

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

Riverside County Administration Center
4080 Lemon St., Hearing Room (1st Floor)
Riverside, California

THURSDAY, November 18, 2004
9:00 A.M.

MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on November 18, 2004 at the Riverside County Administration Center, Board Room.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Ric Stephens, Chairman
Dave Hogan, Vice Chairman
Jon Goldenbaum
Simon Housman
Marge Tandy
Mark Lightsey
Arthur Butler

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Sam Pratt

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Jiyang Hou
Leroy Edwards
John Lyon
Ray Borel
Mark Kranenburg
John Guerin
Manuel Canchola
Mike Smith
Michael Harrod

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Chairman Stephens.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken.
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR: August 12, 2004 and September 16, 2004.

August 12, 2004: Keith Downs indicated that at the hearing Mr. Brilliant requested including his package that was distributed to the Commissioners to be included in the minutes. The minutes only make reference to the package, but due to having a hard copy it would only be included as a hard copy to be viewed in person.

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

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

September 16, 2004: Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners, hearing no response he called for motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Goldenbaum made a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion.

ABSTAINED: Commissioner Tandy.

V. OLD BUSINESS

BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT

9:00 A.M.

A. BD-04-107 – Robert H. Ricciardi – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: BD-04-107 – Robert H. Ricciardi

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Plot Plan 19257

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A plot plan for a 8,172 sq. ft. industrial building on .758 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located east of Adams Street, south of Country Club Drive in the County of Riverside, immediately north of the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

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

- a. Airport Influence Area: Area II*
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area*
- c. Noise Levels: 70 dB CNEL (2003 Noise Data: Mead and Hunt)*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 100 to 150 feet north of the runway and is within Areas I (Approach Surface) and II (Area of Significant Safety Concern) of the current Airport Influence Area. The Approach Surface shall be kept free of all high-risk land uses, such as places of assembly, high patronage services, large retail outlets, residential uses, critical facilities and flammable products. Agricultural, industrial and commercial uses are acceptable in Area II. The proposed industrial use is an acceptable use subject to certain constraints.

NOISE: *The proposal is within 70 CNEL as indicated by the 2003 Existing Noise Impacts Data*

for Bermuda Dunes Airport prepared by Mead and Hunt. The industrial use is acceptable in that noise category if noise reduction measures are utilized for any office portion of the building. That may require more than normal construction, which only attenuates about 20dB.

HEIGHT: Part 77 approach profiles are shown on the attached exhibit and overlie the property. The runway elevation is 73 feet. The highest elevation on the proposed site is 71.54 MSL at the southwest corner. **The height of the proposed structure is 24 feet. An application for an FAA 7460 review of the proposed building has been submitted by the applicant to the FAA. As of the date of this staff report (9/07/04), an FAA 7460 review has not been received.**

Draft Plan: The draft plan designates the site to be within Zones A and B2 and within the 55 CNEL contour. The proposed use is a compatible use under the draft plan subject to certain constraints.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend that the proposal be continued to the December 9, 2004 ALUC meeting in order to receive the FAA 7460 review.

CONDITIONS:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act and prior to recordation of the map, whichever is first.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portion of any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).
4. The following uses are prohibited at this site:
 - A. High Concentration of People
 1. Places of Assembly: Auditoriums; churches; schools, carnivals; drive-in theaters.
 2. High Patronage Services: Bowling alleys; restaurants; theaters; motels; banks; etc.
 3. Large Retail Outlets: Department stores; supermarkets; drug stores; etc.
 4. Residential Uses.
 - B. Critical Facilities: Telephone exchanges; radio/television studios; hospitals; etc.
 - C. Flammable Products: Bulk fuel storage; gasoline and liquid petroleum service stations; manufacture of plastics; breweries; feed and flour mills; etc.
5. The establishment of new land uses involving, as a primary activity, the manufacture, storage, or distribution of explosives or flammable materials are prohibited in this area.
6. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight

final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.

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

7. *Any subsequent permit shall require an ALUC review.*

8. *The buildings in this project shall have an active FAA 7460 review at the time of construction and shall not exceed obstruction standards. Structures shall be lighted as per FAA Advisory Circular 70/7460-1K.*

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

Beverly Coleman indicated this being a continued item pending a 7460 review. The FAA has requested additional information and the applicant's engineer has submitted that information on November 16th. Staff recommends a continuance to allow the FAA to review the submitted information.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners for staff. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens called for the applicant to come forward and present the case, hearing no reply Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no responds he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Housman made a motion to continue the item to the next scheduled hearing. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE

9:00 A.M.

- B. MA-04-144 – Pinnacle Real Estate Holdings, Inc. – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-144 (revision to MA-02-145) Travel Zone
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: CUP 3370

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Conditional Use Permit for a full service travel stop with retail on approximately 11.5 acres and a sign 70' high.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated south of Cajalco Road and west of Harvill Ave., within the County of Riverside, approximately 9,000 ft. south of the south end of RWY 14/32 March Air Reserve Base.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area

b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area II

c. Noise Levels: See Below

BACKGROUND:

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

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

In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The current 98/99 Draft CLUP 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 three 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. Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
4. Draft 2004 ALUCP

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 9,000 feet south of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for a Conditional Use Permit on 11.5 acres. The proposed use includes a truck stop with retail. The proposal is near one flight track and within the conical surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B.

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, the type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II, which allows commercial and industrial land use with a few restrictions. Industrial uses are allowed subject to certain constraints. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The proposed site is 11.5 acres (net). The proposal includes 31,789 sq. ft of buildings and about 54,000 sq. ft. of canopies on 11.5 acres. The structural coverage for the structure will be less than 22%.

Part 77: The elevation at the site is approximately 1,509-1,525 feet. The height of the tallest building is 22.5 ft. The runway end is at 1488MSL and any structures over 1,578 MSL feet in

elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. The sign will be over that elevation Part 77 obstruction criteria are a concern with this project.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the noise level at the property to be less 55 CNEL. Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise level was as high as 60CNEL. The proposed use is not a noise sensitive use.

CONDITIONS:

1. Prior to project development or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport. (Tel.909- 656-7000)
2. An FAA Part 77 review shall be accomplished and any conditions required shall be met.
3. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
4. The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.

RECOMMENDATION: October 14, Staff recommended a continuance until the FAA review is complete.

November 18, 2004: The FAA review is not complete and the case must be continued until December 9, 2005.

Keith Downs requested a continuance pending a 7460 review. Applicant has indicated the request has been submitted to the FAA and has not received a response as to date.

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

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Goldenbaum made a motion to continue the item to the next schedule hearing. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Regional

9:00 A.M.

- D. RG-04-100 and BA-04-100, CS-04-100, DC-04-100, FL-04-101, BD-04-108, BL-04-100, CO-04-100, FV-04-107, RI-02-127 and PS-100 – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: RG-04-100 and BA-04-100, CS-04-100, DC-04-100, FL-04-101, BD-04-108, BL-04-100, CO-04-100, FV-04-107, RI-02-127 and PS-100

APPROVING JURISDICTION: *Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

An update to the 1984 Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) and the subsequent Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUP) for public use airports in and affecting Riverside County. Jurisdictions affected are: the cities of Banning, Blythe, Corona, La Quinta, Murrieta, Norco, Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Indio, Coachella, Palm Springs, Riverside, Temecula and the County of Riverside and any special district within those Influence Areas.

PROJECT LOCATION:

All areas within the Draft Airport Influence Areas (see Map Attached). Affected Airports are: Banning, Bermuda, Blythe, Chino, Chiriaco Summit, Corona, Desert Center, Flabob, French Valley and Riverside.

BACKGROUND: *The ALUC contracted with the consulting firm of Mead and Hunt to prepare the ALUCP in June of 2002. The ALUC held a workshop for the plan in March in Indio and Riverside. The consultants have met with the affected airports and land use jurisdictions and obtained each of their general plan and zoning ordinances. Our consultant has reviewed the proposal against each of those plans and the review is attached. Staff has called the affected city planning departments in the last weeks.*

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

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends that; the ALUC continue to take testimony from the jurisdictions and the public, continue to hold the hearing open for any individual airport that the ALUC wishes, and CONTINUE those airports until the next meeting of October 14, 2004, direct staff and the consultant to review any additional responses from the Cities and County, to respond to those comments, prepare resolutions for adoption and prepare the necessary revisions to the general provisions to implement the procedures outlined in the new plan.*

Response to Comments: *At the Hearing of August 12th there were comments given by a few individuals and some sent in since the hearing. Most of these involve the Initial Study sent out by the Riverside County for their Master Plan for Hemet/Ryan Airport. As you know the airport sponsor, such as a city or county, develop these plans and the ALUC reviews them for consistency. The attached letter has been sent to those senders informing them that they need to direct any further comments to the County. Their specific comments have been forwarded to the County EDA/Aviation.*

Comment: *Mr. William Brelliant, Documents submitted at hearing*

Response: *His comments are directed toward the Master Plan. His attorney had been told that earlier (See March 15, 2004 letter G. Salomens). The attached letter was sent to Mr. Brelliant.*

Comment: *City of Riverside letter August 27th asking for continuance until after September 28, 2004.*

Response: *The Riverside and Flabob should be continued until October 14, 2004.*

Comment: Flabob letter received August 17, 2004.

Response: All Airports were sent a copy of the Staff Report.

October 14, 2004, At the September 16th hearing there were three commenters and a request for a further continuance from the City of Riverside.

COMMENT: Mike Smith from Bermuda Dunes Airport desired some changes to the Influence Area and some zones and stated he would provide those comments to staff.

RESPONSE: No comments were received at this time.

COMMENT: Mr. William Devine an attorney representing the Borel family and Mr. Ray Borel in regards to the Borel Airpark Center requesting additional time to respond to the French Valley Airport.

RESPONSE: The item was continued to October 14th. No further information was received. I have attached the ALUC staff report, Minutes and approval letter from July 18, 1991. Additionally I have included a copy of relevant portions of the County approval from October 4, 1994.

City of Riverside: The City had requested another continuance. We were scheduled for a City Council Workshop for the 28th of September, but staff requested to meet with us in our office instead of the workshop with the City Council.

City of Palm Springs: Staff met with representatives of the City on the 28th of September. We had a productive meeting and expect further comments in the near future.

On October 4, 2004 we received the attached letter from the County Planning Director requesting additional time.

November 18, At the October 14 meeting requests for further continuances from the Cities of Riverside and Palm Springs and the County of Riverside and Mr. Borel. The Commission continued all of the plans and directed staff to notify the surrounding jurisdictions of the proposed expansion of the Influence Area by the Bermuda Dunes airport manager. The surrounding jurisdictions were notified and a readvertisement was made (see attached). Meetings with Mr. Borel, City of Riverside and the County of Riverside were held. The consultants have reviewed the letter from Palm Springs and the County of Riverside and the response is attached. An additional meeting to discuss specific concerns was scheduled with the City of Riverside staff on November 1. Your staff was scheduled for a presentation at the Technical Advisory Committee of the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG), but only a very short discussion ensued at the last few minutes of the meeting and no action was taken by that group due to a lack of a quorum.

IMPORTANT TO NOTE: As of this date none of the comments from any of the local jurisdictions or the public have indicated any corrections to the components in the Compatibility Maps for any of the Airports. The comments we have relate to the land use maps and not the factors from which they are derived.

October 29 from Riverside County TLMA: The consultant has addressed the policy concerns and the following addresses statements of information.

Page 1: Perris Valley and Skylark airports: These airports are not a part of the current effort and no funds are available for their inclusion.

Page 1: The new general plan RCIP: *In October of 2002, when the ALUC consultants were completing the first draft of the new ALUCP; the county submitted its general plan for ALUC review. The initial review indicated a great number of inconsistencies and the absence of many necessary components for consistency with the existing CLUP's or much less the newer handbooks of 1993 or 2002. The ALUC staff met with the county on numerous occasions and offered to have our consultant develop the necessary revisions to bring it into compliance. That method was rejected and the county proceeded with the consultant that developed the RCIP. We did amend our contract to allow Mead and Hunt to divert their time to reviewing the modified plans. This was funded by the application fees from the county. This also delayed our plan completion by 4-5 months. The format, timing and format of our new plan were available and known. It does not appear that the RCIP utilized the current 2002 Handbook for its EIR or airport land use planning. The Board of Supervisors, by a resolution adopted earlier this year has committed to include the new March ALUCP in their plan. That effort is expected to be completed this next year.*

Page 2: 1983 Handbook: *The new ALUCP is guided by the 2002 Handbook; the previous CLUPs from 1984 to 1998 were guided by the 1983 Handbook, while the 1974 Palm Springs version was guided only by the basic version of the state law. The newer zones are consistent with the 2002 Handbook and the 1993 handbook include most of the zones, concerns and differences expressed in the new plan i.e. side line zone and density restrictions.*

Existing Uses: *The new plan expands the definition of 'existing use' to include tentative maps. No plan includes that presently besides the exemption clause in FV and RAL. Existing lots of record can build homes on any lot zoned.*

Page 6: DNL and CNEL: *While the DNL is utilized by the FAA in other states, the CNEL is utilized in this state by statute and CEQA.*

Page 6: Hours of operations: *All airports in this plan are open 24 hours, seven days a week with the exception of Chiriaco Summit and Desert Center which currently have no lighting.*

Keith Downs indicated that at the previous meeting request for a continuance was made from Cities of Palm Springs and Riverside, Borel Air Park, County of Riverside and Bermuda Dunes Airport. Mr. Downs indicated that he has responded to those request as well as Mr. Brody.

Mr. Downs then indicated that meetings were held with cities of Palm Springs and Riverside, Mr. Borel, County of Riverside and Mr. Smith, Bermuda Dunes Airport manager. At the previous hearing the Commission approved to advertise a larger influence area for the Bermuda Dunes Airport. Copies of the advertisement and letters sent to the local jurisdictions have been distributed to the Commissioners. Mr. Smith is present and will testify as to the reason of the expansion. Out of all the comments received none have challenged the scientific and basis for any of the maps created. No errors have been found in the noise contours & Part 77 analysis and the safety zones are out of the Caltrans Handbook.

Mr. Downs referred to the TLMA letter dated October 20th clarifying some misunderstandings regarding the Perris and Skylark airports. These are two very small private airports and are not being changed due to insufficient funding. The 1984 plan will still apply to these two airports. There is also a misunderstanding regarding existing uses. Existing uses are exempt. There is no effect to existing uses. An infill policy has been created that allows up to 20 acres in certain circumstances in zones D, E and C. There is also a reference made in the letter regarding DNL, which is an FAA designation of Day Night Level used in 48 other states, but not in the state of California. In

California for CEQA, CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level) is used, which is an equivalent but slightly different it goes out further. Another reference made was hours of operations of two airports and those airports being closed during the night hours. Mr. Downs clarified that all airports are open 24 hours a day 7 days a week and the confusion can be hours of operations of the FBO's. Also, a reference regarding the new general plan, RCIP indicating that changes would need to be made. This is a known component two years ago when it was reviewed. The County of Riverside has already committed along with three other cities and March Joint Powers Authority (JPA) to adopt changes next year for the March JPA. Mr. Downs then indicated that a letter from Mr. Borel's attorney William Devine was received requesting a continuance for the French Valley Airport to the December 9th hearing. A voice mail from Doug Evans, City of Palm Springs was received although not clear it is assumed it's a request for continuance. County of Riverside, also requesting continuance. Mr. Downs then made him self available for any questions.

Ken Brody, Mead & Hunt came forward and briefly covered some of the response and comments.

In regard to exemptions the plan has been created not to include exemptions in regards to specific plans, although exceptions to site specific can be entertained. In regards to the different numbers for residential density and non-residential intensity is because there are two different set of factors. Residential development weights more towards noise where non-residential is more in the safety and risk side of the component. Other factors need to be taken into account in regards to the over flight concerns that indicate deed notices and easements should be sufficient. Mr. Brody then clarified on a comment made by County Planning in regards to open space. The comments suggest that the reason very low residential density is shown is simply to provide open space for emergency aircraft landings. Mr. Brody indicated that while it would serve that function the real purpose of low residential density is the usage intensity for other uses, as well as to limit the exposure of the public to risk and noise. City of Palm Springs requested for the infill policy to be relaxed to apply it to 40 acres (currently 20) and to reduce the bounding percentage for other areas to qualify for infill. Mr. Brody then indicated that 65% of a parcel must be bounded by similar uses in order for it to be considered infill. The areas for Palm Springs would not qualify for infill; the approach would be to look at whether there are specific areas to consider. Mr. Brody then made him self available for any questions.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners hearing no response Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience.

BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT

Mike Smith, Bermuda Dunes Airport Manager, came forward and indicated being pleased with the effort of the update of the plan. Mr. Smith indicated that his request is to extend the north and south boundaries of Zone "E" in an effort to minimize airport operations below pattern altitude over the residential areas to the north and south of the airport. The airport has adopted a VFR pattern procedure and it's a little different than the standard airport procedure because of the heavy residential area to the north and south, but very little residential to the east and west of the approach and departure into the runway. A pattern was prescribed that calls for maintaining pattern altitude on the down wind leg instead of descending on the down wind leg. In order to stay at altitude until one makes a turn to land on the base leg approach and final approach its

maintaining pattern altitude on the down wind leg. What that does in some cases in particular in higher performance airplanes like jets it necessitates flying a wider pattern. What is actually happening the aircraft are flying to the north traffic pattern for runway 1-0, which is active about 30% of the time. To the south 70% is the prevailing traffic pattern for use of runway 2-8. Because the aircrafts are already flying over the areas slightly over the proposed land use area, we felt it was important to include the additional area in the plan to closely represent what's actually happening in the traffic pattern.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for question from the Commissioner. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no response Chairman Stephens called for a motion to be set in regards to the requested expansion.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Goldenbaum made a motion to accept the expansion of Zone "E". Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Michael Harrod, Riverside County Planning, came forward and indicated that airports of concerned are the French Valley, Bermuda Dunes and Flabob. Mr. Harrod then indicated that a chart of the affected areas has been distributed to the Commissioners for their review and consideration.

John Guerin, Riverside County Planning, came forward recommended that Zone "D" be a lower residential intensity for the affected portions indicated on the chart distributed by Mr. Harrod. Mr. Guerin then indicated having no objection for the expansion requested for the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

***CONSENT ITEMS:**

Keith Downs opened the consent items schedule for 10:00 a.m.

Keith Downs indicated that the consent items would be voted for consistency unless any of the Commissioners or any one from the audience has questions on an item. The item will be pulled and addressed separately, otherwise it will be voted as one and no further discussion will be made.

Consent items; MA-04-148 Canyon Springs Market Place, MA-04-149 IW Consulting Engineers Inc., MA-04-150 CSL Engineering, MA-04-151 Trip Hord Associates, MA-04-152 Riverside County, FV-04-109 Morgan Keith, HR-04-107 Herron Rumansoff, RI-04-131 Canty Engineering, and Continuance for FL-04-103 Emerald Meadows.

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

ACTION TAKEN: Vice Chairman Hogan made a motion of consistency for the consent items and continuance for FL-04-103. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion.

ABSTAINED: Chairman Stephens for item FV-04-109.

CONTINUE REGIONAL

PALM SPRINGS AIRPORT

Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no reply he opened the following airport.

RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL

Mark Kranenburg, Riverside Municipal Airport Director, came forward requesting a continuance due to additional work still pending with the City of Riverside.

FLABOB AIRPORT

Harry Tancredi, Mastercraft Homes, came forward and voiced his concerns regarding the 750' distance from the center line runway. Mr. Tancredi indicated that the Caltrans document mentions that the distance from the center line runway for short general aviation runways less than 4,000' (Flabob being approximately 3,100') is 500'. Mr. Tancredi then requested that the distance be changed from 750' to 500'.

Chairman Stephens indicated that the Caltrans document is only guidelines and it is not something that can be used as a template for all airports, since each airport is different.

Ken Brody indicated that the state handbook diagram referred to, specifically has to do with safety. In developing the zones, noise, safety and airspace protection were combined, that was the rationale for the wider zones. The reason the B2 boundary is drawn at 750' is because it matches the 60 CNEL contour. Given the direction set within the compatibility plan of avoiding new residential within the 60 CNEL contour. Some of the other airports are being reviewed for some adjustments lateral to the runway, especially in areas where residential is not really contemplated and other levels that might be appropriate. The Flabob Airport's 60 CNEL contour would still be the driving factor making it the appropriate noise contour for an airport and community of this type.

Commissioner Goldenbaum indicated that a couple of months ago Mr. Tancredi's proposal came before the Commission and it was found inconsistent due to the issue of the 500' vs 750'. Flabob Airport and Mr. Tancredi came to a compromise to have a buffer zone within the contested area 500' vs 750' of large lots for taxi homes. Both the airport and developer believed it was a good idea. However, the lot line in this case appears to be impeding a good compromise between both the airport and the developer. There are cases where in trying to do the right thing we may whined up doing something that makes it more difficult for the proper development of that airport and hurt a very good compromise that was in the works.

John Lyon came forward and indicated that Mr. Tancredi and his group have been very cooperative and sensitive to the airport's needs. When the compromise took place they were under the same impression that the boundary of the sideline area would be 500'. Mr. Lyon then indicated that the airport would support moving the sideline area on the south side to 500' subject to the usual conditions. Commissioner Goldenbaum inquired to Mr. Lyon if he would support moving the southern line to 500' specifically and only for Flabob Airport. Mr. Lyon responded positively. Commissioner Goldenbaum made a motion for the Commissioner to consider changing the southern line to 500'. Chairman Stephens clarified this meeting being for the purpose of obtaining support and adjustment to the draft plan. Commissioner Housman indicated that when the effort

began in creating the plan he had mentioned to have some mechanism to address a case, which is specifically airport compatible. This compromise as Commissioner Goldenbaum pointed out is airport compatible it is a piece of a property now part of the airport's community.

Chairman Stephens requested that staff and consultant create the language for a motion for this particular airport. Commissioners concurred.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Housman made a motion to direct staff to revise the plan for Flabob in a manner consistent for the type of compromised mentioned and be brought back to the Commission for review and to take such action as necessary. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT:

Ray Borel, Air Park Center came forward and requested continuance. A letter has also been sent to the Commission and Counsel from his attorney William Devine indicating the reason for the request. Mr. Borel then requested exemption due to a prior approved Specific Plan.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioner. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no reply Chairman Stephens indicated that due to funding being exhausted the Compatibility Plan must be adopted soon. Chairman Stephens then indicated that an amendment to the plan is allowed once per calendar year. Vice Chairman Hogan indicated closing the hearing for French Valley, Flabob and Bermuda Dunes. Chairman Stephens clarified to Mr. Borel that by adopting French Valley Airport it would provide him with sufficient time to address issues through the amendment process.

Chairman Stephens called for a motion to be set for each individual airport.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Housman made a motion to close public hearing for the Bermuda Dunes Airport. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Housman made a motion to close public hearing for the Flabob Airport. Commissioner Hogan seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

ACTION TAKEN: Vice Chairman Hogan made a motion to close public hearing for the French Valley Airport. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Housman made a motion for staff to prepare a resolution for the ALUCP for Flabob Airport and be brought back to the Commissioners for review. Vice Chairman Hogan seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Housman made a motion to adopt the resolution for the ALUCP for Bermuda Dunes Airport as per exhibit date November 18th. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

A discussion ensued between the Commissioners regarding exemptions for Specific Plans. Vice Chairman Hogan explained that an exemption exempts projects from coming to the ALUC for review and just about anything can be done.

Commissioner Housman inquired if this Commission could grant an exemption for Mr. Borel's Specific Plan for the French Valley Airport.

Ken Brody responded that the approach was not to include this type of blanket of exemptions to the plan. The approach is to narrowly define site-specific exceptions where necessary. Keith Downs inquired if language could be brought back to the Commission for review regarding exceptions not exemptions. Commissioner Housman concurred. Counsel B.T. Miller indicated that blanket exemptions exposes the Commission to liability and the benefits of not carrying it over it forces the Commission to deal with things on a more pragmatic specific basis.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Housman made a motion for staff to prepare a site specific language not with exemptions for French Valley Airport and be brought back for the Commissioners for review. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Housman made a motion for continuance for the Riverside and Palm Springs Airports. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Housman inquired if there would be three or five units per acre on the "D" Zones. Mr. Downs responded that no changes could be made at this point since there are only two airports open. Ken Brody inquired to the Commission if the five units per acre will remain as drafted for the Bermuda Dunes Airport. The Commissioners concurred.

NEW BUSINESS

MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE

10:00 A.M.

A. MA-04-148 – Canyon Springs Market Place – Consent item see above

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-148–Canyon Springs Marketplace
APPROVING JURISDICTION: *City of Riverside*
JURISDICTION CASE NO: *Parcel Map P04-1213, Plot Plan P04-1068*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A 72,565 sq. ft. industrial building complex consisting of five buildings on 5.15 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is east of Rivercrest Drive and west of I-215 within the City of Riverside, approximately 16,800 feet northwest of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence 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 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 98/99 Draft CLUP efforts were prepared utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the superceded 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

We will utilize four 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 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004
4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 16,800 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The proposal is under or near a major approach and departure track. The proposal is for a 72,565 sq. ft. industrial building complex consisting of five buildings on 5.15 acres. Specific information on the proposed uses at the complex is currently unknown. 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 II. Industrial uses are allowed in Area II subject to certain constraints. The proposed land division is consistent contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The area of the proposed structures is 72,565 sq. ft., which is approximately 32% of the gross area.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is approximately 1,547 MSL feet and the height of the tallest structure is 31 ft. The runway elevation at the north end is 1,535 MSL. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 1,988 MSL feet in elevation. 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. Previous AICUZ reports indicated the property to be between 65 and 70 CNEL.

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

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 avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.*
2. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any office portions of the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
3. *Lighting plans for any additional development on the vacant lots shall be reviewed and approved by an airport lighting consultant or MARB/MIP prior to placement.*
4. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - (a) *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
 - (b) *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
 - (c) *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
 - (d) *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
5. *The above ground storage of explosive or flammable materials is prohibited.*
6. *The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.*

B. MA-04-149 – IW Consulting Engineers Inc. – Consent item see page 11

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-149 IW Consulting
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: PM 33064

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A parcel map to subdivide a 3.63-acre parcel into two residential lots.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located southeast of Raeburn Drive, within the City of Riverside, approximately 34,000 ft. west 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 ALUCP for Riverside County
4. Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposal is to subdivide a 3.63-acre lot into two residential lots. The proposed site is located approximately 34,000 ft. west of Runway 14/32. The proposal is 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 residential land use subject to certain constraints. 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 area is approximately 2.27 acres (net) for Parcel 1. The area of the structures is unknown, however, structural coverage is expected to be less than 20% of the net area.

Part 77: The finished floor elevation of the structure is approximately 1,034 MSL feet and the height of the structure is approximately 35 ft. The horizontal surface elevation is 2,088 MSL and the runway elevation is 1535 MSL at the north end. 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 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 all prospective buyers or tenants.*

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

C. MA-04-150 – CSL Engineering – Consent item see page 11

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-150 CSL Engineering
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Tentative Tract Map 31687

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Tentative Tract Map for 133 single-family residential lots on 40.17 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated north of Mapes Road and east of Trade Winds Avenue within the County of Riverside, approximately 48,000 feet southeast of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

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

BACKGROUND:

Staff utilized four resources for review:

1. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986

2. *Current Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
3. *Draft Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004*
4. *Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 48,000 feet southeast of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for 133 single-family residential lots on 40.17 acres. The existing site is vacant and zoned for residential uses. The proposal is under the major flight track and within the outer horizontal surface.*

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

Density and Coverage: *No structures are currently proposed, however, structural coverage is expected to be less than 20% of the net area.*

Part 77: *The highest elevation at this site is approximately 1,490 MSL feet. The runway elevation is 1488 MSL at the south end. The height of the structures is unknown at this time, but likely to be less than 35 feet. Any structures over 1968 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Any structures over 2088 MSL feet in elevation would be an obstruction. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.*

Noise: *The site has been shown to have noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be inside the 55 CNEL.*

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

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. *Provide Avigation Easements to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act. (909) 656-7000*
2. *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 measures to assure that no lights are above the horizontal plane.*
4. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - a. *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
 - b. *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
 - c. *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor, or which would attract*

large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.

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

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

D. MA-04-151 – Trip Hord Associates – Consent item see page 11

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-151 Trip Hord Associates
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Plot Plan 19728, Changer of Zone 7040

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A change of Zone from R-A-1 to MSC and a plot plan for 4,900 sq. ft. of offices for an equipment storage yard on 5 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated west of Patterson Ave., and south of Cajalco Road within the County of Riverside, approximately 11,000 ft. south of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area II
c. Noise Levels: See Below

BACKGROUND:

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

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

In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The current 98/99 Draft CLUP efforts were 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 ALUCP 2004
4. Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposal is for a contractor's storage yard on 5 acres. The proposed site is located approximately 11,000 ft. south of Runway 14/32. The proposal is near a major flight track and within the conical surface.

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

Density and Coverage: The area of the proposed structures is approximately 5,000 sq. ft. The lot area is approximately 4.85 acres (net). Structural coverage will be less than 3% of the net area.

Part 77: The finished floor elevation of the building is 1,527 MSL feet and the height of the structure is unknown but less than 35 ft. The runway elevation is 1,488 MSL. Any structures over 1,598 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the noise level at the property to be outside 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 above ground storage of explosive or flammable materials is prohibited.

6. *The attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.*
7. *Structures exceeding 1,598 MSL feet in elevation shall require FAA 7460 review.*

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

E. MA-04-152 – Riverside County – Consent item see page 11

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-152 Riverside County
APPROVING JURISDICTION: *County of Riverside*
JURISDICTION CASE NO: *GPA 716*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A General Plan Amendment changing land use designation on four parcels from Commercial Retail, Open Space-Recreation and Light Industrial to Light Industrial and Public Facilities on 71.36 acres. and to create a new category of Closed Landfill Overlay.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated south of Martin St., north of Nuevo Road and west of I-215 within the County of Riverside, approximately 9,000-18,000 ft. south and west of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

- a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area*
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area II 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.

An effort to update the plan has begun and is expected to be completed next year after the AICUZ is adopted.

Since we have not adopted the CLUP for MARB, we will utilize four 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 ALUCP: 2004*
- 4. Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposal is on four parcels on 71.36 acres. The proposed site is located approximately 9,000-18,000 ft. south and west of Runway 14/32. The proposals are within the conical and outer horizontal surface.

Project Description:

Amend the Mead Valley Area Plan as follows:

- (1) Amend the land use designation of a 15.79-acre property located easterly of Harvill Avenue, northerly of "A" Street, and westerly of Interstate 215 from Commercial Retail on the easterly portion and Light Industrial on the westerly portion to Light Industrial for the entire parcel, as shown on Exhibit MV-1.
- (2) Amend the land use designation of a 13.53-acre area consisting of four Assessor's parcels owned by the Metropolitan Water District and located northerly of Rider Street, southerly of Cajalco Road, easterly of Seaton Avenue, and westerly of Interstate 215 from Open Space - Recreation to Public Facilities, as shown on Exhibit MV-2.
- (3) Amend the land use designation of a 28.08-acre area consisting of two Assessor's parcels owned by the Metropolitan Water District and located southerly of Cajalco Road, easterly of Day Street, and westerly of Seaton Avenue from Very Low Density Residential - Rural Community (one dwelling unit per acre) to Public Facilities, as shown on Exhibit MV-3.
- (4) Amend the land use designation of a 13.96-acre property located northerly of Cajalco Road and easterly of Clark Street from Low Density Residential - Rural Community (two dwelling units per acre) to Commercial Retail, as shown on Exhibit MV-4.

(Countywide Policy Amendment)

Amend the Riverside County General Plan by adding a new overlay designation, Closed Landfill Overlay. The Closed Landfill Overlay differs from the Community Center Overlay and the Rural Village Overlay in that it does not provide additional options for development; instead, it relates to a site characteristic that may serve as a constraint to development. The Closed Landfill Overlay is proposed to be applied to closed landfill, waste disposal, and "burn" (former incineration) sites in order to ensure that the landowners and any future land users are aware that the sites were used for waste disposal in the past. The sites initially being proposed for this overlay are entirely outside Airport Influence Areas, but the overlay could potentially be applied to applicable sites within Airport Influence Areas. The overlay is intended primarily as an identifier. Applicable policies would require consultation with the Riverside County Waste Management Department in the processing of any development applications.

Items 1 through 4

All Sites Together

1. Thomas Bros. Map Page and Coordinates: [2002 Thomas Guide] Page 776, J-2 and J-3, and Page 777, A-2, A-3, B-3, C-3, D-3, E-3, and F-7
2. Address of Project: All of the parcels are vacant except for Assessor's Parcel Number 317-150-041, which has an address of 19765 Patterson Avenue, Perris CA 92570
3. Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 305-180-036; 317-140-041; 317-150-041; 317-170-029; 317-170-030; 317-060-042; 317-080-030; 318-100-011
4. Highest Elevation above sea level on project site: 1696 feet

Breakdown by Site:

Exhibit MV-1

1. Thomas Bros. Map Page and Coordinates: [2002 Thomas Guide] Page 777, F-7
2. Address of Project: None
3. Assessor's Parcel Number: 305-180-036
4. Highest Elevation above sea level on project site: 1483 feet

Exhibit MV-2

1. Thomas Bros. Map Page and Coordinates: [2002 Thomas Guide] Page 777, C-3, D-3, & E-3
2. Address of Project: 19765 Patterson Avenue, Perris CA 92570 (on APN 317-150-041)
3. Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 317-140-041; 317-150-041; 317-170-029; 317-170-030
4. Highest Elevation above sea level on project site: 1549 feet

Exhibit MV-3

1. Thomas Bros. Map Page and Coordinates: [2002 Thomas Guide] Page 777, A-3, B-3, & C-3
2. Address of Project: None
3. Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 317-060-042; 317-080-030
4. Highest Elevation above sea level on project site: 1696 feet

Exhibit MV-4

1. Thomas Bros. Map Page and Coordinates: [2002 Thomas Guide] Page 776, J-2 & J-3, and Page 777, A-2 & A-3
2. Address of Project: None
3. Assessor's Parcel Number: 318-100-011
4. Highest Elevation above sea level on project site: 1670 feet

Specific Changes: 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 sites are located in Area II and III, which allows industrial land use. The Public Facilities located at these sites (MV-2 and 3) are part of the MWD aqueduct feeding Lake Mathews. Commercial and Industrial Uses are allowed in Zone III with no restriction and the small portion of MV-4 is in Area II. High Risk land uses (see appendix B) are discouraged in Area II.

Overlay category: The creation of an overly category would not be inconsistent with any land use plan assuming the land use is not a wildlife attractant. The proposed land use designations and changes would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Part 77: Any structures exceeding the Part 77 notification procedure criteria will require an FAA 7460 review. This could involved structures from 90 to 180 feet in height over the runway elevation Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with the project at this time.

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 on portions of the property to be over 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 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 notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential tenant or buyer.*

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

FLABOB AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

- F. FL-04-103 Emerald Meadows Ranch – Continued item see page 11

CASE NUMBER: FL-04-103 – Emerald Meadows Ranch
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Specific Plan 337, Change of Zone 6893 and GPA 679

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a mixed-use Specific Plan to include 20.4 acres of retail/commercial, 1,239 residential units along with parks, school and church facilities on 278.45 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located west of the Santa Ana River and south of SR 60 in the County of Riverside, from approximately 3,600 to 7,900 feet northeast of Runway 9-24 at Flabob Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Flabob Airport
Land Use Policy: ALUP adopted March 30, 1984

- a. *Airport Influence Area:* Zone III
- b. *Land Use Policy:* Influence Area
- c. *Noise Levels:* Outside 60 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 3,600 to 7,900 ft. northeast of Runway 9-24. The southern half of the proposed site is located within Area III of the adopted Flabob Airport Influence Area. The project is a mixed-use Specific Plan to include 1,239 residential units and 20.4 acres of retail/commercial uses, along with parks, elementary school and church facility on approximately 278.45 acres. Most of the commercial area (Planning Area 17) and approximately 2/3 of the proposed elementary school site (Planning Area 4) falls within Area III. The proposed church site (Planning Area 1) is located outside of Area III. The General Plan Amendment proposes to change the site's General Plan land use designation from Light Industrial, Medium High Density Residential, Recreation, Commercial Retail, Water, and Very High Density Residential to Medium, Medium-High, High and Very-High Density Residential, along with Commercial Retail. The Change of Zone proposes to change the zoning classification from A-1 (Light Agricultural), R-2A (Limited Multiple Family Dwellings), R-1 (One-Family Dwellings), R-2 (Multiple-Family Dwellings), M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial), C-1/C-P (General Commercial), and R-3 (General Residential), to SP (Specific Plan). The specific pattern of development and configuration of the homes are not depicted at this time. Area III has no population limits assigned to it, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% of the net lot.

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

Part 77: The elevation on the proposed site varies from 780 to 825 MSL and the height of proposed structures is currently unknown. The site is within the horizontal surface and the runway elevation is 765MSL at the east end. An FAA 7460 review will be required for any structure of a height that would exceed a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway. At a distance of approximately 3,600 ft. from the east end of the runway to the western boundary of Planning Areas 7 and 9, a structure height of 801 MSL would require FAA 7460 review.

DRAFT 2004 ALUCP: The proposal is within Zones D and E. Zone D allows a residential density greater than or equal to 5 du/acre or less than .2 du/acre. The proposed planning areas include medium density (4.8 du/ac), medium-high density (5.5 du/ac), high density (12 du/ac.), and very high density (20 du/ac.) residential uses located within Zone D. The total proposed residential density is 6.8 du/ac.

The proposed elementary school and Planning Area 4 is located within Zone D. The proposed church facility (Planning Area 1) is located primarily within Zone E, although the westerly portion may fall within Zone D. Zone E has no density restrictions and Zone D allows 90% lot coverage and an average density of 100 persons per acre. The entire project is outside the 55CNEL. Information on the proposed density within the commercial area, church facility or elementary school is currently unknown.

Conclusion: The Land Use Plan for Specific Plan 337, along with Change of Zone 6893 and General Plan Amendment 679 appear to be generally consistent with the Flabob Airport CLUP, however, certain changes and additions to the text and graphics of the Specific Plan and Environmental Analysis are necessary. The necessary changes and additions are listed in Appendix A to this Staff Report. In addition, a review and comment on the proposal by Cal Trans Aeronautics and the airport operator is required.

CONDITIONS:

1. Provide Avigation Easements for the entire proposed development to FLABOB Airport ((951) 683-2309) prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act and prior to recordation of the map, whichever is first (909) 683-2309.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.

3. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. All lighting plans should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.*
4. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - a. *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
 - b. *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
 - c. *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
 - d. *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
5. *The attached Notice of Airport in Vicinity shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*
6. *The Specific Plan and Environmental Analysis shall be modified in content and graphics as indicated on the attached Appendix A.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends a CONTINUANCE in order to obtain comments from the airport operator, Caltrans Aeronautics and to obtain and review the required additional text and information identified in Appendix A.*

APPENDIX A

The following shall be incorporated into the text and exhibits for Specific Plan 337 and the Environmental Analysis:

1. *Provide a detail of the proposed density within the commercial area and church, along with the number of proposed children at the elementary school.*
2. *Provide a Jurupa Area Plan exhibit showing the Airport Influence Area (See Figure 5 of Jurupa Area Plan – Riverside Municipal Airport and Flabob Airport Influence Policy Area)*
3. *Include in the Environmental Analysis an evaluation of the policies in the 2004 draft Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for Flabob Airport.*
4. *Use the 2003 Noise Data prepared by Mead and Hunt (attached) as the current CNEL noise contours for the airport in the noise analysis. Include a discussion of aircraft observed, wind direction and wind strength in the noise analysis.*

5. Policies 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3 of the Jurupa Area Plan apply to the southern portion of the project site, which lies within the Airport Influence Area for Flabob Airport. The Jurupa Area Plan Policy Analysis (Pg. V.A.-17) shall be corrected to reflect the applicability of these policies.
6. Include in the Environmental Analysis an evaluation of the impacts of safety and noise using the Cal Trans 2002 California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, pursuant to CEQA.
7. Incorporate Conditions 1 through 5 of the Staff Report, along with any other conditions approved by the ALUC.

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

- G. FV-04-109 – Morgan Keith – Consent item see page 11

CASE NUMBER: FV-04-109 AEI/CASC Consulting Voluntary Review
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: TM 29114-2
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Tract Map for 100 single-family residential lots and open space on 35 acres. This project was reviewed by the ALUC as part of Specific Plan 284 in August 1991(see attached).

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is west of Pourroy Road, north of Skyview Road and east of Winchester Road in the County of Riverside, approximately 11-12,000 ft. north of Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
 a. Airport Influence Area: Conical Surface
 b. Noise Levels: Outside of 55 CNEL for 2022

MAJOR ISSUES:

Background: *In 1991 the ALUC reviewed the Quinta Del Lago Specific Plan # 284 and approved that project consistent with the Interim Land Use Plan in use at the time which placed the project in Zones II and III. In 1997 the ALUC adopted the present plan which includes the project within the FAR 77 boundaries, but not the Safety Zones.*

Land Use: *The proposal is for 100 single-family residential lots on 35 acres.*

Part 77: *The highest elevation on the site is 1,383 MSL. The height of the tallest structure is 27 feet. The horizontal surface is at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,347 MSL at the north end. Structures exceeding 1,493 MSL in elevation will require FAA 7460 review.*

Noise: The site will get some over flight, but is outside of the current and near future 55 CNEL.

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 new draft plan places the area in Zone E, which would allow residential densities.*

HEMET RYAN AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

H. HR-04-107 – Herron Rumansoff – Consent item see page 11

CASE NUMBER: HR-04-107– Herron + Rumansoff Architects, Inc.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Hemet
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Change of Zone 04-12

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Change of Zone from M-2 to CM on approximately 10 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located west of Sanderson, north and south of Wentworth Drive, within the City of Hemet, approximately 2,600 ft. east of Runway 5-23 at 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 II, Area of High Risk
b. Noise Levels: Outside 55 CNEL, but subject to annoyance levels

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: The proposal is for a Change of Zone from M-2 to CM (Commercial Manufacturing) on approximately 10 acres. The proposed site will include a 35,510 sq. ft. commercial center to be located on approximately 2.75 acres north of Wentworth Drive. Based on information submitted by the applicant, no development is currently proposed south of Wentworth Drive. Specific uses at the proposed commercial center are currently unknown. Schools, institutional uses, places of assembly and hazardous material facilities are not permitted within Area II, and a discretionary review is required for commercial uses.

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

PART 77. The runway elevation is 1,512 MSL. The highest pad elevation on the site is approximately 1,524 MSL with a structure height of 28 ft. Structures exceeding 1,538 MSL at this location will require FAA Review. As of the date of this staff report (11/09/04), an application for review of the proposed structures had not been submitted by the applicant to the FAA. The applicant has been notified that an FAA 7460 Review is required.

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. A subsequent review of proposed commercial uses will be required to determine consistency of land use activity and population density.

CONCLUSION: The proposal as submitted is consistent with the Hemet Ryan Airport CLUP subject to the conditions of approval listed below.

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

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. Public and private schools, institutional uses, places of assembly and hazardous material facilities shall not be permitted in Area II.
4. Subsequent permits for all commercial uses at the proposed development and on the vacant portions of the site shall be reviewed by the ALUC (per Pg. 27 of Hemet-Ryan CLUP).
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 shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.
7. The applicant shall complete an FAA 7460 review for all structures over 1,538 MSL in height prior to issuance of building permits and implement any conditions required.

RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

I. RI-04-131 – Canty Engineering – Consent item see page 11

CASE NUMBER: RI-04-131 – Canty Engineering
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: CUP -040-0945

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A building addition to an existing temple.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 9292 Magnolia Avenue west of Everest Avenue within the City of Riverside, approximately 9,800 ft. south 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 ft. south of Runway 16-34 and. The proposal is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for 34,000 sq. ft. building addition to an existing temple. Structural coverage for the site, including existing and proposed structures is less than 30% of the net area. 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 the site is approximately 785 MSL feet and the height of the structure is approximately 42 feet. The site is under the horizontal surface at this location, which is approximately 966 MSL. The elevation at the west end of Runway 9-27 is 758 MSL. Part 77 obstruction criterion is not a concern.

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 ALUCP places the site within Zone E. Zone E allows up to 90% lot coverage.

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.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. ALUCP Meeting Schedule and Location

The Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport (JCRA) Master Plan was supposed to be schedule before the Board of Supervisor on November 30th, but the Clerk of the Board failed to advertise on time and it has been postponed to December 14th. A draft of the ALUCP for JCRA will be before the Commission on the February meeting.

The status for Chino Airport has not changed. Hemet Ryan Airport's situation is the same the Master Plan is not moving forward.

Funding is no different from the last time and the last two airports might need to acquire separate funding through another method.

B. MARB Status

MARB Plan has already scheduled meetings starting December 6th.

Copies have been distributed to the Commissioners of the minutes of the meeting when the Commissions' predecessors approved the current MARB. There have been testimonies at some of the meetings that certain jurisdictions attended the meeting but did not approve of the plan. The fact was that only two people attended the meeting back in 1986. City of Perris and Moreno Valley did not attend the meetings when the plan was adopted, but the information was forwarded to them.

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

None

IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Commissioner Tandy indicated this being her last meeting she would be attending and for the agenda packet to be forwarded to the City Hall and an alternate will be attending the next meeting.

X. Adjournment: Chairman Stephens adjourned the meeting at 12:45 P.M.

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: December 9, 2004 at 9:00 a.m., Riverside.