).*
3. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - a. *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
 - b. *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
 - c. *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
 - 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 flammable materials is prohibited.*
5. *Structures exceeding 1,414 MSL feet in elevation shall require an FAA 7460 review.*
6. *The attached notice shall be given to all potential purchasers and tenants.*

Keith Downs informed the Commission that the inconsistency is cause by the 43' structure on top of the hill.

Chairman Stephens asked for the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Ryan Crowley, Sprint PCS came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation and indicated that the structure is not at the top of the hill, but about 60' short of the top of the hill. Mr. Downs indicated that it could be continued for further examination of the project site and a 7460 review is needed. Chairman Stephens suggested continuing the

project to obtain further information. Mr. Crowley agreed for a continuance. Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion of continuance, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Pratt seconded the motion. Motion carried Unanimously.

- I. FV-03-103 – Esbensen & Associates – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: FV-03-103 – Esbensen and Associates
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PP18349

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Plot Plan 18349 for a 15,000 sq. ft. multi-tenant industrial building on approximately 46,600 sq. ft.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located west of Innovation Court and north of Technology Dr. from approximately 2,000 to 2,200 ft. south of the ultimate Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area: Inner Safety Zone (ISZ)
b. Noise Levels: Within the 55CNEL for 2013 from the Master Plan

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use : *The proposal is for Plot Plan 18349 for a 15,000 sq. ft. multi-tenant industrial building on approximately 46,600 sq. ft. The existing and proposed zoning for the site is I-P Industrial Park. Based on the site plan submitted by the applicant, and the current GIS data for the French Valley Airport, the site is located within the ISZ. 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.*

The proposed site is located within adopted Specific Plan 213. Policies described in Section 7.4 of the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), included as Exhibit B to this staff report, provide for the exemption of projects located within adopted specific plans from all requirements of the CLUP pertaining to land use, development density and development intensity. However, Section 7.4.1 through 7.4.3.d, also included in Exhibit B, require that certain land use restrictions, noise (sound insulation) standards and height standards specified in the CLUP shall be applicable to development approvals within adopted specific plans.

Part 77: *The highest elevation on the property to be developed is 1,277 MSL and the height of the tallest structure currently proposed is 24 ft. The site is within the horizontal surface at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,338 MSL. The distance from the ultimate end of Runway 18/36 to the northeast corner of the proposed site is approximately 2,100 ft. Any future structures over the height of 1,359 MSL proposed on the site may require FAA review.*

Noise: The noise contours for 2013 indicate the site is within 55 CNEL, however, more recent projections would likely include the site within the 60 to 65 CNEL and at ultimate buildout.

Other: Staff received the attached comments on the proposal from Cal Trans Aeronautics. Based on the Cal Trans comments, uses such as shopping centers, multistory office buildings, labor intensive manufacturing plants, above ground fuel storage and some eating establishments are unacceptable.

The land use and height standards of the CLUP applicable to the proposed project are shown in the table below:

SAFETY ZONE	APPLICABLE LAND USE AND HEIGHT STANDARDS	
	For Areas Inside Adopted Specific Plan	For Areas Outside Adopted Specific Plan (For Comparison Only)
ISZ	Exempt from CLUP requirements applicable to land use, development density, and development intensity. However, development approval is subject to certain land use restrictions (Table 7 A, Notes A & B) and height standards (FAR Part 77) set forth in the CLUP.	Structures and land uses involving petroleum, explosives or above-grade powerlines are <u>prohibited</u> . Max. Density- 0 Max. Structural Coverage- 0 Max. Height – F.A.R. Part 77 standards apply

Land Use Restrictions Applicable to Projects Within Approved Specific Plans (Notes From Table 7A of French Valley Airport CLUP):

- A. The following uses shall be prohibited in all airport safety zones:
1. 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.
 2. 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.
 3. 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.
 4. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
- B. Avigation easements shall be secured through dedication for all land uses permitted in any safety zone.

RECOMMENDATION: That the ALUC finds that: 1) those portions of the proposal that are within the ISZ or ETZ and are within SP 213 are exempt from the land use standards of the CLUP, and that the Commission forward the land use restrictions set forth in Notes A and B to Table 7A and the height Standards in Section 7.3.3 of the CLUP to the County of Riverside.

CLUP CONSISTENCY CONDITIONS: For County Utilization

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 for the entire map including the remainder.*
2. *No obstruction of any "FAR Part 77 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 a 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.*
5. *The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*
6. *The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport must be given to each potential tenant.*
7. *Any subsequent permit shall be reviewed by the ALUC.*

Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners for staff, hearing no response, he called for the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Bob Miller came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation and briefed the Commission on the project. Vice Chairman Graff inquired about the type of industrial buildings. Mr. Miller responded that the buildings would be for leasing. Vice Chairman Graff indicated that he would like to have hazardous materials added to condition #5 in order to protect the public. B.T. interjected that by adding additional conditions is going beyond the Commissions jurisdiction and from a legal point of view is perhaps unenforceable. Chairman Stephens indicated that this is an exempt project and conditions are to be forwarded to the planning department. Chairman Stephens then indicated that it is believed that the conditional use permit has restriction on having these types of materials as part of assembly.

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

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to find the project exempt and that all conditions be forwarded to the Planning Department for further action. Commissioner Pratt seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

CHINO AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

K. CH-03-101 – M.B.K. Homes – Consent item see page 17th

CASE NUMBER: CH-03-101 M.B.K. Homes
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: GPA 643, CZ 6737 and Tract Map 30896

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A General Plan Amendment and Change of Zone from Agriculture to Residential and a Tract Map for 72 lots on 19.54 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated south of Schleisman Street and west of Archibald Ave., within the County of Riverside, and from approximately 10,000–11,000 feet south 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 from approximately 10,000-11,000 feet southeast of Runway 26L. The proposal is for 72 lots on 19.54 acres. According to the 1991 CLUP the property is located inside of Safety Zone III, and is within the Horizontal 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 once a new CLUP is adopted.

Part 77: *The highest elevation at this site is 597 MSL and the height of proposed structures is unknown at this time. The site is underlying the horizontal surface, and in order to exceed*

obstruction standards a structure would need to exceed approximately 150 feet in height. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project. The site is near and under an approach and departure track and can expect over flight from aircraft.

Noise: 1991 Report: The site is outside the 65 CNEL contour developed for the airport in 1991, and possibly 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 last year and is expected to be completed later this 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. Any additional facilities to the proposal included at a subsequent date shall be 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.
5. The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport must be given to each potential purchaser.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project subject to the conditions of noted above. A finding of consistency can be made 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.*

BANNING AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

- O. BD-03-100 – Drag City – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: BA-03-100 Drag City Voluntary review
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Banning
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Use Permit 01-47501

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a Professional Drag Racing Facility. The project will include a one-quarter mile drag strip with a shutdown area totaling roughly one-half mile, pit area, concessions, control tower, detention basins, fuel depot, lighting standards, 1,500 parking spaces, restrooms, and grandstands.

The City approved the project in 2002 with the condition that an ALUC review be completed and approved the project. This reviewed should be accomplished prior to the local jurisdiction's approval: therefore this review is advisory or voluntary.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated easterly of Barbour St. and south of the Runway within the City of Banning and from 300 to 1,650 feet south of the centerline of Runway 8-26 for Banning Airport.

*Adjacent Airport: Banning Municipal Airport
Land Use Policy: CLUP adopted January 20, 1993*

- a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ) Banning 'Draft' Zones B-2 and D
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area
c. Noise Levels: Inside 60 dB CNEL with portions within the 65CNEL*

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: *The proposed site is located approximately from 300 to 1,650 feet south of Runway 8-26 on a 55-acre site. The proposed site is within the Traffic Pattern Zone of the Banning Municipal Airport Influence Area. The TPZ has few constraints except for large gathering of people, which are 'discouraged uses'. An area approximately 800' by 500' (9 acres) will include most of the people.*

The full facility will have upwards of 5,000 people. That would put the denser area at 535 per acre. The stands are located from 650 to 1,050 feet from the centerline of the runway.

NOISE: *The site is within the 60 and 65 CNEL. The use should not be considered a 'noise sensitive' use, but a generator.*

PART 77: *The elevation of the surface varies from 2,110 feet to 2,170 MSL the entire site is within the transitional area. The new structures will be placed at elevations ranging from 2,155 to 2,160 MSL, which is below the transitional surface elevation. The race control tower is to be 27 feet, an administrative building will be 35 feet and lighting fixtures will be 60-70 feet above the respective surface elevation. The surface of the Runway varies from 2,110 to 2,219 MSL.*

Any structure in the build out area over 1/100 feet in height over the adjacent runway elevation will need an FAA 7460 review.

WILLIFE ATTRACTANTS: The proposed use with detention features of the facility may attract wildlife and will need to be reviewed by the USDA Wildlife services prior to placement.

DRAFT ALUP AND CALTRANS ZONES: Earlier this year our consultant presented a draft of the Banning ALUP, which includes safety zones including Sideline zones along both sides of the runway. This zone would preclude uses that attract large numbers of people.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Banning Municipal Airport for the portions of the project not on Airport property.
2. The Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a Form 7460 review for the structures including the light standards, unless that agency determines in writing that such a review is not required or not applicable.
3. Subsequent permits for uses within the center shall be reviewed by the ALUC prior to approval by the City.
4. Prior to development of any additional facilities the project shall be evaluated by the USDA Wildlife services in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular AC150/5200-38. The contact for California is Patrick Smith at (916)-979-2675.
5. Structures and uses in the Traffic Pattern Zone shall be restricted as outlined the attached matrix (Table 12) from the CLUP.
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.
7. The airport manager and /or a lighting consultant shall review and approve the lighting plan for the facility.
8. All poles and fixtures over 8 feet in height shall have frangible fixtures.

RECOMMENDATION: If the facility had been brought in prior to City approval Staff would recommend a finding of inconsistency of this project with the Banning Airport Comprehensive

Land Use Plan, Draft CLUP and Caltrans Handbook. As an advisory/voluntary review staff would advise that the Commission recommend that the project have the above conditions be added prior to issuance of any further permits.

Chairman Stephens called for comments from anyone from the audience.

Fern Burklin, Pilot at Banning Airport came forward and voiced his concern of making it difficult to get in and out of the airport due to the congestion of traffic. Chairman Stephens indicated that the Commission has no jurisdiction for traffic circulation and that he would need to meet with Planning.

Vice Chairman Graff indicated that having a drag strip so close to the runway can cause confusion and suggested putting X's on the drag strip to indicate that it is not an active runway. Also having night lighting on the strip from a distance it can be construed as the runway environment since it is strictly in line with the runway.

Andy Marocco, applicant came forward and indicated that this is a project called street legal and its to keep kids off the streets and give them a place to race. Mr. Marocco indicated that the tract is conveyed into the grade level by about 23'. From an aviation stand point it is believed that it would be visible that the starting line is below grade, which can alleviate a lot of the confusion. Regarding the lighting a beacon or a non-related airport color can be installed to show the strip is not a place for landing. Adding X's to the end of the strip would not be a problem, but adding X's to the middle of the strip would be a nuisance to the drivers.

Vicky Burk, Economic Development and Redevelopment Manager for the City of Banning came forward and thanked the Commission and Staff for their thoughtful consideration for this project. The Commission's comments would be related verbally to staff at the City of Banning.

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

ACTION TAKEN: Vice Chairman Graff made a motion of recommendation that the following conditions be forwarded to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. CLUP Update: Status and reports

Keith Downs informed the Commission that on the next scheduled meeting a textual plan would be presented. B.T. Miller and Chairman have reviewed a draft. No advertising of the plan would take place. This is just the first exposure to the Commission on the different policies and directions that ALUC will be taking. The meeting will be held in Palm Spring and ALUC would be reviewing the Palm Springs Master Plan. The City of Perris has a number of cases coming in that is of some concern to the March JPA. They are now on board and staff now has two applications from the City of Perris for residential tracts this will be discussed at the next meeting. A letter was distributed to the Commission from March JPA there is a potential BRAC a committee is being formed to supply information counter acting that and would like to have an appointee to that meeting. Mr. Downs indicated that he has volunteered to go to the meeting whether someone gets appointed today, but if the Commission wishes to appoint someone else that would need to take formal action.

Chairman Stephens interjected that the issues with land use cases around Perris, the changes with the BRAC, Keith Downs' coordination with the CLUP's and RCIP and would like to recommend that Mr. Downs be the representative for this new Advisory Commission. Commissioner Pratt interjected and indicated that he would second that recommendation.

VIII. ORAL COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC ON ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA. NONE

IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Commissioner Bell informed the Commission that City Council overruled the ALUC's decision on the church on Alessandro. Commissioner Bell indicated that a letter should be written to the City Council because the ALUC turned down the Victoria Church almost in the same area. The goal of every church is to get more members and when the church starts expanding they will want to build a bigger church. Chairman Stephens indicated that this is also a concern of his as well. Chairman Stephens then indicated that if staff could look into what is the relationship between churches and airports in other communities and what jurisdictions state. The federal government has given churches more latitude on what can and cannot be done with these properties.

Keith Downs informed the Commission that all the jurisdictions in the state that have a military airport should be developing a CLUP, which these were optional in the past. Keith Downs informed the Commission that there would be a tour of the Palm Springs Airport next meeting it will start at 9:00 a.m., and the hearings will be scheduled for 10:00 a.m., and 11:00 a.m. Lunch will be provided by staff. Mr. Downs then indicated that any of the Commissioners that are interested to carpooling, Jackie and himself will make arrangements. Chairman Stephens welcomed Commissioner Goldenbaum once again. Commissioner Goldenbaum thanked the Commissioners in returned and indicated that he is please to be a member.

Commissioner Bell indicated that he would like for staff to write the letter for the City Council and for all the Commissioners to sign it. Keith Downs indicated that a motion would need to be made.

ACTION TAKEN: Vice Chairman Graff made a motion for staff to draft the letter. Commissioner Pratt seconded the motion. Motion carried Unanimously.

X. Adjournment: Chairman Stephens adjourned the meeting at 11:40 A.M.
NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: June 19, 2003 at 9:00 a.m., Palm Springs