

# AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

Riverside County Administration Center  
4080 Lemon St., Board Room (1<sup>st</sup> Floor)  
Riverside, California

**THURSDAY, January 15, 2004**  
**9:00 A.M.**

## MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on January 15, 2004 at the Riverside County Administration Center, Board Room.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Ric Stephens, Chairman  
Marge Tandy  
Paul Bell  
Jon Goldenbaum  
Mark Lightsey  
Dave Hogan (Alternate)

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Walt Snyder  
Sam Pratt

STAFF PRESENT: Keith Downs, Executive Director  
Beverly Coleman, Development Specialist III  
B.T. Miller, Legal Counsel  
Jackeline Gonzalez

OTHERS PRESENT: Ken Brody, Mead & Hunt  
Barry Brunell, T&B Planning  
Richard MacHott, Albert Webb Associates  
Chris Stadsman  
May Acenbruge  
Joe Minio  
John Ford  
Bob Beers

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:04 a.m. by Chairman Stephens.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken.
  - A. INTRODUCTIONS
  - B. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN  
Chairman Stephens made a nomination to elect Alternat Hogan for Vice Chairman.  
Commissioner Snyder seconded. Motion passed.
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR August 21, 2003 and October 16, 2003 and November 13, 2003

Chairman Stephens indicated not having a quorum for the approval of the minutes. Keith Downs interjected indicating that at the last meeting Commissioners Goldenbaum, Graff and Snyder gave their approval of the August minutes. Commissioner Bell indicated that he also gives his approval of the August minutes.

Chairman Stephens then indicated that the August minutes pass for approval.

Chairman Stephens also indicated not having a quorum for the October and November minutes as well. Keith Downs indicated that any members present can give their approval and it will be carried to the next meeting. Chairman Stephens and Commissioners Tandy and Bell gave their approval of the October minutes. Chairman Stephens and Commissioner Tandy gave their approval for the November minutes.

## V. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

### A. Draft Plan Airport Plans: Desert Center, Corona, Chiriaco Summit and French Valley: MEAD & HUNT

Keith Downs indicated that Ken Brody, Mead & Hunt would be presenting the above-mentioned airports. Mr. Downs indicated that a briefed presentation would be given on how the plan was developed using the Bermuda Dunes Airport as an example for the new Commissioners. Mr. Downs indicated that a plan could not be developed any further for Chino, Hemet/Ryan and Desert Resorts due to their master plans being incomplete. Mr. Downs then called for Ken Brody to come forward and present the plans.

Ken Brody, Mead & Hunt gave a brief presentation of the plan using the Bermuda Dunes Airport as an example in the creation of the compatibility maps. Mr. Brody indicated that his firm and Coffman & Associates have been meeting with all cities and airports for data gathering.

Ken Brody indicated reviewing some of the previous information using the Bermuda Dunes Airport as a sample and exhibits for the presentation. Topics covered in the past were the statues of the project and how to built compatibility maps and compatibility criteria's. Mr. Brody indicated that the Commission had received the Policy portion of the Plan and a few changes had been made since then. There are now ten of the thirteen airports completed in a draft form. The major component in putting together the Plan comes from the Airport Land Use Planning Handbook published by the California Division of Aeronautics. A composite approach was chosen to put together the compatibility, criteria and maps. The traditional way (current), noise contours, safety zones and height limits each include criteria's, were the composite approach overlays them on top of each other ending up with a composite set of zones and criteria's. Mr. Brody then indicated that the basic noise contours and safety zones still remain in the plan as supplemental criteria. The guiding criterion in noise for most of the airports is the 60 CNEL where no residential is permitted. Safety was relied on the guidance of the State Handbook that tailors to each individual airport. Airspace Protection is straight forward, where the Federal Aviation Regulation, Par 77 defines the airspace surfaces for each airport. Over flight has a consideration not for land use restrictions, but for the overall influence area where annoyance is created and how it relates to Real Estate disclosure.

Mr. Brody informed the Commission that in Volume One of their Draft Plans they will find the policy information and a drawing labeled noise contours for compatibility planning purposes, which in most cases is the long-range contour and in others it may be the composite of both the future and the long-range. Both the current and future contours are included in Volume 2.

Mr. Brody called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Lightsey inquired that in developing the risk contours is the number of aircraft movement taken into account or is it a composite of accident records. Mr. Brody responded that it's both. Commissioner Lightsey inquired if the risk contours are also future projected or its based on passed data. Mr. Brody responded that it's not risk over time its risk over geography.

Mr. Brody informed the Commission of the new law effective the beginning of this year that requires for all real estate transactions within the influence area of any airport to be disclosed. Mr. Brody then illustrated through exhibits the different set of zones and runways for Desert Center, Corona, Chiriaco Summit and French Valley

**Consent Items:**

Chairman Stephens indicated that the following items are consent items and would be voted has a group unless any of the Commissioners or anyone from the audience has questions. The consent items are as follow; RI-03-143 SBI Group, RI-03-144 KROH/Broeske, MA-03-155 Douglas Beecroft, MA-03-157 Gabel Cook & Becklund, BD-03-114 Mark Valentino, CH-03-109 VSL Engineering, CH-03-110 Albert Webb Associates and HR-03-111 KB Homes.

Keith Downs indicated that the applicant for item HR-03-111 KB Homes has requested withdrawal of the application.

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Newly elected Vice Chairman Hogan made a motion of consistency for the consent items subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion with withdrawal of item HR-03-111 KB Homes. Motion carried unanimously.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

**MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE/MIP**

**10:00 A.M.**

- A. MA-03-137 – T&B Planning Consultants – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-03-137 T & B Planning  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Perris  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** General Plan Amendment P03-0289, Specific Plan Amendment P03-288, C. Z. P03-0290 and TR 31157

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A General Plan Amendment to change the designations as indicated on the attached Statistical Summary. It would delete 32 acres of Commercial designation, increase the Multiple Family to 370 units and reduce the single family by 220 units for a total of 2,027 dwelling units. Open space is increased from 52 to 149 acres. Total Park space remains at 19.6 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is south of Nuevo Road, east of the Perris Valley Storm drain, west of Dunlap Rd., and southeast of March Air Reserve Base/MIP.*

*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 and III*

*c. Noise Levels: See Below*

**BACKGROUND:**

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

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

*In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft, which was based upon the 1983 Caltrans Handbook. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The 98/99 Draft CLUP effort was prepared utilizing the 1994 Draft, and the 1998 AICUZ noise data in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook. The current countywide effort we have begun with the balance of the airports does not include an update to the Airport, but the March JPA is pursuing separate funding for that portion.*

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

- 1. The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*
- 2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
- 3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994*
- 4. Noise Data from the A.I.C.U.Z. Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*
- 5. Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 26,000–32,000 feet southeast of the south end of Runway 14-32. The proposal consists of a change that would redistribute the housing and parks in a different manner. The proposal is underlying two approach tracks and near others within the approach surface. The land is vacant to the north, east and south with the Perris Valley Storm drain to the west,*

*The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport,*

planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, and noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II, which disallows 'high risk' commercial and industrial uses and agriculture, but allows no residential below lot sizes of two and one half acres. Area III has no residential density restrictions. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property inside of the 60, 65 and 70 CNEL.

Density and Coverage: The lots are a minimum of 5,000 sq. ft. and the average gross density is 3.8 DU/acre including the 19 acres of park and open space/detention basin and structural coverage would likely be less than 30%.

Part 77: The elevation at the tract site is between 1,416 and 1,422 MSL feet and the maximum allowed building height is 2,000 MSL feet. The site is under the approach surface. The entire project is not within Part 77 obstruction review criteria.

Noise: The site has been shown to have noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1986 report showed 65 to 75 CNEL over the property and the 1994 Draft indicated it to be within the 60 and 65+CNEL. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have from below 55 CNEL to well above 60 CNEL. The inclusion of another 2,027 homes will likely result in over six thousand new residents (3.35pph x 2,027+ 6,790). The predicted level of noise complaints from the project would likely produce a complaint level of 3-7% of that population (i.e. 203). This project would likely result in new complaints regarding noise from the airport.

Other: The Traffic Pattern Zones (TPZ's) of other CLUP's define facilities such as churches, amphitheaters, community halls, sports facilities, and outdoor lighting as 'discouraged uses' and require the evaluation of alternative sites. None are indicated.

Wildlife Attractant: The project contains a large regional detention basin. An analysis concerning that issue would need to be accomplished and sent to USDA, Wildlife Services for review. The lead agency may be the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

Environmental: No environmental assessment was included. It should include a requirement for an acoustical analysis in the areas above 60 and 65 CNEL.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the ALUC finds the proposed land use changes within Area II inconsistent with the 1984/86 Airport Land Use Plan.

ADDENDUM: January, 2004: The proposed project was modified by the applicant in December to change the mixture of multi-family and single family, but the overall number remains the same at 2,027 dwelling units on 319 acres

## APPENDIX

1984 RCALUP: The 1984 RCALUP with the 1986 map identifies the entire project as within AREAS II and III.

Area II, Policy #2 states: "Area II shall have a minimum residential lot size of two and one-half acres. Agricultural, industrial and commercial uses are acceptable." Policy #4 states: "New housing to be constructed within the noise level specified by the ALUC for each airport shall be soundproofed as necessary to achieve interior annual noise levels attributable to exterior sources, not to exceed 45 dB (CNEL of Ldn) in any inhabited room with windows closed." Area III has no residential density restrictions.

Conclusion: The proposed residential density is inconsistent with that proposal. The Matrix (Table I) identifies all applicable plans and whether the project is consistent with those plans'

criteria. The proposal is at a density ten times that designated in the 84/86 RCALUP.

*The 1994 Draft CLUP for MARB*

The Draft 1994 plan defined the Traffic Pattern Zone outer boundary as the outer edge of the Military Part 77 Conical Surface. Most of the project is within that boundary as shown on Exhibit "C."

The plan places the property within the 60-65+ CNEL. Section 7.3.1. (Page 7.4 first bullet states): "With the exception of transient lodgings (e.g., hotels and motels) and caretaker residences, all residential uses are considered incompatible with noise levels 60 dB CNEL. However, all residential uses could be conditionally compatible in the noise range between 60 and 65 dB CNEL, if appropriate noise attenuation measures are incorporated into the construction.

Conclusion: The proposal as submitted would be inconsistent with the 1994 Draft for both safety and noise.

1998/99 Draft CLUP:

This DRAFT was an update to the 1994 document with changes proposed for components of the text and graphic illustrations depicting:

1. 1998 AICUZ Noise Contours.
2. 1999 adjusted Area I (APZ II) boundary on the north end, and
3. The addition of the 55 CNEL added to the graphic (1999).
4. Part 77 boundaries are more detailed.

A "First Draft" of the text was completed for review by CalTrans, but no further text has been completed, but the graphics were completed. The site is within the TPZ and High Risk Uses such as schools, hospitals, nursing homes, churches, auditoriums, and concert halls are discouraged. The text would require an acoustical analysis for all projects within the 60 CNEL.

Conclusion: The project as submitted would be inconsistent with the 98/99 Draft CLUP and would require acoustical analysis.

**TABLE 1**

<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>SAFETY</u>	<u>NOISE</u>	<u>PART 77</u>
1984 RCA.L.U.P.	*Not Consistent	**Not Consistent	Consistent
1994 Draft CLUP	Consistent	**Not Consistent	Consistent
1998/99 Draft CLUP	Consistent	**Not Consistent	Consistent

\* Within Area II \*\* for portions within 60 CNEL

CONDITIONS FOR OVERRIDE

Should the City of Perris wish to pursue an overrule of the Commission (PUC 21675.1), the following conditions are recommended for inclusion:

1. An acoustical analysis shall be required that includes the following components:
  - a. A description of the components necessary to achieve a noise reduction level (CRL) of 25 and 30 for each of the project's components with noise sensitive

- uses
- b. *Inclusion of all surrounding noise sources (roadway, industrial) at their ultimate design and buildout capacity. and*
  - c. *Notice to buyers that there is no effective mitigation for outdoor noise.*
2. *Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport (909-656-7000).*
    - a. *No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted*
  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. *All prospective buyers and/or tenants shall receive a copy of the enclosed NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY.*
  6. *Include the availability to homebuyers of an additional noise insulation package (i.e. windows, walls).*
  7. *An analysis regarding wildlife attractants shall be submitted to the USDA, Wildlife Services and any conditions shall be included with the Specific Plan.*
  8. *The text and graphics of the specific plan shall be amended to include descriptions of the relationship of the plan to the airfield and the encountered and expected noise and annoyance.*

Keith Downs informed the Commission about a small wild life attractant issue with the drainage ditch. These issues need to be resolved by the Wild Life Division of USDA and a flyer and link will be available on the ALUC website.

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

Barry Burnell, T&B Planning came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation and distributed handouts of the land plan that's being proposed. Mr. Burnell referred to the handout and indicated that everything south of San Jacinto Avenue shows an open space at the current time. In working with the City of Perris its been agreed to leave that entire area as open space until the resolution of the drainage study is figured out. The open space is to accommodate the San Jacinto River project, which is a County project. There will be detention basins for this project to detain water in the event of a local storm, which will dry out no water, will be retained for long periods of time. Mr. Burnell then indicated deleting the condition number seven regarding wildlife attractants.

Chris Stadsman, City of Perris came forward and made himself available for any question.

Commissioner Tandy indicated that the reason she joined the Airport Land Use Commission was to protect airports for present and future. March Air Reserve Base is more important than adding homes close to the airport and allowing this kind of projects MARB could be lost in the future. If this Commission can avoid finding this project consistent then it needs to be done.

Chairman Stephens indicated that the project does have a noise issue that would not go away. The City can override the project with conditions if the Commission finds it inconsistent. Commissioner Tandy interjected indicating that the Commission should not be granting conditions for override. Keith Downs indicated that effective the first of this year any City or jurisdiction considering an override must notify the ALUC within forty-five days of their hearing.

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Bell made a motion of inconsistency, subject to staff's condition of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT**

**10:00 A.M.**

- B. FV-03-117 –RBF Consulting – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

Mr. Downs indicated opening all three items since all are adjacent with same applicant.

**CASE NUMBER:** FV-03-117 RBF Consulting  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** TM 30694  
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Tract Map for 81 single-family residential lots and open space on 35 acres. This project was reviewed by the ALUC as part of Specific Plan 312 in 2000.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is south of Leon Road, north of Briggs Road and west of Winchester Road in the County of Riverside, approximately 5-6,000 ft. north of Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.*



**LAND USE PLAN:**

Adjacent Airport: French Valley  
a. Airport Influence Area: Extended Runway Centerline (ERC) Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)  
c. Noise Levels: Outside of 55 CNEL for 2013

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposal is for 81 single-family residential lots on 35 acres. The lot coverage standard for the TPZ and ERC is 65% of the net or 50% of the gross.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the site is 1,412 MSL and the highest pad elevation of the residential units is 1,412 MSL. The height of the tallest building is 27.5 feet. The horizontal surface is at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,347 MSL at the north end. Structures exceeding 1,397 MSL in elevation will require FAA 7460 review.

**Noise:** The site will get significant over flight especially with GPS approaches, but is outside of the current and near future 55 CNEL. These aircraft will be coming in low (300-500AGL) over the site as shown on Figure V.C-13.

Conclusion: The proposal is consistent with the French Valley Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) subject to the following conditions of approval:

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, prior to recordation of any map, or issuance of any permit, whichever is first.
2. The attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.
3. No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.
4. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).
5. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
  - (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
  - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be

*detrimental to any operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*

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

*Draft Plan: The Draft Plan has not been completed, but should be soon. With the GPS approach over this site those occasional aircraft using it will be close to the surface at this location and will be of some annoyance to the residents. Additional notification, such as surface signage indicating the approach zone may be necessary.*

**January 15: The new draft plan places the area in Zone C, which would preclude residential densities above one unit per 5 acres.**

*ADDENDUM: January 15, 2003, At the last meeting the Commission continued this and the adjoining items to this meeting to explore method of providing additional notification to the occupants and home buyers' of the 'close in' approach pattern that overlays much of the tracts and the annoyance it will provide. It was suggested that we advise the county of the need for additional notification and the nature of newer guidance from the state' Handbook' for areas this close to the airport. After discussion with staff and counsel we recommend that the following two conditions be added.*

- 1. Signs shall be placed at the locations indicated on Exhibit A that state: The area within these signs is under the Extended Runway Centerline of the nearby airport. As such the area is subject to noise and annoyance from aircraft operations approaching and departing that airport. These can occur at any time.*
- 2. Sales information provided to prospective home purchasers shall include a graphic depiction of figure V.C-12 and 13.*

Mr. Downs recommended adding a condition for sign posting with a finding of consistency.

Chairman Stephens called for questions for staff from the Commissioners. B.T. Miller clarified that the condition for the signs be a recommendation not a condition for approval. Keith Downs responded positively.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Barry Burnell, T&B Planning came forward and indicated that he concurs with staff's recommendations. Mr. Burnell pointed out that the overall density within the extended runway centerline zone is less than three units per acre than the original specific plan. Kathy Rohm inquired about the zone the elementary School would be in, in the upcoming draft. Keith Downs responded that it would be in zone "D". Ken Brody interjected indicating that the recommendation for zone "D" in the draft plan schools are discouraged, but not prohibited. Mr. Burnell indicated that in the original approval the Commission did recommend the school to be discouraged. Working with Mr. Downs and the School District it was move as far northwest as possible. Commissioner Lightsey indicated that finding the projects consistent would be short sided to think there is a draft that would place the projects in a low-density zone even if it meets the criteria that exist today. B.T. Miller interjected indicating that statutorily the Commission needs to act within a certain time frame and if it doesn't the law allows the applicant entity to consider it as being approved. The law compels the Commission to apply findings based on the current plan

not base on the draft plan. Vice Chairman Hogan voiced his concerned on restricting future use of the airport being the busiest airport in the south county area. Commissioner Bell indicated making a motion of consistency, the commission needs to work with what is current not based on what's going to happen in the future. These problems have arisen during the three years as a Commissioner and the Commission needs to be consistent and that is with the current plan not based on emotions. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Lightsey, Tandy, Alternate Rohm and Vice Chairman Hogan on disagreement with staff's recommendation with a finding of consistency and safety. Chairman Stephens interjected indicating that Commissioner Bell and himself are not indicating they agree with the project and would want to sacrifices safety or the impact from noise to the community, but is based on the existing plan that is the parameters of the decision. B.T. Miller indicated that the Commission can disagree with staff's recommendation, but the Commission has to express factor findings and not based on a future draft plans. Vice Chairman Hogan inquired that when the current plan was adopted what was the approved land use in the area.

Barry Burnell responded that the area was low-density rural 2.5 in the County 's Plan. The project being proposed is less intense than the one approved both by the ALUC and the County as being consistent with the CLUP. Mr. Burnell then requested respectfully for the Commission to limit themselves' to the facts of the matter that the decisions need to be based on. Mr. Burnell appreciated the concerns with the safety issues and indicated that, that was the reason the project was redesigned to make it compatible with the adopted plan.

Bob Wolfe, Riverside County came forward and indicated that this project was an approved Specific Plan that was passed by this Commission under a set of rules and policies. The project before the Commission has a lower density than the project previously approved and the same rules and policies that allow the previous approval are applicable today.

Commissioner Tandy indicated that the rules the commission need to go by need to change very fast so the Commission is not faced with something like this again, otherwise more homes will be built in these areas. Commissioner Tandy then indicated that a point was made today, that is how the Commission feels about the rules that need to be followed. Commissioner Bell interjected indicating that at times the Commission say yes when in their hearts they mean no. Vice Chairman Hogan indicated this being an undesirable situation and does not understand how a finding of consistency was made, but would second the motion to move on. Commissioner Lightsey indicated that he understand the need for consistency, however the believes the reason for having a Commission is to apply commend sense and look beyond the black and white issues and still make the proposal to find it inconsistent.

Chairman Stephens indicated that the motion passes with finding of consistency, subject to staff's recommendations and language for the signage.

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

**ABSTAINED:** Commissioner Lightsey

- C. FV-03-118 – RBF Consulting – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations (see above).

**CASE NUMBER:** FV-03-118 RBF Consulting  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** TM 30695  
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Tract Map for 110 single-family residential lots and open space on 49.17 acres. This project was reviewed by the ALUC as part of Specific Plan 312 in 2000.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is south of Leon Road, south of Briggs Road and west of Winchester Road in the County of Riverside, approximately 5-6,000 ft. north of Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.*

**LAND USE PLAN:**

Adjacent Airport: French Valley  
a. Airport Influence Area: Extended Runway Centerline (ERC) Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)  
c. Noise Levels: Outside of 55 CNEL for 2013

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposal is for 110 single-family residential lots on 49 acres. The lot coverage standard for the TPZ and ERC is 65% of the net or 50% of the gross.*

Part 77: *The highest elevation on the site is 1,412 MSL and the highest pad elevation of the residential units is 1,412 MSL. The height of the tallest building is 27.5 feet. The horizontal surface is at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,347 MSL at the north end. Structures exceeding 1,397 MSL in elevation will require FAA 7460 review.*

**Noise:** *The site will get significant over flight especially with GPS approaches, but is outside of the current and near future 55 CNEL. These aircraft will be coming in low(300-500AGL) over the site as shown on Figure V.C-13.*

Conclusion: *The proposal is consistent with the French Valley Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) subject to the following conditions of approval:*

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. *Provide Avigation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, prior to recordation of any map, or issuance of any permit, whichever is first.*
2. *The attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.*
3. *No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.*
4. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).*
5. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*

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

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

**Draft Plan:** The Draft Plan has not been completed, but should be soon. With the GPS approach over this site those occasional aircraft using it will be close to the surface at this location and will be of some annoyance to the residents. Additional notification, such as surface signage indicating the approach zone may be necessary.

**January 15:** The new draft plan places the area in Zone C, which would preclude residential densities above one unit per 5 acres.

**ADDENDUM:** January 15, 2003, At the last meeting the Commission continued this and the adjoining items to this meeting to explore method of providing additional notification to the occupants and home buyers' of the 'close in' approach pattern that overlays much of the tracts and the annoyance it will provide. It was suggested that we advise the county of the need for additional notification and the nature of newer guidance from the state' Handbook' for areas this close to the airport. After discussion with staff and counsel we recommend that the following two conditions be added.

1. Signs shall be placed at the locations indicated on Exhibit A that state:  
The area within these signs is under the Extended Runway Centerline of the nearby airport. As such the area is subject to noise and annoyance from aircraft operations approaching and departing that airport. These can occur at any time.
2. Sales information provided to prospective home purchasers shall include a graphic depiction of figure V.C-12 and 13.

D. FV-03-119 – RBF Consulting – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations (see page 9-11).

**CASE NUMBER:** FV-03-119 RBF Consulting  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** TM 30696  
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A Tract Map for 464 single-family residential lots and open space on 173 acres. This project was reviewed by the ALUC as part of Specific Plan 312 in 2000.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is north of Leon Road, north of Briggs Road and west of Winchester Road in the County of Riverside, approximately 5-9,000 ft. north of Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

**LAND USE PLAN:**

Adjacent Airport: French Valley  
a. Airport Influence Area: Extended Runway Centerline (ERC) Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)  
c. Noise Levels: Outside of 55 CNEL for 2013

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposal is for 464 single-family residential lots on 173 acres. The lot coverage standard for the TPZ and ERC is 65% of the net or 50% of the gross.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the site is 1,412 MSL and the highest pad elevation of the residential units is 1,412 MSL. The height of the tallest building is 27.5 feet. The horizontal surface is at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,347 MSL at the north end. Structures exceeding 1,397 MSL in elevation will require FAA 7460 review.

**Noise:** The site will get significant over flight especially with GPS approaches, but is outside of the current and near future 55 CNEL. These aircraft will be coming in low(300-500AGL) over the site as shown on Figure V.C-13.

Conclusion: The proposal is consistent with the French Valley Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) subject to the following conditions of approval:

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, prior to recordation of any map, or issuance of any permit, whichever is first.
2. The attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.
3. No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.
4. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).
5. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.

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

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

**Draft Plan:** The Draft Plan has not been completed, but should be soon. With the GPS approach over this site those occasional aircraft using it will be close to the surface at this location and will be of some annoyance to the residents. Additional notification, such as surface signage indicating the approach zone may be necessary.

January 15: The new draft plan places the area in Zone C, which would preclude residential densities above one unit per 5 acres.

ADDENDUM: January 15, 2003, At the last meeting the Commission continued this and the adjoining items to this meeting to explore method of providing additional notification to the occupants and home buyers' of the 'close in' approach pattern that overlays much of the tracts and the annoyance it will provide. It was suggested that we advise the county of the need for additional notification and the nature of newer guidance from the state' Handbook' for areas this close to the airport. After discussion with staff and counsel we recommend that the following two conditions be added.

1. Signs shall be placed at the locations indicated on Exhibit A that state: The area within these signs is under the Extended Runway Centerline of the nearby airport. As such the area is subject to noise and annoyance from aircraft operations approaching and departing that airport. These can occur at any time.
2. Sales information provided to prospective home purchasers shall include a graphic depiction of figure V.C-12 and 13.

**CHINO AIRPORT**

**10:00 A.M.**

- E. CH-03-108 – Albert Webb Associates – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** CH-03-108 – Albert Webb Associates

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** SP 331, CZ 6759 and Tract Map 30971

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Specific Plan, Change of Zone, and Tract Map for 242 single-family lots and 278 condominium lots with a commercial alternative

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is situated west of Archibald Avenue south of Schleisman Road within the County of Riverside, approximately 8,000-10,500 ft. southeast 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 Referral Area C
c. Noise Levels:	See Below

**BACKGROUND:**

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

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

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 8,000 feet east of Runway 26L and 1 mile to one and one-half miles from the airport ultimate boundary. The touch and go flight tracks are overhead to the west and one departure flight track is overhead.

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

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is 626 MSL feet The runway elevation is 635 MSL at the east end of the runway. The site is within the horizontal surface at this location. Structures exceeding 723 MSL in elevation at this location will require an FAA 7460 review. An instrument approach is near the parcel, and this site can expect overflight from aircraft entering the approaches. Part 77 height issues should not be a problem.

Noise: 1991 Report: The site is outside the 65 CNEL contour developed for the airport in 1991, and may 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. The newest draft plan has noise contours, but they do not currently indicate an ultimate reasonable capacity nor do they include the 60 or 55 CNEL.

Master Plan: A new Master Plan at Chino Airport was started last year and is expected to be complete this year. As of now, the San Bernardino ALUC has not reviewed the new Master Plan. Due to the proximity to a flight track the site can expect single noise events to disturb indoor and outdoor events.

**CONDITIONS:**

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 or adoption of the Specific Plan.
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. Proposals for subsequent development of the site shall be reviewed by ALUC until such time that a CLUP is adopted for the Airport by RCALUC.



4. *The Specific Plan and Draft EIR shall be modified in content and graphics as indicated on the attached Exhibit A.*
5. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
  - (a) *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
  - (b) *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
  - (c) *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
  - (d) *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
6. *The attached notice regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser.*

**RECOMMENDATION:**

*Staff would recommend approval if the proposed changes are added to the Specific Plan in textual and graphic form. Until that time staff recommends that the item be continued until the adjustments are made.*

*In order to recommend approval of this project the following findings must be made as identified in Section 21675.1 of the California Public Utilities Code (PUC).*

*The ALUC is making substantial progress toward the completion of the Chino Airport Land Use Plan; and*

*There is a reasonable probability that the project will be consistent with the plan; and*

*There is little or no probability of substantial detriment to or interference with the plan, if the project is ultimately inconsistent with the plan.*

Keith Downs recommended a continuance for additional information pending.

Chairman Stephens called the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Richard Mac Hott, Albert Webb & Associates came forward and indicated he would be getting together with Mr. Downs to resolve some issues that have arisen. Mr. Mac Hott referred to the staff report and indicated that under project description it states 278 condominiums the proposal is all single family no condominiums are being proposed with this project. Condition number six indicates that the attach notice be given to each potential purchaser, there was no notice attached and request for the notice be attached on the next staff report.

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Tandy made a motion for continuance to the next scheduled meeting. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

**RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT**

**10:00 A.M.**

A. RI-03-143 – SBI Group – Consent item see page 3

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-03-143- SBI Group  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Plot Plan P-03-1404

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A 23 unit apartment building in the 10300 block of Gould Street.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located east of Jones Street and south of Arlington Avenue within the City of Riverside, approximately 7,500 ft. southwest of Runway 9-27 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport*

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

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 8,400 feet southwest of Runway 9-27 and is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for a 23 unit apartment building. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.*

Part 77: *The highest elevation at this site is approximately 790 MSL feet and the height of the structures is approximately 28 ft. The site is under the horizontal surface at this location, which is approximately 966 MSL. Any structure over 900 MSL would need an FAA review.*

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

**DRAFT PLAN:** *The new tentative draft ALUP places the site within Zone E. The site has lot coverage of less than 50%, and Zone E allows at least 90%. The proposed use is a compatible use under the draft plan.*

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. *Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport (909-351-6113).*
2. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*

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

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

**B. RI-03-144 – KROH/Broeske – Consent item see page 3**

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-03-144- Kroh/Breske  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Plot Plan P-03-1438

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Permit for motorcycle sales facility.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located west of Madison Street and north of Indiana Avenue within the City of Riverside, approximately 9,800 ft. southeast of Runway 9-27 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport*

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

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 9,800 feet northeast of Runway 9-27 and is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is motorcycle dealership. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.*

*Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 845 MSL feet and the height of the structures is approximately 46 ft. The site is under the horizontal surface at this location, which is approximately 966 MSL. Any structure over 60MSL would need an FAA review.*

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

**DRAFT PLAN: The new tentative draft ALUP places the site within Zone E. The site has lot coverage of less than 50%, and Zone E allows at least 90%. The proposed use is a compatible use under the draft plan.**

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport (909-351-6113).
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
  - (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
  - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
5. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers or tenants.

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

- C. RI-03-145 – Adkan Engineers – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-03-145-Adkan Engineers  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Tract Map 31542

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project is a subdivision of approximately 120.18 acres into 10 commercial lots and 17

residential lots.

### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is situated north and south of Jurupa Avenue and west of Van Buren Avenue within the City of Riverside, from approximately 720 to 4,000 ft. west of the west end of Runway 9-27 for Riverside Airport. The site is underlying an approach and departure flight track centerline.

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

- a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ) Inner Safety Zone (ISZ) Emergency Touchdown Zone (ETZ) and Outer Safety Zone (OSZ)
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area
- c. Noise Levels: Inside 60 dB CNEL, but portions would likely be within the 65 CNEL

### **MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located from approximately 720 to 4,000 feet west of the west end of Runway 9-27. The proposed site is within the Traffic Pattern Zone, Inner Safety Zone, Emergency Touchdown Zone and Outer Safety Zones of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The OSZ Zone allows surface structure but at limited densities and with restricted uses. The ETZ and ISZ allow no structures and no significant obstructions. The TPZ has few constraints. Eight of the proposed residential lots (Lots 20-27) are located within the ETZ and the remaining nine residential lots are in the TPZ. Residential uses are prohibited within the ETZ. The seven commercial lots are located within the ETZ, OSZ and TPZ and the ISZ.

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

Part 77: The highest pad elevation on the site is 745 MSL, which is below the conical surface elevation of 966 MSL. The height of the structures is unknown. The runway elevation is 816 MSL at the west end. Structures will require FAA review.

**DRAFT PLAN:** The new tentative draft ALUP places the site within Zones A and C. The proposed use is an incompatible use in Zone A. Certain density restrictions apply to residential units in Zone C.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends the following findings, subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in this staff report: 1) Structures and residential uses within the ETZ and ISZ are inconsistent with the Riverside Municipal Airport CLUP; 2) Proposed residential and commercial uses within the TPZ are consistent with the CLUP, subject to the Conditions of Approval; 3) Proposed commercial uses within the OSZ are consistent with the CLUP, subject to the Conditions of Approval.

### **CONDITIONS OF OVERRIDE:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport. (909) 351-6113
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels and a noise reduction level (SRL) of 25.
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.*
6. *The Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a Form 7460 review, unless that agency determines in writing that such a review is not required or not applicable.*
7. *Subsequent permits for uses within the site shall be reviewed by the ALUC prior to approval by the City. Any noise sensitive use within the site shall have an acoustical noise study completed prior to that review.*
8. *Structures and uses in the Outer Safety Zone shall be restricted as outlined the attached matrix (Table 12) from the CLUP.*

Chairman Stephens called for question from the Commissioner for staff. Keith Downs indicated that a letter was distributed to the Commission from John Sabatello, Riverside Municipal Airport Manager stating he is in favor of the project. Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Bob Beers, came forward in response to Chairman Stephens invitation and indicated that this is part of a complicated project. A large part of the property is intended to be part of the existing golf course, which is the Van Buren Golf Center. The reason for the addition of the residential is a security issue for the golf course operation. The proposed residential was a project that was never completed due to ownership. The intent is to complete the residential pattern and close off the residential for an operational standpoint. This has been done after close discussion with John Sabatello, Airport Manager and the City of Riverside.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience.

May Acenbruge, came forward and inquired about the residential lots. Beverly Coleman responded that the proposal is for ten commercial lots and seventeen residential lots.

Mrs. Acenbruge then inquired about the sewer issues. Chairman Stephens indicated that would need to be addressed to the planning department at the City of Riverside. Beverly Coleman interjected and referred Mrs. Acenbruge to the appropriate planner who is handling the project at the City of Riverside.

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Alternate Rohm made a motion to find 1) Structures and residential uses within the ETZ and ISZ inconsistent, 2) Proposed residential and commercial uses within the TPZ consistent and 3) Proposed commercial uses within the OSZ consistent. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

B.T. Miller informed the Commission that should the City chooses to override the override only applies to the first inconsistency finding.

## **MARCH AIR RESERVED BASE/MIP**

**10:00 A.M.**

D. MA-03-154 – Inland Empire Development Services – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-03-154- Inland Empire Development Services  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Design Review  
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A drive-thru restaurant totaling 3,136 sq. ft on .71 acres.*

### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is east of San Gorgonio Drive, north of Alessandro Blvd. within the City of Riverside, approximately 10,000 feet north 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: See Below*  
*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 Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 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 10,000 feet north of Runway 14-32. The proposal is near several approach and departure tracks and within the horizontal surface. The proposal is for a drive-thru restaurant totaling 3,136 sq. ft on .71 acres. Based on the 1984 Plan and 1994 Draft CLUP the site is located in Area II. Commercial uses are allowed in Area II subject to certain constraints. However, the proposed use is a high-risk land use as described in the 1984 Plan. Based on the 1998/1999 Draft CLUP, which includes a modified APZ II area based on the actual flight tracks, the site is located within APZ II as shown in Exhibit A. The flight tracks for March Air Reserve Base are shown in Exhibit B. According to the 1998/1999 Draft CLUP, high density uses such as multi-story buildings, high-density office uses and places of assembly, including churches, theaters, schools, and restaurants are not considered appropriate within APZ II. Based on the applicable guidelines in the 2002 Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook the site is located in Zone 4, the Outer Approach/Departure Zone (Accident Potential Zone). Uses having moderate or higher usage intensities, such as major shopping centers, fast food restaurants, theaters and meeting halls are generally unacceptable within Zone 4.

Density and Coverage: The net area of the proposed building pad is .71 acres and structural coverage is approximately 3,136 sq. ft., which is 10% of the net lot. The proposed building occupancy is 75 persons, or approximately 105 persons per acre. The estimated building occupancy based on the UBC is 148 persons per acre. According to the Cal Trans Handbook criteria the maximum allowable non-residential (urban) intensity in Zone 4 is 80-100 persons per acre.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 1,555 MSL feet and the height of the proposed structure is approximately 25 ft. The horizontal surface elevation is at 1,688 MSL ft. The runway elevation at the north end is 1,535 MSL. Any construction above an elevation of 1,635 MSL feet at this location would require FAA 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 be within 65 CNEL.

Conclusion: According to the 1984 RCALUP the proposed restaurant use is a high-risk land use.

According to the safety criteria contained in the Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook and the Draft 1998/1999 CLUP for March Air Reserve Base, which consider the effect of the actual flight tracks on the Accident Potential Zones, the proposed project is inconsistent based on safety. It is the conclusion of staff that the proposed project is inconsistent based on safety and intensity of use.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the ALUC finds the proposed project inconsistent with the Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, the draft 1998/1999 draft



CLUP and the 1984/1986 RCALUP.

**CONDITIONS OF OVERRIDE:**

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 attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.*

APPENDIX

1984 RCALUP: *The 1984 RCALUP with the 1986 map identifies the project as within AREA II and between 75 and 80 CNEL.*

*Area II, Policy #2 states: "Area II shall have a minimum residential lot size of two and one-half acres. Agricultural, industrial and commercial uses are acceptable." Appendix B of the Plan identifies high patronage services such as restaurants, bowling alleys, theaters and banks as high- risk land use.*

*The 1994 Draft CLUP for MAFB*

*The Draft 1994 plan defined the Traffic Pattern Zone outer boundary as the outer edge of the Military Part 77 Conical Surface. The entire project is within that boundary.*

*The plan places the property near the 70 CNEL. The 1994 Draft CLUP indicates that commercial uses are compatible in the noise range between 65 and 70 dB CNEL.*

1998/99 Draft CLUP:

*This DRAFT was an update to the 1994 document with changes proposed for components of the text and graphic illustrations depicting:*

- 1. 1998 AICUZ Noise Contours.*
- 2. 1999 adjusted Area I (APZ II) boundary on the north end, and*
- 3. The addition of the 55 CNEL added to the graphic (1999).*
- 4. Part 77 boundaries are more detailed.*

*A "First Draft" of the text was completed for review by CalTrans, but no further text has been completed, but the graphics were completed. The site is within APZ II with a noise range between 65 and 70 CNEL based on the 98/99 AICUZ. According to page 68 of the 98/99draft CLUP high density uses such as multi-story buildings, high-density office uses and places of assembly, including churches, theaters, schools, and restaurants are not considered appropriate within APZ II. Commercial uses are compatible within the noise range of 65 and 70 CNEL.*

*Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook:*

*Page 9-48 of the Cal Trans Handbook states the following regarding the use of AICUZ recommended Accident Potential Zones for military runways: " The AICUZ-recommended accident potential zones ( APZs) are illustrated in Figure 9L. The depicted zones assume that flight tracks are straight-in and straight-out. Where different or additional tracks are used on a regular basis, as is often the case, the APZs should be modified or expanded." Based on the attached flight track exhibit for March Air Reserve Base (Exhibit B) the flight tracks form a curved pattern to the west of the runway rather than straight in and straight-out, and a modified APZ II such as the one depicted in the 98/99 draft CLUP is necessary.*

*Based on the Cal Trans criteria the proposed site falls within Zone 4, the Outer Approach/Departure Zone (Accident Potential Zone). Uses having moderate or higher usage intensities, such as major shopping centers, fast food restaurants, theaters and meeting halls are generally unacceptable within Zone 4.*

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for question from the Commissioners for staff. Hearing no response, Chairman Stephens requested the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Joe Minio, Farmer Boys Restaurant came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation. Mr. Minio gave some history about the company and indicated that the concept is fast casual within the restaurant industry. The restaurant will sit seventy-five thru eighty people max and there will be eight thru twelfth employees. There will not be a maximum occupancy at all times since there will be a drive thru meaning people would not stay on the premises. The reason for this proposed location is due to the fast growing region that in composes industrial office and retail. The estimated time people would spend in the restaurant would be between twenty to thirty-five minutes. Based on the 1984 draft this proposed project is in Area II, which is an acceptable commercial use. Cayon Crossing is also in Area II northeast of APZ II. In the 1999 draft the APZ II is modified putting this proposed project at the south edge, which Ms Coleman pointed out in the staff report. Mr. Minio indicated that to his understanding the 1984 draft is in effect not the 1999 draft and would like the Commission to consider the 1984 draft, which would place the proposed project in Area II making it an acceptable use. Mr. Minio then made himself available for questions.

Chairman Stephens indicated for clarification that the 1999 draft states restaurants being inappropriate and the Caltrans guidance includes fast food restaurants. Mr. Minio

interjected indicating that in the Caltrans Handbook the maximum occupancy is one-hundred five (105) and it's indicated that this project exceeds the occupancy, which this projects occupancy would be under one hundred. Beverly Coleman indicated that the Caltrans' criteria is based on persons per acre and the building pad site is .71 acre.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience. Hearing no response he called for a discussion from the Commissioners. Vice Chairman Hogan indicated that this proposal does not seem to be a problem it's a small site and no people would be living there.

A discussion ensued between the Commissioners regarding the proposal not being a noise issue but a safety issue and the applicant obtaining additional land would place the project for finding of consistency.

Joe Minio indicated that he would need to get together with the developer to discuss the issue about acquiring more space.

Chairman Stephens inquired to Mr. Minio if he would accept a continuance or rather have the Commission make a finding of inconsistency. Mr. Minio hesitant inquired if the Planning Commission prefers to have a finding from the ALUC prior to the hearing with the City. Chairman Stephens responded positively indicating that the Planning Commission includes the ALUC conditions to their conditions of approval. Mr. Minio then indicated he would prefer the Commission make a finding on the proposal today.

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

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

E. MA-03-155 – Douglas Beecroft – Consent item see page 3

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-03-155-Douglas Beecroft  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Parcel Map 31403  
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Parcel Map two divide a 2.65-acre parcel into two residential lots.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is west of Golden Star Avenue, east of Washington Street, north of Iris Avenue within the City of Riverside, approximately 31,000 feet west of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.*

*Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port*  
a. *Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence 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 31,000 feet west of Runway 14-32. The proposal is within the outer horizontal surface. The proposal is to subdivide a 2.65-acre parcel into two residential lots. The existing and proposed zoning is A-1, single family residential, and there is an existing single-family home on the site. 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. Residential uses are acceptable in Area III contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The area of the proposed site is 2.65 acres and structural coverage of the site, including the existing structure, is expected to be less than 20% of the net area.

Part 77: The pad elevation for a proposed unit is 1,304 MSL feet and the height of the proposed structure is unknown. The existing structure is at 1,344 MSL feet. The runway elevation at the north end is 1,535 MSL. Any structures over 1,798 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.

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 be 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. *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 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-03-156 – Robert Beers – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-03-156-Robert Beers  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** *City of Perris*  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** *General Plan Amendment 03-0404, Change of Zone 03-0405 and Tract Map 31660*

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A General Plan Amendment, Change of Zone and Tract Map for 170 single-family residential lots on approximately 40 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is south of Citrus Avenue, east of Evans Road within the City of Perris, approximately 26,000 ft. southeast of March Air Reserve Base/MIP.*

*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, which was based upon the 1983 Caltrans Handbook. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The 98/99 Draft CLUP effort was prepared utilizing the 1994 Draft, and the 1998 AICUZ noise data in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook. The current countywide effort we have begun with the balance of the airports will not include an update to the Airport, but we are pursuing separate funding for that portion.

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

1. The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993/2002
3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
4. Noise Data from the A.I.C.U.Z. Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
5. Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP

#### **MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 26,000 feet southeast of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for 170 single-family residential lots on approximately 40 acres. The proposal is underlying an approach track and within the horizontal surface.

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, and noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II, which does not allow residential uses below lot sizes of two and one half acres.

Density and Coverage: The lots are a minimum of 6,016 sq. ft. and the proposed density is 5.38 DU/acre (net). Structural coverage would likely be less than 50%.

Part 77: The highest pad elevation at this site is 1,438.5 MSL feet and the height of the proposed structures is unknown at this time. The runway elevation at the south end is 1,488 MSL. Any construction above an elevation of 1,748 MSL at this location would require an FAA review. Part 77 obstruction review criteria is not a concern.

Noise: The site has been shown to have noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1986 report showed the property to be within 65 CNEL and the 1994 Draft indicated it to be outside the 60 CNEL. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be outside 60 CNEL. The inclusion of another 170 homes will likely result in new residents (3.35 pph x 170 = 570). The predicted level of noise complaints from the project would likely produce a complaint level of 3% of that population (i.e. 17) regarding noise from the airport.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the ALUC finds the proposed Tract Map inconsistent with the 1984/86 Airport Land Use Plan.

**APPENDIX**

1984 RCALUP: The 1984 RCALUP with the 1986 map identifies the entire project as within AREA II.

Area II, Policy #2 states: “Area II shall have a minimum residential lot size of two and one-half acres. Agricultural, industrial and commercial uses are acceptable.” Policy #4 states: “New housing to be constructed within the noise level specified by the ALUC for each airport shall be soundproofed as necessary to achieve interior annual noise levels attributable to exterior sources, not to exceed 45 dB (CNEL of Ldn) in any inhabited room with windows closed.”

Conclusion: The proposed residential density is inconsistent with that proposal. The proposal is at a density over ten times that designated in the 84/86 RCALUP.

The 1994 Draft CLUP for MAFB

The plan places the property within the Traffic Pattern Zone and inside the 60 CNEL. Section 7.3.1 of the 1994 Draft CLUP states that residential uses could be conditionally compatible in the noise range between 60 and 65 dB CNEL if appropriate noise attenuation measures are incorporated into the construction.

Conclusion: The proposal as submitted would be consistent with the 1994 Draft for both safety and noise, with appropriate noise attenuation measures.

1998/99 Draft CLUP:

This DRAFT was an update to the 1994 document with changes proposed for components of the text and graphic illustrations depicting:

1. 1998 AICUZ Noise Contours.
2. 1999 adjusted Area I (APZ II) boundary on the north end, and
3. The addition of the 55 CNEL added to the graphic (1999).
4. Part 77 boundaries are more detailed.

A “First Draft” of the text was completed for review by CalTrans, but no further text has been completed, but the graphics were completed. The site is within the TPZ and High Risk Uses such as schools, hospitals, nursing homes, churches, auditoriums, and concert halls are discouraged. The text would require an acoustical analysis for all projects within the 60 CNEL.

Conclusion: The project as submitted would be consistent with the 98/99 Draft CLUP.

The matrix below identifies all applicable plans and whether the project is consistent with those plans’ criteria.

**TABLE 1**

<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>SAFETY</u>	<u>NOISE</u>	<u>PART 77</u>
1984 RCA.L.U.P.	Not Consistent	Consistent	Consistent
1994 Draft CLUP	Consistent	Consistent	Consistent
1998/99 Draft CLUP	Consistent	Consistent	Consistent

**CONDITIONS FOR OVERRIDE**

*Should the County of Riverside wish to pursue an overrule of the Commission (PUC 21675.1), the following conditions are recommended for inclusion:*

1. *An acoustical analysis shall be required that includes the following components:*
  - a. *A description of the components necessary to achieve a noise reduction level (CRL) of 25 and 30 for each of the project's components with noise sensitive uses*
  - b. *Inclusion of all surrounding noise sources (roadway, industrial) at their ultimate design and buildout capacity and*
  - c. *Notice to buyers that there is no effective mitigation for outdoor noise.*
2. *Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.*
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. *All prospective buyers and/or tenants shall receive a copy of the enclosed NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY.*
5. *Include the availability to homebuyers of an additional noise insulation (5NLR) package (i.e. windows, walls).*

Chairman Stephens called for question from the Commissioners for staff. Commissioner Tandy inquired about the inconsistency finding. Beverly Coleman responded that the matrix shows inconsistency finding for safety with the 1984 plan.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens requested the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Bob Beers, came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation. Mr. Beers requested the Commission to consider that the City of Perris does not have zoning in the area consistent with the 1984 plan.

John Ford, Developer came forward and indicated that directly to the east and continuance to the property there is a higher density land use. This project is a consistent use with the 1994 and 1998 CLUP's. Currently the zoning is R4, which calls



for 2 thru 4 units if its 4 units per acre it would be 160 units and the proposal is for 170 units. Additional developments in the area are expected to be lower density.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commission for the applicants. Hearing no response he called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Vice Chairman Hogan made a motion of inconsistency, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

G. MA-03-157 – Gabel Cook & Becklund – Consent item see page 3

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-03-157 Gabel Cook & Becklund  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Tract Map 32042

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Tentative Tract Map for eight residential lots on approximately 16 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is situated east of Talcey Terrace, south of Overlook Parkway within the City of Riverside, approximately 31,000 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 III*
- c. Noise Levels: See Below*

**BACKGROUND:**

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

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

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

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

- 1. 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 Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
5. Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposal is for an eight lot residential development on approximately 16 acres. The proposed site is located approximately 31,000 ft. northwest of Runway 14/32. The proposal is near a major flight track and within the outer horizontal 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 III, which allows 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 lot sizes range from 1.01 to 3.78 net acres with a proposed lot density of .5 units per acre. Structural coverage will be less than 50% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation at the site is 1,370 MSL feet and the height of the structures is unknown at this time. Any structures over 1,798 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.

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 less than 55 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 attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.

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

**BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT**

**10:00 A.M.**

H. BD-03-114 – Mark Valentino – Consent item see page 3

**CASE NUMBER:** BD-03-114 – Mark Valentino.  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Plot Plan 18991

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project is a Plot Plan for a 3-unit apartment building consisting of 4,992 sq. ft. on approximately 3 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is situated south of Avenue 42 and west of Adams Street in the County of Riverside, approximately 2,900 ft. southwest of 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 proposed site is located approximately 2,900 feet southwest of the west end of the runway and is within Area III of the Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for a 3-unit apartment complex on approximately 3 acres. Policies in the Bermuda Dunes Airport Land Use Plan indicate that residential land uses would be allowed in Area III.

NOISE: The site will be subject to intermittent 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 86.5 MSL ft. and the height of the structure is approximately 17.5 ft. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. At a distance of 2,900 feet from the runway, proposed structures exceeding 102 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. Bermuda Dunes currently has a VASI system.

**OTHER:** As you know, a new plan has been 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 D and outside the noise contours.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport.
2. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - 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.
3. Proposed structures higher than 102 MSL feet in elevation shall be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration for review and comment relative to the provisions of FAR Part 77.
4. The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser.

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

**CHINO AIRPORT**

**10:00 A.M.**

- I. CH-03-109 – VSL Engineering – Consent item see page 3

**CASE NUMBER:**

CH-03-109 – VSL Engineering

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:**

County of Riverside

**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:**

Change of Zone 6849 (A-2-10 to R-1) and Tract Map 31492

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A Change of Zone (A-2-10 to R-4) and Tract Map for 187 single family residential lots on approximately 50 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is at the northeast intersection of Archibald Avenue and Schleisman Road within the County of Riverside, approximately 12,100 – 13,850 ft. east of Runway 26L at Chino Airport.

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

### **BACKGROUND:**

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

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

### **MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 12,100 –13,850 feet east of Runway 26L. The touch and go flight tracks are overhead to the west and the straight in flight track is directly overhead.

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

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 623 MSL feet. The runway elevation is 635 MSL at the east end of the runway. The site is outside the approach surface and in order to exceed obstruction standards a structure would need to exceed approximately 133 feet in height. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern with this project. Instrument approaches are near the parcel, and this site can expect overflight from aircraft entering the approaches.

#### Noise:

1991 Report: The site is outside the 65 CNEL contour developed for the airport in 1991, and likely to be within the 55 CNEL. Page 2-3 of the report discusses these concerns and discusses **prohibiting** residential development within the 60 and 55 CNEL where overflights are conducted, particularly where flights are below 500 feet above ground level.

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

### **CONDITIONS:**

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. Proposals for subsequent development of the site 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 notice regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser.*

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

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

J. CH-03-110 – Albert Webb Associates – Consent item see page 3

**CASE NUMBER:** CH-03-110 – Albert A. Webb Associates  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Change of Zone 6863 and Tract Map 31725

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Change of Zone (A-2-10 to R-1) and a Tract Map for 127 single family residential lots on approximately 40.61 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is situated at the southeast intersection of Harrison Avenue and 65<sup>th</sup> Street within the County of Riverside, approximately 12,500 – 13,600 ft. east of Runway 26L at Chino Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport:* Chino Airport (County of San Bernardino)  
a. *Airport Influence Area:* Within Area of Influence Study Area

- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area
- c. Noise Levels: See Below

**BACKGROUND:**

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

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

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 12,500 – 13,600 feet east of Runway 26L. The touch and go flight tracks are overhead to the west and the straight in flight track is directly overhead.

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

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 630 MSL feet. The runway elevation is 635 MSL at the east end of the runway. The site is outside the approach surface and in order to exceed obstruction standards a structure would need to exceed approximately 130 feet in height. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern with this project. Instrument approaches are near the parcel, and this site can expect overflight from aircraft entering the approaches.

Noise:

1991 Report: The site is outside the 65 CNEL contour developed for the airport in 1991, and likely to be within the 55 CNEL. Page 2-3 of the report discusses these concerns and discusses **prohibiting** residential development within the 60 and 55 CNEL where overflights are conducted, particularly where flights are below 500 feet above ground level.

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

**CONDITIONS:**

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.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky or above the horizontal plane.
4. Proposals for subsequent development of the site shall be reviewed by ALUC until such time that a CLUP is adopted for the Airport by RCALUC.
5. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - (b) 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.*
- 6. *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
  - 7. *The attached notice regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser.*

**RECOMMENDATION:**

*Staff recommends a finding of consistency of this project subject to the conditions noted above. The project can be approved based upon the following, as identified in Section 21675.1 of the California Public Utilities Code (PUC).*

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

**HEMET/RYAN AIRPORT**

**10:00 A.M.**

- K. HR-03-111 – KB Homes – Consent item see page 3

**CASE NUMBER:** HR-03-111-KB Homes  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Hemet  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Change of Zone 03-31 and TM 30560

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Change of Zone from A-I-C and A-2-C to R-1 and OS for Tract Map 30560.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is situated south of Eaton, west of Sanderson Ave., east of Cawston Ave., within the City of Hemet, approximately 10,300 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 10,300 feet north of Runway 5-23. The portion of the proposed site located north 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-1-C and A-2-C to R-1 and OS for a tract with 196 residential lots. Area III has no population density limits assigned to it.*

**NOISE:** *The site is underlying general traffic patterns for sailplane approaches and will experience some 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 1,524 MSL. Structures exceeding 1,625 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. *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 given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*
5. *Structures exceeding 1,625 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.*

The administrative items were postponed to the next schedule meeting.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

- A. Draft Plan Airport Plan
- B. MOATF Committee September 22<sup>nd</sup> and October 8<sup>th</sup> Resolution of Support
- C. Meeting Date – See 2003/04 Calendar
- D. AB332

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

VIII. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

- IX. Adjournment: Chairman Stephens adjourned the meeting at 12:55 P.M.  
NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: February 19, 2004 at 9:00 a.m.,  
Riverside